



1200 Wilmette Avenue
Wilmette, Illinois 60091-0040

MEETING MINUTES

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

WEDNESDAY, JULY 5, 2017

7:30 P.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Members Present: Chairman Patrick Duffy
John Kolleng
Michael Robke
Reinhard Schneider
Bob Surman
Christopher Tritsis

Members Absent: Mike Boyer

Staff Present: Lisa Roberts, Assistant Director of Community Development

I. Call to Order

Chairman Surman called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

II. 2017-Z-31 808 Linden Avenue

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

III. Approval of the June 7, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Kolleng moved to approve the June 7, 2017 meeting minutes.

Mr. Robke seconded the motion and the voice vote was all ayes and no nays. Motion carried.

IV. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

V. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Roberts
Assistant Director of Community Development

3.0 TESTIMONY, COMMENTS AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANTS

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

- 3.11 Mr. Gerald Callahan, representing the applicant
Freeborn and Peters
311 S. Wacker Drive, Chicago
- 3.12 Mr. Chris Wallace
522 Forest Avenue
- 3.13 Ms. Colleen Barrett, principal
St. Francis School
- 3.14 Father Sheridan
St. Francis Parish
- 3.15 Ms. Martina Stoycheva
Partners in Design Architects
- 3.16 Mr. Peter Lemmon
Kimley Horn

3.2 Summary of presentations

- 3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a special use for the expansion of a special use (educational facility, primary), a 7,652.2 square foot (10.9%) floor area variation, a 14.83' side yard setback variation, a 7.08' rear yard setback variation, a 2,280.0 square foot (40%) side yard impervious surface coverage variation, a 37.0' rear yard playground equipment setback variation, an 18.25' rear yard step setback variation, a 5.0' side yard parking space setback variation, and a variation to allow parking spaces to open directly upon an alley to permit the construction of a two-story addition on the legal non-conforming structure (St. Francis Xavier School). The Village Board will hear this case on July 25, 2017.
- 3.22 Chairman Duffy noted that there is another meeting for the case by the Appearance Review Board. That meeting is on July 10, 2017 at the Community Rec Center on Glenview Road.
- 3.23 Mr. Callahan said he is representing the applicant as well as the Catholic Bishop of Chicago. The latter is a corporation and was created by special act of the legislature in 1845. The Catholic Bishop of Chicago owns the property owned by the Archdiocese of Chicago.

The property is located at the northeast corner of 9th and Linden. The parish operates two school buildings on that site. One is to the west and was built in the early 1900s and the other was built in 1956 and is referred to as the east building. The east building is the subject of the hearing. This is the building that they are requesting expand. A portion of the building will be demolished and replaced with an addition.

There are two forms of zoning relief required. One is a special use for a primary educational facility and the other is a series of variations from the bulk standards in the zoning ordinance. The property is located in the R1H zoning district. Most of the property in this zoning classification is single family residential. There is one other school in this district, Baker Demonstration School.

At the meeting tonight is a parishioner, Chris Wallace, who has put in many hours on the project. He will present the history, the purpose of the addition, why it is needed and other details. Martina Stoycheva, from Partners in Design is also at the meeting. They are the project architect. Peter Lemmon with Kimley Horn, the transportation consultant who prepared the study. They are at the meeting to answer questions and will not make presentations.

- 3.24 Mr. Wallace said that his family are active parishioners. They have lived in the Village since 2004 with a brief stint overseas. He is the parent of six children, many of whom have gone to the school or are currently at the school. He thanked the Board for their time and talent. He thanked Ms. Roberts and Mr. Adler on the plans. He recognized Fr. Sheridan, pastor; Colleen Barrett, school principal; Mike Henn, co-chair of building and capital committee.

The taxpayers do what they can to sustain the facilities that make attributes critical for the Village and contribute to what it is today. It is incumbent on the residents to help with private facilities. They have invested the time and resources to improve attributes. St. Francis is growing and thriving. There are over 1,500 households that are registered parishioners. It is an active community. There are over 41 varied ministries. Over 920 are educated on the premises of St. Francis. 50% are in the full-time school, preschool to 8th grade and the other 50% are in the Sunday school program.

In 1904, they had the first mass celebration at the parish. In 1910, the school opened with 37 students. In 1922 the current church building was dedicated and built at 9th and Linden. In 1922 the west school building was built. That is referred to as the old school building. The new school building was built in 1955. It has been over 60 years that they have had significant reinvestment in the school plant or parish.

He showed slides that exhibited parishioner and household growth. Each chart is a 10-year look. There is a 25% parishioner/household growth with 1,574 parishioners. Over that same period of time the Village has had a relatively flat population base. The ministry has grown in the local community. Ten years ago, they had 35 ministries and today there are 41 ministries. Their prep program, which

is the Sunday school program, has 460 children, most of whom are from the Village. They have run out of space for this program which is why the number is not higher. The school has had remarkable growth, almost 70% growth in the past ten years. They are bursting at the seams in the current facilities with 466 full time students, preschool through 8th grade.

He showed the site within the neighborhood and described the buildings on site. He showed a view of pick up and drop off. It is well orchestrated. There are 60 preschoolers that are in classrooms north of the alley. There is a drop off process where they are going across the public alley. One objective is to get those 60 children into the main education facilities south of the alley and the proposed plan will accomplish that goal. Pick up and drop off is laid out in the traffic study.

He spoke about the exhaustive planning process. They have done a lot to make it as collaborative as possible. They have worked on the plans for two years. They have worked with parishioners, parents, children, Village staff, traffic specialists, neighbors and hired vendors. The goal was to get the best plan, which is the one that minimizes neighborhood impact while still delivering what they need from a physical facilities perspective. The plan is not perfect. They have gone through over 15 versions of the plan to get to the plan they are presenting this evening. The footprint is increasing by over 3,000 square feet while the net usable square footage is increasing by over 14,300 square feet. The latter square footage gets them what they need to meet the needs of current enrollment. They are not building for future growth. They have done what they can to limit footprint expansion and work within existing height limitations.

They are trying to use modern building materials, modern building practices and modern interior learning and community spaces. They are doing all this while trying to pay homage to the existing parish education buildings and being respectful of their neighbors. They tried to minimize destruction to the parish school, to parishioners and to the neighbors. They selected Bulley & Andrews to be the general contractor. There is a nine-month construction schedule that starts spring break 2018. They are trying to do a lot when students are not in school. They will do the interior fit out from September through December. Bulley & Andrews feels confident they can meet this schedule.

Why now for the expansion? Robust school enrollment and the diversity in school programming. They are up 70% in enrollment. They have children taking classes behind the stage in the gym. They need classrooms and flexible learning space. The gymnasium is a well utilized space. They will make that a proper middle school sized gym. Child safety and security are a key need for them. They have not had any accidents so far but it is time to act in these areas. They do not have a purpose-built library or cafeteria. They do not have enough classrooms for breakout sessions and tutoring. They are creating spaces for all those needs, but will be used for the broader parish and community for adult education and the ministries, as well as

parish-wide events. The gymnasium also has benefits from a community standpoint.

They think that the proposal benefits the parish and the school, as well as to the local community. High quality options for public and private schools are critical to a community that wants to have defendable home values. There are fiscal benefits to the proposal. The operational spending for a District 39 student is \$14,804 per student. If one looks at the operating spending for the students at St. Francis who are not preschoolers and residents of the Village, they will save \$4.7M annually in operating spending with children going to St. Francis instead of going to District 39.

They have had broad-based support for the project at the parish level. They have current pledges of more than \$6.3M. It is more than double what the parish has raised for any other capital campaigns. The last campaign was 13 to 14 years ago. The pledges came from over 280 donors and they are in active fundraising mode. Most of the students are from the Village or neighboring towns. Teachers are from Chicago or the suburbs. They are bringing people in and this is beneficial to the local business community.

He is not going to go through the site plan in detail. The Board has the site plan in their packet. He said that the first-floor plan is basic and efficient as well as flexible. The second-floor plan has four more classrooms on the west side, the library, media space, common atrium that goes from first to second floor and the gymnasium.

3.25 Mr. Schneider asked if the atrium was internal enclosed space.

He said that it is enclosed. They plan to enclose an existing courtyard.

3.26 Chairman Duffy asked about the footprint of that space because this counts for FAR.

He said information is contained in the variation table. They will provide specific square footage of that space in a few moments. The landscape plan is also before the Board as are elevations. They had a productive preliminary review discussion with the ARC. The elevations take feedback received into account. From a south perspective, not much is happening to the elevation. There is a ramp up and tie in from the existing limestone building that fronts Linden to the back new building that has a brick façade that matches the brick façade of the west building.

For the west elevation, the ARC asked that they fit more into the residential neighborhood and provide peaks to the roofline vs. a flat roof. They have now made changes to the west elevation. Windows on the top of the new building are classrooms. On the first floor is the new cafeteria, prep kitchen and administration offices. For the north elevation, they are within code for height and they are well inside the height of the current west school building. Regarding the east elevation,

one piece of feedback had to do with pitching the roof, provide more windows and more brick façade.

He showed renderings and views from various locations in the area. They have done a significant outreach process. Many residents signed letters of support for the project. Not everyone agreed to sign, but they did reach out to the immediate neighborhood. This does not count the over 285 donors.

- 3.27 Mr. Surman referenced the existing preschoolers use. What is the intention for that space after the addition is built?

He said that space would convert to community space for the parish.

- 3.28 Mr. Surman asked for an explanation of what spaces are and what the differences are between proposed and existing.

He said that the current gym is 60 years old, but the size of the school and parish continues to grow while the gym has not. There is no room for proper seating for athletic events or plays. The new gym will be middle-school sized. The school goes through 8th grade. There will be parish events held in the gym. The current gym is about 5,000 square feet and the new gym is about 7,700 square feet. They can subdivide the gym and have two classes going on at the same time. They cannot currently do this. They are building a retractable stage. The current stage is deep, but does not get used 98% of the year. They are not trying to go over the top with the addition. It will be privately funded. There is a high degree of focus on efficiency.

- 3.29 Mr. Schneider asked about the enrollment objective.

He said that he would ask the principal to add anything to his answer. Their objective is to have two homerooms/class objective. Their objective is not to grow the school.

- 3.30 Mr. Schneider asked if they would accept a limit on enrollment as part of the request.

The principal said that the objective is to have 23 students per class.

- 3.31 Chairman Duffy asked where that limit came from.

Ms. Barrett said they established that classroom cap about five years ago when the growth picked up. That number is the best size for them. They try to honor that.

- 3.32 Mr. Schneider clarified that they would not exceed the current 460 students.

Ms. Barrett said not every class is at 23 students.

- 3.33 Chairman Duffy clarified they are adding four classrooms.
- Mr. Wallace said they are adding a library which frees up an existing classroom that is a make do library so net they will get five additional classrooms.
- 3.34 Chairman Duffy noted that more classrooms provide the opportunity for more students.
- Ms. Barrett said that they are not planning on adding homeroom spaces. The new classrooms will further allow them to differentiate programming so they can remain competitive. Students will be broken down into match groups, fine arts electives and other things that public schools are already doing. They cannot do this now due to space limits.
- 3.35 Mr. Surman asked how many classrooms preschoolers would take.
- Mr. Wallace said they are redeveloping existing community space in the school building and it will be for the preschool. It will be flexible modular classrooms. It can also be used for community space when school is not in session.
- 3.36 Mr. Schneider clarified that they are not willing to put a limit on enrollment at this time.
- 3.37 Chairman Duffy noted that they keep stating they will not increase enrollment.
- Mr. Wallace said they would consider putting a limit on enrollment. The objective of the plan is to meet current enrollment with 23 students per class and two classes per grade. They have junior kindergarten through eighth grade, ten grades, and they have the early learning child center. That total number could be slightly higher than 460 and that would be within the overall plan for the school.
- 3.38 Mr. Schneider asked if it would exceed 500 students?
- Mr. Wallace said it would not exceed 500 students.
- 3.39 Mr. Kolleng asked if there have been discussions about maximum enrollment.
- Ms. Barrett said there have been several discussions this topic.
- 3.40 Mr. Schneider said that there is a lot on the north side of the alley that has a house on it. What is the plan for that lot?
- Mr. Wallace said that the current plan is to not change anything. The house is a rental.
- 3.41 Mr. Schneider asked when they acquired the house.

Fr. Sheridan said they bought the house about 25 years ago.

Mr. Wallace said there is no current intention to change the house situation.

- 3.42 Mr. Schneider asked when there is a not-for profit entity, are there any restrictions on acquiring land? Could they acquire adjacent lots without any restrictions? There are lots to the east of the proposed building.

Ms. Roberts said they could acquire more lots without any restrictions. She might suggest they consolidate all parcels if that came to be but that would not be required.

- 3.43 Chairman Duffy said if they acquired lots and changed the use then it would be time to consider the situation.

- 3.44 Mr. Schneider said he was at the site. The main area, which is south of the alley and it appears as if 90% of that is impervious surface. On the parking lot, he saw one drain and nothing in the alley. He assumes that they are not managing storm water on site and it either drains into the sanitary sewer or the alley to the street. They are imposing a tremendous burden on the Village's sanitary sewers especially on the east side. Do they have plans to mitigate this?

Mr. Callahan said that they are not increasing the amount of impervious surface. Under the MWRD ordinance, there is no requirement for mitigation. There is no place to mitigate. He understands Chairman Duffy's concern, but talked about MWRD and exemptions if impervious surface was not increasing.

- 3.45 Chairman Duffy said that Site Plan Review Committee would look at the plans and will hold them to best practices.

- 3.46 Mr. Schneider said they were increasing impervious surface somewhat. They are increasing the size of the courtyard.

Mr. Callahan said that the courtyard was paved so that is impervious. He said Ms. Stoycheva said that the playfields across the alley are totally pervious. That is part of the school campus.

- 3.47 Mr. Schneider asked if the architects or planners thought if they were tearing down a big chunk of existing buildings and starting again and repaving and restriping the parking lot, is there anything they can do in how they pave the parking lot or create a reservoir to retain storm water as long as possible rather than pouring it into the sewer system.

Mr. Wallace said they did talk about this at length. At the end of the day, because they were not providing a significantly greater impact because of existing paving, they concluded that they did not need to do that given the process.

- 3.48 Mr. Robke asked if they would consider doing this. It is part of tonight's process because one of the variances relates to impervious area. It is a non-conforming use and application. Maybe a rain garden or pavers would help mitigate some of these issues.

Ms. Stoycheva said they are resurfacing the parking lot and not repaving it. They cannot have the parking lot function the way that it does and add any landscaping. They were not required to add landscaping per ordinance, but they are including some landscaping on the north and east sides to help soften building mass and help with storm water.

- 3.49 Mr. Surman asked if they were removing pavement in those areas with the plantings.

- 3.50 Chairman Duffy said that the north side does not have plantings at this time. North side is the alley and all parking.

Ms. Stoycheva said they would add above-grade planters along the alley at the north side of the building and along the east side of the building. The courtyard is primarily paved at this time and will be enclosed with the new proposal.

- 3.51 Mr. Robke said they are asking for 40% impervious surface coverage variation.

Mr. Tritsis said that a lot of people have worked on projects that are all parking and then one day there is a building. He has seen timing solutions for rain water.

- 3.52 Mr. Robke said that the timing solution would be a good suggestion. He is looking for something to help mitigate rain water. A green roof with seeding trays that would not impact the use could be a solution.

Mr. Wallace said they can further look into a solution for rain water.

- 3.53 Mr. Schneider said he knows that the applicant is not obligated to do this. He does not know if approval can be conditioned upon some sort of mitigation of the rain water.

- 3.54 Mr. Kolleng noted that the Board is advisory only. Comments from tonight's meeting will be on the record. The Village Board can impose a condition if they want.

- 3.55 Chairman Duffy asked how they came up with the number of 1,500 parishioner households.

Mr. Wallace said this is from the parish registration census.

- 3.56 Mr. Robke asked if they would turn down students if growth continued.

Mr. Wallace said that out of the over 1,500 households, 250 send children to the school.

3.57 Mr. Robke said this goes back to limiting the number of students at the school.

3.58 Chairman Duffy said that this is a concern that neighbors have about growth and impact. He is against a cap and the Board is running into this issue with another school. But there should be something that will assure neighbors that growth will not impact them.

3.59 Mr. Kolleng said that there are other parishes around so if St Francis could not admit more students there are alternatives.

Mr. Wallace agrees with the cap concept but the Board heard the assurance to maintain the two classroom/grade concept with 23 students per classroom. That model is important to current parents and students. That is 460 students – junior kindergarten through 8th grade. There is 60 in the existing preschool and this is not part of the 460.

Ms. Barrett said that the preschool programming is slightly different. 23 classroom cap is K-8. They have started turning students away and have started waiting lists. There are pros and cons to this. The new classrooms are not to encourage growth but to sustain growth.

3.60 Mr. Surman said it would be difficult to have a cap. There should be some flexibility.

Ms. Barrett said that there is some flexibility at times.

Mr. Wallace said they can provide feedback with actual numbers that includes preschool plus K-8. Preschool starts at age 3. That number will max out in the direction of about 500.

3.61 Mr. Kolleng noted that they are adding a cafeteria. Does the school currently have a cafeteria?

Ms. Barrett said that the school does not have an actual cafeteria at this time. They have a multi-purpose space that they use for a cafeteria two hours/day for lunch but this is not an ideal.

3.62 Mr. Kolleng noted that there will be a kitchen. Will they serve hot food?

Mr. Wallace said this is a prep kitchen. A third-party vendor provides the food.

3.63 Mr. Tritsis asked how many employees and volunteers drive and park?

Ms. Barrett said this number is about 45 on the average. Employees come and go at different times. They park along Linden, in the lot that is north of the alley and in the neighborhood. Full time employees do not use the main lot. They use that area as a play space. Some parish members might park there as short-term parking. The lanes shown are for dismissal time, from 2:40 p.m. to 3:15 p.m.

An audience member said that the document indicates 52 employees.

Ms. Barrett said that is a total and most of them are not there every day.

- 3.62 Chairman Duffy said they are losing parking spaces by expanding the building. Is that not impacting available spaces for staff/volunteers and/or drop off/pick up?

Mr. Wallace said they are losing 10 to 12 spaces in the aggregate.

- 3.63 Chairman Duffy said that 2 to 3 of those spaces are handicapped.

Mr. Wallace showed another parking area for 30 cars. The parking on the north side does not count towards the total.

- 3.64 Chairman Duffy asked about the parking requirement for a school.

Ms. Roberts said that the requirement is one space per classroom.

- 3.65 Chairman Duffy said that per code there is not a parking issue but he is asking about functionality.

- 3.66 Mr. Robke said that graphics show the area as a loading/unloading zone.

- 3.67 Chairman Duffy said it is not used as parking for the school. When school is in session people do not park there – they are parking in the lot across the alley to the north, along the existing building or on the streets. The parking lot is mainly used on Saturdays and Sundays for service off-school hour event times. The problem is the loss of spaces around the existing building – 13 to 15 spaces. Will this impact the neighborhood? Those cars will be forced to park on the street. There are 45 employees who drive and 30 cars are accommodated off the street.

Ms. Barrett said that rarely are those spaces all filled.

Mr. Wallace said he thought that the spaces to the north do not count.

- 3.68 Chairman Duffy said that there is no parking variation before the Board. They are talking about the functional aspect of parking.

- 3.69 Mr. Robke asked should there be a parking variation in front of the Board.

- 3.70 Chairman Duffy said that per code, only one space per classroom is required.
- 3.71 Mr. Robke asked where the parking was on the site.
- 3.72 Chairman Duffy said drop off/pick up is their parking.
- 3.73 Mr. Robke said then it is not dedicated parking. The three ADA spaces to be relocated are actually not for use. The graphic shows no parking there.

Ms. Stoycheva said it is important to note that the 45 to 52 employees are never on site at the same time. The way the parking lot works now has been successful for a long time. During the day, the lot is almost always empty. Everyone knows that the lot needs to be cleared by 2:50 PM for pick up.

- 3.74 Mr. Robke said they indicated that the ADA spaces were relocated to that parking lot. Could they be relocated to the south of the building where there are 7 other spots?

Mr. Callahan said that code says that parking should be located on the same lot as the structure. However, off-street parking may be located within 300' walking distance of the use. They discussed this entire concept with staff. They wanted to declare the parking lot to the north of the alley and the playfield as part of zoning so it was all considered together. But there is a public alley that separates it. The parish looks at this as a unified site. For parking purposes, making a commitment that will remain parking for the school is not a problem (parking to the north).

- 3.75 Mr. Robke said that traditionally they could consider that as parking for the school. But they cannot have the three designated accessible spaces that are not available during certain hours of the day for loading/unloading.

Mr. Wallace said that the existing parking situation and traffic was reviewed by the Village.

- 3.76 Mr. Surman asked if they did put dedicated ADA spaces in the front area is there easy access to the building.

Ms. Stoycheva said that the accessible entry would be where the existing court yard entrance is. There are no stairs. They would need to consider the grading.

- 3.77 No additional questions from the Board at this time.

- 3.78 Mr. Callahan put the zoning history in the narrative. It is unusual that when the first building was built the Village was not zoned. The second building was established before second uses because they were not established until the 1960s. This is a unique set of circumstances. They need to ask for a special use. They need to ask

for the variations. Five of the variations are variations from the code but not from existing conditions. That is worth considering.

They wanted to declare all of the site as a zoning lot but they could not because of the intervening alley. If it was counted as a zoning lot, with the holdings across the alley being the playfields and parking lot, there would not be a side yard setback issue and there would not be an FAR issue. The parish sees this as all one site, but they cannot do this for zoning purposes. The site functions as a unified site for the school and parish usage.

3.79 Mr. Schneider asked if they planned to keep the play lot where it was.

Mr. Callahan said yes.

3.80 Mr. Schneider said he assumes no one objects to this being so close to the property line although neighbors may talk about this.

3.81 Mr. Tritsis asked about parking to the north of the field. What is current zoning? In 20 years could they sell it off to add housing?

Ms. Roberts said that those lots could be sold off and developed as single-family homes. That is permitted zoning.

3.82 Mr. Callahan said there was a variation granted in 1955 for the east school building, which is the one being discussed. It would allow this entire addition, with the exception of the north 2', to be located in those setbacks granted in 1955, but they cannot use them. This should be taken into consideration. A larger building could have been built in that location. It could have gone further to the east and closer to the property line. It is almost 33' from the property line and a 20' setback was granted. 13' was not used. The same situation applies to the north. 17' was not used on the north side.

They addressed all standards for special uses and variations. In summary, why do they need the variations? The historical location of the school, but the space is tight. There are limits to what they can do. They could expand the east building to achieve their goals because nothing else would work. They are trying to minimize the impact by limiting the footprint, by staying within height limitations of the ordinance and to push the north side of the addition 8" further to the west. It does not encroach further than the existing building does. This is a critical fact. The parish was mindful of what was going on in the area and to address this with their architects on the overall plan.

The map of supporting property owners was shown. He sent letters of support to Ms. Roberts.

- 3.83 Mr. Tritsis asked if the neighbors who sent letters of support parents of students? Or are they just neighbors?

Mr. Wallace said they are neighbors and some are also parishioners. Forty percent of those that signed are parishioners.

- 3.84 Mr. Schneider said that letters he received are from realtors. Did he miss something?

Chairman Duffy said that there are letters at Board members' places.

- 3.85 Chairman Duffy said there are more signatures than lots sited as in favor.

Mr. Callahan said some houses have two people living in one house.

- 3.86 Mr. Callahan said they submitted letters from four real estate brokers that do residential sales in the area. They support the fact that the parish has done everything to minimize impact on surrounding property values, which is a standard for special use and for variation.

- 3.87 Chairman Duffy asked if any realtors were parishioners.

Mr. Wallace said there were four letters and three are parishioners.

- 3.88 Chairman Duffy said that hardship is one of the standards. He talked about what hardship meant. If the alley was not there, the FAR variation would not apply because of lots to the north. Can they touch on the setbacks? They are increasing the size of the building. The setback to the east is not increasing, but the setback to the north is increasing.

Mr. Callahan said that was a conscious decision to push the building in the direction of property owned by the parish to minimize impact to the east. Most of the property to the north is controlled by the parish. To the west is the parish. A lot of property owners across the street on Linden support the proposal.

- 3.89 Mr. Tritsis asked if there was any thought of reducing the FAR request by pulling the building back from the alley. If it was within the setback perhaps the request could be minimized.

Ms. Stoycheva said they would not be able to fit the proper sized gym if they came back any further.

- 3.90 Mr. Tritsis said that the gym includes ancillary seating. He talked about the mezzanine.

Ms. Stoycheva said that in the mezzanine above was the library and classrooms.

Mr. Wallace is retractable seating to be used for specific athletic events or plays. Most of the time they are retracted back to the wall.

- 3.91 Mr. Tritsis said that there is an open mezzanine. Could seating go there?

Mr. Wallace said that is their library.

- 3.92 Mr. Tritsis referenced the open mezzanine again. Could there be seating in any part? They could perhaps push back from the alley. They are gaining about 15' off of the alley.

- 3.93 Mr. Schneider said the dimension of that space includes the retractable ceiling. There is no mezzanine above the retractable ceiling.

Mr. Wallace said that the area for the seating will mostly be used as gym space. If they were to encroach further south or bring the setback further south they would defeat the purpose of getting a larger gym. One of the benefits of having a larger gym is that they could provide event seating.

Ms. Stoycheva said that when it is in use it is important for seating to be on the ground floor. There is no mezzanine floor for the gym. The seating retracts back.

- 3.94 Mr. Tritsis asked about doors so it looks like there is a walkway around the mezzanine level.

Ms. Stoycheva showed where the mezzanine floor was located.

(After section 4.0)

- 3.95 Chairman Duffy asked the applicant to address some points brought up by neighbors.

- 3.96 Ms. Stoycheva said that with regard to atrium space it was important for them to preserve the way the courtyard is used. Regarding getting more use out of that space, she showed a second story plan. The way that the atrium is designed right now, they will bring natural light into the core of the building. They are pushing out the library into that space. She talked about a staircase and it being needed for egress purposes of the second story. They will now integrate an elevator that makes all four stories of the buildings accessible. They are creating a grand staircase to connect all levels. They did not present a section through the building but it is important to note that the existing west school building is half below grade and half above grade. With the atrium connection piece, they are making accessible two stories of the old and two stories of the new building. In working with the ARC and their feedback, the ARC said they saw this as an opportunity to bring natural light into the building. On the south elevation is an expansive row of windows which bring in low winter sun but block out high summer sun. The atrium brings together the old and what will be the new school.

- 3.97 Mr. Schneider said he thought that the atrium was very positive. It is a common area and a link.
- Ms. Stoycheva said that it is a multi-functional space for spillover classrooms, for pre-sports events and activities. It is only two stories.
- 3.98 Chairman Duffy asked the existing height of the tallest part of existing buildings relative to the proposed height of the new structure.
- Ms. Stoycheva said that the peak of the existing gym is 28'. The peak of the atrium will be at 33'10". The new gym is at 28'10". The clear height inside is close to 30' but the gym floor is sunken.
- 3.99 Chairman Duffy said that the mass of the height is about the same. It will be a few inches taller at the gym point. The peak of the atrium space is the tallest part of the new building.
- 3.100 Mr. Surman said that the space is peaked which is different from a rectangular space.
- Ms. Stoycheva said that part of the zoning code for a flat roof is up to 30' and up to 35' for a peaked roof.
- 3.101 Chairman Duffy said the proposed is what?
- 3.102 Ms. Stoycheva said it is 33'-10" and 28'-10".
- 3.103 Chairman Duffy said the existing is 28' at the gym and it is going to 28'-10". The atrium space is going to be 33'-10"
- 3.104 Mr. Surman said that code is 27'.
- Mr. Robke said that is for residential.
- 3.105 Mr. Surman asked about the code for commercial.
- Ms. Stoycheva said that it was her understanding that the height limits were 30' and 35' as discussed above.
- 3.106 Chairman Duffy asked the applicant to address public comments.
- 3.107 Mr. Callahan said that one of the points made was the encroachment of the proposal on the alley. The alley is remaining at current width. They are 5' off of the alley. He referenced a plan view. Mr. DeGrandis's house is closer to the alley. Some of the comments made about variations that were granted for that property he didn't understand.

The first variation for the neighbor's house was in 1999 and was for a 22.46' rear yard setback variation, a 7.18' side yard setback variation, and others. He was noting that these requests had been made in order to correct the record.

- 3.108 Mr. Tritsis asked how the neighbor's variations impacted tonight's case.
- 3.109 Chairman Duffy said that Mr. Callahan bringing up the neighbor's variations in the proposal was showing that the school was being a good neighbor. They were not trying to create a precedent because there is no precedent when someone asks for variations. Every lot is unique and all situations are different.

Mr. Callahan said that their point was that there were three variations over a short time and the school did not object to any of them.

- 3.110 Chairman Duffy clarified that some of the points of discussion include size and scope, flow of traffic and other topics brought up.
- 3.111 Mr. Kolleng said that with regard to traffic, the Board is seeing one thing on paper and the neighbors are saying something else.

Mr. Lemmon introduced himself. He put up the slide related to circulation. He explained the circulation pattern. In the morning people use lane 1 for drop off. They can north through the lot to Greenleaf or they can go east through the alley to 8th. The rest of the lot area is for short-term parking. He showed the area for staff parking. They did an employee count at 8:30 a.m. and half of spaces were occupied. There are parking restrictions around the block. The south curb lane along Linden has no restriction and Greenleaf has no parking restrictions. During pick up time there are seven lanes. The first five going from south to north are generally full. The sixth lane was not full and the last lane is used as angled parking. People exit north up to Greenleaf or east through the alley through 8th. There is pick up queueing occurring along the north curb of Linden.

They were engaged to review the master plan last fall. They did some observations in late September. People were also walking and biking to school. They saw the queue back up to the corner. In bad weather, the children who bike or walk might get dropped off so the queue would get longer.

The enrollment will remain about the same. They would not be looking at higher traffic volume. The patterns would remain the same. There were comments about people parking in the alley for other activities. His scope was focused on the school day. He showed the spaces that would be removed if the plan went forward. They want to avoid people parking in the alley however. There is plenty of parking along Greenleaf.

- 3.112 Mr. Kolleng noted that one of slides showed everything going to Greenleaf.

Mr. Lemmon said some people go into the alley to get to 8th Street. He does not know the split.

- 3.113 Mr. Tritsis asked about the traffic count.

Mr. Lemmon said they were out before school started in the morning. He showed the drop off area. He showed where there was some backup.

He also showed the slide showing residences in the area.

- 3.114 Chairman Duffy asked about the parking ban.

Mr. Lemmon said 9th Street is southbound during the school day. There are other parking restrictions on other streets.

- 3.115 Mr. Tritsis asked if there was a thought to have a drive aisle so they are not going down an alley.

Mr. Lemmon said this plan would impact trees. If people would go through the lot to Greenleaf would be ideal. Someone would have to stand in the alley to enforce people not driving down the alley. Someone directing drivers to Greenleaf would be ideal.

- 3.116 Chairman Duffy said there were several other issues that he asked Mr. Wallace to address including buildings too close to the alley, move mass to center of property and more. How did they decide on this proposal vs. other options?

Mr. Wallace said a key objective was to be try to minimize disruption to the neighborhood. They looked at several plans including the consideration of building on the current parking lot. Doing a minimal increase to the footprint of the existing building was the most efficient plan and would have the least amount of issues with and from neighbors. They looked at the existing playfield and parking lot. Each location has its own issues. No plan is perfect so he expected some objections. They tried to find the best plan for the current situation to minimize disruption.

Reviewing additional options was an exhaustive process.

Regarding growth of the school and a neighbor noting that they created this plight, they illustrated a 10-year look at the school. There have been ebbs and flows with school enrollment and parish enrollment over time. In the late 60s, the school had 740 students. There would be 50 students per class and two homerooms per grade. Having a vibrant modernized private faith based school that is the example for other North Shore communities is positive.

Regarding outreach to neighbors, he agreed that it was different from what New Trier did with their expansion. The size and scope is different. New Trier was

funded by taxpayers. They reached out to neighbors. They were not perfect in their outreach. He met with the DeGrandises and the Merens to walk the site and this was not mentioned in neighbor comments. They went door to door to speak with several neighbors but sometimes no one answers. They have almost 30 supporting signatures from the 250' radius and three objected. He met with the neighbor who will be most impacted. They are not objecting. They tried their best with neighborhood outreach.

They do not want to substantially impact home values of nearby residences. They walked through four of the most active residential brokers in east Wilmette to get their views. All four provided letters of support. They believed that the massing does not diminish or impact home values. Most brokers said what they are doing is likely going to benefit home values.

They commissioned the traffic study. The Village was very helpful. They said to get the traffic study and what the applicant needed to think about regarding neighbors. That is productive collaboration. Regarding the ARC, the elevations shown at the meeting tonight are different from the originals based on ARC comments. There are more windows. There is more brick, dropped down the height and more. They are trying to take the neighbors into account with their plans.

- 3.117 Mr. Kolleng referenced traffic and implementing the type of entrance/exit program that the school wants. How is that accomplished?

Mr. Wallace said one idea is to adhere to a more orderly drop off and pick up is to have traffic go through Greenleaf and not through the alley. The alley can be manned.

Ms. Barrett came to the mic and said that blocking off the alley is currently done at 3:00 p.m.

- 3.118 Mr. Tritsis asked for clarification about how they block off the alley.

Ms. Barrett said they had friendly conversations with the Village several times in terms of solutions. And all revolve neighborhood safety and students and neighbors. There is no perfect solution. Faculty and volunteers try to keep things orderly. But they know that they can improve upon this. They will continue to work on this.

- 3.119 Mr. Kolleng asked if 23 students per room the sweet spot in education.

Ms. Barrett said District 39 has excellent schools and there are excellent independent schools. St. Francis needs to remain competitive. That number was established five years ago. She has had to tell families that not all of their children can attend the school due to space constraints. Prior to five years ago, there was no

cap on number of students/class. Twenty-three students is a school policy. They spent a lot of time looking at average class sizes in the area.

- 3.120 Mr. Surman asked if there was a master plan done for the property that describes what they are going to with current sites, will they acquire future sites?

Mr. Wallace said that the parish has not done recent significant purchases. The master plan is to make the south education building efficient, take the preschoolers on the north side of the alley to another location and do interior renovation in the parish office building to make it general community space. That is the current master plan. The rental house was bought 25+ years ago. There might have been some plan at this time. He reiterated that the proposal is not being done for growth, but to sustain the current growth they have had up to this point. They want to build optimal facilities for enrollment and parish needs.

- 3.121 Chairman Duffy said that Mr. DeGrandis made a comment about the Catholic church reducing parishes. Will this help the parish be more viable in the future?

Mr. Wallace said this is called the Renew My Church program. What they are doing is consistent with Renew My Church is to reinvest in vital parishes. Those that are not viable or financially sustainable may need to close down. That is already happening.

- 3.122 Mr. Robke said it was mentioned that the last capital campaign was 13 years ago. What was that campaign for?

Mr. Wallace said that was before his time. It was about a \$3M campaign for deferred maintenance and sprinklers and bringing things up to code. The present campaign is the first significant improvement to modernize the facility since 1955.

- 3.123 Mr. Tritsis referenced massing. Was there a shadow study done to show impact on neighbors?

Mr. Wallace said they looked at a sunlight analysis to make sure there was ample light for neighbors.

Ms. Stoycheva said that there are not many windows on that residence that face the school and they looked at this when in design mode. She showed shadows throughout the day and the impact on neighbors. She showed where the neighbors' property lines were. There is a 10' chain link fence with ivy. That spans the width of the neighbor's western property line.

- 3.124 Mr. Surman said it looks like the shadow casts over the neighbor's backyard.

- 3.125 Mr. Tritsis asked about the delta between today's shadow and future shadow.

- 3.126 Chairman Duffy asked if the 10' fence also cast a shadow into the backyard.

Ms. Stoycheva said that per the ARC and zoning codes they are required to remove that 10' fence and replace it with a 6' wood fence, solid.

- 3.127 Mr. Surman said he thought the 6' fence would be less desirable for the neighbors.

Ms. Stoycheva said they are required to do this.

- 3.128 Mr. Surman asked if massing studies were done to show impact? The realtors don't know how to read those plans and they think that it sounds great from verbal descriptions. The existing building was designed on an angle. Then there was a one story portion. That could have been done to alleviate the feeling of the mass for that adjacent neighbor. He has no problem with building up to the alley, but could only build a one story structure. Now they are going up 28'. He suggested that it be slid down or keep the design queues more open.

Ms. Stoycheva said that the height and footprint of the current gym is not what a middle school gym height and footprint should be.

- 3.129 Mr. Surman said there might have been a way to rotate the plan or do something. Maybe spaces along the alley should be one story.

- 3.130 Mr. Schneider referenced exhibit 1.2 that shows the lot as platted at 50'. If the school did not exist and there were houses on the lots running east/west with a garage on the alley and a house that could be 35' high. The garages may or may not have a flat roof.

Ms. Stoycheva said if they were to tear down the school and develop it as residential, this is what could be done by right.

- 3.131 Mr. Surman said if he was on that lot he would have a problem with a 28' building going towards the alley. The original plan was more sensitive to the design. There is a way to accommodate their needs but be more sensitive to the neighbors. He has no problem with the circulation or traffic. Those issues can be solved/modified. But impacting someone's house is something that the Board needs to consider.

Ms. Stoycheva said they can only see what the building looks like now. They know enrollment and programmatic needs in the past. They developed their plan based on present programmatic needs.

- 3.132 Chairman Duffy asked if they could talk about this as most efficient for the space that they are willing to change versus the most efficient for the site that is available. Instead of just changing the gym's footprint, maybe they need to change the footprint of the two story building as well. It is a bigger project.

- 3.133 Mr. Schneider said that this is a design issue and this is not within the purview of the Board.

Ms. Stoycheva said that the two-story portion of the building does function well. Their present classroom space there are sufficient as they stand today. They want to repurpose as much as possible and keep the character while getting the school what they need.

Mr. Wallace said that there is a more significant massing to the west of the home on the east. They have over 33' of setback to the property line at this time versus 2.5' for the neighbor. They tried to be conscious to not encroach further east. They tried to focus on expanding the footprint immediately to the north, which is adjacent to property they own and away from neighbors. After extensive design options, the current design was viewed as the most efficient design to meet their needs.

- 3.134 Mr. Surman noted that where the setback is the roof height is 15'. That is one story and does not accurately show the building height. That shows the footprint but not the volume. He has a problem with the way this impacts the neighbor. The neighbor did not buy into this.

4.0 INTERESTED PARTIES

4.1 Persons speaking on the application

- 4.11 Mr. Burt Frost
531 8th Street
- 4.12 Ms. Dana Frost
531 8th Street
- 4.13 Mr. Paul DeGrandis
515 8th Street
- 4.14 Ms. Teri Merens
806 Linden Avenue
- 4.15 Mr. Paul Pasin
687 Sheridan Road

4.2 Summary of presentations

- 4.21 Mr. Frost said he has lived in the Village for 8 years and there are 7 in his family. He is against the project mostly related to size and scope and what this means to the neighborhood. They are expanding a non-conforming build and this is a bad idea and precedent for future development and the neighborhood. It will change the scope and flow of the neighborhood traffic and other patterns. He does not agree

about neighborhood involvement or interaction. They had 0 engagement from the church and were made aware of this when they got a mailing 2 to 3 weeks ago. Today was the first time someone came to his house to talk about this. This is not a preferred use of the space. Expanding churches and schools in residential areas needs to conform to existing zoning rules and either the rules should be changed or adapted to existing rules.

The parish already owns 80% of the block. That is significant. How and what they are doing is outside of conforming.

Mr. Surman asked if he was within the block.

Mr. Frost showed where he was located. The last property that the church owns and rents to the right, he is the corner lot at 8th and Greenleaf. He is on the alley.

Chairman Duffy referenced 1.1. They are on the southwest corner of 8th and Greenleaf.

Mr. Surman asked if he was concerned about square footage, bulk or what?

Mr. Frost said he watches the flow of traffic and it is not as presented. He showed what areas were used as parking lots. They are encroaching on a common area. There are zoning rules and they are already non-conforming. What they are proposing is not appropriate use for a residential area. Perhaps they need to change rules in that area so requests are conforming.

- 4.22 Ms. Frost said she is curious about the map of the families who signed something. If there are four residential properties that are on the alley, her house is one of them, why weren't they contacted. The project has been worked on for several years. Because they share an alley they are impacted. Maybe there was community involvement with parishioners but not with other neighbors. They asked their realtor to look at the plans and to explain the impact on her property. The realtor said it negatively impacts their property. She will ask her realtor to submit a letter. She agrees that there is a negative impact due to a new massive structure.

Mr. Surman asked what key points the realtor referred to.

Ms. Frost said that her children go to public school. The public high school had a renovation. For several years there was community involvement about this because residential properties in the neighborhood were impacted. How can the scope of the neighborhood be changed without talking to neighbors that share an alley. She cannot access her garage at certain times of the day.

Mr. Schneider agreed with the above. He said he understands that the number of cars driving down the alley won't change. What is the negative impact?

Ms. Frost said it is already non-conforming and there is a negative impact. The expansion will aggravate the situation.

Mr. Frost said that construction crews produce more traffic, dust and noise. How can that not impact the neighborhood?

Mr. Schneider said if a neighbor builds a new house they will have the same problem.

Mr. Robke said that the Board saw a traffic pattern that didn't send anyone down the alley because everyone was exiting through the parking lot and going out on Greenleaf.

Ms. Frost said that traffic now comes down the alley.

Mr. Frost said it's a one-way alley in effect. He showed the flow of traffic.

Ms. Frost said students are dropped off and parents come down the alley going east.

Mr. Tritsis asked if the proposed new routing would improve the situation.

Mr. Frost said he is not sure.

Ms. Frost said they are a direct neighbor and will be impacted.

Chairman Duffy asked when they bought their house.

Ms. Frost said they bought the house in 2008.

- 4.23 Mr. DeGrandis moved into his house in 1998. He showed a visual and said that there incredible impact on his property that changes the nature of his property from residential to institutional. They have had a good, friendly and collaborative relationship with the school and they plan on keeping the relationship. They are not parishioners. They are opposed to the proposal. When they bought the property they understood what life next to a school meant. They clean up the alley after school events. They are cognizant of safety matters. The current project, as proposed, is unreasonable and too large for the space. It dramatically changes the character of his property from residential to massive institutional.

It negatively impacts his property value. He spoke with realtors who told him to fight the proposal, but the realtors would not end letters because they do a lot of business with parishioners.

This is a creeping project and an attempt to capture the alley in stages. The Village has not shown an interest in capturing the alley. Moving the building 5' from the alley property line restricts them in many ways. It imposes fire and safety issues.

Has the fire department looked at the proposal? Was there a fire safety evaluation of the project?

Ms. Roberts said that the fire chief reviewed the plans. He did not indicate any specific problems at this time.

Mr. DeGrandis said that the proposal causes access problems to the center of the building and the back of his house. He said that no one reached out to his adjacent neighbors about the proposal.

There is no parking variance. The school is large. Reducing parking spaces is the wrong direction to go. The neighborhood is highly dense. The practical use of the school was not taken into account in the parking survey. In the past few years the neighborhood and parking lot are overrun with cars during activities, masses, funerals, etc. People park in the alley. It's not safe.

Chairman Duffy asked if he has called the police or fire department about the above parking problems.

Mr. DeGrandis said they have a good relationship in the neighborhood. He has been a good neighbor.

Mr. Schneider asked Mr. DeGrandis to superimpose the current mass on top of the proposed mass for comparison.

Chairman Duffy said it was better to wait for St. Francis to respond.

Mr. DeGrandis explained the current building vs. the proposed building, which has immense massing. He is not going to call the police on his neighbor – that is not his nature. They need more room for what they want to do.

The home that they rent has four parking spaces behind it. They put a sign reading no parking residents only to protect their tenants. The tenant writes a note if someone parks in their spots. There is a clear issue with parking.

How did we get here? The application states they have 70% growth in enrollment over ten years. Growth has been extraordinary, deliberate and sustainable. Deliberate is the applicant's word. The petitioners caused this plight so of course they have to build more. They got too big for the space. They are asking others to suffer as they ask for many variances. In February 2016, the Chicago Archdiocese said they were going to shutter churches and consolidate parishes. St. Francis is a vibrant community. Is the growth sustainable? Everywhere else faith-based education is dwindling.

He is opposing the project and not the school. He went to Catholic school. The project feels overwhelming. The parish is wealthy with influential members. The

process does not feel right. He learned that St. Francis has announced to parishioners and school members that they moved spring break to accommodate construction. This was announced months ago. This doesn't feel right.

He was told that the Village looks favorably on projects like this because it takes students off the District 39 rolls. Education and zoning should not be correlated. It feels like the cake is bake.

He asked if any of the Board members are St. Francis parishioners or have contributed to the \$6.2M fund.

Chairman Duffy is not a parishioner.

Mr. Schneider is a parishioner but he has not donated.

Mr. Tritsis is not a parishioner and has not donated.

Mr. Surman is not a parishioner and has not donated.

Mr. Robke said it is not relevant but he is not a parishioner.

Regarding precedents, the applicant cites setback variances that were granted along the property line that he shares with them. He said that a variance was granted in 1955 but he is not sure that a 62 year old variance matters in today's current world. He was granted a variance to attach two existing non-conforming structures. He went to the Historical Society and got a plat from 1954 that is the same plat as when he bought his house. There are major differences between his setback and the setbacks the applicant is asking for. He has not asked for an FAR variance. The precedent is not there for an FAR variance.

When he applied for a variance and removed a non-conforming wall, they would have to rebuild in a conforming location. He is asking that if St. Francis takes down a non-conforming wall or play lot that they have to build it in a conforming space. His variance as a precedent makes no sense.

He applied for a variance in 2003 for homes that have a front porch. They could then build above the garage and he received the variance. They did not ask for more square footage and did not overbuilding. They built in the existing footprint and used existing walls. He does not see a precedent. If you tear down a non-conforming wall you have to building in a conforming space.

The petitioner wants to tear down something that is non-conforming and build something that is large and non-conforming. The precedent the applicant put forth is not relevant.

Chairman Duffy said that the applicant never said that changes to his property were viewed as a precedent. They pointed out that they were being good neighbors and not objecting to changes.

He said that he did not interpret the language that way.

He talked about the standard indicating that it will not be detrimental to public health, safety or welfare. Building in the alley setback takes up passage for fire equipment and they are hindering emergency equipment.

He talked about the proposed use not being injurious to the use or enjoyment of other properties in the neighborhood. They are building off the back of his house.

He talked about the standard related to property values. He believes that his property value will be diminished.

He talked about adequate utilities, road access and drainage. They are limiting road access. They are moving the building much closer to the alley.

He talked about adequate measures related to ingress and egress and traffic congestion. They are removing parking spots in an already congested area. It will be made worse if they are taking parking spaces away.

The proposed use in the specific location will be consistent with neighborhood character. This location was not built or set up to handle the capacity they have. It alters the area from residential to massive institutional.

Regarding the plight of the property owner, 10 years with 70% growth just didn't happen. The applicant caused their own plight. They let enrollment go up 70%.

Mr. Kolleng noted that enrollment had been higher several years ago and they are not exceeding that.

He said if they were managing for their space then they would not need to ask for seven variances. The applicant let the enrollment get this high. There was no information provided about historical attendance at the school.

There are other options. They could redesign and move the massing more towards the center of the property and not impose on neighboring properties. They could come up a more linear proposal that takes everything along the south side of the property. They have not connected the two buildings that are there. Why wouldn't you connect them? The money is there – they could sell the rental property. The parish is wealthy.

St. Francis needs more space to do what they want to do. If they would step back and consider a larger campus plan for the entire block, take steps to acquiring the

entire block over time and they could build a campus fitting of the neighborhood with space needed and not what they proposed.

Mr. Tritsis clarified that Mr. DeGrandis does not like the current plan but there might be things that the applicant could do to get his support.

Mr. DeGrandis said that the applicant could make changes and he might support a new plan. St. Francis is good for the community.

- 4.24 Ms. Merens bought her house in 1997. She lives at 806 Linden. Her house was new construction from a tear down. Her house was fully built when they bought it. She knew she was moving next to a church and a school. The enrollment in 1997 was significantly less than it is now. They moved in thinking that the area would be safe, that the school/church would be good neighbors and that there would be two-way communication. This has happened. Over the last several years traffic issues have become difficult. Around 8:15 a.m., driving down 8th Street, people pull out on the alley who are not paying attention and they are not courteous. There are too many people trying to get to the same place at the same time. She understands the need to make the school larger, but she is skeptical at the proposed plan to cap enrollment. If someone has children at the school and more children are born, the school will not deny admission. That is unrealistic. Growth will continue. They will keep outgrowing the space. She has spoken with the principal about traffic safety. She wants to be a good neighbor but worries about traffic safety and such an imposing structure. She would not know about this if not for the DeGrandis family. She was never contacted. The neighbor across the street, Ms. Lyons, was not contacted. The people who signed off on the proposal are petitioners who were contacted. She was contacted by the church for other occasions. The project is too much. There are already too many children. The playground is crammed.

Mr. Tritsis asked which neighbors should have been notified.

Ms. Roberts said that neighbors within 250' should have been notified.

The neighbor said that the parking study showed the queue lining up along Linden. That did not account for weather and in the winter the line goes well beyond 8th Street and curves around and blocks her driveway. Some people have actually have used her driveway.

- 4.25 Mr. Pasin is a parishioner. He does not have children at the school. One of the greatest attractions of moving here was the diverse community. Being part of St. Francis is enriching. The vibrancy of the community has a huge impact on the Village and attracts a lot of people to the Village. He is on the capital campaign committee. The school and parish will exist with or without zoning approval. They need to meet the needs of the school. The intent was to create an efficient plan with minimal impact. They looked at many options. He understands not everyone will be happy with the chosen plan. There will be a building project even if the variances

are not granted. The current situation will continue to exist. He is in favor of the proposal.

Chairman Duffy asked if he was involved in the design meetings.

Mr. Pasin was involved in design meetings.

Chairman Duffy asked about any consideration for a third story on the east building and not having the new gym building be as tall or as impactful.

Mr. Pasin said a project goal is to create multi-use spaces. This is both a school and a parish/community project. The parish community needs spaces for gathering places. Some of the other plans did not provide multi-function spaces. As Mr. Wallace mentioned, they have raised twice as much as was previously raised to initiate this type of project. They have to be cost efficient as to how they do the project.

Chairman Duffy asked if the atrium space could be turned into building space.

Mr. Pasin said that the proposed plan integrates the atrium into space.

Chairman Duffy said that it is an atrium and not classrooms.

Mr. Pasin talked about the room that is presently used as classrooms, the cafeteria and extracurricular activities. The new enclosed atrium space is similar.

Chairman Duffy said it is great space but if they are trying to minimize impact maybe that space is minimized or taken way for other space usage. Mr. Pasin said that they see the space usage as multi-functional.

Mr. Pasin asked If it was not used as described, how would the space be used?

Mr. Kolleng said that it could be three stories of classroom space or other usable space.

Mr. Pasin talked about joining the two buildings with the atrium.

Mr. Tritsis said the atrium is a volume of air so on the second floor nothing is there.

Chairman Duffy wanted to know if there were alternate options for that space.

Mr. Pasin said he would defer but thinks that there are structural issues.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

- 5.1 Mr. Robke said there are a lot of pieces to the request. He can support some easily and others he is not sure if he can support. The existing special use is something he can support.

He is a little bit troubled by the FAR and the 10% increase. He generally does not like to see an increase in FAR. He is troubled by the setback at the alley, particularly in light in the amount of traffic. His biggest objection is the impervious area. He knows that it is existing but the Board should improve upon this. This is a 40% variance. 100% of the side yard is impervious. That is contrary to what the Board is trying to accomplish.

- 5.2 Mr. Kolleng said that during his time on the board, they have tried to accommodate schools and churches. They are in the residential areas but do not fit the definition of a residential home. The board needs to look at these cases differently. He is a parishioner at St. Francis. This is an old facility. There used to be over 700 students. They have done a great job with the school. His children went there. They are as popular as they are because of how good they are. The St. Francis community is wonderful.

They need to address the issues they are addressing because they have not addressed them for a long time. It costs a lot of money. It is privately funded by parishioners. They need to deal with traffic. There are two different stories about traffic. Regarding the alley and impervious surface, they should try to do something with impervious surface. He does not have an issue with alley width. What creates some angst is the situation with the home at 515. Overall he can support this proposal. The school representatives spent a lot of time trying to forecast various scenarios and how to deal with them. They put together the best plan they could. In these situations, there will always be some impact.

- 5.3 Mr. Schneider said this is a difficult request in some ways and it makes sense in other ways. He agrees that there are two variations that are self-imposed, the floor area and the setback on the north wall. The other variations are grandfathered and he has no issues with those. But 10% is a lot and it could have been managed via the design process. He assumes traffic would not get worse if enrollment does not increase. But there is a reluctance from the applicants to limit enrollment. Maybe the Village Board will be more definite like they were with Loyola. He the storm water management is an important issue because they are doing a significant rebuilding. They need to address the storm water issues. He practiced architecture and programming – the upfront period when you deal with stakeholders. You spend as much time as possible discussing options with stakeholders and coming to a buy in from everyone. This was not done in this case, but this is not part of the Board's purview. Since his concerns are self-imposed, he does not see the hardship. He has a difficult time supporting the request as presented.

- 5.4 Mr. Tritsis said everyone likes to see progress in the Village. He is torn because some items are self-imposed. He believes there are other options. The massing on the east side impacts the neighbors and that is powerful. Pushing closer to the alley and into the setbacks is tough. You can build certain things as of right but it does not mean that they should until other problems are solved. This is a tough situation for him.
- 5.5 Mr. Surman said he mentioned most of his comments above. It is a great project. He would like to see the project move forward in some way. He has no problem with the FAR. It is similar to people who come in and say that their kitchen is too small and not up to today's standards. It is reasonable to accept that the education process and class sizes have changed. Accommodations have to be made for more space. He would not want to see the atrium reduced or eliminated. That space counts against them.
- 5.6 Mr. Tritsis agreed that the atrium was nice, but there are neighbors commenting on massing getting closer to people's yards. They are asking for a large variation which is the size of a house.
- 5.7 Chairman Duffy asked if all of the 7,600 square feet was new.
- Ms. Roberts said that the 7,600 square feet was all new.
- 5.8 Mr. Surman said circulation can be dealt, the impervious has to be dealt with although this is not a requirement.
- 5.9 Mr. Robke said that they are getting a variation for impervious surface. There is an obligation to address this somehow. Everyone is trying to suggest some flexibility about how to address this. What they are trying to is good for the school and for the community. We want to encourage this type of project.
- 5.10 Mr. Surman said there is impact on the neighbor to the east. Maybe they should rotate the gym. Maybe there is one story along the alley. It is too big of a mass and would diminish property values.
- 5.11 Mr. Schneider asked if ARC saw this case.
- Ms. Roberts said that ARC did a preliminary review of this case.
- 5.12 Mr. Schneider asked if ARC expressed opinions regarding massing or do they just look at the aesthetics.
- Ms. Roberts is not sure what the discussion focused on.
- 5.13 Mr. Surman said drawings submitted does not show existing gym. The impact would be felt more if there was a comparison between existing and proposed.

- 5.14 Chairman Duffy said that the ARC is meeting on July 10, 2017 at 7:30 p.m. at the community center, 3000 Glenview Road. He encouraged attendance to share comments.
- 5.15 Mr. Surman said it is a great project that needs to be tweaked a little. He cannot support it as proposed.
- 5.16 Chairman Duffy is on the fence because it is an improvement to the current structure. It is an improvement for the church and for the Village. The school is an asset. It does have a negative impact on some neighbors and the impact is significant. There is a way to move some of the bulk to the west and not just south. The structure is large and is close to the property lines. If the houses to the east were not as close, then it would not be as impactful and then he would probably support the proposal 100%. He could support this without that one issue happening. But the bulk is too close to the houses. It's the way this was laid out a long time ago. There are nine requests including the special use. The only one he saw as an issue is the FAR. He could give some allowance for the atrium and they minimized the amount of space requested. But the issue for him is bulk along the eastern edge of the development. He cannot support the proposal with the existing plans.

(after section 6.0)

- 5.17 Mr. Robke said that the Board had slightly different objections and concerns but everyone wanted to see a way to get this to move forward. With tweaking of the plans, they can probably address enough of the concerns to get Board members to the other side of the fence.

6.0 DECISION

- 6.1 Mr. Robke moved to recommend granting a request for a special use for the expansion of a special use (educational facility, primary), a 7,652.2 square foot (10.9%) floor area variation, a 14.83' side yard setback variation, a 7.08' rear yard setback variation, a 2,280.0 square foot (40%) side yard impervious surface coverage variation, a 37.0' rear yard playground equipment setback variation, an 18.25' rear yard step setback variation, a 5.0' side yard parking space setback variation, and a variation to allow parking spaces to open directly upon an alley to permit the construction of a two-story addition on the legal non-conforming structure (St. Francis Xavier School) at 808 Linden Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted. The use shall run with the use.

- 6.11 Mr. Kolleng seconded the motion and the vote was as follows:

Chairman Patrick Duffy	No
Mike Boyer	Not Present
John Kolleng	Yes
Michael Robke	No
Reinhard Schneider	No

Bob Surman	No
Christopher Tritsis	No

Motion failed.

6.2 Mr. Schneider moved to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for the Zoning Board of Appeals for case number 2017-Z-31.

6.21 Mr. Surman seconded the motion and the vote was all ayes and no nays.

Motion carried.

7.0 FINDINGS OF FACT UPON WHICH DECISION WAS BASED

A majority of the Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the request does not meet the special use standards of Section 5.3.E and the variation standards of Section 5.4.F of the Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the floor area and setback variations for the addition will injure the residential properties to the east and will alter the essential character of the neighborhood. The proposed addition and site work result in the north side yard continuing to be completely covered with impervious surfaces; the Board would prefer to see some reduction proposed. The owner is creating their own hardship with the design of the addition and with the programming of the school (number of students and class offerings).

A minority of the Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the request meets the special use standards of Section 5.3.E and the variation standards of Section 5.4.F of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed request is for an addition that will replace an existing gymnasium to a standard size, allow for additional specialized instruction rooms, and allow the school to consolidate all of their student programming into one building. The addition consists of upgrading existing facilities. The school will continue to operate with improvements but with no planned increase in students. Therefore, the school as a special use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. These changes to the school facilities will not diminish property values in the neighborhood. Adequate measures exist for ingress and egress. No reduction in parking is proposed. Utilities and drainage remain unchanged. The school will not change and remains consistent with the existing community character.

The variations are related to the replacement and upgrading of the facilities including replacing the existing gymnasium with one of a standard size. In some cases, the existing conditions are the same (side yard impervious coverage) or more non-conforming (existing rear yard setback). The physical conditions of the property impose upon the owner a practical difficulty. The plight of the owner was not created by the owner and is due to the unique development of the property. The difficulty is peculiar to the property to in question. The difficulty prevents the owner from making reasonable use of the property with improvements to the facilities. The proposed variation, specifically the rear yard setback variation, will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property. The nearest residential neighbors are to the east. The proposed addition is 32.92' instead of the required 40', still providing a substantial distance from the homes. The variations, if granted, will not alter the

essential character of the neighborhood. The addition will not substantially alter the appearance from the street and the function of the property will not substantially change.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends denying a request for a special use for the expansion of a special use (educational facility, primary), a 7,652.2 square foot (10.9%) floor area variation, a 14.83' side yard setback variation, a 7.08' rear yard setback variation, a 2,280.0 square foot (40%) side yard impervious surface coverage variation, a 37.0' rear yard playground equipment setback variation, an 18.25' rear yard step setback variation, a 5.0' side yard parking space setback variation, and a variation to allow parking spaces to open directly upon an alley to permit the construction of a two-story addition on the legal non-conforming structure (St. Francis Xavier School) at 808 Linden Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted. The use shall run with the use.