



1200 Wilmette Avenue
Wilmette, Illinois 60091-0040

MEETING MINUTES

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

WEDNESDAY, MAY 12, 2021

7:00 P.M.

REMOTE MEETING

Members Present: Chairman Reinhard Schneider
Brad Falkof
Didier Glattard
Ryrie Pellaton
Maria Urban

Members Absent: Christine Norrick
Bob Surman

Staff Present: Lisa Roberts, Assistant Director of Community Development

I. Call to Order

Chairman Schneider called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

II. Opening Remarks and Swearing In

Ms. Roberts reviewed the meeting procedures for remote meetings. Chairman Schneider how the Zoning Board of Appeals will conduct business. All applicants and interested parties present were sworn in.

III. 2021-Z-14 1300 Middlebury Lane

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

IV. 2021-Z-18 1155 Wilmette Avenue

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

V. 2021-Z-16 424 Linden Avenue

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

VI. 2021-Z-15 222 Lockerbie Lane

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

VII. 2021-Z-17 1100 Laramie Avenue

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

VIII. 2021-Z-19 1605 Elmwood Avenue

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

IX. Approval of the April 7, 2021 Minutes

Mr. Pellaton moved to approve the April 7, 2021 meeting minutes. Ms. Urban seconded the motion. Voting yes: Mr. Falkof, Mr. Glattard, Mr. Pellaton, Ms. Urban, and Chairman Schneider. Voting no: None. The motion passed.

X. Approval of the April 21, 2021 Minutes

Ms. Urban moved to approve the April 21, 2021 meeting minutes. Mr. Falkof seconded the motion. Voting yes: Mr. Falkof, Mr. Glattard, Mr. Pellaton, Ms. Urban, and Chairman Schneider. Voting no: None. The motion passed.

XI. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

XII. Adjournment

Ms. Urban moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Falkof seconded the motion. Voting yes: Mr. Falkof, Mr. Glattard, Mr. Pellaton, Ms. Urban, and Chairman Schneider. Voting no: None. The motion passed. The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Roberts
Assistant Director of Community Development

3.0 TESTIMONY, COMMENTS, AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

3.11 Mr. Matthew Goddard, applicant
1300 Middlebury Lane

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Mr. Goddard requested that the case be continued to the May 19, 2021 meeting.

6.0 DECISION

6.1 Mr. Pellaton moved to continue this case to the May 19, 2021 meeting.

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

Chairman Reinhard Schneider	Yes
Brad Falkof	Yes
Didier Glattard	Yes
Christine Norrick	Not Present
Ryrie Pellaton	Yes
Bob Surman	Not Present
Maria Urban	Yes

Motion carried.

3.0 TESTIMONY, COMMENTS, AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT**3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant**

3.11 Ms. Carole Dibo, applicant
Actors Training Center

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Dibo requested that the case be continued to the May 19, 2021 meeting.

6.0 DECISION

6.1 Ms. Urban moved to continue this case to the May 19, 2021 meeting.

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

Chairman Reinhard Schneider	Yes
Brad Falkof	Yes
Didier Glattard	Yes
Christine Norrick	Not Present
Ryrie Pellaton	Yes
Bob Surman	Not Present
Maria Urban	Yes

Motion carried.

3.0 TESTIMONY, COMMENTS, AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT**3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant**

3.11 Ms. Mari-Rose McManus, applicant
Luigi's Dress Shop

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. McManus requested that the case be continued to the May 19, 2021 meeting.

6.0 DECISION

6.1 Ms. Urban moved to continue this case to the May 19, 2021 meeting.

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

Chairman Reinhard Schneider	Yes
Brad Falkof	Yes
Didier Glattard	Yes
Christine Norrick	Not Present
Ryrie Pellaton	Yes
Bob Surman	Not Present
Maria Urban	Yes

Motion carried.

3.0 COMMENTS AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

3.11 Mr. John Stutz, applicant
222 Lockerbie Lane

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said this is a request for a 2.0' fence height variation and a fence openness variation to permit the replacement of a 6.0' tall solid fence in the rear yard of a double-frontage lot. The Village Board will hear this case on June 8, 2021.

3.22 Mr. Stutz said he is requesting a variance of 2 feet for his backyard fence which abuts Old Glenview Road. He wishes to replace a 20-year-old 6' fence that he installed in 2002 with another solid wood 6' fence. He said neighbors to the south also adjoin Old Glenview Road. There are 13 neighbors who also have 6' solid wood fences; at least 12 do, another one has an 8' solid wooden fence. He would like to replace his existing 6' fence with another 6' fence. The 6' fence is needed to keep out the pollution and noise from the Edens Expressway to the east of the property. Not having a 6' fence would decrease his property value.

3.23 Mr. Pellaton said in the case packet are two fence permit applications: one from 1997 and one from 2002. He asked if the 2002 permit was for the fence that is currently on site.

Mr. Stutz said that was true, the current fence is there from 2002.

3.24 Mr. Pellaton asked if the applicant was looking to make a change in the style of fence or height of fence from what is already there.

Mr. Stutz said he was not. He said it's exactly the same style and height.

3.25 Mr. Falkof said the existing fence looks like a stockade fence.

Mr. Stutz said yes.

3.26 Mr. Falkof said exhibit 1.8 in the case packet is a color photograph of a nice looking fence that does not appear to be stockade in style.

Mr. Stutz said that is a white PVC fence, which is longer lasting.

3.27 Mr. Falkof asked why the photo was included in the packet materials.

Mr. Stutz said he wanted to inform the village of what he has in mind for the new fence.

- 3.28 Mr. Falkof said Mr. Stutz said it would be a stockade fence, similar to what is currently on the property.

Mr. Stutz said the new fence will be similar as far as the height but he prefers a different color and a different material, something longer lasting, than what he has now.

- 3.29 Mr. Falkof asked if the picture included in the packet then shows the type of fence the applicant is planning to install.

Mr. Stutz said yes.

- 3.30 Mr. Falkof asked if the new fence will follow the exact same line.

Mr. Stutz said yes, it will follow the same line.

- 3.31 Mr. Falkof noted that there is jog in the fence in a couple of places, presumably to go around something.

Mr. Stutz said yes, it does a little jog at the corner of the property because of a tree that is growing out toward Old Glenview Road. He has asked the fence company to not obstruct the tree. There's a 3' deviation around the tree to give it room to grow.

- 3.32 Mr. Falkof said you practically cannot tell the difference between the applicant's fence and the neighbor's fence. He asked if the neighbor's fence is approximately the same age as his fence.

Mr. Stutz said they could be the same age. They are identical in appearance. That continues all the way down Old Glenview Road, to the next 12 or 13 residents, they all have the same 6' wooden fences.

- 3.33 Ms. Urban said it is only the neighbor immediately to the south that has a double-frontage lot. The other 12 neighbors with stockade fences do not abut to a street.

Mr. Stutz said no, their homes, like his, back up to Old Glenview Road.

- 3.34 Chairman Schneider said that the road is the frontage road going south. There is another fence like the applicant's, then he said he did not notice any other fences along the road until the commercial property.

- 3.35 Ms. Urban said there is a townhouse complex two doors down on Old Glenview Road.

- 3.36 Mr. Stutz said yes.

- 3.37 Ms. Urban said that development does not have a stockade fence. So the people who do have a stockade fence, the applicant's neighbors, do not go all the way to Old Glenview Road from Lockerbie.

Mr. Stutz said that was not correct. He said the condos that Ms. Urban referred to are 5 to 6 houses away to the south of him. The 5 or 6 properties are just like his, up against Old Glenview Road. He said the 6-foot solid wooden fences continue around the condos and extend further to the south.

- 3.38 Ms. Urban asked Ms. Roberts to display exhibit 1.0.

- 3.39 Ms. Urban explained the location of the applicant's property and the proximity of Old Glenview Road to the others that have their frontage on Lockerbie. There are only one or two other properties like the applicant's that have frontage on Old Glenview Road. She said that this is a unique situation with a double-frontage property.

Mr. Stutz said that his property and 6 to 7 other houses to the south all abut Old Glenview Road. They have 6' solid wooden fences. He said if he can't replace his 20-year-old dilapidated fence, he'll leave it as is.

- 3.40 Mr. Glattard asked if another stockade fence to match was considered.

Mr. Stutz said it was considered but he doesn't think it's appealing as he likes the new type of PVC fence in white. This will accentuate his house, which he just had repainted and reroofed.

- 3.41 Chairman Schneider asked Ms. Roberts if anyone is in the audience.

Ms. Roberts said there was one else in the meeting nor anyone with comments in the YouTube chat nor other emails.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

- 5.1 Ms. Urban said she can support this as Mr. Stutz abuts on two roadways. She noted any family would like privacy. This creates a hardship as he cannot fully use his property.

- 5.2 Mr. Glattard concurred.

- 5.3 Mr. Falkof said he supports this. He stated the key is that it's a double-frontage lot and unique.

- 5.4 Chairman Schneider said he supports this. He said there are no sidewalks and no pedestrian traffic; a unique situation. There is one white fence when approaching Lockerbie Lane.

6.0 DECISION

6.1 Ms. Urban moved to recommend granting a request for a 2.0’ fence height variation and a fence openness variation to permit the replacement of a 6.0’ tall solid fence in the rear yard of a double-frontage lot at 222 Lockerbie Lane in accordance with the plans submitted.

6.11 Mr. Glattard seconded the motion, and the vote was as follows:

Chairman Reinhard Schneider	Yes
Brad Falkof	Yes
Didier Glattard	Yes
Christine Norrick	Not Present
Ryrie Pellaton	Yes
Bob Surman	Not Present
Maria Urban	Yes

Motion carried.

6.2 Mr. Pellaton moved to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for case number 2021-Z-15.

6.21 Ms. Choca Urban seconded the motion, and the vote was as follows:

Chairman Reinhard Schneider	Yes
Brad Falkof	Yes
Didier Glattard	Yes
Christine Norrick	Not Present
Ryrie Pellaton	Yes
Bob Surman	Not Present
Maria Urban	Yes

Motion carried.

7.0 FINDINGS OF FACT UPON WHICH DECISION WAS BASED

The Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the request meets the variation standards of Section 5.4.F and the fence variation standards of Section 5.4.F.h of the Zoning Ordinance. The physical conditions of the property, the location as a double-frontage lot, imposes upon the owner a practical difficulty. The plight of the owner was not created by the owner and is due to the development of the lot. The difficulty is not generally shared by others in the immediate area. The difficulty prevents the owner from replacing an existing fence and securely enclosing his backyard. The variations, if granted, will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property or otherwise injure other property or its use. The variations, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood, which

includes a tall, enclosed fence in that location and a fence of similar material and color a few houses away.

The proposed fence faces Old Glenview Road, which functions as a frontage road, and a one-story office building. There are no properties that would be impacted by the proposed fence. The applicant is seeking to replace a fence of the similar height that has been replaced with a permit in the past.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a 2.0' fence height variation and a fence openness variation to permit the replacement of a 6.0' tall solid fence in the rear yard of a double-frontage lot at 222 Lockerbie Lane in accordance with the plans submitted. at 222 Lockerbie Lane in accordance with the plans submitted.

3.0 COMMENTS AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

3.11 Mr. Dennis Stonequist, Executive Vice President
Loyola Academy
1100 Laramie Avenue

3.12 Ms. Sara Lundgren, Lead Architect
Krueck Sexton Partners
221 W. Erie Street, Chicago

3.13 Mr. Harold Francke, Attorney
Meltzer Purtill & Stelle LLC

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said this is a request for a 4.73' fence height variation to permit the construction of an equipment enclosure. The Village Board will hear this case on June 8, 2021.

3.22 Mr. Stonequist thanked the Village for working together to bring the Campus Master Plan to this point. He displayed the Conceptual Master Plan, addressed the Performing Arts Center, which is there for the student experience, and noted they collaborated with neighbors and village staff.

3.23 Ms. Lundgren said they are requesting a fence to enclose a chiller plant on the east side of the property adjacent to the Edens Expressway. A site plan was shown. She said the fence is between the access and egress, will be 11'4", and made of sturdy galvanized tubes and above grade to prevent acoustical noise from the chiller. Variation standards were referenced and all are being met with the exception of the height variance.

3.24 Mr. Pellaton asked if this fence is necessary for the operation of the chiller.

Ms. Lundgren stated it is not however, it would prevent the noise; acoustical mitigation.

3.25 Mr. Pellaton asked, as this is facing I-94, who they are protecting the sound from.

Ms. Lundgren said they are trying to do everything possible to mitigate noise to the environment. She said the acoustical engineer said as long as the height of the fence is as tall as the walls, no noise would spill over.

Mr. Stonequist added the building is so attractive, the chiller needs to be shielded.

- 3.26 Ms. Urban asked how much noise is anticipated and if erecting the fence would bring it down to zero.
- Ms. Lundgren said she cannot respond to technical points. The goal is to mitigate ambient noise.
- 3.27 Mr. Falkof understands about the soundproofing and asked if the chiller is 11'4".
- Ms. Lundgren said it is.
- 3.28 Mr. Falkof asked if a noise study was conducted and if a shorter fence could be used to contain the noise.
- Ms. Lundgren said, per the engineers, the fence needs to be at the same height as the top of the chiller.
- 3.29 Mr. Falkof asked if there is a guard against hazards if one gets close to the chiller.
- Ms. Lundgren said there is a transformer from Com Ed there also. She said for visual effect and acoustics, this should be shielded.
- Mr. Stonequist said they are working with the ARC as well. The Commission has taken an interest in the material they are using.
- Ms. Lundgren said they had a very productive meeting with the ARC the previous Monday.
- 3.30 Mr. Pellaton asked if this is a 3- or 4-sided fence.
- Ms. Lundgren said it is 3-sided and abuts the precast wall.
- Mr. Stonequist described the adjacent student spaces within the building and their expected use for daily classes as well as performances.
- 3.31 Mr. Francke stated he saw only the first 2 applicants swear in.
- Chairman Schneider understood that everyone was sworn in.
- Mr. Stonequist and Ms. Lundgren said they raised their hand and were sworn in.
- 3.32 Mr. Francke said he wanted to reiterate there is a detailed response regarding fence relief beginning on Page 19. He believes all standards are satisfied, and granting the variance would be a benefit to all.
- 3.33 Chairman Schneider asked Ms. Roberts if anyone is in the audience.

Ms. Roberts said there was no one else in the meeting nor was any communication received.

- 3.34 Mr. Pellaton asked if there is room on the roof for the chiller rather than at ground level.

Ms. Lundgren said there is a mechanical well where large air handling units are so there is no more space on the roof.

- 3.35 Mr. Pellaton asked if there are any windows on the east elevation of the building.

Ms. Lundgren said there are 2 openings but no windows.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

- 5.1 Mr. Falkof stated there are 3 reasons why he will support this. First, the chiller and transformer will be hidden. Second, he doesn't believe anyone will see the fence. Third, if there is soundproofing value, it is worth it.

- 5.2 Ms. Urban concurred and said in recent meetings, there has been discussion about decibels of air conditioning units, and this is a much larger unit. She said measures to keep sound down are a good thing. She will support this.

- 5.3 Mr. Glattard said the building is very nice, and unshielded equipment would not complement any building. He would support this.

- 5.4 Mr. Pellaton said he believes an 8-foot fence would suffice. He said the Com Ed transformer doesn't need to be hidden. No data was provided on sound mitigation. Though, due to this location being out of the way, he would support this.

- 5.5 Chairman Schneider said he also would support this as it is in keeping with the façade and the rest of the building and will mitigate sound though it faces a highway.

6.0 DECISION

- 6.1 Mr. Falkof moved to recommend granting a request for a 4.73' fence height variation to permit the construction of an equipment enclosure at 1100 Laramie Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted.

- 6.11 Ms. Urban seconded the motion, and the vote was as follows:

Chairman Reinhard Schneider	Yes
Brad Falkof	Yes
Didier Glattard	Yes
Christine Norrick	Not Present

Ryrie Pellaton	Yes
Bob Surman	Not Present
Maria Urban	Yes

Motion carried.

6.2 Mr. Falkof moved to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for case number 2021-Z-17.

6.21 Ms. Urban seconded the motion, and the vote was as follows:

Chairman Reinhard Schneider	Yes
Brad Falkof	Yes
Didier Glattard	Yes
Christine Norrick	Not Present
Ryrie Pellaton	Yes
Bob Surman	Not Present
Maria Urban	Yes

Motion carried.

7.0 FINDINGS OF FACT UPON WHICH DECISION WAS BASED

The Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the request meets the variation standards of Section 5.4.F and the fence variation standards of Section 5.4.F.h of the Zoning Ordinance. The particular physical conditions of the property, the use of the building and the need for commercial-grade mechanical equipment and the siting of the building on the lot, 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 and use of the lot. The difficulty is peculiar to the property and is not generally shared by others. The difficulty prevents the owner from making reasonable use of the property with appropriate mechanical equipment in a location and with screening so as to have the least impact on the building occupants as well as the immediate neighborhood. The location of the fence is such that it will not be visible from a residential street and therefore have no negative impact on adjacent neighbors or the neighborhood character.

The proposed fence is oriented toward the Edens Expressway, which generates noise. The proposed fence is very far from residential properties and will help contain any noise from the mechanical equipment within.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a 4.73’ fence height variation to permit the construction of an equipment enclosure at 1100 Laramie Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted at 1100 Laramie Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted.

3.0 COMMENTS AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

3.11 Mr. Gregory Braun, applicant
1605 Elmwood Avenue

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said this is a request for a 126.47 square foot (2.66%) lot coverage variation, 1.5' side yard setback variation, a 2.58' combined side yard setback variation, a 2.58' combined side yard chimney setback variation, and a 2.58' combined side yard window well setback variation, to permit the construction of a new home. The Village Board will hear this case on June 8, 2021.

3.22 Mr. Braun said they are requesting primarily side yard setback variances as the lot is narrow, 34' by 140'. They are not asking for relief for the floor area or height or front yard setback. Per the packet, similar materials and design will be used to be sympathetic to the neighborhood. It will be a modest home, less than 2,000 square feet. Because of the way the lots were platted, there is just not room to build a modern home on the lot.

3.23 Chairman Schneider asked if the existing foundation would be used.

Mr. Braun said no, a new foundation will be poured. The existing home is very similar to what they are proposing. The new home will be 2 feet wider. Pouring a new foundation also allows them to construct the basement to a more functional height.

3.24 Chairman Schneider clarified that the new house is 2 feet wider than the existing.

Mr. Braun said the old house is 2.5' from the west neighbor. They are sliding the new home to the east to give them a bit more room. They have put the home equal distance from each neighbor. He has talked extensively with both neighbors and they both support this.

3.25 Mr. Falkof asked if the side yard setback variation is due to the new walls or due to the chimney?

Mr. Braun said the required side yard setback is 5' from each neighbor, and they're about 1.5' short of that to the east, though they have provided a greater separation on the west side. Because the lot is so narrow, the combined side yard setback will not result in 15 feet [note: the required combined side yard setback is 12.5'].

3.26 Mr. Falkof asked what is going on with the current home.

Mr. Braun said that the prior permit was canceled due to a calculation miscommunication with zoning over the demolition and the stucco exterior. He said the solution was to raze the home and build a new one. They started with a goal to save the home but due to construction factors such as basement height, fire retardation, etc., the only choice now is to build new.

- 3.27 Ms. Urban asked if the side yard setback is a function of a bedroom in the basement with the window well having an escape exit.

Mr. Braun concurred stating this will comply with the Code and have an emergency exit ladder; this is much safer.

- 3.28 Chairman Schneider noted this is a new house and wonders why one can't comply with the requirements. He referenced another petition on a narrow lot. If one is starting from scratch, why not have plans without variations.

Mr. Braun said they are trying to create a house that's livable. They are not requesting relief for floor area or building setback. He said there is ample evidence in the packet. Mr. Braun is in agreement that one should live within the Code. He noted that's why they are centering the home on the lot. They are downsizing and building a modest home.

- 3.29 Ms. Urban said, regarding most homes not complying with the Code, it states in the packet that homes do comply.

Mr. Braun said neither neighbor complies. The intent is to center the home.

- 3.30 Chairman Schneider asked where the condensing unit is.

Mr. Braun said it is in the rear yard, not the side yard. He said a neighbor designed this.

- 3.31 Chairman Schneider asked if the Brauns will live in this house.

Mr. Braun explained they have had 5 homes in Wilmette and this is their downsized forever home.

- 3.32 Chairman Schneider asked Ms. Roberts if anyone is in the audience.

Ms. Roberts said there was one else in the meeting nor anyone with comments in the YouTube chat nor other emails.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

- 5.1 Mr. Pellaton said he struggles with standard b: the plight of the owner was not created by the owner and is due to unique circumstances. He is sympathetic to

narrow lots. The neighbors are non-compliant due to older houses. This is a nice plan for all reasons stated. The hardship is the narrow lot. He would support this.

- 5.2 Ms. Urban concurs as this is new construction. She believes the house could conform to the space.
- 5.3 Mr. Falkof concurs though said it comes down to the neighbors having the houses be more centered. He would support this though there is hesitation. This is a narrow lot and small house in Wilmette.
- 5.4 Mr. Glattard said if this house were remodeled, it still would not comply. He believes having a new house on the street is a good thing. Two feet is not a big number. He will support this.
- 5.5 Chairman Schneider said it should be feasible to comply. He expounded and struggles as it is not an insurmountable challenge. Four town houses were referenced. Chairman Schneider would reluctantly support this. He doesn't want to send a message of setting precedence.

6.0 DECISION

6.1 Mr. Pellaton moved to recommend granting a request for a 126.47 square foot (2.66%) lot coverage variation, 1.5' side yard setback variation, a 2.58' combined side yard setback variation, a 2.58' combined side yard chimney setback variation, and a 2.58' combined side yard window well setback variation, to permit the construction of a new home at 1605 Elmwood Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted.

6.11 Ms. Urban seconded the motion, and the vote was as follows:

Chairman Reinhard Schneider	Yes
Brad Falkof	Yes
Didier Glattard	Yes
Christine Norrick	Not Present
Ryrie Pellaton	Yes
Bob Surman	Not Present
Maria Urban	Yes

Motion carried.

6.2 Mr. Falkof moved to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for case number 2021-Z-19.

6.21 Ms. Pellaton seconded the motion, and the vote was as follows:

Chairman Reinhard Schneider	Yes
-----------------------------	-----

Brad Falkof	Yes
Didier Glattard	Yes
Christine Norrick	Not Present
Ryrie Pellaton	Yes
Bob Surman	Not Present
Maria Urban	Yes

Motion carried.

7.0 FINDINGS OF FACT UPON WHICH DECISION WAS BASED

The Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the request meets the variation standards of Section 5.4.F of the Zoning Ordinance. The physical conditions of the property, the narrow lot width and small lot area, impose upon the owner a particular hardship. The plight of the owner was not created by the owner and is due to the unique development of the lot. The hardship is peculiar to the property in question. The hardship prevents the owner from making reasonable use of the property with new construction that is consistent with and sympathetic to other homes in the neighborhood. The proposed variations will not impair an adequate supply of light and air. The home is modest in scale, conforms to the lot coverage and floor area requirements, and increases the space between it and the home to the west. The proposed variations will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood and the new home will enhance the neighborhood.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a 126.47 square foot (2.66%) lot coverage variation, 1.5' side yard setback variation, a 2.58' combined side yard setback variation, a 2.58' combined side yard chimney setback variation, and a 2.58' combined side yard window well setback variation, to permit the construction of a new home at 1605 Elmwood Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted.