



1200 Wilmette Avenue
Wilmette, Illinois 60091-0040

MEETING MINUTES

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2015

7:30 P.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Members Present: Chairman Patrick Duffy
Bill Merci
Lynn Norman
Reinhard Schneider
Bob Surman

Members Absent: Mike Boyer
John Kolleng

Staff Present: Lisa Roberts, Assistant Director of Community Development

I. Call to Order

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

II. 2015-Z-46 1115 Ashland Avenue

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

III. 2015-Z-44 123 Prairie Avenue

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

IV. 2015-Z-45 114 16th Street

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

V. 2015-Z-47 927 Greenleaf Avenue

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

VI. 2015-Z-48 1100 Central Avenue Unit D

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

VII. Approval of the September 2, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Surman moved to approve the September 2, 2015 meeting minutes.

Ms. Norman seconded the motion and the voice vote was all ayes and no nays. Motion carried.

VIII. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:49 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. Charles Fitzgerald, applicant

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a 7.78' front yard stoop setback variation and a 10.11' front yard step setback variation to permit the construction of a new stoop and steps on the legal non-conforming structure. The Village Board will hear this case on October 27, 2015.

3.22 The applicant has lived in the home since 1985. When they first moved in they did not notice that the steps were dangerous. They find them now to be unsafe. There are seven steps leading up to the door and the last step has a 7" tread. There is no landing or guard rail.

They want to change the design. The existing steps encroach. The new design minimizes the encroachment. When one exits the door they would come onto a landing. He showed a depiction on exhibit 1.4, which is a view from the top. The landing would be 6' wide. One would then turn 90 degrees and go down five steps to another landing, then another 90 degree turn would turn the person towards the street. The last two treads on those steps would increase the encroachment.

It is a small structure on a footing. It is no higher than chest high so there is no impact on light/air. It will be in keeping with the neighborhood. The outside will be a brick wall to match current house brick. There will be a safety rail at the top of the landing.

3.23 Mr. Surman asked after one goes down five stairs are there then a few more stairs? He did not see those on the elevation.

The applicant agreed that they were not on the elevation. There will be two more steps.

3.24 Mr. Surman clarified that an architect would complete the plans.

The applicant said that the drawing submitted to the Board was done to scale. There are five steps, a landing and two steps.

3.25 Mr. Surman said that the railing is also not shown on the drawing.

The applicant said that the railing would be around the landing at the top and to the second landing.

- 3.26 Chairman Duffy asked if the applicant was saying that from the existing stairs to the proposed stairs, the increase depth into the front yard is only a few feet.

The applicant said that it is less than 36”.

- 3.27 Chairman Duffy said that the packet indicated an increase of just over 3’.

The applicant said that it is less than 3’.

Ms. Roberts said that the 34” for the existing structure is approximate.

- 3.28 Mr. Surman said that this is a much safer solution. It will not impact the neighborhood.

- 3.29 There was no one in the audience to speak on this case. There was no additional communication on this case.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

- 5.1 Mr. Schneider said that when he looked at existing steps he said that they were a safety hazard. There is no landing. If they were to create a landing and then proceed directly into the front yard with the steps it would encroach even further. This solution minimizes the front yard encroachment. It is consistent with the neighborhood. He can support the request.

- 5.2 Mr. Merci said that is an attractive solution to eliminate a potentially dangerous situation. He can support the request.

- 5.3 Mr. Surman agreed with above.

- 5.4 Ms. Norman agreed with above.

- 5.5 Chairman Duffy also agreed with above. This is the optimum solution with the least impact. He can support the request.

6.0 DECISION

- 6.1 Mr. Schneider moved to recommend granting a request for a 7.78’ front yard stoop setback variation and a 10.11’ front yard step setback variation to permit the construction of a new stoop and steps on the legal non-conforming structure at 1115 Ashland Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted.

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

Chairman Patrick Duffy	Yes
Mike Boyer	Not Present

John Kolleng	Not Present
Bill Merci	Yes
Lynn Norman	Yes
Reinhard Schneider	Yes
Bob Surman	Yes

Motion carried.

6.2 Ms. Norman moved to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for the Zoning Board of Appeals for case number 2015-Z-46.

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

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 existing siting of the house on the lot and the lack of a landing and code-compliant steps, impose upon the owner a practical difficulty. The plight of the owner was not created by the owner and is due to the unique circumstances of the house and lot. The difficulty is peculiar to the property in question with the required front yard setback and the location of the house. The difficulty prevents the owner from having safe egress from the house. The proposed variations will not impair an adequate supply of light and air. The variations, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. The proposed stoop and steps are designed to minimize the intrusion into the front yard so that only the bottom two steps are closer than the existing steps.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a 7.78' front yard stoop setback variation and a 10.11' front yard step setback variation to permit the construction of a new stoop and steps on the legal non-conforming structure at 1115 Ashland Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted.

3.0 TESTIMONY, COMMENTS AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

3.11 Mr. Andrew Venamore, applicant
Mach 1
602 Academy Drive, Northbrook

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a 90.0 square foot (9.0%) rear yard structure impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a two-car detached garage. The Village Board will hear this case on October 27, 2015.

3.22 Mr. Venamore said this is a replacement of a detached garage for a structure that is very undersized, has a flat roof, and is falling to pieces. The objective for the replacement is to get a two-car garage on the property in approximately the same location. The owner is working to update the home due its age and lack of functionality. The variation is related to the narrowness of the lot. It is only 40' wide and the required rear yard setback means that the size of any replacement garage would be limited to 350 square feet, which is below a practical size garage. They are proposing a 20' x 22' garage.

The lot width of 40' is a hardship.

The owner is not at the hearing because he is traveling.

3.23 Ms. Norman asked why a 20' x 20' garage would not work.

Mr. Venamore said that they want a larger garage because of the relationship to the house. The house is one-story and they are going to remodel the interior of the house to make it more functional. The home does not have a lot of storage space. The extra few feet in the garage is for storage that cannot be in the house and not practical to have outside the house.

3.24 Chairman Duffy said his first question related to size of the lot when he read the case packet. There are ratios that allow building density to be at a reasonable level. He also looked at how many two-car garages were on the alleys. This alley had less than the other alley, but there are still a few and there are other lots with a 40' width.

Mr. Venamore said that there are larger lots on this block to the south and to the north.

- 3.25 Chairman Duffy said that there were three houses with 40' x 125' lots on this block and two had two-car garages.
- 3.26 Mr. Merci asked if there was additional paving proposed to gain access to the man door on the north elevation.
- Mr. Venamore said that the path will extend to the back of the garage where the man door will be.
- 3.27 Mr. Merci asked if the impervious paving was calculated in the request.
- Mr. Venamore said he thought that it was.
- 3.28 Chairman Duffy asked if any of the paving is to be removed.
- Mr. Venamore said that there is now paving on the north side of the current garage and this is all being removed. The path that runs there right now will go to the back of the garage and they are still under 60%.
- Ms. Roberts said that the rear yard is only the last 25' so the rear yard ends at the back side of the garage. The walk would not count as coverage in the rear yard.
- 3.29 There was no one in the audience to speak on this case. There was no additional communication on this case.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

- 5.1 Ms. Norman said she makes this complaint about garages, but everyone wants more storage and a larger house. Her garage is 20' x 20' and she would like a bigger garage also. She finds other places for storage. More pavement is not good and she will not support the request.
- 5.2 Mr. Surman said that he is on the fence. He can see Ms. Norman's point. There are two cases for garages on small lots at tonight's hearing. If everyone added two linear feet, this adds up. When one buys a small house with a one-car garage and now they want a larger two-car garage is not reasonable given the house size.
- 5.3 Mr. Merci said that 20' x 22' garages are prevalent throughout the Village. It would be difficult to resist that trend.
- 5.4 Mr. Schneider said he can support the request. He said that the garage size is more convenient and seems to be the standard garage size in the Village.
- 5.5 Chairman Duffy said he had concerns before he went to the site. Are applicants asking to put more on smaller lots? What does that turn the alley into? Is that different from other alleys? He dismissed that initial argument. It is a two-car

garage and the garage is 20' wide on a 40' wide lot. There is 20' of open area. There are a couple of other two-car garages on smaller lots. He rationalized, Why not? He will probably support the request.

6.0 DECISION

6.1 Ms. Norman moved to recommend granting a request for a 90.0 square foot (9.0%) rear yard structure impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a two-car detached garage at 123 Prairie Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted.

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

Chairman Patrick Duffy	Yes
Mike Boyer	Not Present
John Kolleng	Not Present
Bill Merci	Yes
Lynn Norman	No
Reinhard Schneider	Yes
Bob Surman	Yes

Motion carried.

6.2 Mr. Schneider moved to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for the Zoning Board of Appeals for case number 2015-Z-44.

6.21 Ms. Norman seconded the motion and the voice vote was all ayes and no nays.

Motion carried.

7.0 FINDING OF FACT UPON WHICH DECISION WAS BASED

A majority of 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 shallow lot depth, impose upon the owner a particular hardship. The plight of the owner was not created by the owner and is due to unique circumstances. The hardship is peculiar to the property in question, which is narrower and shallower than a typical lot. The hardship prevents the owners from making reasonable use of the property with a two-car garage. The proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air. The variation if granted will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. The proposed garage replaces an existing one-car garage behind the house and detached two-car garages are common in the neighborhood.

A minority of the Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the request does not meet the variation standards of Section 5.4.F of the Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the plight of

the owner is being caused by the owner with their request for a 22' by 20' garage, rather than a 20' by 20' garage. The difficulty of the lot size is not preventing them from making reasonable use of the property as many properties have 20' by 20' garages.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a 90.0 square foot (9.0%) rear yard structure impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a two-car detached garage at 123 Prairie Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted.

3.0 TESTIMONY, COMMENTS AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

3.11 Mr. Andrew Venamore, applicant
Mach 1
602 Academy Drive, Northbrook

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a 90.0 square foot (9.0%) rear yard structure impervious surface coverage variation and a 47.04 square foot (4.7%) rear yard total impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a two-car detached garage. The Village Board will hear this case on October 27, 2015.

3.22 Mr. Venamore said that is another replacement garage request. The structure is old and in poor shape. It measures 19' x 18'. That size, with a 16' door, makes for a tight situation. It needs to be replaced.

They are requesting a 20' x 22' garage. The variation is similar to the previous case heard this evening, 123 Prairie Avenue. The ordinance only permits 350 square feet on a 40' wide lot.

There is an additional request. He talked about existing and proposed site plans. There are some existing impervious surfaces in the yard. One accesses the alley and they will keep that. There is a 10' diameter paver brick patio that is for recreation. It has a table in the summer.

What is driving this request is that a 40' wide lot exists. There are quite a few 40' lots on the block. There are a number of two-car garages along the alley.

The structure is of limited width and depth and it is old, there is no benefit to keeping the current garage. They are providing a basic two-car structure, 20' x 22'.

The variation and hardship relate to the 40' wide lot. It is hard to get a practically sized structure with a lot of that size. The hardship was created to the existing garage.

The applicant is at the hearing.

3.23 The Board had no questions for Mr. Venamore.

3.24 There was no one in the audience to speak on this case. There was no additional communication on this case.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

- 5.1 Mr. Surman said his comments were the same as the last case. He agreed with Chairman Duffy's comment that the impervious surface request is nominal.

[Note: Mr. Surman's comments from 123 Prairie Avenue case were: "Mr. Surman said that he is on the fence. He can see Ms. Norman's point. There are two cases for garages on small lots at tonight's hearing. If everyone added two linear feet, this adds up. When one buys a small house with a one-car garage and now they want a larger two-car garage is not reasonable given the house size."]

- 5.2 Mr. Schneider said that the Board would think about the 22' dimension. If there are two cars in there and a workbench in the front. If that's the case, he understands why the standard is becoming 22' deep. He will support the request.
- 5.3 Ms. Norman is not opposed to two-car garages, but she is opposed to the additional 40 square feet. Her garage fits a lot at 20' x 20'. Part of the Board's job is to minimize variations.
- 5.4 Mr. Surman said a parking space is about 18' deep. If the overall structure is 22', that leaves 4' and the walls on each side so there is 3' of additional space that could be used for storage.
- 5.5 Ms. Norman said people buying huge cars is not a hardship.
- 5.6 Chairman Duffy made his comments on the last case. In this case there are more two-car garages on the alley. He noted that the existing garage is considered to be a two-car garage at 18' x 18'.
- 5.7 Mr. Surman noted that when the home was designed, most families probably had one car. So there was one car in the garage plus storage space. Now families have more than one car.
- 5.8 Mr. Merci said that the request is consistent with design trends for cars and the habit of storing things in garages is the trend.

6.0 DECISION

- 6.1 Mr. Surman moved to recommend granting a request for a 90.0 square foot (9.0%) rear yard structure impervious surface coverage variation and a 47.04 square foot (4.7%) rear yard total impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a two-car detached garage at 114 16th Street in accordance with the plans submitted.
- 6.2 Mr. Schneider seconded the motion and the vote was as follows:

Chairman Patrick Duffy	Yes
Mike Boyer	Not Present
John Kolleng	Not Present
Bill Merci	Yes
Lynn Norman	No
Reinhard Schneider	Yes
Bob Surman	Yes

Motion carried.

6.2 Mr. Schneider moved to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for the Zoning Board of Appeals for case number 2015-Z-45.

6.21 Ms. Norman seconded the motion and the voice 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 meets the variation standards of Section 5.4.F of the Zoning Ordinance. A majority of 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 shallow lot depth, impose upon the owner a particular hardship. The plight of the owner was not created by the owner and is due to unique circumstances. The hardship is peculiar to the property in question, which is narrower and shallower than a typical lot. The hardship prevents the owners from making reasonable use of the property with a slightly larger two-car garage than was existing. The proposed variations will not impair an adequate supply of light and air. The variations if granted will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

A minority of the Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the request does not meet the variation standards of Section 5.4.F of the Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the plight of the owner is being caused by the owner with their request for a 22' by 20' garage, rather than a 20' by 20' garage. The difficulty of the lot size is not preventing them from making reasonable use of the property as many properties have 20' by 20' garages.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a 90.0 square foot (9.0%) rear yard structure impervious surface coverage variation and a 47.04 square foot (4.7%) rear yard total impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a two-car detached garage at 114 16th Street in accordance with the plans submitted.

3.0 TESTIMONY, COMMENTS AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

3.11 Ms. Healy Rice, architect

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a 5.58' front yard porch setback variation, a 7.54' front yard porch step setback variation, a 62.68 square foot (3.8%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation, and a 125.25 square foot (7.6%) front yard porch coverage variation to permit the construction of a new front porch and steps on the legal non-conforming structure. The Village Board will hear this case on October 27, 2015.

3.22 Ms. Rice said the owners were at the hearing. They want to rebuild an existing front porch. They want to expand the porch width so it is a wrap-around porch. The current porch is non-conforming and they are looking to rebuild in the same location from a setback standpoint. They will actually shrink the porch by a few inches. There are several other homes on the block with similar sized porches.

The current porch is in bad condition and the roof has some issues because the roof pitches are off. The look of the new porch is similar to the current porch.

The house sits up about 3' in the air so they need steps to get up to that. They are permitted to go 6' into the 10th Street side and that is all they want to do on that side. The only issue is the number for impervious lot coverage. They are adding 54 square feet. The porch exceeds what is allowed because of the house's position on the lot. The house is 1,200 square feet under the overall number and 600 square feet under for lot coverage. If the house was set back further, these issues would not exist.

3.23 Chairman Duffy asked if they were increasing impervious surface coverage.

Ms. Rice asked Ms. Roberts to explain how the calculation was created.

Ms. Roberts said that she does not calculate existing coverage.

3.24 Mr. Schneider asked Ms. Rice to show exhibit 1.7 on the overhead projector.

Ms. Roberts said that the front yard is the first 33' of the property. The house is at 30.42'.

Ms. Rice showed what was being added.

- 3.25 Mr. Schneider asked if the northwest corner of the porch, which looks to be 6.5' x 6', is part of the front yard.

Ms. Roberts reiterated that the front yard setback is the first 33' of the property. The house is at 30.42'. The front yard setback cuts through the front of the house. The part of the porch that sticks out beyond the house, to the west, would be additional coverage from what is existing.

- 3.26 Chairman Duffy said it is already over because it is 6' wide by 7.5' so they are adding 45 square feet, but the request is for 62 square feet.

- 3.27 Mr. Surman noted that is adding to the impervious coverage.

- 3.28 Chairman Duffy said that the 6' that goes to the west beyond the side of the house of the front porch back to about 3' into the house is what is counting and is new. That is about 45 to 50 square feet and they are requesting a variance of 62 square feet.

- 3.29 Ms. Norman asked if there was a reason why the applicants wanted to extend the porch further to the west.

Ms. Rice said that the house is skinny for the lot and they were trying to give the corner more presence on the front of the lot.

- 3.30 Ms. Norman said that the porch is fairly large to begin with.

Ms. Rice said that the position of the house on the lot is causing the hardship.

- 3.31 Mr. Surman clarified that the porch was wood decking.

Ms. Rice said that it was open below. There is a roof over the porch.

- 3.32 Mr. Surman said that water could travel below if there was significant flooding.

Ms. Rice clarified that the entire porch was on piers.

- 3.33 Mr. Surman asked about the bottom piece that is along the ground.

Ms. Rice said they have to sit up 6" off of the ground. The foundation has to sit up 6" and the lattice would be at that level. There is a gap underneath.

- 3.34 There was no one in the audience to speak on this case. There was no additional communication on this case.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

- 5.1 Mr. Merci said that the variation seems to be not in excess of what exists in the front yard, conforms to the side yard variation, and there is a modest increase in impervious surface for a substantial improvement in appearance of the elevations – front and side – and he can support the request.
- 5.2 Ms. Norman said that she is somewhat appeased that there is gravel underneath the porch and it is not true concrete. The house, itself, is under the limits by substantial amount. She thinks she can support the request. The porch will look great.
- 5.3 Mr. Schneider said he would support the request. The hardship is how the house sits on the lot. The only question is the addition that was made on the existing plan. It makes a lot of sense and is an attractive solution.
- 5.4 Mr. Surman can also support the request. It is a nice solution. Impervious area has not changed that much because of the use of gravel.
- 5.5 Chairman Duffy supports the request. It makes perfect sense.

6.0 DECISION

6.1 Mr. Merci moved to recommend granting a request for a 5.58’ front yard porch setback variation, a 7.54’ front yard porch step setback variation, a 62.68 square foot (3.8%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation, and a 125.25 square foot (7.6%) front yard porch coverage variation to permit the construction of a new front porch on the legal non-conforming structure at 927 Greenleaf Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted.

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

Chairman Patrick Sullivan	Yes
Mike Boyer	Not Present
John Kolleng	Not Present
Bill Merci	Yes
Lynn Norman	Yes
Reinhard Schneider	Yes
Bob Surman	Yes

Motion carried.

6.2 Ms. Norman moved to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for the Zoning Board of Appeals for case number 2015-Z-47.

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

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 condition of the property, the existing siting of the house on the lot, imposes upon the owner a practical difficulty. The plight of the owner was not created by the owner and is due to the unique circumstances of the house and lot. The difficulty is peculiar to the property in question with the required front yard setback and the location of the front porch. The proposed variations will not impair an adequate supply of light and air. The floor of the porch is open and there is gravel underneath, making the structure somewhat pervious and therefore not detrimental to other properties. The variations, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. The proposed porch will improve the appearance of the house and street and is consistent in scale with others in the neighborhood.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a 5.58' front yard porch setback variation, a 7.54' front yard porch step setback variation, a 62.68 square foot (3.8%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation, and a 125.25 square foot (7.6%) front yard porch coverage variation to permit the construction of a new front porch and steps on the legal non-conforming structure at 927 Greenleaf Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted.

3.0 TESTIMONY, COMMENTS AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

3.11 Mr. John Fonseca, applicant
Fonseca Martial Arts

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a special use for an arts studio (Fonseca Martial Arts). The Village Board will hear this case on October 27, 2015.

3.22 The applicant said that he and his wife co-owned the business. He gave a brief history and began teaching in Wilmette in 1998. He taught at the Park District and at schools in the Village. He taught Karate at 1215 Washington, which moved to 1211 Washington. They were sub-tenants of that space for five years. They grew that program to 120 students, 3 days per week. They relocated to the Kenilworth Village House. The company was formed in 2003. They have one main retail location at 823 Chicago Avenue, Evanston and about 20 satellite locations throughout the North Shore.

He is very proud of his program. He serves youth and adults. He explained more about the program. He and his wife were co-captains of the U.S. Karate team and most decorated athletes in the sport in the U.S. It will become an Olympic event in 2020.

If they relocated to the proposed location, this would be a great addition to the Village. In Evanston, it has brought a lot of business to the southeast Evanston corridor. Most parents drop off their children and then shop in the vicinity. Classes are 30 or 60 minutes. If they located in the Village it would drive a lot of business to downtown Wilmette.

Their program is a safe sport and they teach about respect and anti-bullying. Their program is about not letting anything defeat oneself. They envisioned their move for quite a long time. They got 75 signatures from local residents and 30 signatures from local businesses approving their request.

3.23 Ms. Norman said that she sees bleachers in the drawing. Will tournaments be held in the space and if so, what does that do to parking?

The applicant said that bleachers are for seating for parents during classes and belt exams. All competitions are held at rented facilities. Their annual tournament is at Evanston Township High School. They have held tournaments at the Wilmette Park District.

- 3.24 Ms. Norman noted that they said peak hours were after school until 8:00 p.m. How many days a week is this?

The applicant said it is Monday through Friday. Fridays are a lighter day and they start classes later and end earlier. The hours the rest of the week would be 4:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. Their high traffic time for Saturday is from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Sundays are scheduled for special events for belt testing and parties.

- 3.25 Ms. Norman asked about student ages.

The applicant said that 90% of students are under 12. Ages 4 to 12 are the bulk of clientele. 15% of students are adults. Parents train with children.

- 3.26 Ms. Norman asked if there was sufficient parking.

The applicant said that their Evanston space has no designated parking and it is metered street parking. Most of the parking at the Wilmette space is vacant during peak hours. There are 32 spaces in the rear lot as well as 10 in the back.

- 3.27 Mr. Surman asked about the previous tenant.

The applicant said that it was a tile store.

- 3.28 Mr. Surman asked if they planned to renovate the space.

The applicant said they are not doing a lot of renovation. He showed the floor plan. They require a nice area for training, which is the 1,000 square foot mat area. All of the clients would enter through the breezeway. They would have reception area. Changes would be minor.

- 3.29 Mr. Surman asked if an architect drew the plans.

The applicant said their designer put the floor plan and rendering together.

- 3.30 Mr. Surman said that the toilet room area is not ADA compliant.

The designer said it was existing.

- 3.31 Mr. Surman said the decision about being ADA compliant is up to the Village. If it was created new it would not be ADA compliant per the drawing.

- 3.32 Chairman Duffy asked if this was a new location.

The applicant said they would close the program in Kenilworth and relocating to Wilmette. They are also in Wilmette schools.

- 3.33 Mr. Merci asked about that lockers are intended for.

The applicant said that the lockers are for coats and shoes. Most of the students come in dressed for training in their uniforms.

- 3.34 Mr. Merci said he assumes that the Village looked at the population, ADA requirements and men/women requirements for the patrons. It might not be part of the Board's discussion, however.

- 3.35 Ms. Norman said her major problem is the amount of traffic generated by the business on a narrow street with parking on both sides. It's great that people will enter through the breezeway. Are there four classes Monday-Thursday? She clarified that each class has 8 students.

The applicant said there are 30 minute classes for younger children. A student to instructor ratio of 8:1 is their goal. Average attendance is 1.5 times per week.

- 3.36 Ms. Norman asked if this information was also for Saturday morning classes.

The applicant explained Saturday programs.

- 3.37 Chairman Duffy asked if the applicant would be willing to instruct parents for drop off to drop off in the back parking area.

The applicant said he was willing to do this. Most parents do not want to stay on site. They have to be quiet during class. Most drop off children and shop, go to Starbucks, grab a bite to eat, and then return to pick up their children.

- 3.38 Mr. Surman said that the ZBA had approved a dentist for that space, but the Village Board did not grant approval. They might have been looking at retail for that space and businesses that draw more people and the business would be a good solution.

- 3.39 Mr. Schneider said that the Board recently looked at a medical office in the back of the space, which does not generate a lot of traffic. There is a below grade lot below that building and it is under-utilized. They should point out that space to parents.

- 3.40 Chairman Duffy said that there is parking directly across Central Avenue behind the buildings. If one walks through the small park there is another parking lot.

(After 4.0)

- 3.41 Mr. Schneider asked the ratio between boys and girls in the classes.

The applicant said when he was teaching by himself, about 80% of the students were boys. Now, with his wife also teaching, it's more like 60% boys and 40% girls.

3.42 There was no additional communication on this case.

4.0 INTERESTED PARTIES

4.1 Persons speaking on the application

4.11 Ms. Carol Dibo
1600 Washington Avenue

4.12 Mr. Tom Generowitz

4.13 Mr. Fred Abrams
400 Beverly Drive

4.14 Mr. Ryrie Pellaton
1115 Lake Avenue

4.2 Summary of presentations

4.21 Ms. Dibo has lived in the Village for 26 years. She bought the Wilmette Theater, along with her partners, in 2006. She works for the Wilmette Theater Education Project.

The focus of the Village Center meetings is how to drive business. Her above project has 100 to 165 students per term. The parents drop off, shop and get coffee, and this is what is wanted for the Village. Parking is not a problem. There is more than enough parking. At her business they educate and provide a place for kids to go after school. Parents appreciate this and will appreciate the proposed business. She cannot think of a better neighbor to have next to the theater, which is always looking for more business. The theater is a night business.

She encouraged the Board to vote in favor of this special use. They encourage their parents to come through the breezeway.

4.22 Mr. Generowitz has lived here for 13 years. He is in retail real estate and supports the request. He worked with the Village when they commissioned a report for ideas about how to increase the vibrancy of the Village Center. There is a lot of retail turnover in the Village Center. Stability is being created. This business will bring people in and keep them for a period of time. The martial arts owners are famous within their profession and it is an amenity/asset to their students and others in surrounding communities. He asked the Board to support the request.

Chairman Duffy asked if Mr. Generowitz had an involvement in this transaction.

Mr. Generowitz said he did not have involvement with this transaction.

- 4.23 Mr. Abrams has lived here since 1977. He knows the applicant for many years and he has trained with them. He has met many people in karate and the applicant is a wonderful person and teacher. This business would be an asset to the community.
- 4.24 Mr. Pellaton is a Wilmette Park District Commissioner. He is in favor of the request. His older son has been taking karate from the applicants for over 5 years. He took most of his classes at a location that had a street narrower than Central Avenue. There was no off-street parking. He talked about businesses gaining traffic if this business moved to Wilmette. The Village Center would become more vibrant. As part of belt tests, the students have a personal goals journal and many belts require some type of volunteer activities. The kids are respectful. The business does require some seating area. The Park District works with the business but there is more of a need that can be met from an after-school club. He is in favor of the request. He would be walking to the business if they move to this location.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

- 5.1 Mr. Schneider said he agreed with the applicant and supporters said about generating traffic for other businesses. Parking is not an issue. It will add to more pedestrian traffic in the Village Center. He can support the request.
- 5.2 Mr. Surman agreed and said that this was a good solution and will support the request.
- 5.3 Mr. Merci agrees and will support the request.
- 5.4 Ms. Norman said it is great what they are doing but she hopes that this does not aggravate traffic on Central. She supports the request.
- 5.5 Chairman Duffy said that standards of review are met and he can support the application.

6.0 DECISION

- 6.1 Mr. Schneider moved to recommend granting a request for a special use for an arts studio (Fonseca Martial Arts) at 1100 Central Avenue, Unit D in accordance with the plans submitted. The use shall run with the use.

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

Chairman Patrick Sullivan	Yes
Mike Boyer	Not Present
John Kolleng	Not Present
Bill Merci	Yes
Lynn Norman	Yes
Reinhard Schneider	Yes

Bob Surman

Yes

Motion carried.

6.2 Mr. Schneider moved to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for the Zoning Board of Appeals for case number 2015-Z-48.

6.21 Ms. Norman seconded the motion and the voice vote was all ayes and no nays.

Motion carried.

7.0 FINDINGS OF FACT UPON WHICH DECISION WAS BASED

The Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the request meets the special use standards of Section 5.3.E of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed use in the specific location will be consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan to encourage a vibrant commercial district in the Village Center. The applicant has an international reputation and will bring customers from outside Wilmette to the Village Center in addition to serving current Wilmette residents. The proposed use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety or general welfare nor will it be injurious to the use or enjoyment of other property. The proposed use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding properties nor will it diminish property values. The proposed use will complement existing businesses. Adequate utilities, road access, and other facilities already exist. Adequate measures already exist to provide ingress and egress with the lot to the rear of the building. The proposed use will be consistent with the community character. No known archaeological, historical or cultural resources will be impacted. No buffers, landscaping or other improvements are necessary. No other standards of Article 10 apply.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a special use for an arts studio (Fonseca Martial Arts) at 1100 Central Avenue, Unit D in accordance with the plans submitted. The use shall run with the use.