



1200 Wilmette Avenue
Wilmette, Illinois 60091-0040

MEETING MINUTES

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

WEDNESDAY, JULY 19, 2017

7:30 P.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Members Present: Chairman Patrick Duffy
Mike Boyer
John Kolleng
Reinhard Schneider
Bob Surman

Members Absent: Michael Robke
Christopher Tritsis

Staff Present: Lisa Roberts, Assistant Director of Community Development

I. Call to Order

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

II. 2017-Z-32 516 Linden Avenue

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

III. 2017-Z-34 100 Girard Avenue

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

IV. 2017-Z-33 1157 Wilmette Avenue

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

V. Approval of the June 21, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Kolleng moved to approve the June 21, 2017 meeting minutes.

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

VI. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:27 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 Ms. Laura Geiger, applicant
516 Linden Avenue

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a 1.37' side yard garage setback variation, a 1.98' rear yard garage setback variation, a 0.37' side yard garage eave setback variation, a 0.98' rear yard garage eave setback variation, a 5.0' side yard parking space setback variation, a 3.32' rear yard parking space setback variation, a 165.16 square foot (8.42%) rear yard pavement impervious surface coverage variation, and an 81.16 square foot (4.14%) rear yard total impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a replacement detached garage and replacement parking pad. The Village Board will hear this case on August 22, 2017.

3.22 The applicant said that although it sounds as if she is asking for a lot, when she explains this she said that she is not asking for anything out of the ordinary. Her home was built 100 years ago and the garage was built 50 to 60 years ago. The house has been rehabbed but the garage never has. The garage is not a perfect square. The southeast corner is nicked off due to a beautiful oak tree.

She moved into the house about 12 years ago. The tree is about 175 years old and between 3' and 4' wide at chest height. The garage has grown around the tree. They want to replace the garage as it is in disrepair. If they were to build a garage in the current location, they would need to come in a little bit from the tree to save the tree. They would have a hard time fitting two family-sized cars into the garage. They are a family of five with a dog.

They need to get a new car. They measured a car, but it does not fit into the garage. That's why she is asking for a new garage.

They want to build the garage slightly wider and coming back towards the house so there is room for cars and bikes. There will be no impact on neighbors' light and air. The neighbor to the south has written a letter to help the applicants save the tree. They want to maintain the oak tree. There is no place on the property for a conforming garage and saving this tree.

The process is extensive and costly. She also wants to talk about the parking pad. Right now, it is gravel. They are constrained because they want to protect the tree roots. They are looking at their options.

3.23 Chairman Duffy clarified they are not pouring concrete on the parking pad.

The applicant said that there is gravel for the parking pad now. When it rains, the gravel washes into the alley. She does not know if it would be possible to do pavers or pervious concrete. But all water must get to tree roots. She does not know her options. But she is asking for the parking pad tonight because the variation process is long.

- 3.24 Chairman Duffy said that in the request, they are asking to have the area paved.

The applicant said if that would work she would consider paving. Impervious surface also includes gravel. If she even wanted to add new gravel, the Board would need to approve her request to do that.

- 3.25 Chairman Duffy clarified that they are not pouring concrete.

The applicant said she would not do anything to impact water runoff.

- 3.26 Chairman Duffy said that the applicant is asking for gravel.

The applicant said that she has gravel now. She would need to maintain gravel or install something that would allow the flow of water. She does not know what that is.

- 3.27 Chairman Duffy said that he does not want to tell the applicant to do whatever she wants.

The applicant said they are before the Board because she wants to save the trees.

- 3.28 Chairman Duffy noted that even if they wanted to do pervious pavers, they would have to dig out 4" to 6" of ground and that would impact the tree that is in the middle of the parking area.

The applicant said she is open to any ideas.

Ms. Roberts said she thought that the plan was to do a paver or something in concrete. Gravel is not a permitted surface for parking or driving. That might need to be added as a variation request even though it exists.

- 3.29 Mr. Boyer asked if there was anything in the code to maintain existing conditions.

The applicant asked about pavers and gravel in tandem so they could keep the tree roots.

- 3.30 Mr. Surman asked Ms. Roberts if the rear yard request included pavers in that location or is that just the garage.

Ms. Roberts said it included the garage and parking pad.

The applicant has yet to find a perfect solution.

- 3.31 Chairman Duffy said if nothing was done to the gravel and treated it as they always have treated it and then they found a solution, it appears as if they would have to come back for the parking pad request.

Ms. Roberts said that the above is accurate. She reiterated that the gravel is non-conforming.

- 3.32 Mr. Schneider asked about the number of spaces in the parking pad area.

The applicant said that there are two spaces in the parking pad area.

- 3.33 Chairman Duffy said that the tree sits far enough forward so they might get a third car in the middle.

- 3.34 Mr. Schneider clarified that this is a request for a parking pad and two-car garage. Several neighbors have done this in one way or another with gravel or whatever.

- 3.35 Chairman Duffy asked if there was a need for a parking pad with two cars in the family.

The applicant said that the pad would be for guests or workers who work on her home. There is no parking on the street in front of her house but there is parking across the street.

- 3.36 Chairman Duffy clarified that it is an inconvenience for her to have people park across the street and therefore she needs a parking pad.

The applicant said parking across the street has a time limit. They live close to the El.

- 3.37 Mr. Kolleng said it looks like the garage is abutting the tree. Is that correct? Are they putting in a new slab?

The applicant said that is correct. They will hand dig out the area. She was told by an arborist that there probably not a lot of tree roots under the garage. They may encounter tree roots in areas where they are expanding. There is a scrub tree in the backyard but they won't know about roots until after they get into that area.

- 3.38 Mr. Schneider said that most garage sizes are 22' x 20'.

The applicant said her garage would be that size but with a cutoff corner and they are adding a bump out in the back.

3.39 Chairman Duffy said that the bump out is more than the corner that is cut out. The bump out is 12' x 6'.

3.40 Mr. Kolleng asked the size of the current garage.

The applicant said that the current garage is 20' x 20' with the corner cut off.

3.41 Mr. Schneider noted that the Board is reluctant to add to garage sizes beyond 22' x 20'. There is a lot of space in that size garage available for storage. Would she be amenable to reducing the parking pad to one space?

The applicant said if they put grass in between the tree and garage and gravel on the other side. She hadn't thought of a one space parking pad.

3.42 Mr. Schneider asked if the gravel absorbed the rain.

The applicant said that the gravel absorbs some of the rain. Some of the rain flows off because of the angle.

3.43 Mr. Kolleng clarified that they are using the parking pad as intended now. He suggested leaving it the way that it is.

The applicant said it was her understanding that it is not conforming as is.

3.44 Mr. Kolleng asked how long it hasn't been conforming.

The applicant said as long as anyone can remember. If the non-conforming parking pad can remain non-conforming and she can build a garage that would be fine with her.

3.45 Mr. Kolleng said it is difficult for the Board to get on board with something they are not sure about.

3.46 Chairman Duffy suggested that they take out the parking pad request now. He knows that it is a hassle to come back later to ask for the parking pad. But the Board won't say that she can do whatever she wants to do – there must be a plan for the parking pad. He referenced the survey and said it looks like there is a wall between the wall and the 12' x 6' addition. But in the floor plan, it is shown as one piece. The depth is 26' and 12' wide.

The applicant said that the line is because the addition was drawn on the existing survey. There is no wall.

3.47 Chairman Duffy said that there is service door that accesses that extra area. The plan is that the bump out area is for storage. The door opens into the space and then they will walk down to the cars.

- 3.48 Chairman Duffy said if the parking pad is gone, what variances will be eliminated.
- Ms. Roberts said they are still counting the gravel as impervious. It is an existing condition that is not being changed.
- 3.49 Mr. Boyer asked how the language for the request is changed.
- Ms. Roberts said we could take out reference to the replacement of the parking pad.
- 3.50 Chairman Duffy said that the 5' side yard parking space setback variation and 3.32' rear yard parking space variation could be removed.
- 3.51 Mr. Schneider said that the garage bump out is 72 square feet. If that was eliminated, it would reduce the request for rear yard impervious surface.
- Ms. Roberts said that they would still be over by a little.
- 3.52 Mr. Schneider asked about the 165 square foot variation request.
- Chairman Duffy said that this was from the parking pad and the garage.
- Ms. Roberts said that number does not include any part of the garage – it is the apron, walks and parking pads – flat open surfaces.
- 3.53 Chairman Duffy asked if the 81 square foot variation gets reduced.
- Ms. Roberts said it would be reduced if the 12' x 6' garage section was taken out.
- 3.54 Chairman Duffy said that there is no FAR issue. The garage is odd because of the requested depth.
- 3.55 Mr. Schneider said they cannot move the front wall of the garage 5' because of the tree. That makes sense. He wants to see the tree preserved. The side yard is also impacted because the garage cannot move farther to the east.
- 3.56 There was no one in the audience to speak on this case.
- 3.57 Mr. Surman said that the 6' x 12' request is unusual for standard garages. If that dimension was reduced it would be more amendable to him.
- 3.58 Mr. Kolleng said if there was no 6' x 12' request, could they put in a shed of that size.
- The applicant said a shed could not go that close to the building and it has to be 4' off the property line and off the building.

3.59 Mr. Surman asked how big a shed could be.

Ms. Roberts said it could be a maximum of 64 square feet and then it starts to count as FAR, which could still work.

3.60 Chairman Duffy said that the 72 square foot space could be detached and put somewhere else.

3.61 Chairman Duffy said that the Board does not have total agreement and the goal is to reduce some requests. The parking pad is eliminated now, but she might come back in the future. Would the applicant amend her request to take the bump out of the garage?

The applicant asked what size the Board would be comfortable with.

3.62 Mr. Surman additional paving would add to flooding in the area. Does the back area or basement flood during heavy rains?

3.63 Mr. Schneider said he would want to see the 6' x 12' bump out eliminated as proposed.

3.64 Mr. Surman would like to see the bump out reduced in size.

3.65 Mr. Kolleng said she should keep the bump out as proposed. Don't build something and then not be able to use it.

3.66 Mr. Surman said maybe it's not worth it to reduce the bump out.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

5.1 Mr. Boyer said one of the primary goals is to save the trees. The gravel area exists. They are asking for a larger garage. Most of the variances are existing conditions. He has no issue with the proposal and standards of review are met. He can support the request.

5.2 Mr. Surman said that he agreed with the above comments. They are not over on FAR. He can support the request. This is a good integrated solution.

5.3 Mr. Schneider asked if a shed that was 72 square feet require a variation.

Ms. Roberts said if it was in the rear yard it would need a variation, but otherwise it would be allowed on the lot.

5.4 Chairman Duffy clarified that for the shed to not come before the Board it would need to be closer to the house.

Ms. Roberts said the structure would have to be 10' or more from the house and 4' or more from the garage.

- 5.5 Chairman Duffy said a shed pushes it more into the middle of the yard.
- 5.6 Mr. Schneider said he does not have a great objection, but the Board would be creating a new template for garages. In this case, however, he can support the request.
- 5.7 Mr. Kolleng said he could support the request the way it was first presented. This is a unique situation. A shed would not be convenient. They are looking for more storage space.
- 5.8 Chairman Duffy said he is torn between Messrs. Kolleng's and Schneider's thoughts on this case. He agrees that the Board currently has a template for garages. This is a unique situation with the trees. He said that the proposal is not impacting anyone and they are not over on FAR. He can support this as amended. The hardship is the trees. A wider garage would not fit because of the trees. The Board has sometimes approved three-car garages but there is no room for a garage of that size in this case.

6.0 DECISION

- 6.1 Mr. Boyer moved to recommend granting a request for a 1.37' side yard garage setback variation, a 1.98' rear yard garage setback variation, a 0.37' side yard garage eave setback variation, a 0.98' rear yard garage eave setback variation, a 165.16 square foot (8.42%) rear yard pavement impervious surface coverage variation, and an 57.16 square foot (2.92%) rear yard total impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a replacement detached garage at 516 Linden 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	Yes
John Kolleng	Yes
Michael Robke	Not Present
Reinhard Schneider	Yes
Bob Surman	Yes
Christopher Tritsis	Not Present

Motion carried.

- 6.2 Mr. Boyer moved to recommend authorizing the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for the Zoning Board of Appeals for case number 2017-Z-32.

- 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 particular physical condition, the siting of two mature trees in the rear yard, 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 trees. The difficulty is peculiar to the property in question where the trees are so large and in the rear yard. The difficulty prevents the owner from making reasonable use of the property with a garage of a typical size as there is no place to fit a standard two-car garage without damaging the trees. The proposed variations 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 allow the replacement of an aging garage and the retention of large, mature trees, and will therefore not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a 1.37' side yard garage setback variation, a 1.98' rear yard garage setback variation, a 0.37' side yard garage eave setback variation, a 0.98' rear yard garage eave setback variation, a 165.16 square foot (8.42%) rear yard pavement impervious surface coverage variation, and an 57.16 square foot (2.92%) rear yard total impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a replacement detached garage at 516 Linden 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 Ms. Raana Saric, owner

3.12 Chad Boomgaarden, architect
1315 Central Avenue

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a 212.34 square foot (4.17%) total floor area variation to permit the construction of two-story addition. The Village Board will hear this case on August 22, 2017.

3.22 Ms. Saric said they have lived in their home for six years. They have two sons at Central School. The boys' grandmother cares for them while she and her husband are at work. The grandfather helps pick up the boys at school. She has two parents who live in Wisconsin. They are planning for the future when they might have to care for one or more parents. They want to build a parent/in-law suite.

3.23 The architect said that the family lives in a unique area. It is R1-I zoning district. It has some special concessions for people asking to do additions. The architecture is dated and most houses have not been gutted and flipped. The lot size is unique and there are some constraints. A lot of families buy these homes and want to renovate and expand.

First, they looked at zoning and there are special constraints in the area. One of their neighbors went through the process and it seemed lengthy. They looked at that request and knew that they had to ask for something less than that request. How do they get a bedroom and bathroom at the smallest dimension possible and fill in beneath that?

There is an existing 10' structure at the back of the house. This is not large enough for a bedroom. They added 2' to get 12' clear of the rear and added 8" for a brick masonry wall. The addition is at 12'8", which is 2' farther back from where there is an existing two-story structure. They will not ask for a side yard setback variance and the addition will be in line with the current house. The request is for the first-floor space. They extended the kitchen, filled in the area under the master bedroom with a family room/office. There are some other ways they could maximize their investment if that was an issue by doing a shed roof off the attic or by raising the gable. They are allowed up to 6'9" of head height that does not count. That would impact the neighbors in a negative way.

He explained how they developed the proposal. The ridge height is about 31'. The neighbor to the north will be impacted by the addition. They put a shed dormer above the bathroom to try to keep the gable as low as possible.

- 3.24 Mr. Schneider asked about how much of the third floor counts. Is the space usable?

The architect said that the existing third floor counts for about 200 square feet. The space is usable and is used for the current home office. That is in the middle of the house and runs north/south along the main gable line.

- 3.25 Chairman Duffy asked if there was anything in the front.

The architect said nothing is in the front. The proposed addition will have attic space that is inaccessible. They looked at the minimum amount of square footage for their request and be under the neighbor's request. There is no average percentage. A modern amenity like a bedroom takes up a higher percentage on a smaller lot.

- 3.26 Mr. Schneider asked how high the deck was.

The architect said he thought that it was about two risers or 14.5". The deck is wood and does not count against them. If the handrail is greater than 6'6" from grade to the top of handrail, it would count as FAR against them. But it does not count against them.

- 3.27 Mr. Surman said there are three risers and a handrail. The handrail is about 36" high. So, the area is less than 5'.

- 3.28 Chairman Duffy said that the architect noted they are going out 2'. Does this mean going 2' to the east?

The architect said that was correct.

- 3.29 Chairman Duffy that going from north to south, they are going 7' in one direction and 18' in the other direction.

The architect said that was correct.

- 3.30 Mr. Surman said that the home to the north is squared off as well. Do they extend further to the east or do they extend less?

The architect said they do extend further to the east but he doesn't have the exact dimension but it is in inches. They go just past the neighbor's main façade.

- 3.31 Chairman Duffy said that to the south is Evanston. This is the first house into Wilmette.

- 3.32 Mr. Boyer asked if they looked at a conforming addition and whether a conforming addition would accomplish their goals?

The architect said they would not get the bathroom with a conforming addition. They have 224 square feet of FAR left over to build upon. The first floor is about 218 square feet. The problem is with the second floor. There would be no mudroom if they built it as conforming.

- 3.33 Mr. Boyer said if they built got conforming, they would leave the master bedroom in the proposed location and remove the master bath and have that cutout. If they kept the north wall, they would take the wall between the master bath and master bedroom, take it straight down and remove everything south of that wall.

The architect said that the applicants want the bedroom/bath combination.

- 3.34 Mr. Kolleng asked about the hardship.

The architect said they gave additional evidence regarding reasonable use of the property in this area. He talked about how he defined reasonable and compared it to other requests. They tried to stay under what had been granted so they could remain reasonable. They had to keep client needs in mind.

- 3.35 Mr. Kolleng asked what was in the basement.

The architect said there is a lot of storage. There is an open area/play room.

- 3.36 Chairman Duffy clarified that there currently is a three bedroom, 2.5 bath house. The front bedroom has its own bathroom.

- 3.37 Mr. Surman said that the Board makes decisions based on hardship and standards of review. Hardships are not based on looking at other properties in the neighborhood. He gave examples of hardships.

The architect asked if lacking a modern amenity a hardship. He knows that there is flexibility in the definition of hardship. There has never been an addition to this house. They need the extra space.

- 3.38 Chairman Duffy asked if any space counted against them that is not used.

The architect said attic space does not count against them. They are using the attic space. They would give up the attic space if they could get their request.

- 3.39 Chairman Duffy said they would increase project cost if they lowered the roofline.

The architect said that the attic could be seen as a hardship.

(after 4.0)

- 3.40 The architect said if they asked for more roof for the attic they would be asking for more FAR.

4.0 INTERESTED PARTIES

4.1 Persons speaking on the application

- 4.11 Ms. Mary Beth Robinson
106 Girard Avenue

4.2 Summary of presentations

- 4.21 Ms. Robinson said her main issue is light and air. When they first moved there she liked that she has sunlight in her kitchen. On her landing is a window seat used as a reading nook. Her daughter's bedroom also faces south. She submitted photographs. By their coming 7' north and going back 2.8' they lose some sky and some sun mostly in the kitchen and in south facing windows.

Mr. Boyer said there is a conforming location for an addition and not need a variance.

She understands that.

Chairman Duffy said if they were to build this conforming it would still go 2' east and on her side. He understands the concern about light coming into windows.

She asked for clarification of the location of the nonconforming use.

Mr. Kolleng said they could make a conforming use on the south side. They want to do it on the north side.

Chairman Duffy said if the request was conforming they could build where they want. He referenced the second-floor floor plan. The hallway leads into the edge of the master bedroom. The bathroom is to the south. They would build the bedroom to the neighbor's side of the space.

Mr. Surman it would be close to conforming if they eliminated the bathroom on the second floor and the space below. They could still build right up to the lot line.

The neighbor said her goal is not to stop them. She does not object to what happens on the south side. It does not impact her.

Chairman Duffy said the proposed is not how they have to build but it is the most efficient way to build it.

Mr. Kolleng said if they cannot create the new master bath then maybe they won't build anything. They want a new master bedroom and bathroom.

The neighbor said that the home has been marketed as having four bedrooms. She has been in the attic. Can't they do something with the attic space?

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

- 5.1 Mr. Boyer said he is on the fence on this case and wants to hear what his colleagues have to say. He tries to balance private property rights with the zoning code. This is a reasonable request. This is a smaller lot. There is often a need for a variance with smaller lot. Are smaller lots something that creates a hardship or practical difficulty? There is no height, side yard setback or lot coverage issues. They are asking for over 200 square feet and squaring off a house. Is a small lot a practical difficulty or hardship?
- 5.2 Mr. Schneider referenced the first floor. They plan to expand the kitchen in a reasonable way and put in a small family room. The first floor becomes more functional for today's needs. He has no problem with that. The issue is whether the second floor needs to be the same dimension to create a master bedroom suite. What incremental area is added to the second floor that could be reduced to conform? He agrees with Mr. Boyer. The lot is small. The percentage variation is fairly small. They have anticipated the Board's concerns about not being extravagant in what they are requesting. They have proposed a functional and modest addition.
- 5.3 Mr. Kolleng said he has an issue with the request mostly related to hardship and impact to light and air to property to the north. If he was the neighbor he wouldn't want to see the wall go up. He understands they can build this to be conforming but they would not have a bath. He cannot support this considering standards of review four and five.
- 5.4 Mr. Surman is also on the fence. The difficulty he has relates to hardship. He said that the first floor is more usable to meet today's standards. He does not think that there is hardship related to the second floor. It is hard to give a variance when there is a big impact to the neighbor. In this part of the Village houses will not be torn down because of development restrictions. Houses have to meet modern standards.
- 5.5 Chairman Duffy said that his struggle was hardship. Density should be kept to a certain percentage of the lot. This house will not get torn down. The house has three bedrooms and 2.5 baths. This is a functional house for a family. It is a small request but it is over and impacts a neighbor in a negative manner. They could build by right in that space and create that wall that blocks out some light. One of the goals of the project is the master bedroom suite. What is the hardship? Is the hardship that they need a fourth bedroom? Or a unique quality of the house that makes it unlivable? Most people want the opportunity to have a parent live with them and have their own space. But they don't have that need now and they are anticipating

that this might happen. That is not the hardship to fulfill the request. The lot is small for the Village but not for the neighborhood.

- 5.6 Mr. Boyer said he is struggling with the reasonableness of the request.
- 5.7 Chairman Duffy said that there is an impact to the neighbor. As presented the request is not conforming.
- 5.8 Mr. Boyer said he feels for the neighbor but the Board should look at all the pieces. They have a conforming build in a location that the neighbor objects to.
- 5.9 Mr. Surman said that the house is a reasonable size for the lot size. A way to get this where the neighbor is not impacted and they get some modern amenities would have the bathroom on the second floor, center area. The master bedroom could be 10 x 12.
- 5.10 Chairman Duffy said that the architect stated that a 10' x 12' bedroom is not adequate size for a master bedroom.
- 5.11 Mr. Surman said that the house would still be three bedrooms but with a nicer master bath. They might need a variance or impact the neighbor and they would have a bigger first floor. He understands it would be nice to have a fourth bedroom.
- 5.12 Chairman Duffy said they could have the fourth bedroom but not the third bathroom.

6.0 DECISION

- 6.1 Mr. Boyer moved to recommend granting a request for a 212.34 square foot (4.17%) total floor area variation to permit the construction of two-story addition at 100 Girard Avenue in accordance with the plans as submitted.

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

Chairman Patrick Duffy	Yes
Mike Boyer	Yes
John Kolleng	No
Michael Robke	Not Present
Reinhard Schneider	Yes
Bob Surman	No
Christopher Tritsis	Not Present

Motion failed.

- 6.2 Mr. Surman authorized the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for this case.

- 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

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 size of the house and 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 circumstances of the development of the lot. The difficulty is peculiar to the property and only shared by others this small area. The difficulty prevents the owner from making reasonable use of the property with a master bedroom suite and expanded kitchen. The proposed variation was designed to minimize the impact on the neighbor to the north. The variation, 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, there is no hardship that is preventing the owners from making reasonable use of the property. The bedrooms and bathrooms are adequate for a house this size. Also, the proposed variation, because of the addition size and location, will impair an adequate supply of light and air to the adjacent property to the north.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends denying a request for a 212.34 square foot (4.17%) total floor area variation to permit the construction of two-story addition at 100 Girard Avenue in accordance with the plans as submitted.

3.0 TESTIMONY, COMMENTS AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

3.11 Ms. Carole Dibo, applicant

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a special use for an Arts Studio (Actors Training Center). The Village Board will hear this case on August 22, 2017.

3.22 The applicant has been a Village resident for 28 years. She lives at 1600 Washington Avenue. She has been active in the Wilmette schools. She has the support of her fellow retailers and neighbors for her request. She and her husband and another family bought the Wilmette Theater in 2006. The theater is a vibrant place for movies, live theatre and comedy and in 2007, she opened the Actors Training center on the second floor.

They opened it to bring in revenue for the theater and to fill a void to have a creative arts home for youth. Since they opened, they have 150 students per term. The area is about 1,700 square feet. Her center has become to Wilmette what Piven is to Evanston.

The school has a national reputation. About a dozen students work off Broadway, working in film and TV. They are regularly called by casting agents around the country. They attract residents from other suburbs. Students come in from around the country for specific weekend workshops. They have made a mark in their industry.

The training center has three major components – musical theater, improve, and acting. The second floor has two studios. They were once housed at the Masonic Lodge and that did not work out. Now they have space at the Legion Hall, but this space is slated for development so it is short term. It is not convenient or safe for their students.

What works for them is having a studio around the corner from the theater. Students don't have to cross the street. Staff can be there as needed. It is convenient for those students who don't live in the Village and who take public transportation. It is a great studio space for movement.

The building was built in 1911 and had seven stores on the first floor. It was used as a community center for support of troops in WWI. One of the goals of the Village master plan was to bring people to the Village. So many people come to the Village to shop and/or eat.

Retail is changing. What is unique about Wilmette's development is that there is service, education, and retail spaces. People come and stay.

She showed renderings of the building. They will keep the historic look of the building. Students will be visible when they are working. They will bring a contemporary visual to the Village. The interior will be a rehearsal space. The design is very simple. There are bathrooms in the building.

She is all about Wilmette. The acting school has been branded in the Village. There is little space in the VC with direct access to the theater. She does not want to move the studio somewhere else.

- 3.23 Mr. Surman asked if the glass along the street would be left open. Will it be used for public events?

She said that people would be able to look into the space. She wants to offer the space for community events. It will be vacant during the day.

- 3.24 Chairman Duffy asked if it was to code if students use a bathroom in the hallway.

Ms. Roberts said she thought that this was okay.

- 3.25 Chairman Duffy asked if the public came to the space, could they use the bathroom.

Ms. Roberts said she was not sure.

- 3.26 Mr. Surman said that in a mall, there does not have to be a bathroom at every location.

- 3.27 Chairman Duffy wants to make sure that the applicant does not run into an issue with bathrooms.

The applicant noted that there will not be performances in this space. There will be end of term parent observations.

- 3.28 Chairman Duffy said he is not standing in the way but wants to make sure there are no problems after they start to move forward.

4.0 INTERESTED PARTIES

4.1 Persons speaking on the application

- 4.11 Ms. Elissa Morgante
1330 Sheridan Road

- 4.12 Ms. Sabrina Schoenberg
3216 Highland Road, Northbrook
- 4.13 Mr. Jake Rasof
444 Brookside Drive
- 4.14 Ms. Joan Oh
1742 Highland Avenue
- 4.15 Ms. Judy Tater
Wilmette resident

4.2 Summary of presentations

- 4.21 Ms. Morgante has lived in the Village for 23 years. The applicant did a great job outlining the reasons for her request. The Board should approve the request. She is all about Wilmette. The purchase of the theater and rejuvenation of the Village Center go hand in hand. Retail is in a decline. Adding this service to the Village Center is a positive.
- 4.22 Ms. Schoenberg spoke about what she has learned from ATC about performing and about life. They rehearse at the Legion Hall and it is not the best space. There is no AC or Wi-Fi. Due to the air quality, they cough when they sing.
- 4.23 Mr. Rasof said he has been with ATC for four years. He has made friends with his peers and teachers. It is a great group. For some of the classes they had to go between locations. He thinks that the closer space will be much easier.
- 4.24 Ms. Oh said that three of her four children have taken classes. Her oldest son was one of the first students. There are high school and junior high students at tonight's meeting, but there are classes for younger children. Sometimes students do back to back classes. It is a wonderful program. She has lived in the Village for 22 years. She supports the request and hopes that the Board approves it.
- 4.25 Ms. Tater has lived in the Village for over 35 years. She taught at New Trier and in Lincolnwood. When she retired from teaching, she wanted to do something that took her out of her comfort zone. She took acting classes and developed a lot of confidence. She found a career, has an agent and has had several jobs. ATC is the only school that has classes and that is not located in Chicago. One of the issues of taking classes is the space. She hopes that the Board will grant a variance for the special use.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

- 5.1 Mr. Surman said it is a great project and a great way to bring people into the Village. Retail is changing. There has to be a variety of different retail than the Village has

had in the past. Being able to see activity from the street is interesting. He can support the request.

5.2 Mr. Boyer agreed with the above. It is a good fit for the Village Center. It will bring more business to the Village Center. He can support the request.

5.3 Mr. Schneider said he can support the request.

5.4 Mr. Kolleng can support the request.

5.5 Chairman concurs. It is a great use for the space. Service businesses can fill vacant retail spaces. Brick and mortar is slowing down.

6.0 DECISION

6.1 Mr. Surman moved to recommend granting a request for a special use for an Arts Studio (Actors Training Center) at 1157 Wilmette Avenue, in accordance with the plans submitted. The use shall run with the use.

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

Chairman Patrick Duffy	Yes
Mike Boyer	Yes
John Kolleng	Yes
Michael Robke	Not Present
Reinhard Schneider	Yes
Bob Surman	Yes
Christopher Tritsis	Not Present

Motion carried.

6.2 Mr. Schneider authorized the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for the Zoning Board of Appeals for case number 2017-Z-33.

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 special use standards of Section 5.3.E of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed use allows for the relocation and expansion of a successful existing use that is associated with the theater. The proposed use in this location is consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed use in this location is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan to encourage a

vibrant commercial district in the Village Center. 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 12 apply.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a special use for an Arts Studio (Actors Training Center) at 1157 Wilmette Avenue, in accordance with the plans submitted. The use shall run with the use.