



1200 Wilmette Avenue
Wilmette, Illinois 60091-0040

MEETING MINUTES

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2017

7:30 P.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBERS

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

Members Absent: None

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-45 1932 Washington Avenue

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

III. 2017-Z-47 242 Thelin Court

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

October 11, 2017 Zoning Board of Appeals

Approved November 15, 2017

IV. 2017-Z-41 321 Wilshire Drive West

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

V. 2017-Z-43 711 Laramie Avenue

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

VI. 2017-Z-44 3201 Old Glenview Road

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

VII. 2017-Z-31 808 Linden Avenue

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

VIII. Approval of the July 5, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Schneider moved to approve the July 5, 2017 meeting minutes.

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

IX. Approval of the August 16, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Surman moved to approve the August 16, 2017 meeting minutes.

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

X. Approval of the September 6, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Surman moved to approve the September 6, 2017 meeting minutes.

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

XI. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

XII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:27 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 None

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that the applicant could not attend the meeting and sent an email asking to continue until November 1, 2017.

6.0 DECISION

6.1 Mr. Boyer moved to continue this case to the November 1, 2017 meeting.

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

Motion carried.

3.0 TESTIMONY, COMMENTS AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

3.11 Mr. Peleg Holzmann, applicant

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a 162.68 square foot (14.39%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation and a variation to permit a parking space in the required front yard on the legal non-conforming structure. The Village Board will hear this case on November 14, 2017.

3.22 The applicant said he did not know that he needed a permit to create a parking space in the required front yard. He did this because they have a combined driveway in the front with his neighbor. They are the only house in their cul de sac that has this condition. It gets tricky if the neighbor has a lot of cars parked on the driveway and it is hard to get out. He talked to his neighbor about creating a patch of asphalt on the side. The section is 52 square feet. They spent three weeks building a deep whole and filled it with gravel, limestone and asphalt. Then he found out he needed a permit and was surprised to hear this. It was an unintentional safety-related change and he didn't know that he needed a permit to do the work.

3.23 Mr. Boyer asked if the change in the driveway improved the situation.

The applicant said this was a positive change and the situation is much better. He didn't touch the curb. The neighbor, who could not attend the meeting, is happy with the change. The neighbor helped him with the project. He said they got the stone from a quarry on Lake Ave and bought bags and bags of asphalt.

3.24 Mr. Surman asked if there was a sidewalk would it be considered to be parking in the parkway.

3.25 Chairman Duffy said it is in the parkway.

3.26 Mr. Surman said that the issue is impervious surface. If there was no impervious issue could they park the car that close to the street.

Ms. Roberts said that is what the other variation is about. They can park in the wider spot, drive along the side and go to the legal parking space in the garage.

3.27 Chairman Duffy clarified that because they widened the driveway, they created the parking space. If there was no widening of the driveway, they would block the entire driveway.

The applicant said that the change was consistent with what was in the neighborhood.

3.28 There was no one in the audience to speak on the case.

3.29 Mr. Surman asked how long the applicant lived in the house.

The applicant said he lived in the house about 12 years.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

5.1 Mr. Schneider said it is a small addition to the site. It was an honest mistake. He can support the request.

5.2 Mr. Kolleng agreed and said it is a minor increase in impervious surface. There is a safety aspect. He can support the request.

5.3 Chairman Duffy asked if the applicant had come to the Village and asked to do this what would the response have been?

Ms. Roberts said that a variation would have been required.

5.4 Mr. Robke said that everyone keeps mentioning the additional square feet. He is not troubled by that but is troubled by parking in the front yard setback, especially right at the curb line. He went by the site and the car that was there was right in your face. This situation is generally discouraged. He has difficulty supporting this request.

5.5 Chairman Duffy agreed with Mr. Robke's comments. With parking right at the street, it made backing out for the neighbor somewhat more difficult. Having the car at the street was obtrusive. Everyone else who parks in the driveway has the car closer to the street and not at the street.

5.6 Mr. Surman also agrees with the above comments. The ordinance is there for a reason and people should not park in the front yard. Maybe if it was further up it would have been acceptable. He sees it being a problem He also sees a problem with plows trying to plow snow.

5.7 Mr. Kolleng said this is a hard street to park on. There is a little strip of grass between two driveways that is the parking space. They could park on the driveway. He has a hard time seeing how this creates any issue. They are creating a safer feature.

5.8 Chairman Duffy said that the grass is opposite the parallel driveway and not in between the driveways. There are parking restrictions on both sides of the street.

There is no overnight parking. If this case had come before the Board would the Board have decreased the size or just said no? He knows that this is already done.

- 5.9 Mr. Boyer is not sure they can make the size any smaller.
- 5.10 Mr. Robke said it is about the location with a car right at the curb line.
- 5.11 Mr. Boyer said that is where some of the hardship comes in – size of the lot, shape of the lot, where the lot is located on a cul de sac and an arc for the front lot line. All of those things combined creates the hardship. What is this truly impacting? Looking at the neighborhood it is fairly common to see a car parked in the driveway. The car parked where it is isn't any different than a side drive leaving the car on the driveway.
- 5.12 Chairman Duffy said he does not think that anyone leaves a car in the driveway at the street. They pull forward.
- 5.13 Mr. Tritsis said this house has the toughest conditions for parking than any other house on the cul de sac. He got out of his car and looked.
- 5.14 Mr. Boyer said that the neighbor's lot is much larger and his asphalt space is much greater. The sidewalk ends right there and it fans wide. His parking issue is totally different from the applicant's. The house is further back. The opposite end of the cul de sac did not have the same problem.
- 5.15 Mr. Surman said that the width of the driveway is like other properties in the Village. A lot of people must jockey the cars to get out. If they would have come to the Board before doing the work he would have approved the area that is further away from the curb. There are cars in the driveway at other houses but not right at the curb.
- 5.16 Mr. Boyer said that there were cars right at the sidewalk when he drove by. This is a unique situation. Normally he would not agree to have cars parked in the front. There is a hardship.
- 5.17 Chairman Duffy asked if there was a calculation to determine if the front yard was squared off instead of having that arc.

Ms. Roberts said she did not have this calculation.

6.0 DECISION

- 6.1 Mr. Schneider moved to recommend granting a request for a 162.68 square foot (14.39%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation and a variation to permit a parking space in the required front yard on the legal non-conforming structure at 242 Thelin Court in accordance with the plans submitted.

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

Chairman Patrick Duffy	No
Mike Boyer	Yes
John Kolleng	Yes
Michael Robke	No
Reinhard Schneider	Yes
Bob Surman	No
Christopher Tritsis	Yes

Motion carried.

6.2 Mr. Boyer moved to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for the Zoning Board of Appeals for case number 2017-Z-47.

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

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 width at the front of the lot and the configuration of the cul de sac, impose up 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 lot. The difficulty is peculiar to the property in question. The difficulty prevents the owner from making reasonable use of the property with adequate parking. The proposed variations will not impair an adequate supply of light and air or otherwise injure adjacent property. The proposed variations 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 are no particular conditions to the lot that are creating a practical difficulty. The difficulty described by the applicant is not peculiar to the property in question. Many properties have a driveway only one car in width and many properties have on-street parking restrictions that limit such parking. The owner is able to make reasonable use of the property without the variations being granted. Allowing a parking space so close to the street will alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a 162.68 square foot (14.39%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation and a variation to permit a

parking space in the required front yard on the legal non-conforming structure at 242 Thelin Court 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. Kristopher Nosek
321 Wilshire Drive West

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a 6.5' front yard setback variation, a 0.03' minimum side yard setback variation, a 2.27' combined side yard setback variation, and a 90.95 square foot (4.49%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a garage addition. The Village Board will hear this case on October 24, 2017.

3.22 The applicant said that his house is in West Wilmette off Glenview Road. Like most houses in the neighborhood, it was built with no garage. His front yard includes two large trees, 20' and 22' diameter. They provide shade to their property. There is also a large tree in their parkway. There are 35 homes in his neighborhood and only five do not have a garage. One of them is his home. They have been planning for a garage and tried to find the best location. He talked about garage location options. The final location would be on the front of the property along the northeast side of the home. A side load garage is proposed in the space that is currently their front porch. The north driveway, which is a semi-circle, would be removed and replaced with green space of 80 square feet. The windows along the kitchen would be removed and there would be a skylight for natural light in the kitchen. They would be 25' from the east property line. If they were at a different distance their trees would be impacted. This is the best option for garage location. The garage would be 600 square feet and will blend with the other garages on the block. They are requesting a variance for the front setback and a combined side yard setback.

3.23 Mr. Schneider referenced 1.4. He said that the tree appeared to be in a different location than what is shown on 1.4.

The applicant said that Mr. Schneider is correct. It is a little bit further to the south than is shown on 1.4.

3.24 Chairman Duffy asked the width of the garage door.

The applicant said that it is 16' wide. It will be a two-car garage.

3.25 Chairman Duffy asked if they considered having the door on the east face.

The applicant said that would require a driveway and removal of one tree or possibly two.

- 3.26 Chairman Duffy clarified that the pine tree would remain between the two houses. Did they layout the garage and where the apron would come? Would the driveway impact that tree?

The applicant said it would impact the tree if the garage had east loading.

- 3.27 Chairman Duffy said that he saw this as using the current driveway but then open into the door. Then they could have a 20' door and room for the two cars to get in and out.

The applicant talked about other scenarios and losing trees.

- 3.28 Chairman Duffy said that even if they put the garage to the north and then be in the side yard setback, that would impose more on the neighbor to the north.

The applicant said that a side loading garage blends in better with the neighborhood.

- 3.29 Mr. Schneider asked why the garage was 24' deep.

The applicant said it gives them a nice place for storage.

- 3.30 There was discussion about allowed garage sizes. With an attached garage, there is more leeway in garage size.

The house at Lake and Hunter just was before the Board requesting a garage, three car, in the back yard. This garage was not challenging the FAR.

- 3.31 Mr. Robke asked Mr. Schneider if he thought that if the garage was shorter it would eliminate one variance.

- 3.32 Mr. Boyer said that the second variance is very small. The bigger issue is the 6.5 front yard is there because he has 27' wide and 24' deep and it is 27' wide because of the stoop.

The applicant explained why the garage was dimensioned this way.

- 3.33 Chairman Duffy said that he only has a 16' wide door. It is a side loaded garage. If it was a front-loaded garage it could be shallower than 27'. But then a tree is lost.

- 3.34 Mr. Surman asked if they would have an existing slab for the porch. Is that within the garage? Will it remain?

The applicant said that it is in the garage and it will remain. It would be at a different level.

- 3.35 Chairman Duffy asked if the existing concrete porch is being torn out.

The applicant said that there is no slab. There are bricks that will be removed.

- 3.36 Mr. Surman clarified that the applicant said that a lot of houses in the area have two-car garages.

The applicant said that only five houses in his immediate area, including his house, does not have a two-car garage.

- 3.37 There was no one in the audience to speak on this case.

- 3.38 Mr. Boyer asked about the original impervious surface.

Ms. Roberts said that existing is 793.5 square feet.

The applicant showed what exists and what is being removed.

- 3.39 There was no one in the audience to speak on this case.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY THE WILMETTE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

- 5.1 Mr. Robke said he can support this. It is a reasonable way to accommodate a garage, which is standard in the Village and in this neighborhood. He is pleased they are eliminating a circular driveway. They will have less impervious surface area with the proposed design.

- 5.2 Mr. Boyer said he is on the fence. There could be a reduction in the variance request or site the garage differently. If it was a front-loaded garage, it wouldn't need to be 27' wide and it could be 24' wide, which would reduce the request. The other requests are not that concerning. He wants to hear what his colleagues have to say on this case.

- 5.3 Mr. Robke agreed with Mr. Boyer's concern. The tree would need to be removed. But the tree seems to be healthy.

- 5.4 Mr. Surman said he is on the fence also and wants to hear his colleagues' comments. The proposal addresses the design concern that the Village is trying to implement, which is to have the doors not face the street.

- 5.5 Mr. Schneider said that he thought that the revised ordinance was to have the garage 5' back of the front of the house.

Ms. Roberts said that is true for new construction.

- 5.6 Mr. Schneider said if they eliminated the front yard setback by pushing the front of the garage back 6', which would still give 20' of depth. They could create a driveway that might save a tree. They would save a lot more impervious surface.

- 5.7 Chairman Duffy said they could remove the longer side of the driveway.
- 5.8 Mr. Schneider said they would have a reasonably sized garage. Is the only hardship the tree?
- 5.9 Mr. Robke said that the hardship is the configuration. There are different ways to solve the problem. There is a proposed solution in front of the Board. Perhaps alternatives are less demanding. This solution meets the criteria.
- 5.10 Mr. Kolleng said that the Village supports having a two-car garage. This garage is attached. There is more leeway. When trees have been an issue before, the Board has worked with the applicant around that. This is a minor variation. The design accomplishes a lot. He does not have many options. He can support this request.
- 5.11 Mr. Tritsis said the discussion is about the tree. If they are building the garage on an impervious surface driveway – what is he missing?
- 5.12 Chairman Duffy said that it is his understanding is that to allow a second car to get in the driveway, you can go straight to get into one spot, but to get to the spot to the south you must cut into the yard and pull in. To have enough room to cut in and go into the garage space and back out of the garage space, the tree impacts where the driveway must go.
- 5.13 Mr. Tritsis said that there is no issue with the tree the way the driveway is proposed. There is decrease in impervious surface. He likes the look of not seeing doors from the street. It is more tasteful. It is the right path.
- 5.14 Chairman Duffy said that he agrees with this. The proposal works better with the front load and it looks better with the side load. He has handcuffed himself with a 16.5' door, but if he is willing, then that's his choice.

6.0 DECISION

- 6.1 Mr. Robke moved to recommend granting a request for a 6.5' front yard setback variation, a 0.03' minimum side yard setback variation, a 2.27' combined side yard setback variation, and a 90.95 square foot (4.49%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a garage addition at 321 Wilshire Drive West in accordance with the plans submitted.

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

Chairman Patrick Duffy	Yes
Mike Boyer	No
John Kolleng	Yes
Michael Robke	Yes
Reinhard Schneider	No

Bob Surman	No
Christopher Tritsis	Yes

Motion carried.

6.2 Mr. Kolleng moves to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for the Zoning Board of Appeals for case number 2017-Z-41.

6.21 Mr. Robke 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 particular physical conditions of the property, the location of the house on the lot and the siting of two trees in the front yard, impose upon the owner a practical difficulty. The plight of the owner was not created by the owner and is due to the circumstances of the lot. The difficulty is peculiar to the property in question. The difficulty prevents the owner from making reasonable use of the property with a two-car garage. Most of the homes on his street, south of Glenview Road, were built without a garage. Most now have a garage. The proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent properties. The proposed request reduces the front yard impervious coverage. The variations, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. The proposed request allows for two large trees to be retained and orients that garage so that the door does not face the street.

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 specific to the property and necessitating the proposed plan. Facing the garage to the street would allow for a smaller garage and less front yard impervious surface coverage, reducing or eliminating some of the variations that have been requested.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a 6.5' front yard setback variation, a 0.03' minimum side yard setback variation, a 2.27' combined side yard setback variation, and a 90.95 square foot (4.49%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a garage addition at 321 Wilshire Drive West 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. Brigitte Berger-Raish, Director of Engineering and Public Works
Village of Wilmette

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for an expansion of a special use (Public Works Facility), a 5.46' accessory structure height variation and a 12.16' accessory structure height variation to permit the construction of a roofed salt storage accessory structure and a roofed spoil bins accessory structure. The Village Board will hear this case on November 14, 2017.

3.22 The applicant said that the location of the project is at their public works facility. There are many operations coming from that facility – fleet division, forestry, water sewer operation, as well as street divisions like snow plowing and leaf collection. All needs of the infrastructure are served out of that facility. The current zoning is GC2, which is heavy commercial. The Village yard is well buffered on four sides. It has a nicely landscaped frontage on Laramie. There is a park district facility on the north side of the site. On the west side of the site is a Com Ed easement and the UPRR. On the south side of the site is a commercial storage facility.

They are asking to expand their special use. The proposal is to build a new salt storage facility and she showed its location on a plan.

They have two accessory structures, one is new and one is existing. The proposal is to build a new salt storage facility. There is a 700-ton salting facility which only stores about 36% of salt storage needs. Best practice would have them storing 100% of their salt on site. That is not possible, but as part of the parking lot reconstruction project, they have an opportunity to build a smaller accessory structure for salt storage. That will bring their total storage up to 1120 tons, which is 60% of total annual usage. They will have more capacity and flexibility to store on site.

Under current IEPA regulations, any salt storage facility must be covered. They don't want the salt rained on and creating a run off that would contaminate the sewer system.

The second area that are adding a roof on is the spoil bins. These are two existing concrete spoil bins that are protected on three sides but do not have a roof structure. As part of their project they would like to add a fabric structure over the two facilities. Their spoil bins hold street sweepings, what is pulled out of the sewer systems, asphalt, etc. According to the MWRD and IL EPA, they must cover those

facilities to ensure that contaminants go on them and then into the storm sewage system.

The heights were determined based on operations and the type of equipment moving in and out of the facility to load salt or drop off debris into the spoils bins. Those are operational functions. Both facilities are next to existing structures that are also quite high. The proposed salt storage area is next to an existing materials storage bin that is 21' high. It is taller than the proposed roof over the salt storage. And the spoils bin in this area is behind an existing vehicle storage wash bay. It is about 1' taller but it is well buffered from Laramie Ave.

- 3.23 Chairman Duffy said that there was something in the proposal that was important – if they don't use all the salt what happens.

Ms. Berger-Raish said that this winter was a lighter winter so they did not use all salt they bought. They must purchase a minimum amount of salt. Not all of it can be stored on site based on the limited salt storage. They created a temporary spot by moving other materials off site. If they couldn't do that, it would have cost taxpayers' money to go the salt provider for storage. There is an economic benefit to having more storage on site.

- 3.24 Mr. Kolleng asked where the excess salt got stored now.

Ms. Berger-Raish said they moved some sand and gravel out of existing bins to a new location and they are storing it at that location temporarily.

- 3.25 Mr. Robke asked if there was anything in the proposed improvements that would increase traffic. Have neighbors expressed any concern about the proposal?

Ms. Berger-Raish said traffic would not increase. Neighbors have not voiced objections to the proposal.

- 3.26 There was no one in the audience to speak on this case.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

- 5.1 Mr. Surman said that the request is straightforward and a good improvement so he can support the request.

- 5.2 Mr. Robke said that the request has no adverse impact in the neighborhood.

- 5.3 Chairman Duffy agrees with the above comments.

6.0 DECISION

6.1 Mr. Surman moved to recommend granting a request for a request an expansion of a special use (Public Works Facility), a 5.46’ accessory structure height variation and a 12.16’ accessory structure height variation to permit the construction of a roofed salt storage accessory structure and a roofed spoil bins accessory structure at 711 Laramie Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted. The use will run with the use.

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

Chairman Patrick Duffy	Yes
Mike Boyer	Yes
John Kolleng	Yes
Michael Robke	Yes
Reinhard Schneider	Yes
Bob Surman	Yes
Christopher Tritsis	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 2017-Z-43.

6.21 Mr. Boyer seconded the motion and the 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 and the variation standards of Section 5.4.F of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed use, the expanded accessory structures, is consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan for this property to act as the public works facility. The continued maintenance and operation of the proposed use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety and welfare. The proposed improvements are away from residential neighbors, therefore the proposed uses will not be injurious to the use or enjoyment of other property nor will the use impede the normal and orderly development of other property or substantially diminish property values. Adequate utilities and other necessary facilities already exist. Adequate measures already existing to provide ingress and egress. The proposed use will have no impact on the community character of the neighborhood. No known archaeological, historical or cultural resources will be impacted. Adequate buffers already exist. No other standards of Article 12 apply.

The physical conditions of the property, the necessity of the storage bins and the size requirements for them, impose upon the owner a practical difficulty. The plight of the owner was not created by the owner and is due to the requirements for the storage bins. The difficulty prevents the owner from making reasonable use of the property with storage

bins of the required size and height. The difficulty prevents the owner from making reasonable use of the property as a public works facility. The proposed variations will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent properties. The accessory structures are located away from residential neighbors and will have little impact. For this reason also, the variations, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a request an expansion of a special use (Public Works Facility), a 5.46' accessory structure height variation and a 12.16' accessory structure height variation to permit the construction of a roofed salt storage accessory structure and a roofed spoil bins accessory structure at 711 Laramie Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted. The use will run with the use.

3.0 TESTIMONY, COMMENTS AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

3.11 Mr. Paul Russo, attorney
Akerman LLP

3.12 Ms. Beth Lakier, Executive Vice President Early Learning/Childhood
Development
One Hope United

3.13 Ms. Heidi Hoppe, Principal
Heidrun Hoppe Associates

3.14 Mr. Peter Lemmon, Senior Transportation Engineer
Kimley Horn

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a special use for a child day care center (Wilmette Child Development Center). The Village Board will hear this case on October 24, 2017.

3.22 Mr. Russo is representing the applicant, One Hope United. In the audience are Beth Lakier, Executive Vice President, One Hope United; Todd Schultz, Financial Officer, One Hope United; Heidi Hoppe, principal, Heidrun Hoppe Associates and Peter Lemmon, Senior Transportation Engineer, Kimley Horn & Associates. One Hope intends to move its existing child development center from 3013 Illinois Road to a new location at 3201 Old Glenview Road.

The new center will operate from 6:30 AM to 6:30 PM, Monday through Friday. Children will arrive and depart during a two-hour window at the beginning and end of the day. The facility will have about 107 children, ages 6 months to 5 years. There will be 18 full time staff.

Ms. Lakier said their child development center has been in the Village for about 25 years. Their lease at the current site is expiring. Their programs have national accreditation.

Heidi Hoppe will testify about the planned build out of the site.

Ms. Hoppe said the site is a combined three story and four story building. The lower level of the four-story building is at grade, which is required for children 2.5 years and younger. That part of the building has its own entry. It has its own dedicated parking area with safe drop off. They will build out the space. It was formerly a lab

that did development of non-alcoholic fruit drinks. There is an existing grassy area and they would enclose some of that area with a fence. The requirement is for a 4' high fence. She is not sure if the fence will be 4' or 6'. They will go to the ARC.

3.23 Mr. Surman asked if exterior doors were existing.

Ms. Hoppe said that there are four doors that go to the space. That is a fire requirement. Right now, those are windows that will become doors. The doors will be glazed. Those are fire exits. The building is not sprinklered.

3.24 Chairman Duffy clarified that there are three classrooms not directly connected to the exterior.

Ms. Hoppe said that those are double classrooms. It is not a separate classroom. Because they have ingress and egress it is sufficient. Egress doors are for emergency only. There are other doors out to the lobbies.

3.25 Mr. Tritsis said it appears to be a steep grade from the drop off to where proposed fence area is. Will there be a sidewalk?

Ms. Hoppe said that there will be a path to it but the path will be landscaped and not concrete. It will be a natural path to go up. One can also go up through the parking lot. This is a separated parking lot so it would be possible to go that way. There will be a curving path up the hill to the top for the children.

3.26 Chairman Duffy clarified that no one is using the parking right now.

3.27 Mr. Tritsis asked how does the proposed use fit in with the current use for cars and traffic. Will there be too much intensity?

The attorney said that Peter Lemon will speak on parking and traffic.

3.28 Mr. Lemmon said that the focus of the study was on pick up and drop off characteristics. It is a rolling pick up and drop off. They went to the existing site and did some counts. They found that the existing peak was 10 at any one time. During the afternoon the existing peak was 8. They increased that proportionately. It was 13% relative to potential enrollment. There is slightly higher capacity at the new site. They end up with 19 in the morning and 13 in the afternoon. They did some counts at the new site to understand where parking was occurring. Are there spaces available both in the area that is planned for pick up and drop off as well as for employees and staff. On the west side there is plenty of parking. They recommended the staff park on the west side. The north side would be an isolated pick up and drop off area where there is plenty of parking.

3.29 Mr. Tritsis asked if he was saying there would be twice as much traffic.

Mr. Lemmon said that the increase in potential enrollment would be 13% over current enrollment.

- 3.30 Chairman Duffy asked if the 7 spaces in front of the building would be a lane for drive through or will they stay parking spaces.

Mr. Lemmon said they are parking spaces designated for parent pick up and drop off.

- 3.31 Chairman Duffy clarified that there will not be a circular flow except in and out of the access drive. Everyone will walk their children in.

- 3.32 Mr. Tritsis said that as the cars pull up there are four egress doors. Are they parking almost up to the doors?

Mr. Lemmon said there are spaces on the north side of the building.

Ms. Hoppe said that those doors are a certain amount away from the parking. If there was an emergency while cars were parked there they can still get out. There is a 5' sidewalk. The door is set back from the face of the building. When the doors are open there will be 3.5' to 4' that is walkable space.

- 3.33 Mr. Kolleng referenced the current site. Do they have any issues with drop off and pick up?

There are not issues regarding this. Ms. Lakier said a lot of parents park in the parking lot and walk their children into the building.

- 3.34 Mr. Boyer said that Illinois is a busier road than the Frontage Road/Old Glenview Road. Was there a car count done?

Mr. Lemmon said they did not do a car count.

Ms. Hoppe said the children do not go in and out of those emergency doors. They are checked in in the morning.

- 3.35 Mr. Surman clarified that this was their only location.

- 3.36 Mr. Schneider's grandchild attended the facility. He picked up and dropped off several times. People would park in the circular driveway. Pick up and drop off was never a problem.

- 3.37 Chairman Duffy asked about the capacity increase by moving to the new location.

Ms. Lakier said they currently have about 85 children and the capacity at the new center is 107.

3.38 Mr. Surman asked if this was a single facility for One Hope United.

Ms. Lakier said they have 12 child development centers in the Chicago area.

3.39 There was no one in the audience to speak on this case.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

5.1 Mr. Kolleng said he has two grandchildren at the center. The center lost their lease and must find a new space. This is a good space. It is a little more secluded than the current operation. He can support the request.

5.2 Mr. Boyer said that the primary issue could be traffic concerns. The traffic count on that road is low. It is a good use of the space. All standards of review are met.

5.3 Chairman Duffy asked about number of staff and whether there was ample parking.

Mr. Lemon said there is ample parking for staff. When he was there the parking lot was only 30% to 40% full.

5.4 Mr. Robke said that the office use would generate more parking being used.

6.0 DECISION

6.1 Mr. Kolleng moved to recommend granting a request for a special use for a child day care center (Wilmette Child Development Center) at 3201 Old Glenview Road 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	Yes
Reinhard Schneider	Yes
Bob Surman	Yes
Christopher Tritsis	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 2017-Z-44.

Mr. Boyer 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 is consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan to promote educational opportunities. The establishment, maintenance or operation of the proposed use in the specific location will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety and welfare. The site is large and will accommodate the drop-off, pick-up, and play needs of the applicant without negatively impacting residential neighbors or other commercial tenants. The proposed use will not be injurious to the use or enjoyment of other property in the neighborhood. The establishment of the use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding properties. The proposed use will not substantially diminish property values. Adequate utilities, road access, drainage, and other necessary facilities already exist. Adequate measures will be taken to provide ingress and egress in a manner that minimizes traffic congestion in the public streets. The proposed use is consistent with the community character. There are no known archaeological, historical or cultural resources that would be adversely affected. The applicant has made adequate legal provision to guarantee the provision and development of improvements associated with the use. The proposed use meets the additional standards use standards in Section 12.3.E of the Zoning Ordinance.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a special use for a child day care center (Wilmette Child Development Center) at 3201 Old Glenview Road in accordance with plans submitted. The use shall run with the use.

3.0 TESTIMONY, COMMENTS AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

- 3.11 Mr. Gerald Callahan, representing the applicant
Freeborn and Peters
311 S. Wacker Drive, Chicago
- 3.12 Father Bill Sheridan
St. Francis Parish
- 3.13 Ms. Colleen Barrett, Principal
St. Francis Xavier School
- 3.14 Mr. Chris Wallace
522 Forest Avenue
- 3.15 Mr. Warner Briske
Partners in Design Architects
2610 Lake Cook Road, Riverwoods
- 3.16 Ms. Martina Stoycheva
Partners in Design Architects
2610 Lake Cook Road, Riverwoods
- 3.17 Mr. Peter Lemmon, Senior Transportation Engineer
Kimley Horn

3.2 Summary of presentations

- 3.21 Ms. Roberts said this is a revised request for the expansion of a special use (educational facility, primary), a 7,214.2 square foot (10.3%) floor area variation, a 12.08' side yard setback variation, a 26.11% side yard impervious surface coverage variation, a 32.0' rear yard playground equipment setback variation, an 18.25' rear yard step setback variation, a 1.0' rear yard step setback variation, and a 5.0' side yard parking space setback to permit the construction of a two-story addition on the legal non-conforming structure (St. Francis School). The Village Board will hear this case on October 24, 2017.
- 3.22 Chairman Duffy asked about the comparison of the original proposal to this proposal and the differences between the two.

Mr. Callahan said he will address that early on in his presentation. The architects can provide technical answers.

- 3.23 Mr. Callahan said they were before the Zoning Board on July 5, 2017. At that time, St. Francis was requesting approval for a special use for primary educational facility and for several variations necessary for the proposed addition. The vote was 5 to 1 with five members recommending that the variations not be approved. Since July 5th, St. Francis considered comments made at that meeting. All Board members present made comments at that time. They took the comments into consideration. The parish has been meeting with neighbors and setting up a community outreach program. As a result, the plan was modified.

When the case went to the Village Board, there is a provision in the ordinance that allows cases to be remanded back to the Board. The Village Board did not take a vote.

Their primary presentation will be made by Fr. Sheridan, pastor. He will provide an overview for the need for the addition. Colleen Barrett, principal, will describe the importance of the addition to improve education, safety and security of the school; Chris Wallace, parishioner, who has been working on this project for several years will talk about neighborhood outreach and community outreach; Werner Brisske and Martina Stoycheva, Partners in Design, are the architects and will talk about the changes to the plans; Peter Lemmon, traffic consultant, will discuss ingress, egress and other traffic matters. There are 12 members of the parish and community to make comments about topics and they were asked to limit comments to three minutes. They are trying to be as efficient as possible by presenting the proposal this way.

On October 2nd, the Appearance Review Commission considered the proposal and the ARC made a unanimous recommendation to approve the design.

He wanted to focus on how variations changed since the last hearing. On July 5th they asked for seven variations. Tonight, they are asking for six variations. Regarding the rear yard setback variation on the east side, they asked for the variation because they wanted the building set back 33' and the standard is 40'. Under the new plans, the gym is now 40' back. They don't need the rear yard variation. A lot of comments focused on that issue.

Three of the six variations were reduced in scale. They requested an impervious surface variation for the interior side yard which is north yard adjoining the alley. The standard is that they could have 60% impervious surface coverage. The current condition is 100% coverage. On July 5th, they asked that this be kept the same at 100%. They reduced coverage to 86% with the new plan. There is an additional 800 square feet of pervious surface. When they take the gym building and move it further to the west, they gain 1200' of pervious surface. There is 2,000 more square feet.

Another reduced variation is the interior side yard setback, north setback. On July 5th they wanted to be 5'2" from the alley. Tonight, they are almost 8' from the alley.

The north wall of the gym is being moved south by 3' from what they originally presented.

Regarding the FAR variation, the standard is .70. On July 5th they were at about .81. This evening they are at about .80. The building footprint was reduced by 584 square feet from what it was on July 5th. They reduced the FAR by 438 square feet.

The reason they need an FAR variation is that they cannot count the playfields across the alley. With the intervening alley, they cannot count that as a combined zoning lot with the rest of the property. If they could do that no FAR variance would be required. They spoke with Village staff and said that no FAR variance is not possible.

There are three variations that they asked for on July 5th that are about the same. One is a variation to allow playground equipment in the rear yard. That exists today and will be removed during construction and then put back. They are continuing to ask for a parking variation in the interior side yard, which is the north yard against the alley. That is an existing condition but they improved the condition from what it is today. Right now, you can drive down the alley and pull into a parking space. The way the lot is being restriped, there will be bumper stops along the alley. One must come into the parking lot and pull into a parking space through an interior drive aisle instead of right off the alley. There are two emergency stairs in the rear yard. There is one that exists today and they must add emergency exits. It must be done in the rear yard due to an elevation change. There must be a stair there.

Regarding standards of review, they got comments about this on July 5th.

Standard one – the school and parish are over 100 years old. The west school building was built in 1922. The east building was built in 1956. There were no zoning vehicles for approval when the buildings were built. In 1955, the Village passed an ordinance granting several setback variations for the east building. They could fit the addition within the variations granted in 1955. In 1955, the Village Board concluded that there was hardship and they believe that there is a hardship that continues and exists. There are physical constraints on the property.

Other hardships are the size of the property, shape of the property, building orientations, and parking.

If St. Francis was a public school, this standard would be presumed by the ordinance to be met. That does not apply for religious schools. Public schools have preferential treatment under the ordinance which is unusual. He has never seen this disparity and treatment in a zoning ordinance. There is a federal law that addresses this that says religious schools must be given the same treatment as public schools. He read the act about this. Considering this federal law, he asked that the Board extend the school the same treatment that a public school would receive. He read

the institutionalized person's act at the meeting which deals with land use regulations and religious institutions.

Considering the above, he asked that the Board extend the same treatment to St. Francis that a public school would receive if a public school was applying for these variances.

This is true of some other standards.

Standard 2 – the need for the variations is not related to an expanding school population but must do with the need to make changes to address modern educational facility needs.

The next standard is the plight of the property owner was not created by the owner and is due to unique circumstances. There is a need to make changes to address modern education facility needs. The newest building Saint Francis has is over 60 years old. They need to make changes to remain competitive with other schools. They need to offer students the opportunity that everybody else has and the public schools offer. The standard is presumed if you are a public school. It is not presumed if you are a religious school. He asks that that the same treatment be extended to St Francis.

The next standard is that your hardship is peculiar to the property in question and is not generally shared by other properties classified in the same surrounding zoning district and/or used for the same purposes. This includes the need to accommodate desirable site, landscape, or reflect new conditions created by the age and character of the property. Saint Francis is located in the R1-H zoning district. The only other school in that district is the Baker Demonstration School. Baker came in a few years ago for changes on their site. All the other property in the R1-H zoning district is single family residential. The difficulties and hardships faced by Saint Francis are peculiar and not shared by other properties because there are no other properties except for Baker that are the same as Saint Francis.

The age and character of the building create the unique conditions. That can only be addressed by the variations being requested.

The next standard is about a hardship resulting from the application of the zoning ordinance and would it prevent the owner from making a reasonably to show the property. However, the fact that the property could be utilized more profitably with the variation than without the variation is not considered as grounds for granting the variation. The standard is not applicable to Saint Francis. The variations are needed to allow Saint Francis and modernize the site. This is another standard that would be presumed if Saint Francis were a public school. He asked that the same treatment be extended to Saint Francis as it would be extended to a public school.

The next standard is the proposed variation will not compromise an adequate supply of light and air to an adjacent property. The variation will not substantially increase the danger of fire or otherwise endanger the public health safety and welfare and will not substantially impact the neighborhood. They are no longer requesting the rear yard variation. The addition is set back 40 feet. They are not asking for a height variation. They moved the north wall to the south by another 3'. They submit that there is no impact on light and air to adjacent properties. The property to the north is owned by Saint Francis so there can be no impact.

Regarding to danger of fire, this is new construction with all of the modern fire codes being met. This would be a safer building than the existing building. They submit that property values will not be substantially diminished. At the last meeting, they submitted letters from several real estate brokers who do work in the Village. All concluded that there is no impact on property values.

Regarding the next standard about not altering the essential character of the neighborhood and will be consistent with goals and policies of the comprehensive plan, St. Francis is part of the essential character of the neighborhood. The addition will be consistent with the comprehensive plan. The comprehensive plan classifies the property as institutional. The Village has recognized that St. Francis will remain.

One of the land use goals is to promote education for Village residents and St. Francis does that.

He will not review every special use standard as they are similar to the standards he discussed. He talked about the special use standard not impeding the orderly development and improvement of surrounding properties for uses allowed in the zoning district. This is a developed neighborhood. There is no future development that can be anticipated.

Regarding adequate utilities, road access etc. already exist or will be provided. All utilities are there. There will be drainage enhancements, additional pervious surface and the parking lot will have a dry well installed in the drainage system.

Regarding adequate measures exist or will be provided to provide an egress that minimizes traffic congestion etc., the existing ingress and egress system has served well over time. Peter Lemmon talked about this at the last hearing. He will also talk about it this evening. New traffic flows were implemented this school year to make sure traffic is not going east on the alley up to 8th Street.

The development of the proposed use will not substantially adversely impact known archeological, historical or cultural resources – the property is already developed and there are no designated landmarks or other historical features.

The applicant has made adequate legal provision to guarantee the provision and development of any buffers, landscaping, public open space, etc. – they are limiting the amount of impervious surface. Additional landscaping will be on the north side of the gym building, as well as to the side.

- 3.24 Fr. Sheridan was asked to make a comment about the parish. He gave a history of the parish. He is the pastor of St. Francis and this is his 17th year.

It was founded in 1904. Five buildings make up the campus. The oldest building goes back to the founding of the parish and that is the rectory. It is west of the church. Modifications have been made. There is an old school building on the northeast corner above 9th and Linden and goes back to the early 1920s. The next building built was the church and was put up in 1939. It is still used. The next two buildings put up is the new school adjacent to the old school and was put up in the 1950s. The final building was put up in the 1950s and was the convent. When the sisters left in the 1980s, the parish offices were moved to the convent.

Regarding the mission of St. Francis – Christian people following the gospel of Jesus in the Roman Catholic tradition. Their buildings need to help them follow their mission. What is behind the plan is to take care of the buildings and to modernize them.

He said that the team heard what the Board said at the last meeting and took comments and recommendations seriously. He asked the Board for their support to allow them to continue to be in the Village for at least another 100 years.

- 3.25 Ms. Barrett will focus on the educational impact of the project for students, families and parishioners. The campus has a long and rich tradition in East Wilmette. They have served students for almost 110 years. The school opened in 1910 with 110 students. Nothing remarkable has been done to the footprint and the spaces since the 1950s.

They are proud of how they have grown and evolved as a school to meet the needs of diverse learners. Over the past 10 years they have grown opportunities that exist for students. They could not have done this ten years ago. Some of those things include growing faculty in significant ways, included a full time social worker, two reading specialists and a full time school nurse for the first time. They are truly limited by the current space and where students can be taught and supported. They have teachers and specialists who meet with students in hallways and closets. The nurse works in a busy area without privacy. They have a critical need for more space. They want to continue to grow and develop programming and to offer the best. They want to increase math opportunities, science, the fine arts. They can't do what they want with the current spaces.

The plan calls for increased accessibility, which is a big priority. The building is not currently accessible. They want to include the first ADA accessible elevator.

The plan calls for a more centralized school office located on the main level, which is important for safety and security.

They are proposing a new early childhood center, which would give them more space for the youngest learners. The early childhood program is the front door to the school. It currently is located in the parish office which is north of the alley. The space is inadequate. There are safety concerns about crossing a busy alley. They want to move that program to the main school building. They have a unique ability to educate students, ages 3-13, under one roof. Most schools in Wilmette cannot do this.

Much of what they are requesting exists in District 39 schools. They are blessed with large buildings, updated facilities, many offices and rooms. This is about equal opportunity for Catholic school students. She asked the Board for their support. They want to remain a competitive option in east Wilmette.

- 3.26 Mr. Wallace is a St. Francis parishioner, parent, and volunteer. His focus is what they have been doing since the July 5th meeting. They got a lot of feedback that kept them busy. There were four categories of feedback. To facilitate neighbor and broader community dialog – this was their #1 takeaway and the best feedback they received. They are in a predominately single family residential community. There will not be unanimous support from neighbors but tonight is a much improved plan based on feedback, engagement, and listening. On August 14, 2017, they held a community meeting. They had over 130 attendees. They reviewed prior plans from July 5th and received real time and follow up feedback. The feedback is in tonight's plans. They also went door to door. There were 34 individual meetings with neighbors including more than one meeting with the most immediate neighbors. They formed a neighborhood relations committee (NRC). It is a committee of 14 people. The first meeting was on August 28th. They talked about traffic flow, safety improvements and some have been implemented. They have received positive feedback. The 14 members are both parishioners and non-parishioners of St. Francis. The outreach helped galvanize broad based community support. Posters speak to the support. They have 341 letters or signatures of support. 43 are from neighbors within 250' of the site. 60 letters were from students talking about the importance of what they are doing and how it impacts them.

Takeaway #2 – reduce impervious surface, add storm water management strategies. Mr. Callahan touched upon that. They added a drywell in the parking lot to the west of the school addition. That will help with roof runoff. They added 2,000 square feet of permeable area around the perimeter on the north and east of the addition. They have a 14% improvement in coverage on the north side. They have incremental improvement on the east side. They have landscaping along the building addition perimeter.

Takeaway #3 – revise ADA parking location. The ADA parking stalls were moved parallel to the building addition. They will be available at all times including during pick up and drop off. They will have direct access to the new secured entry.

Takeaway #4 – move the building further away from specific residents – try to make the building footprint more compact. On the east side or rear yard setback, they now conform at 40'. They have brought the building over 7' to the west, which has added to the permeable area. They brought north in about 3' so now they are 8' south of the north alley. They made a more compact footprint without sacrificing the integrity of the plan and the improvements. They reduced the FAR in doing this. They worked with the Village to maintain an ivy covered fence on the east property line. This was a request from the adjacent home owner.

He thanked the Board of listening, patience and support.

- 3.27 Mr. Brisske wanted to talk about the process and the plan. This design solution is driven by the parish and school needs. It is a facility for the parish for a whole. The parish will also use the space. The process started over three years ago. Numerous solutions were reviewed and explored including one with a cost estimate of over \$21 million. They looked at previous plans and talked about new ideas. They looked at additions to both buildings. They looked at closing the alley and consolidating the parcels. These concepts were not going in the right direction. They knew that they had to be responsive to program needs in a compact and efficient way for students and parishioners and be cost effective.

The existing parking lot serves the entire parish. It is well located to do that. The parking lot flows well in critical times of morning drop off and afternoon pick up. Looking at all areas of the school and trying to figure out how to do this as efficiently as possible, they looked at where and where not things were working.

In the existing building, the gym was not working. It is a geographic problem. It is small and doesn't meet the need for seating and larger groups. It is an inefficient use of precious ground space.

They tried to keep the plan very compact. The green overlay is the existing building and they connected the line to the east school building to enclose the court yard. The tan areas are outward expansion. The eastern wall was pulled away from where the current footprint is. The other areas are kept as tight and compact as possible. They are pushing growth toward property that they own. They are trying to minimize impact.

He walked the Board through the building. He showed the first floor plan. He talked about the office area. The entrance is accessible and secured and can be seen by office staff. There is larger area with a dedicated space for the nurse.

Regarding the gym, it is a middle school sized gym. It is flexible for multiple uses. It incorporates retractable seating and a retractable stage. Clerestory windows bring in natural light. There is a dividing curtain for flexibility.

The lunch room is currently a multi-use space so it is set up and torn down. The new lunch room is a dedicated space. It could be used as an anteroom before and after gym functions. There is a serving kitchen along the alley.

There is a central gathering area or atrium space. This provides natural light. They are adding clerestory windows to bring in natural light. There is a curtainwall. This provides an opportunity for flexible and creative teaching environments and can be used as a student commons gathering area. The stone feature is the elevator providing accessibility for four floors. On the wall to the right is the mosaic that is currently on the exterior west wall of the gym. Their goal is to put it back together and locate it in the atrium space.

The early learning classes has three classrooms being created.

On the second floor are four classrooms and will be used by all students.

There is a library/tech/media center. Size is increased for this function by more than double. This can provide more learning opportunities.

There are specialist offices for private functions.

- 3.28 Ms. Stoycheva showed another slide of the atrium space. She is going to discuss exterior views of what they are proposing. She showed the current view looking from Linden north towards the existing building. The proposed view is very limited. There is a sloped metal roof and clerestory windows over the common atrium space. Standing in front of the church looking east to the parking lot is the west wing of the addition that houses admin offices and classrooms. She described additional views. They met with the ARC last Monday with a revised proposal. They met with the ARC last March and received a lot of feedback on the aesthetics, material selection and window proportions. Since that time they added more brick and limestone features, landscaping and revised the number and proportions of the windows to better complement existing architecture. At the recent ARC meeting, they were highly complimentary on their progress and granted them a positive recommendation.

Peter Lemmon of Kimley Horn will discuss improvements to neighborhood traffic.

- 3.29 Mr. Lemmon showed portions of the school property that are served by the lot. The main lot is centrally located and he explained what that lot served. The lot is non-conforming in that it does not have landscaped islands. That is an important feature in terms of flexibility. They discussed pick up and drop off at the last hearing. That is an important part of managing the traffic flow. He showed drop off circulation in

the morning and short term parking. He explained the circulation flow. There are safety patrols. There were some cars that were going east through the alley to 8th. They are trying to avoid this.

Regarding the neighborhood relations committee, they provided feedback about traffic and pick up and drop off. There is a higher level outside today regarding traffic than ever before. The safety patrols orient drivers out to Greenleaf after school.

- 3.30 Mr. Callahan said there now would be short presentations from members of the community and the parish.

Chairman Duffy said suggested taking a ten minute break and then they will start with that section.

(After section 4.31)

- 3.31 Mr. Callahan said they tried to be efficient in terms of length of presentation. There are others who support the request but are not speaking. He asked for everyone in attendance who supported the request to stand.

On July 5th a lot of good suggestions were made. They responded to the suggestions and he hopes that the Board concludes that the responses were genuine. They addressed the concerns the Board had at that point. Going into the community was good. It improved the plan. Last time they did not do a good job is that they didn't tell the story of St. Francis. The people who spoke this evening did a better job than the professionals could have done. He hopes the Board has a better feel of the parish.

He wanted the people to get their stories across. They met the standards with the redesigned plan. He asked the Board for support and thanked the Board for their time and attention to the request.

- 3.32 Chairman Duffy asked if the Board had any questions for the professionals who spoke tonight.
- 3.33 Mr. Schneider said he looked in the zoning code and could not find the relevant area regarding the difference between public and private schools.

Ms. Roberts said in that section of the ordinance, there is a provision for the presumption of certain variation and special use standards for requests by local government units. The presumption is that specific standards are being met unless it is shown otherwise.

- 3.34 Mr. Schneider asked if that would have applied to the public works case.

Ms. Roberts said that it probably would.

- 3.35 Chairman Duffy said that whenever there is a division of land in the community, a certain amount of land has to be set aside for a public school.

Ms. Robert said she was unaware of any such requirement but that it might be a state law.

- 3.36 Chairman Duffy said there is designated area for them and the lot they sit on is quite a bit larger than the lot being discussed tonight. There are parcels across the alley. The discussion has been that they count towards the FAR etc. At the last meeting, one of the big points the Board struggled with was that although the Board could forgive the FAR issue because of the lots across the alley, the impact the building was having on immediate neighbors was negative. The argument about letting some zoning requirements pass because a public school or government entity would not have to meet those requirements. It does not line up right with what the Board is dealing with tonight.

Mr. Callahan said they heard the Board and moved the wall back. The way it is written it does provide a presumption and it does not say because they have more land than somebody else.

- 3.37 Chairman Duffy said that does not allow them to negatively impact somebody else. This is a point that was brought up at the last hearing.

Mr. Callahan explained why the plan was changed.

- 3.38 Mr. Schneider referenced the landscape plan. The area between the alley and the north side of the gym, someone mentioned that there was parallel parking. On the landscape plan it shows that it is all landscaped.

Mr. Brisske said he was not sure what the parallel parking discussion was for that area. There was a discussion about access of the parking spaces off of the alley in the parking lot. There is no parking by the gym.

- 3.39 Mr. Boyer asked the height of the building at the northeast corner. Was there a change from the original plan at that corner? There was discussion about change of height from the original plan.

Ms. Stoycheva said that the height is 28'10". The height has not changed. They started with a 30' high building. They have since dropped the height by 1'2". The height of the current structure at the northeast corner is 16'.

- 3.40 Chairman Duffy asked the highest point of the existing building that is being taken down and of the proposed building.

Ms. Stoycheva said it is about 26' or 28'. The height of the proposed building is 33'10". That point is at the eave. There is a sloped roof over the atrium and that is

the highest point. It is closest to the east building.

(After section 4.32)

3.41 Chairman Duffy said there were a number of questions posed. He wrote some down.

Mr. Callahan said he would answer the questions that he could.

3.42 Chairman Duffy said they should start with storm water on the east side.

Mr. Callahan said they are increasing the amount of pervious surface on the east side. Compared to existing, it will be better. The existing building is 33' from the property line and the addition will be 40'.

3.43 Chairman Duffy asked where the water from the roof collecting.

Ms. Stoycheva said that all storm water collected from the new roofs will be directed towards the dry well. They will rework the existing sewer in the parking lot to have a dry well. The way this works is that it has extra capacity below where the pipes are that feed into the main storm system. It fills up and water percolates through holes in the dry well.

3.44 Mr. Surman asked about the capacity.

Mr. Brisske said this has not been engineered to size yet.

3.45 Chairman Duffy clarified that water would come down and be funneled towards the dry well. When does the capacity get calculated and added to the plan?

Ms. Roberts said that it is part of the building permit process. A lot of times information about water is submitted before the permit is submitted. So much review needs to be done. It would be an approval that is part of the permit process.

3.46 Mr. Surman said they have to meet the current standards for the Water Reclamation District, which have increased dramatically over 20 years.

Ms. Stoycheva said they are just below the threshold that would trigger the Water Reclamation District and they are only dealing with the village. Most of the St. Francis site is currently paved. By pulling the new addition away from the building's existing footprint, they can add 2,000 more square feet of pervious surface.

3.47 Mr. Surman referenced the additional 7,200 square feet. That is not all on one level. How much has the building footprint changed from what it was currently to now?

- 3.48 Mr. Schneider asked if some of the increase be allocated to the fact that they are enclosing the atrium.

Ms. Stoycheva showed the addition to the footprint on a slide. If they were to enclose the courtyard and looking at the footprint of the existing facility, she showed what they were adding. They are also subtracting a back part.

- 3.49 Mr. Surman said the neighbor indicated 7,200 square feet. What does that yellow on the slide represent?

Ms. Stoycheva said a lot of that is in the second floor space that they are adding.

- 3.50 Mr. Surman asked that as an estimate that out of the 7,200 square feet, it is a little more than half because are one story and some are two story.

Ms. Stoycheva Martina said that the number was 2,421 square feet.

- 3.51 Mr. Surman said that is much less than 7,200 square feet.

Ms. Stoycheva said the incremental FAR is due to the second floor – four classrooms, library and media center. When they met in July, the addition to the footprint was 3,005 square feet and they have reduced this to 2,421 square feet.

- 3.52 Mr. Schneider asked the square footage of the proposed atrium.

Ms. Stoycheva said it is 80 x 120 or 1,600 square feet.

- 3.53 Mr. Schneider said that the existing outdoor courtyard is largely impervious because it is mostly paved. They are not adding impervious surface.

- 3.54 Mr. Boyer asked if there was drainage in the open courtyard and where does it go?

Ms. Stoycheva said that feeds into the storm sewer in the parking lot.

- 3.55 Mr. Boyer asked that when it gets roofed and guttered, where will water be directed?

Ms. Stoycheva said it would be directed to the same above-referenced location.

- 3.56 Mr. Robke asked the cutoff for MWRD to be applicable.

Mr. Briske said it is based on the size of the property.

Ms. Stoycheva said it is how much of the area they are disturbing. Their civil engineers did the calculations.

- 3.57 Mr. Robke said that even though they are not required to meet MWRD requirements due to lot size, would they be willing to agree to meet those requirements?

Mr. Brisske said they would have to look at what they are capable of doing within the constraints they have.

- 3.58 Mr. Robke said it might require a storm trap or something more extensive.

Mr. Brisske said they would have to review that and understand what that is. They are trying to improve an existing condition the best that they can. He talked about reduction of the current impact to the storm water system.

- 3.59 Mr. Robke said he understood that and know that they made changes from the last hearing. He said that everyone is concerned about storm water in the village. The site being discussed tonight is way out of compliance. There are a number of asks before the Board. He believes that MWRD would address what the Board is looking for. If the Board knew that those requirements would be met it would move them away from that aspect of the discussion.

- 3.60 Mr. Surman said he does not know how extensive those are.

Mr. Callahan said they cannot agree to something because they don't know how it would impact the overall plan.

- 3.61 Mr. Robke said they could add a storm trap system. There are things that they could be doing.

Mr. Callahan said that disturbing the parking lot disturbs other things in the village code. That might require additional variations and they really don't want to have to come back. What Mr. Robke is talking about is a greater disturbance.

Ms. Stoycheva said that would require digging up the entire parking lot.

- 3.62 Mr. Robke said that it would ensure that there are no storm water issues.

Mr. Brisske said that with regard to the storm water, they have made substantial improvements. The proposed improvements are significant.

- 3.63 Mr. Robke said that a portion of that improvement is something that they don't have sense of the capacity for or what impact it will have.

- 3.64 Mr. Surman said that to be fair to the applicant, they can't and as an architect they can only design so much before they get certain level approvals.

- 3.65 Mr. Surman said he trying to figure out that whatever is being done at the northeast corner, will the situation will be improved compared to today. If any of the water is running off and going onto the property line or to the east, that will not happen. The situation is only going to be improved. That is all that the Board can address right now.
- 3.66 Ms. Stoycheva said they went with the rain garden option along the building instead of doing a green roof. There are added structural requirements that would be requested. That prevented them from looking further into that at this point.
- 3.67 Chairman Duffy asked the square footage of the rain garden.
- Martina said that it is 800 square feet along the north wall.
- 3.68 Mr. Robke asked if there was extra capacity underneath.
- Ms. Stoycheva said it will have deep rooted plants and it will be recessed so rain water from the alley is brought into there.
- Mr. Brisske said that today, that area is 100% impervious.
- 3.69 Chairman Duffy said that the next issue brought up in the public comments was FAR. Does any Board member have an issue with FAR?
- No board member had an issue with FAR.
- 3.70 Chairman Duffy said there was a question about parking – double parking. The reference was that parking for service and use for the school was referred to as double parking.
- 3.71 Mr. Robke talked about ADA spaces and said they had dedicated ADA spaces.
- Ms. Stoycheva said that what was brought up was using the main parking lot being used for parking, as well as drop off and pick up. You can't the count the square footage of the school and base the need for parking when those spaces are not needed during pick up and drop off.
- 3.72 Chairman Duffy said that the parking requirement for a grade school is one space per classroom. There is parking relative to that. As far as the solutions for the pick up/drop off relative to concerns raised at the last meeting, mostly involved running out to the east down that alley. There has been active efforts to change that.
- Ms. Stoycheva said that there were active efforts to change. The north parking lot is available for additional parking.

- 3.73 Mr. Boyer said he saw in the study that there was an idea of actually capturing the alley and taking that space and barricading the alley where the residences begin. Did they take that discussion to the village?

Ms. Stoycheva said they met on a staff level to review that and the final decision was that alley needs to be accessible to emergency vehicles and service vehicles. The village did not see this as a viable option.

Mr. Brisske said they are trying to internally monitor it using staff and students to close it off during critical times and when students go to the playfield so there are better controls.

Ms. Stoycheva said that it was on a trial period and testing out how that works. Are there temporary barricades? There is no permanent agreed upon solution at this point.

- 3.74 Mr. Robke said that there was a comment that the service and deliveries to the kitchen would be coming from the north. Are they using the alley as a loading zone?

Mr. Brisske said they hope to use the alley as a loading zone. The building is set back from the alley. The alley is 20' wide.

- 3.75 Chairman Duffy said that another question brought up related to massing along the east side of the property. They addressed this by moving the building to the west by 8'. The east wall did not move.

Ms. Stoycheva said that is moved slightly. That is where the reduction in the footprint came from.

- 3.76 Chairman Duffy said the last point brought up related to classroom size and number of students at the school. Loyola Academy got into a little bind in the 1990s when a discussion came up and a number was stuck on Loyola Academy as a cap. He does not think that the board should put a cap on any school. That was agreed to by the board at the Loyola meeting. It doesn't seem fair. Many schools, including public, are not capped. There was a good point brought up that there is a movement within the diocese to reduce the number of parishes. He is not sure how this can be addressed. Does the school have comments regarding classroom size and intent?

Ms. Barrett said today they have 435 students. They see growth throughout the year particularly in preschool. They ended last school year at 463 students. Every school's enrollment ebbs and flows. They are smaller today than they were in the late 1990s.

They have historical enrollment data from the Archdiocese. When they opened, they had 110 students. Enrollment peaked in the 1960s with 753 students. They have a self-imposed class size of 23. This was imposed in 2013. They have honored

this decision. They take this seriously. There is no plan to change that. There are two classes at the school at capacity.

There has been much conversation about church consolidation. At this time there is no talk about the schools. The focus is on the parishes.

- 3.77 Chairman Duffy said if a parish closes, then where does the support from the school come from.

Ms. Barrett said it is all hypothetical. There are a lot of decisions that will be made in the coming years for them and for the Archdiocese. Investing in their buildings will allow them to remain the best option for their students. It is important for the village to have a vested interest in making St. Francis the best possible place it can be.

- 3.78 Mr. Kolleng asked if the 10' fence could be incorporated as part of this case.

Ms. Roberts said that a variation request for the fence has not been noticed. She would be uncomfortable with including it, but if the Board wants to do that, there can be discussion.

Mr. Callahan said Mr. DeGrandis wants the fence to stay and they have agreed that the fence with the ivy would stay.

- 3.79 Chairman Duffy said that Mr. DeGrandis is also asking that the fence remain after the project is done and after he moves.

Mr. Callahan said they are happy to leave the fence there.

Ms. Stoycheva said they presented this to the ARC and they have approved to allow them to keep the fence. They granted the variance to not impose the additional wooden fence.

- 3.80 Chairman Duffy said they are not changing the fence so they do not need to ask for a variance. In Mr. DeGrandis's letter, he asked that anytime in the future that the replacement of the fence be granted without a variance. He is not comfortable saying this. It is not in the proposal. Ms. Roberts is not comfortable adding that at this point.

- 3.81 Mr. Kolleng clarified that the fence will stay there. And if it falls over in the future, they will need a variance to replace it.

4.0 INTERESTED PARTIES

4.1 Persons speaking on the case

- 4.11 Ms. Susan Goodson
347 Washington Avenue
- 4.12 Mr. Patrick Hanna
809 Linden Avenue
- 4.13 Mr. Randy Tieman
905 Linden Avenue
- 4.14 Ms. Susan Gordon
526 8th Street
- 4.15 Ms. Jackie Petrozzi and John Phillips
436 10th Street
- 4.16 Mr. Mike Henn
533 Forest Avenue
- 4.17 Mr. John Mawicke
230 Oxford Road, Kenilworth
- 4.18 Mr. Jim Duca
921 Greenleaf Avenue
- 4.19 Mr. Jim Phillips
625 Greenleaf Avenue
- 4.20 Ms. Carol Ann Zordani
224 Greenleaf Avenue
- 4.21 Mr. Kevin Lawler
530 8th Street
- 4.22 Mr. Paul DeGrandis
515 8th Street

4.2 Summary of presentations

(After section 3.30)

- 4.21 Ms. Goodson lives with her husband and three daughters who go to St. Francis School. She has been on the school board for 3 years and is president this year. They love the community feel of St. Francis. She and her family support the school

improvement plan as it brings the building and learning environment up to the standards of the 21st century. It will provide ADA accessibility to all who enter. The plan allows students and faculty to have a dedicated learning space for art, music, technology and language specials. She has worked with school administration in her role. There is no plan to expand the school population. They are committed to no more than 23 students/class. She asked the Board to vote yes and support this plan.

- 4.22 Mr. Hanna moved to the Village 18 months ago from Ohio. St. Francis was the reason why they moved to their neighborhood. He is the pastoral council, he chairs the neighborhood relations committee, and he explained what the committee does. He said that there are many people on the committee who are not affiliated with St. Francis. Each person serves one year terms or quarterly or as issues arise. The first meeting was August 28th and they already have had an impact. He talked about a traffic safety problem. They formed a sub-committee to work with construction teams to manage traffic related to the campus improvement project in the safest way possible and to come up with a customized traffic management plan. Randy Tieman heads this effort. He is a real estate developer and lives where the traffic will be coming and going. He concluded his comments with the need to update the facility and bring it up to modern times.
- 4.23 Mr. Tieman said he is diagonal from the school and across the street from the church. He and his wife have lived in the village for almost 30 years. They moved to their current home 20 years ago due its proximity to St. Francis School. They are parishioners and parents. He told why they chose St. Francis School. He is in the commercial real estate business and chairing the construction management subcommittee of the NRC. They will look at traffic, parking, neighborhood cleanliness, providing updates and hearing concerns. He supports the project wholeheartedly. It is overdue. First and foremost he is a Wilmette resident and neighbor who cares about the community, Public schools and real estate values are directly related to the health of the school. Young couples have told him that if wants to sell his home they would be interested because they want to be in the St. Francis neighborhood.
- 4.24 Ms. Gordon lives very close to St. Francis. They moved to their house in 1994 specifically to be within walking distance of St. Francis so that their children could go to school there and that could be their parish. St. Francis is a treasure. She talked about why St. Francis was created. It is her job to make sure that the school goes into the future for at least another 100 years. Her grandmother, her mother, her siblings, and her four children all have been at St. Francis. She was a school board member and president of the school board several years ago. The building has been made smaller, the FAR is reduced, they moved the building west and south, permeable area is a 200,000 square foot increase, water mitigation, landscape, traffic, neighbor's fence.

A neighbor's fence has a beautiful fence with ivy. They can keep that fence. The proposed plan is thrilling. Everyone in the Village can feel proud of this plan. This project meets the standards of the Board and she asked for the Board's support.

- 4.25 Ms. Petrozzi is a parishioner and she works at the school. She submitted 341 petitions and letters from the community in support of the project. She introduced John Phillips, a student at St. Francis, who is submitting 60 letters of support from the student body.

Mr. Phillips is an 8th grade student. He has been there since junior kindergarten. He is the commissioner general of the student council. He is at the meeting to present letters of support to the ZBA. He witnessed constraints at the school and how the constraints impact students. The 60 letters tell the stories of the writers about why campus improvements are needed. He told about how the outcome of the project will impact future students. He thanked the Board, on behalf of the students, for their support.

- 4.26 Mr. Henn said he lives with his wife and four children. They have lived in the village for over 10 years. The two oldest children graduated from St. Francis and the two youngest attend school there now. They are active parishioners. He talked about his varied parish activities. He is co-chair of the campus improvement capital campaign, a past member of the finance committee and a regular coach for sports teams both at St. Francis and at the Park District. His family supports the proposed improvement plans.

He is speaking tonight as co-chair of the capital campaign. He shared comments about the process and other alternative facility concepts that they considered. He explained the capital campaign team process and how team members were selected. The challenges faced are financial and spatial. He talked about design objectives from 3 to 4 years ago. He talked about the three major ideas that they considered that included building a third story on top of the east structure, build on the current parking lot space or connect east/west buildings. He explained why these did not work. He talked about squaring off the footprint and they considered a general plan. They looked at a lot of design iterations.

They brought the initial plan to the Board on July 5th. Since that time they worked hard to keep safety at the forefront, to minimize the increased footprint; build inwards towards the center and build something beautiful. They tried limiting the footprint increase but some increase was needed. They learned that they could do more. They could think differently and harder about the plan. They could listen to neighbors' input.

He personally assured the board that they have been open minded. They have altered and improved the plan since the last meeting. He asked the Board to vote in favor of the plan.

- 4.27 Mr. Mawicke does not live in the village and he is not a parishioner at St. Francis but he grew up in the area and knows it well. He is a member of the Mawicke group at @properties, the largest brokerage group in Chicago and the North Shore. He explained his team and what the team does. He has done this for 35 years. Their focus is residential. He received a request from the planning group to look at the site in their original proposed plans in connection with the July 5th ZBA meeting. They walked the site and submitted their thoughts in a July 29th letter to the Board. They did not believe that the proposed addition substantially impacted the values of the residential area in the surrounding neighborhood. They have reviewed the revised plans and renderings, which accommodate a 40' setback requirement from the east of the property and the additional relief from the alley to the north. At 40' for the east setback, this does not negatively impact residential values to the neighbors including those immediately to the east.

They reviewed the renderings, elevations and floor plans and concluded that they believe the design and aesthetics would be a welcome improvement for the neighborhood compared to the existing structure it would replace.

Having good public and private schools in the area positively impacts real estate values. He provided commentary. There has been a change in buyer profile over recent years. People are not just moving out of the city for a public education. Buyers have a significant plan. They've toured the schools and talked to principals before making preferences. They probably will choose an area in the town based on school choices. There is public or private education. Many had their children in a private school in the city and they can follow that path in the suburbs if they want. They all talk about traffic in the city and unpleasant experience of urban school drop off and pick up. He talked about why parents wanted to move to the suburbs. A household where both parents work creates a new dynamic and different family needs. Convenience is an important factor.

Many buyers prefer the option to have all young children together at one school. St. Francis offers preschool through 8th grade makes this an attractive option. There are few areas on the North Shore where you can find this scenario. Kenilworth provides this on the public side.

It is their opinion that the proposed plans will not diminish or impair property values in the neighborhood but rather investing in this manner in a private school should benefit property values within the immediate and surrounding neighborhood as it continues to be a value draw for prospective purchasers.

- 4.28 Mr. Duca lives with his wife in their home. They live a half block west of St. Francis. They moved to the Village 15 years ago. Their children were already out of school. He wished his children had the opportunity to attend St. Francis based on the results he's seen in families he has come to know. St. Francis is a very good neighborhood. It is an important part of the neighborhood. He knows that the school has to remain current in its curriculum and its physical plant. The project the school

is pursuing is important for their growth. They need to update to serve the entire community. He complimented the parish for its communication and outreach. He was aware of the project when Mr. Henn was going door to door introducing the neighborhood to the project and asking for feedback. This is what good neighbors do. He was asked to serve on the NRC and is happy to do so and to support this project.

- 4.29 Mr. Phillips lives with his wife and their five children. He is the VP of Athletics and Recreation at Northwestern University. He talked about his focus with 500 student athletes. When there were planning on moving to the village, they first had to find the right school for their children and then find where to live. It was clear that St. Francis was the perfect place for his family. They found a home two blocks away. His children could walk to and from school. Their three oldest graduated from St. Francis and now attend Loyola Academy. Their two youngest attend St. Francis. The school offers an exceptional faith based education with incredible teachers and staff led by a great duo in Principal Barrett and Fr. Sheridan. They would have to consider other options if they were looking for a school today. The world has changed. Technology and learning have changed. Keeping our schools safe has changed. And there are a lot of other changes. St. Francis must change. Options for education are critical. St. Francis is long overdue for this upgrade. Each day that passes causes the school to fall further behind in the service of our children. He talked about the safety and security of the school and its students. His family supports this thoughtfully revised school facility plan that has listened and addressed any and all concerns. It will have a transformative effect on the students. His family asks the Board to vote yes and support the future of the community.
- 4.30 Ms. Zordani has been a parishioner at St. Francis since she and her family moved here ten years ago. She is a teacher in their prep program, which is the parish religious education program (PREP) or Sunday school. Her children currently or have attended the local public schools only. Many parishioners choose public school for their children. Due to the large PREP program – over 500 students – there is always the concern about where should they teach their students. Often they use space not intended for a classroom. The extensive PREP program needs adequate space and this project will fulfill that need. She asked the Board to please consider the request.
- 4.31 Mr. Lawler said he lives at the southeast corner of 8th and Greenleaf. He lives with his wife and two children and has lived there for nine years. They wanted to be part of a strong faith based community. They have found this at St. Francis. They are parishioners. He is a member of the NRC. He was president of the school board. He was involved with campus ministries. He wants to share some information about the campus ministry programs that are very important. He explained the programs. There are about 40 total. Ministries are primarily staffed by volunteers. He explained what the ministries do. He is one of 43 neighbors in the 250' radius, he supports the renovation plans. It is the right thing to do for the community. For all families in the community. He thanked the Board.

(After section 3.41)

- 4.32 Mr. Degrandis lives with his wife and two children. He read a prepared statement. This is the home that is along the alley just to the east. His statement included thanking the Board for their time and their knowledge. He watched the previous hearing several times.

For 20 years he has been a good neighbor. The school needs an upgraded facility. Since the July 5th meeting a lot has happened. He and his wife hired an architect who has been in front of the board many times. They asked this experienced architect to help them find a path to support the project. A number of points stood out through hiring this experienced architect.

This is not a popularity contest. These are technical issues that have significant impact on infrastructure, flooding and property values as related to water damaging those properties. When addressing matters of nonconforming structures, the goal is to make them more conforming or maintain the existing situation and not make them more nonconforming. This project pushes more in the non-conforming direction.

This project tonight needs to stand on its own and not in comparison to the earlier version. Comparative analysis would set a precedent of petitioners asking for significantly overages on the first attempt knowing they can return with minimal reductions in a clear path to approval. The 10' fence is a clear architectural element that lends itself to the privacy between the two properties. They learned from the applicant's architect at the July meeting that it will be taken down and replaced with a 6' high wooden fence. This was a shock. The fence needs to stay in place and be maintained and cared for at its current height. St. Francis offered to keep it in place during construction. If the fence were to be replaced it would need a variance and they would have to go through this entire process. He is asking that the fence be included in any approval.

Building a structure that is 7,200 square feet over the FAR code is a massive request especially in a densely populated residential area. 10% is a big ask and will set precedent that this and future cases will be measured against. The massing along their property line, although setback 8' more is equal to two homes over code. His home is 3,100 square feet. A lot of home in the area are similar in size. This is substantial as it relates to storm water management. On the east side where will the storm water go?

The massing along the property line when combined with impervious surface overages and FAR overages is a recipe for infrastructure challenges and flooding his basement.

The massing and structure along their property line is substantial as it relates to the current side yard orientation of their property. This was not talked about at the last hearing. Much was made of where their garage sits and what little impact the

proposed project will have on them. This is a 100' lot line with the garage covering 25% of it. The existing side yard orientation of his property comprises the remaining 75% of their active living experience. From the first time they talked they repeatedly asked St. Francis to move the massing to the center of the property. It was slightly moved.

Because of these points and their negative impact on his adjacent property, the architect could not advise them to support this project as proposed. Regarding density, traffic and overburdening a primarily residential neighborhood, much was discussed at the July hearing about parking. Mr. Robke identified that spaces were being counted towards parking but they need to be vacated for drop off and pick up. This is a gray area of a complex project that shows that this plan is too big for this space.

There was a lot of discussion about classroom size and potential capping of enrollment. Officially, not capping classroom size is where St. Francis currently stands. Like the gray area of double counting parking, class room size will have a direct impact on congestion. At the July meeting they were promised a total planned enrollment of the school. Did they ever get that number? Did they get current enrollment number? It was promised at the last meeting.

Chairman Duffy clarified that Mr. DeGrandis would finish and then the applicant could respond to the questions.

Mr. DeGrandis continued and talked about the planned closing of many parishes. He read the current proposed scenarios that the archdiocese has put forth towards consolidation of five parishes on the north shore. In two of four scenarios, St. Francis would merge with St. Joe's. What happens if this happens and hypothetically St. Joe's closes? Will the 23 student/classroom verbal agreement hold? No one was willing to confirm this in writing last time. How will this impact traffic in a congested area? If this project is to move forward and they need a new campus, capping enrollment in light of what is going on in the Catholic Church. It is important to understand current enrollment and it needs to be capped in light of possible changes.

What happens if St. Francis is designated to close because St. Joe's has more capacity and is centrally located in the village? If approved, the ZBA has set a precedent that 10% over FAR is okay and many people could have flooded basements. There is current parish consolidation happening right now. Sunday mass auditing is going on. Whether physically consolidating or taking on more students, change will occur. The zoning laws are in place for good reasons especially in older communities with aging infrastructure. The size of the FAR request and impervious surface request are not minor.

He asked the board if they had enough technical data that the infrastructure can support constructing a building along his property line that is 1,200 square feet over

code. Is there enough information that basements in the area will not flood? This is a real issue. He thanked the Board for their thoughtful approach to a serious matter. He said that he supports St. Francis but the plan has to be right and not rushed.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

- 5.1 Mr. Schneider said that at the July meeting the board raised a lot of issues. He was focused on storm water and enrollment issues. Others were concerned about the extent to which the school and church were communicating to the community. With tonight's presentation and changes made, he is comfortable that they responded to all issues. Regarding the 7,200 square foot FAR, almost half of that is due to the second story. 1,600 square feet is due to enclosing the court yard to be an atrium. Regarding storm water, they are improving the status quo. They are doing more than is there now. They are putting in dry wall to capture new roof run off, the rain garden and the setback to the east. If the alley were not there and all properties were contiguous, there would not be half of the variations. He is satisfied that the applicant has responded to concerns raised. He can support the request.
- 5.2 Mr. Surman congratulated the team on the efforts. Everything has been dramatically improved since the last hearing. It is a better project. They went beyond what the Board requested. They reached out to the neighbors and it worked out well. He can support the request.
- 5.3 Mr. Kolleng agrees with the above. Tonight's presentation was terrific. He likes the way they responded to previous comments. If they were starting the school from scratch today, they would use the property differently. But they have what has been there for 100 years and are trying to do the best job possible. He can support the request.
- 5.4 Mr. Tritsis said there was a fair amount of advice and recommendations given. He appreciates the attempt the applicant made. Drainage was improved. He is leaning yes, but wants to hear more comments.
- 5.5 Mr. Robke said he appreciates changes made in response to comments at the last hearing. He is troubled by drainage issues. It is not correct to refer to it as a rain garden, but it is a landscaped area. It is an improvement over existing to have some areas landscaped. They did something in that direction. But they are far out from what a new standard would be. He wants to understand the review standards the village will use. It is not subject to MWRD requirements. If the alley was there they would have a bigger issue with MWRD to meet requirements. The alley is there so that concern has to be addressed. That is his only concern. It can be addressed with engineering. They don't need to get into an extensive storm trap system. He wants to know what the steps are to make the storm water detention work.
- 5.6 Mr. Boyer said that the site itself is almost full paved at this time.

- 5.7 Mr. Robke said that the site itself has a different building and a different configuration, which is why they are looking for variances. What they are proposing is an improvement over current conditions. They are saying that it is a rain garden, but it is not a rain garden. A dry well has not been engineered. He wants the improvements to meet MWRD standards.
- 5.8 Chairman Duffy said that for the sake of clarification, when new construction to this degree happens, the village steps in and Engineering creates some calculations about the amount of water to be retained on site. Mr. Robke is asking they go to a higher standard. With new construction and engineering taking a look at this and placing requirements for storm water retention, it will improve existing conditions.
- 5.9 Mr. Robke said that appears to be the case.
- 5.10 Chairman Duffy said that Mr. Robke is asking that the applicant present something closer to MWRD standards.
- 5.11 Mr. Robke said they are approving a variance for impervious surface. The Village's standard for looking at this is not based upon the size of the site or the fact that it is 100% impervious. It is based on how much area they are disturbing and how much work needs to be done.
- Ms. Roberts said that the village has a storm water ordinance that is overseen by the Engineering and Public Works Department. It is her understanding that it was largely modeled on MWRD and the county standards. She does not know the details of the ordinance.
- 5.12 Mr. Surman said if they were pushed to meet the requirement, it could be a big budget number. They are tearing down an existing structure and building a new one. They are not doing much to the parking lot.
- 5.13 Mr. Robke said they can take what is existing into consideration, but they are requesting a 26% variance in the side yard. It is significant.
- 5.14 Mr. Boyer said he is generally supportive. The buildings are sited where they are. The new structure's location is the most logical place. They made a number of alterations from the original request which would lead him to support the request.
- 5.15 Chairman Duffy said his biggest issue at the last meeting and is still a problem for him is the bulk of the building relative to the east property line. They moved it 8' back. They are now at the edge of the setback. It is still a mass of a building close to a neighboring property line. The impact that the height of the building has on neighboring properties to the east has been nominally modified. Is that enough? He knows that it conforms with the code. They are asking for a special use. This is an FAR issue. He has struggled with the bulk near the property line.

- 5.16 Mr. Surman said if one buys next to a school, his assumption is that there will be changes.
- 5.17 Chairman Duffy said the applicant has done a fantastic job working with the neighbors and the community. Four things that needed to be addressed from the last meeting including neighbors and the community interacting with the applicant; the traffic; storm water; bulk near the property line.
- 5.18 Mr. Robke asked if the applicant could commit to landscaping along the alley being a true rain garden.

Ms. Stoycheva said that they would commit to that.

6.0 DECISION

- 6.1 Mr. Schneider moved to recommend granting a revised request for an extension of a special use, educational facility, primary; a 7214 square foot FAR variation; a 12' side yard setback variation; a 26.11% side yard impervious surface coverage variation; a 32' rear yard playground equipment setback variation; an 18.25' rear yard step setback variation; a 1' rear yard step setback variation; and a 5' side yard parking space setback variation to permit the construction of a two story addition on the legal nonconforming structure at 808 Linden Avenue 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 Duffy	Yes
Mike Boyer	Yes
John Kolleng	Yes
Michael Robke	Yes
Reinhard Schneider	Yes
Bob Surman	Yes
Christopher Tritsis	Yes

Motion carried.

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

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

The variations are related to the replacement and upgrading of the facilities including replacing the existing gymnasium with one of a standard size. The applicant has worked to improve existing conditions, reducing impervious coverage in the north side yard and providing a conforming rear yard (east) setback to the addition. The physical conditions of the property impose upon the owner a practical difficulty. The siting of the building on the lot and the relative location of the west building and parking lot limit how improvements can be made. The plight of the owner was not created by the owner and is due to the unique development of the property. The difficulty is peculiar to the property to in question. The difficulty prevents the owner from making reasonable use of the property with improvements to the facilities. The proposed variations will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property. The nearest residential neighbors are to the east. The bulk of the floor area of the structure is towards the center of the building and away from adjacent neighbors. The other encroachments to the east, for required egress and for playground equipment, will not impact light and air. The playground equipment is currently located in the rear yard. The variations, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. The addition will not substantially alter the appearance from the street and the function of the property will not substantially change.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a revised request for the expansion of a special use (educational facility, primary), a 7,214.2 square foot (10.3%) floor area variation, a 12.08' side yard setback variation, a 26.11% side yard impervious surface coverage variation, a 32.0' rear yard playground equipment setback variation, an 18.25' rear yard step setback variation, a 1.0' rear yard step setback variation, and a 5.0' side yard parking space setback to permit the construction of a two-story addition on the legal non-conforming structure (St. Francis School) in accordance with the plans submitted. The use shall run with the use.