



1200 WILMETTE AVENUE
WILMETTE, ILLINOIS 60091-0040

MEETING AGENDA
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

June 15, 2020
4:00 p.m.
Remote Meeting

Due to the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic, this meeting will be held remotely by the Zoning Board of Appeals. The meeting will be broadcast live on YouTube at <https://www.youtube.com/user/villageofwilmette/live> and on Channel 6 and then published on the Village's website at www.wilmette.com. To participate in the meeting, please contact the Community Development Department prior to the meeting at comdev@wilmette.com or (847) 853-7529 for instructions on how to participate by computer. To participate by telephone, call (872) 239-8225 and use code 711 868 60#. Written comments may be submitted to comdev@wilmette.com. Comment may be made during the meeting through YouTube live where comments submitted will be read to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Review of Remote Meeting Procedures**
- III. Approval of the February 5, 2020 Meeting Minutes**
- IV. Approval of the February 19, 2020 Meeting Minutes**
- V. Approval of the March 4, 2020 Meeting Minutes**
- VI. Public Comment**
- VII. Adjournment**

NOTE: The Chairman reserves the right to alter the order of the published agenda if he deems a change necessary.



1200 Wilmette Avenue
Wilmette, Illinois 60091-0040

MEETING MINUTES

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2020

7:30 P.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Members Present: Chairman Reinhard Schneider
John Kolleng
Christine Norrick
Ryrie Pellaton
Bob Surman
Maria Choca Urban

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Lisa Roberts, Assistant Director of Community Development

I. Call to Order

Chairman Schneider called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m.

II. 2019-Z-44 735 Leamington Avenue

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

III. 2020-Z-03 3527 Greenwood Avenue

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

IV. 2019-Z-35 1 Indian Hill Road

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

V. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Roberts
Assistant Director of Community Development

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

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

3.11 Mr. German Criollo, applicant
735 Leamington Avenue

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a 2.6' side yard setback variation, a 3.48' combined side yard setback variation, and a 6.15' rear yard setback variation to permit the construction of a one-story addition for a garage. The Village Board will hear this case on February 25, 2020.

3.22 The applicant has lived in the village for three years. They are requesting variations because one of the contractors recommended it would be more difficult to create a new garage if they moved back towards the house. He talked about a condition of water. There are electrical wires that are more toward the back. One of the main concerns was water and the allowed location is the lowest part of the land. The contractor recommended moving the garage farther forward towards the front of the house. Based on that, they decided to ask for the variations so they can build their garage.

3.23 Chairman Schneider asked if the neighbors had a similar water problem.

The applicant said that the neighbors also have an accumulation of water, but the neighbors to the right and left of his home don't have garages.

3.24 Chairman Schneider asked if there is ponding in the back yard after a heavy rain.

The applicant said that this happens. Water is standing. It takes at least a day for the water to go down.

3.25 Chairman Schneider clarified that the applicant is requesting these variances due to the water problem and the electrical easement.

The applicant said the rules say that he needs 25' for a detached garage in the back yard. That is why they decided to make it a little wider, but a little shorter. If they move it towards the front of the house, the entrance into the garage would be harder to maneuver. It was his idea to create a detached garage. But then there was the problem of the setback to the back of the house. There was concern about the applicant

maneuvering the cars into the garage. The space in the front was short. That is why they decided on a garage that is 19' wide by 22' long.

- 3.26 Chairman Schneider said that a 19' garage is narrow for two cars.

The applicant agreed that it was narrow, but he doesn't have more space. He then decided to come to the board with his plans.

- 3.27 Mr. Pellaton said he assumed the applicant would drive on the north side of the property to access the garage.

The applicant said that was correct.

- 3.28 Mr. Pellaton referenced an existing carport on the side of the house.

The applicant said they would remove the carport.

- 3.29 Mr. Pellaton said that the current driveway is less than 9' wide. That is very tight. The board heard a case two weeks ago where the applicant was asking for relief because they did not believe that an 8' wide driveway could get a car in and out of their property safely. Does the applicant plan on adding more concrete? There is already a lot of concrete. Is the applicant going to widen the driveway?

The applicant said they have small cars. He said they cannot add more concrete. So, their plan is to move back and forth in the same direction.

- 3.30 Mr. Pellaton said they have an exit door/back door which leads out. There is not stoop or step. Generally, you don't want a door opening out onto what is a road. You don't want someone stepping out into the path of a moving car. The applicant is going to create the condition with his proposal. He is concerned about that. He is not sure if the applicant thought about that.

The applicant said he did not think about that and did not realize it will be a concern. He said that he has two children at home who are 21 and 15.

- 3.31 Mr. Surman asked if they could push the garage further back because that would require more of a variance.

Ms. Roberts said if the garage was pushed further back it would require more of a variance.

- 3.32 Mr. Surman said then what they proposed is a reasonable solution for a two-car garage. They have enough space to turn cars around. Going more

to the back would create more impervious surface. Is the side door the current entry door?

The applicant said it is the current entry door. That door swings in. It is a storm door.

- 3.33 Mr. Surman said that the garage width is acceptable. A typical driveway is 9'. He thinks that the proposal is straight forward.
- 3.34 Ms. Choca Urban said that the applicant's request is very modest in terms of side yard setbacks on a tight lot. She does not know the size of a standard garage. What they are proposing is not the standard size. She can support the request. The family will have a two-car garage and they currently do not have one.
- 3.35 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 this is a straightforward case with a good solution. The area the applicant lives in is mainly carports so to have a garage will be helpful. Most of the applicant's shovels and bikes are outside right now. He can support the request.
- 5.2 Mr. Kolleng said that the village favors two-car garages. The fit on this is tight. Regarding a stoop, he is not sure that one would even fit so they would need to leave it the way that it is. Given the village's preferences for garages and getting cars off the street, the standards of review are met. He can support the request.
- 5.3 Ms. Norrick said she could support the request.
- 5.4 Chairman Schneider said there are not many garages up and down the street. He is not sure how easily two cars will be able access the proposed garage. Regarding getting cars off the street, the applicant has a pad and there are two cars on the pad. So, they can get cars off of the street but not under cover. He discussed this case with Ms. Roberts. But for the easement in the back and possibly aggravating a water situation, they could have moved the garage all the way to the rear with 3' on the back and 3' from the side and be within the rear yard setback. But that might create problems for the relatively small variation request and the board does not want to aggravate the current water situation. He can support the request.

6.0 DECISION

6.1 Mr. Surman moved to recommend granting a request for a 2.6’ side yard setback variation, a 3.48’ combined side yard setback variation, and a 6.15’ rear yard setback variation to permit the construction of a one-story addition for a garage at 735 Leamington Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted.

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

Chairman Reinhard Schneider	Yes
John Kolleng	Yes
Christine Norrick	Yes
Ryrie Pellaton	Yes
Bob Surman	Yes
Maria Choca Urban	Yes

Motion carried.

6.2 Ms. Choca Urban moved to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for the Zoning Board of Appeals for case number 2019-Z-44.

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

Motion carried.

7.0 FINDINGS OF FACT UPON WHICH DECISION WAS BASED

The Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the request meets the variation standards of Section 5.4.F of the Zoning Ordinance. The physical conditions of the property, the siting of the house on the lot and the standing water in the backyard, impose upon the owner a practical difficulty. The plight of the owner was not created by the owner and is due to the unique circumstances of the lot. The difficulty is peculiar to the property and not generally shared by others. The difficulty prevents the owner from making reasonable use of the property with a two-car garage. The proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air or otherwise injure adjacent properties. While a more conforming option may exist, the proposed request minimizes the added impervious coverage on the lot and avoids putting the garage in a location where water currently collects, which would otherwise cause the water to be displaced onto neighboring properties. The variations, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. The garage is at the rear of the home and will have little impact on the view of the property from the street.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a 2.6' side yard setback variation, a 3.48' combined side yard setback variation, and a 6.15' rear yard setback variation to permit the construction of a one-story addition for a garage at 735 Leamington Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted.

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

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

3.11 Mr. Gregory Geslicki, architect
OCGG Architects

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a 7.14' front yard setback variation, a 6.72' front yard porch setback variation, a 4.72' front yard porch step setback variation, a 176.56 square foot (8.01%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation, and a 29.54 square foot (1.34%) front porch coverage variation to permit the construction of a substantial addition and remodel that is classified as a new home. The Village Board will hear this case on February 25, 2020.

3.22 The architect said he was engaged to design an addition and porch for the home. He looked at the proposal in several different ways of how to create the addition and porch. The stumbling block is the location of the residence. It was already past the front setback because of the established front yard calculations. They wanted to keep the addition, so it was not overwhelming. They are concerned about the bulk. He noted that he is on a zoning board in a different municipality, so he is sensitive to the issues. He has been in practice since 2001 and has done several projects in the village, but this is the first time he has been before the board.

He could explain the project from an architectural point of view. Why is the addition created in the way that it was? Or he could make a list and review the list of regulations they are seeking relief from. He will present the proposal as a project and board members can ask questions about why they decided to go in the direction they propose.

What they build will have an impact on the neighborhood for several years.

They tried to ameliorate the situation by creating a pleasing piece of architecture as well as eliminating the bulk of the house. His client requested a porch and that put them over the setback. They propose a 6' porch, which is a reasonable depth so that the porch can function as a porch.

He referenced the last page of the packet and also showed a picture of the home. The attempt is to minimize the home's volume, which is why

they went with the bungalow look. The front porch is not the full width of the house, but it is in proportion to work with the two dormers. The house has a detached garage. It helps to park the car, go to the residence and through the front door. There is also a small portion of the porch in the back is to alleviate the concern of stepping into the driveway.

He created a graphic of what the setback would cause if they tried to do the project a different way. The setback is going through the first one-third of the home. To do any kind of addition, they would have to go to the back and build the residence on partial volume of the home. The graphic gives a better idea of what the setback would make them do if they adhered to all regulations. He talked about the floor plan. He showed the existing line of the residence and if they confirmed, it would cut off a slice of the project if they did a second-floor addition. They still would have to get variances if they just did a second-floor addition. He said that they were left with very few options on how to create the project without requesting a variation.

With regard to impervious coverage, the project is classified as a new home, but the addition to the back is 14' x 30'. The only variation for coverage they are seeking is for a small area because of the stoop.

- 3.23 Chairman Schneider asked what would remain of the existing house.

The architect said that what would remain include foundation, first floor outline, and the second-floor addition will be a taller roof with a half story and some dormers on the front and back.

- 3.24 Chairman Schneider clarified that the basement walls and the first-floor interior walls would remain and all else would be demolished.

The architect reiterated they considered various options. If they take everything out and start from scratch it is much more cost effective. The home is an early post war structure. There is not that much in the plan that is comparable with today's requirements. They will keep the stair going down to the basement or a portion of it.

The basement floor plan changes very little from the previous plan. The kitchen is very small. There is a set of bedrooms to the east. No matter how they did it, it would be a hodge podge of elements.

- 3.25 Chairman Schneider said that two-thirds of the rear wall on the first floor will be taken out.

The architect said that this would occur at the back. It is for a new family room.

- 3.26 Chairman Schneider said he assumes that some of the penetrations of the existing first floor perimeter walls will also change with a double door leading to the porch.

The architect said that keeping existing openings does not play well with the project. It is not a budget move but has a long-lasting impact on the project.

- 3.27 Chairman Schneider referenced the cost factor. If they started with a blank piece of land, how would it compare in terms of cost to what they are doing.

The architect said this can be answered in several different ways. It comes with a certain set of clients. If it is a new residence, it is very seldom that it is the same resident in the location. It is usually a house that has sold, and new people are coming in. Their requirements are very different from someone who lived in the residence and asks for a new home.

He talked about projects he did when people lived in the home then asked that the house be demolished, and a new house be built. But that comes with different financing regulations. They either need money to build the house, but to demolish a residence means they have to pay off the mortgage. The mortgage has its own set of rules and regulations. They cannot demolish the entire home without foreclosure. His answers are relevant to Chairman Schneider's question. If someone comes in to buy the lot, they see the lot as a piece of land. The neighborhood does not have a lot of examples about what can happen with that approach. A new house's massing should work with the design of the neighborhood.

Where does the price come in? If a new house is being built, it goes to the maximum of what the lot allows. He talked about houses he has done in the area. He wants to keep new homes in scale with other neighborhood homes.

In summary, his proposal is less money than building a new home and the financing is different.

- 3.28 Mr. Kolleng clarified that the existing owner will stay, and they are the ones who want the changes.

- 3.29 Chairman Schneider asked if they could keep existing financing in place.

The architect said they can keep the existing financing in place.

- 3.30 Chairman Schneider asked how the applicants would finance the construction.

The architect said this will be taken care of, but he does not need to be privy to the details.

- 3.31 Mr. Surman noted that the board generally does not consider finances in making their decision. His concern is that the house is out further than any house on the street on that side of the block. The houses are of modest size.

He does not see a hardship that they need all that they are proposing in front especially when they are tearing off a portion of the back of the house. There is no reason why they should not try to be more in conformance with the code than what is proposed. He is an architect and he said that the design is very nice. He understands the rationale for the plans. Right now, the lot line to the face of the building is 19', which is close for a Wilmette home to be.

He suggested that the first floor have an angled roof going back to reduce the bulk of the house. The block is small. The proposal goes beyond the context of the street.

The porch looks great, but there is no hardship that they need a full length. The board looks at the proposal and determines if there might be other options to reduce the amount of the variation. Right now, it would be tough to sell the proposal the way that it is because they are asking for a lot. They are asking to go in front of the lot line. They are asking to go 6' beyond where they are now. They want to go straight up with a second floor. If they are already expanding the back of the home, there is the opportunity to shift the mass that way.

The architect agrees with Mr. Surman 100%. But the client wants a front porch. If the front porch is not approved, then he would have a different conversation with the client. Until that happens, he cannot recommend that the client take off the porch. Adding a porch creates a pleasing effect. He is creating a project where he is trying to minimize the impact of the volume, but not deprive his client something they can have with a like property, which is a porch.

- 3.32 Mr. Surman said he understands what the architect is saying, but the board is told by the Village Board that the size of variations should be reduced if the size is not appropriate and there are other options.

- 3.33 Mr. Kolleng noted that this is considered as new construction so if this was a piece of land without a house on it and the architect came to the

board to ask for what he is proposing, it would not be granted. They are coming out farther and there is more room in the back. There are ways to minimize what they are asking for. The architect may be getting the sense that what he is asking for may not work.

The architect said if he goes to the back, he has to dig out a lot. When they are doing this, they are spending a lot more money proportionately versus building up.

- 3.34 Mr. Surman asked if it would be slab on grade.

The architect said that the house is elevated so they would need to put in footings and joists. The porch is a good solution in terms of architecture, but it is a subjective way of looking at it. What he has proposed is an optimal way to solve the problem. No matter what they do there is a negative and a positive. There are tradeoffs.

- 3.35 Mr. Surman said to look at the big picture, this property will impact the neighborhood character, which could set a precedent. The board looks at each case individually. But he is talking about changing the character of a neighborhood that has a crowded feeling to it already. From an architectural standpoint, he understands the rationale for the request, but from a zoning standpoint, there is no real hardships. He explained what a hardship could be.

- 3.35 Mr. Pellaton said it looks like they are adding the 1.5 story addition across two-thirds of the rear, so they are already going to put footings or basement below that.

The architect said that there is an addition that is 14' x 27' to the rear.

- 3.36 Mr. Pellaton said they could build further in the back without too much additional cost as they are putting an addition back there. He likes the design and is a big advocate for porches. Every other house is in line with this house unless they add on the front porch. He is not in favor of that.

- 3.37 Ms. Choca Urban agrees with above comments. She said that there is not another house on the street that has a front porch. The front porch encroaches on the front yard setback but adds to impervious surface coverage by a significant amount. They could do away with one variation by reducing the request. She also likes the design. The size of the homes in the area are small, but she does not see the hardship on the front porch.

The architect said he respects the comments but has a different opinion.

- 3.38 Chairman Schneider that there is a sense from the discussion that the front porch is an issue. No one is asking him to move the north wall of the house back to conform because that would not be economically feasible. But the porch is something that is being created. One of the key standards for a variation is hardship.

The architect said that any solution for this property needs approval by the board. If his request is not approved, he cannot return for an extended time period.

- 3.39 Chairman Schneider said that the proposed second floor does not add or detract from the variations.

Ms. Roberts said that the second floor requires a variation.

- 3.40 Mr. Pellaton asked if no motion was made and no vote was taken then it has not been rejected. Could he return with a revised plan?

Ms. Roberts said she would suggest continuing the case or not continue it and the applicant can come back when ready and re-notice.

The architect said he is putting his client at a distinct disadvantage and he did not create the disadvantage. He thinks that a compromise could be to listen to the board's recommendations and revise the plans. His client can evaluate the revised plans and return to the board. They will do the best they can to reasonably satisfy all involved.

- 3.41 Mr. Surman said a continuance would give him the opportunity to work with his clients.

- 3.42 Chairman Schneider clarified that the porch is the issue. Is the issue also the second-floor addition that requires a variation because it goes beyond the line?

- 3.43 Mr. Pellaton said the addition is much less of an issue because the existing wall is there and is line with other houses on the block. He understood Mr. Surman's design suggestion, which is to keep the current roof line and have the second-floor addition start beyond the setback. But those are design questions for the architect and applicant to review.

- 3.44 Ms. Choca Urban is not concerned about the second floor. The current house is non-conforming, which is a hardship that was not created by the applicant. They are exacerbating the situation by adding a 6' porch that spans the entire front.

- 3.45 Mr. Kolleng noted that there are one story homes on the block. In back are two huge homes and he was not on the board when those were approved. Those do not fit the character of the neighborhood.

The architect said that there is a beautiful tree in the rear. If he went further back with the addition, he would go past the root line. This is another reason why the addition is where it is at.

- 3.46 Chairman Schneider said that most board members concur that the porch is the issue. What options does the applicant have?

Ms. Roberts said they would want to continue to a specific date, so they don't have to re-notice. She reviewed open meeting dates.

The architect said that March 4, 2020 would work for him.

6.0 DECISION

- 6.1 Mr. Kolleng moved to continue the case to the March 4, 2020 meeting.
- 6.11 Mr. Pellaton 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. Jon Talty
OKW Architects
600 W. Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, IL

3.2 Summary of presentations

- 3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a revised request for a variation to permit the expansion of legal non-conforming uses (Club and Golf Course), a 25.0' north side yard adjoining a street setback variation (equipment wash/storage, a 30.0' rear yard of a double-frontage lot setback variation (dumpster pad), a 41.37' north side yard adjoining a street setback variation (loading), a special use for three accessory buildings each in excess of 200 square feet, a 2,028.25 square foot south side yard adjoining a street impervious surface variation, a 2,631.1 square foot north side yard adjoining a street impervious surface variation, a 2.0' fence height variation, and a fence openness variation to permit the construction of a one-story employee center, a one-story equipment wash building, parking lot, and other site improvements. The Village Board will hear this case on March 10, 2020.
- 3.22 Mr. Talty said that the last hearing for this case was on November 20, 2019. He put a revised package at each board member's place. He said the addition to this packet from the other packet for this meeting is a sheet that explains what they have done so everyone can understand the changes more clearly.

They are here at the meeting because the club needs improvements to their maintenance facility. The stewardship and management of the 138-acre-plus adjacent golf course has changed in the last 60 years when the facility was built. As a result, they are asking for variances so that they can build two new buildings on the site. One is an employee center and the other is an environmental building. They were asking for variances relative to setbacks, building heights, and impervious surface issues.

At the last hearing, the site plan addressed the buildings located within the setbacks. He then said that he would explain where they have gone since the last hearing and then he will get into specifics.

Regarding building heights, they reduced the new building heights to 15' so they conform. The environmental building sits to the north and

the roof has a slight pitch. The employee center sits to the south is now a flat-roof building and sheds water east to west and the water will be captured on the backside. There are no issues regarding building heights.

The employee center was previously located within the side yard setbacks. One thing that adds to the complexity of the ask and the site is that there is a non-conformity within a residential community, and it is an unusual site in that it is surrounded on four sides by streets.

The front yard is on Hunter and the requirement is a 40' setback. The rear yard is on Indian Hill Road to the west and is a 50' setback. There are side yard adjacent to street setbacks of 50'. What is a two-acre site is encumbered by robust setbacks in all directions. They have moved the employee center within the setbacks of 50' from the west and 50' from the south. They now conform within the building envelope allowed by zoning.

They also addressed a parking scenario that they had and reoriented the parking lot in a different direction. Currently all cars park along the southern property line with headlights pointing south. In restudying the site plan, they reoriented the lots so that the car lights head east and west, away from the neighbors to the south.

The equipment building to the north used to comply with the 50' setback, but it is now pushed into the setback. It is not impacting anyone on the north side of the property. Only the golf course is impacted. They moved it into the setback because they need the real estate in the middle of the site for vehicular movement accessing all of the materials stored in the bins, the equipment wash, and then access to sand storage.

At the last hearing they talked about sand storage silo on the site, which was tall. This element has been removed. The equipment building grew in an east/west direction to add another bay for interior sand storage, which is accessed via an overhead door.

The above are the primary changes they made to the property in an attempt to better conform to village requirements and to demonstrate their want to get the request approved.

- 3.23 Mr. Kolleng referenced the pad for the two dumpsters and asked if that moved.

Mr. Talty said they moved the pad west. There are currently dumpsters on the site. They sit on soil. By placing them on an impervious surface, it allows for better clean up and better movement without tearing everything up around it.

- 3.24 Mr. Kolleng said that the applicant was very responsive to comments and incorporated them into the new plan. He wants the applicant to speak about the exterior perimeter screening and foliage outside the fence line.
- 3.25 Mr. Surman talked about a plan submitted by a neighbor about the above. He also congratulated the applicant on the revision and said that they listened well. The new solution is very good.

Mr. Talty said that the property is complicated. He showed the Kenilworth Avenue elevation and the image provided by a neighbor. There was a recent meeting with the Appearance Review Commission (ARC). One of the subjects was landscaping inside the site and what they are doing to address this as well as addressing neighbor's needs on Kenilworth Avenue and the Nelsons to the immediate east.

He talked about the parkway being club property. The property line goes to the center line of Kenilworth Avenue. It is unusual and is the only property like that that is remaining. If the project moves forward, the 33' from the center line of Kenilworth Avenue to the fence line becomes village property. The club would bestow that back to the village. Currently the club pays taxes on that to the center line of the road. This parcel is club property. In 2017 the fence was replaced. In 2016 or 2017, pines were planted to help mask the site from the neighbors to the south. There has been concern that the property is unkempt. There is a vertical board that is missing at the meeting of the gates and will immediately be replaced, he said that part of the property has been well cared for. There is not a lot of room to plant more materials, especially overstory materials.

- 3.26 Chairman Schneider said that at the last meeting, one of the neighbors to the east made a point of asking what they will do to visually make their view to the west better.

Mr. Talty said they spoke with the Nelsons, who are the neighbors. Club staff has continued that dialog. They reduced the paved area on the north side of the existing building by half to allow for them to landscape an area in a more robust way. They will work out the plans with the Nelsons. They will provide a conclusion that gives comfort to the Nelsons that the area will not be an eyesore.

Mr. Talty said that there is nothing that speaks to the purpose of equipment staging that is annotated. There is a vagueness to the conversation relative to public testimony. The staging area is not an area that will have noisy equipment or nuisances to the public. It is capturing space that is part of the property. He said that the fence line comes back to the north side of the maintenance building and goes east. But the

property line goes all the way to the corner. They want to recapture what is theirs as it relates to the village parcel. The parcel to the north of that is unincorporated Cook County. They want to enable the fence to follow the property line in the northeast corner. It then enables them to capture other real estate as pointed out on the plan. It is not their intent to have that become an eyesore or any kind of area of dispute between the club and their neighbors, specially the Nelsons.

- 3.27 Ms. Norrick asked if there was any type of coordination with the Nelsons.

Mr. Talty said they are in the process of doing that. Regarding the ARC, they are returning with a more site-specific landscape plan, which identifies what will go in that corner. The Nelsons will feel comfortable with the solution.

- 3.28 Ms. Choca Urban said that there is an email from the Nelsons in the board packet dated 1/28/20 and they still object to the loading area. She went to the site to see it through the Nelson's eyes. She was struck by how close the Nelsons house is to the property. She was also struck that this is an area that is currently not used and is truly an expansion of the facility in a way that some of the other uses are not. She is concerned that the plan does not address the Nelson's concerns as they are used to looking at bushes with no activity in the area. The vagueness Mr. Talty spoke of about the staging or loading area will be used is a cause for concern.

Mr. Talty said that he understands her comments.

- 3.29 Ms. Norrick asked if they could just move the fence and not put their pavement there. And then they could have their area.

Mr. Talty said he would speak to his client about this, but they could reduce the impervious surface. They would use that space in some way to have equipment or golf courts parked there. Maybe they could get a vehicle out of the way while other vehicles were coming in and out. It would not sit there as a side yard lawn and would be used in some way.

- 3.30 Chairman Schneider said that the ARC has to make its case, positive or negative, to the board of trustees in addition to what the board recommends.

Ms. Roberts said that unless a variation is granted, the ARC would have the final word on an appearance review certificate, but the approval would be conditioned on having approval by both bodies.

- 3.31 Chairman Schneider noted that he would assume that the ARC would focus on the landscape.

Ms. Roberts said that is correct.

Mr. Talty said that was the ARC's intent at the last meeting. And they will address the neighbor's concerns.

- 3.32 Mr. Surman said he appreciates all of the changes made. He referenced the old maintenance building and noted that Mr. Talty said it has been there for about 60 years. He referenced the area they are trying to recapture and asked if dumpsters were in that area.

Mr. Talty said dumpsters were not in that area. The last proposal had a deeper well with the same use they are proposing. The area to the north of the maintenance building is used by the club and the neighbors on Indian Hill Road to park cars. There were disassembled paddle courts that sat there for several months late last year. There will be less of that available as time goes on.

- 3.33 Mr. Surman said he does not have as much of a problem with a vehicle being parked there. The neighbors bought the home with the building there, so they had to expect something. Setting it back is a reasonable compromise. He could see an Evergreen or several of them in that location.

Mr. Talty said that a vertical planting would block the view.

- 3.34 Ms. Norrick asked about room for additional landscaping.

Mr. Talty said that as the property gets improved, storm water management needs to be addressed. There is none today and they are providing it with the proposed plan. The L shaped property will have underground pipes to hold water and release it at an appropriate rate into the village's systems once the property is redeveloped. They have to be sensitive and are working with their civil engineers who will work with landscape architect to ensure that landscape improvements on the inside of the fence line do not negatively impact underground storm water management that will be part of the project.

- 3.35 Chairman Schneider noted that the plan must comply with MWRD requirements.

Mr. Talty said that is correct. He said that the Kenilworth Avenue view into the site is opaque. Another tree could not be put between the other trees because they would not grow. Maybe they could do foreground

plantings but that does not impact any views into the property. The hope is that if they supplement landscape on the Kenilworth Avenue side it would occur inside the fence in a way where they could block views. The building's new height of 15' won't be visible from the street or sidewalk. It can be viewed from the second floor of the homes across the street as they look down. The building is 50' back from the fence line. He respects the opinions of Kenilworth Avenue residents; he does not know what they want to happen from a landscape perspective. The area is maintained and was planted by the club. The club will care for the plantings even though it won't be the club's property. It is village parkway.

- 3.36 Mr. Pellaton said he agrees about the applicant's responsiveness to all of the board's issues. He appreciates their efforts to minimize the amount of paving north of the maintenance shed. He said that the comments about the maintenance of the exterior primarily related to the east side behind the maintenance side on the roadside of the fence. A comment was made that it was overgrown or wild looking.

Mr. Talty said they can address that.

- 3.37 Mr. Pellaton continued and said he agreed about the trees and the screening effect. Working with the neighbors on the north and east sides is good. Drawing 6 indicates additional plantings as determined by neighbors on the west side and northeast corner. It might help the neighbor's feelings about this to pretty the area up with decorative plantings along Kenilworth Avenue and Hunter. Make it look pleasant and maintained.

(after 4.0)

- 3.38 Mr. Talty talked about the club's relationship with the neighbors. He has not spoken with the Nelsons. It is Dave's role to speak with neighbors. He said that the club is not entering into the proposed changes lightly. Dave's stewardship is commendable. They left the ARC meeting at 9:30 p.m. yesterday and today the fence was repaired. The fence was installed in 2017.
- 3.39 Chairman Schneider said they asked for a fence height variation. He does not know if that was for the entire fence on Kenilworth Avenue.

Mr. Talty said they replaced the entire length of fence. Regarding storm water, the deep tunnel failed due to extraordinary circumstances in 2018. If the deep tunnel was not there, the problem would have been exacerbated. He promises that the engineering efforts as related to the site will vastly improve storm water management on the site and its impact on neighbors. Water will not leave the site. The surface of the

site is currently impervious. By creating an engineered environment, they will capture water in multiple locations. If needed, they will store water on the site. It will be released in increments that are determined by the village. It will be vastly better.

Regarding the issue of the industrial complex, there are no more employees, equipment, and hours of operation are the same. This has been the maintenance yard for 105 years predating every home in the area. Regarding the red bushes, they pulled the pad back so the bushes could remain. They will supplement with other landscape material. They are trying to make the situation better for everyone.

4.0 INTERESTED PARTIES

4.1 People speaking on the application

4.11 Mr. and Mrs. Mike and Debra Thompson
2305 Kenilworth Avenue

4.12 Mr. Joel Boyd
2309 Kenilworth Avenue

4.13 Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd and Peggy Nelson
2244 Beechwood Avenue

4.2 Summary of presentations

4.21 The Thompsons have lived in the village for 33 years. They own the property at 2305 Kenilworth Avenue. It is directly across from the club and the maintenance facility site. In November, he presented his concerns at a board meeting regarding his concerns about the request to expand the present maintenance facility and add two new buildings, several accessory structures, parking lot, dumpster pad, and holding area. At the time, he said that the project was an extreme industrial overbuild for a zoned residential area. He also indicated that the project would undermine and alter the residential character of the neighborhood and added that there was no significant buffering of the site to insulate the neighborhood from the club. He then thought that the club was not being considerate of the neighbors. He suggested that the club downsize and/or move aspects of the maintenance facility to other vacant locations on the golf course property more to the interior northward and along the golf course's western perimeter adjacent to Locust Road.

In reviewing the most recent plan for the maintenance expansion, he finds that the club did reduce the new building height and modified somewhat the accessory storage structures, the overall extend of the

maintenance facility expansion has not diminished in size or scope. The proposed expansion looks like an industrial site more consistent with business operations in west Wilmette. The club's maintenance operations cannot be distanced from the golf course, but a more concerted effort by the club could have been given to disperse some of the maintenance functions to other areas around the golf course grounds.

It appears as if the club still does not understand the need to make some significant effort to insulate the surrounding residential neighborhood from the visual impact of the expansive project. In October he offered some suggestions, but the club has not come forth with more buffering or landscape enhancements that would be beneficial to the neighborhood. The club seems to understand the importance of adding more landscaping buffering to the golf course side of the maintenance facility site but does not understand or chooses to ignore the residential areas to the east and south that are impacted by the project.

He stands in front of his property and looks across Kenilworth Avenue and all he sees is an old stockade fence. He does not see that the fence was replaced in the last two years. He talked about evergreen trees that need pruning and nourishment. The trees are frail and flimsy. Further to the west they planted new evergreen trees. But there was no improvement from the gate eastward towards Hunter Road.

Mrs. Thompson showed what they see. There is a new part of the fence and an old part of the fence. The gate was fixed early today, and she showed a photo of the fix, which is two slats. As far as they know, the maintenance is complete. There were four big trees planted, but there is nothing in another area.

Mr. Thompson said the appearance is not appealing. They can see cars on the club's site from their first floor. How much more equipment will they see with an expansion? The club is being short sighted and overly optimistic that the property is being adequately shielded. They were at the ARC meeting on Monday. The issues blend together. There is no extensive landscape plan that was presented during the process.

She said that they will do landscaping on the interior that will help their second-floor view. If it's not going to improve, say it's not going to improve but don't say that the view isn't bad because it is bad.

He said that the neighborhood will be altered in character if the project moves forward in its proposed manner. What is the village benefitting from industrializing this area? There is not an increase in taxation. The local resident's property values will not be enhanced because they will be proximate to an industrial area. All of the benefits are for the club.

The village is exchanging characteristics unique to a residential area for more concrete and asphalt, industrial structures, and noise and pollution inherent with the expansion of a maintenance facility. There is no benefit to the village to allow the project to proceed. He urged the board to not allow the club project to proceed as presented and asked that there be an extensive landscape plan presented to the board before any true assessment can be made in allowing the project to move forward. They have photographs that his wife showed.

Chairman Schneider said that board members were at his property several times. He assumes that the neighbors attend ARC meetings and share their concerns.

Ms. Norrick asked if the case would go back to the ARC before the village board.

Ms. Roberts said it depends on timing, but the applicant would not get permits until the ARC approved final plans.

- 4.22 Mr. Boyd bought his property in June 2019. His wife attended the November meeting and the recent ARC meeting. Tonight is his first meeting regarding the case. He lives to the west of the above speaker's property. He has some concerns. He questions whether the club has met the standards of review to expand the non-conforming footprint. The club said no additional employees or change in maintenance procedures, but by building more buildings with more uses, it is an expansion of the non-conforming footprint. He questions if the club has demonstrated that the project will not diminish property values of nearby properties, diminish the enjoyment of property by changing the appearance and character of the neighborhood. The club is proposing more paved surface and industrial appearance. He questions whether the club has demonstrated a hardship versus an inconvenience if they were to have the current setup. It is an old building that cannot be renovated/improved. Why can't they tear down the existing structure without expanding the footprint?

Another concern is with storm water management. There is a vast increase in impervious surface. The club said they are working with engineers and will use best practices and have a plan for management, but there is no guarantee is that the plan will work. With the current system, the ground absorbs water. The current village storm water system is not adequate. The applicant is proposing a deep tunnel system with the underground pipes but there is no guarantee of success. He pointed to the deep tunnel system in Chicago and that system filled to capacity in March 2018.

The proposal still mentioned the sand silo, but the architect said that is off of the table. He sent some photos to Ms. Roberts at 4:30 today and has them on their phone. He has a photo that shows that views are visible from their first floor. The photo shows the club's existing structure. He also showed photos from the second floor.

- 4.23 Mr. Nelson said their property adjoins to the east. He showed a view from his bedroom window. They have lived in their home for 29 years. He was at the previous hearing. He wrote two to three emails. He asked if the board had any questions for them. It is a not-in-my-backyard issue.

He looks at the project as follows – what is the club getting out of this? They are getting an employee building, an employee parking lot, new storage bins, an environmental building, an equipment wash, concrete pad for dumpsters and they are trying to clean up their act.

Mr. Kolleng said all of that is going on now.

Mr. Nelson said that the two new buildings are not there now.

Mr. Kolleng said that except for the employee building, everything else is going on at the site. Wouldn't it be more organized in a better form be better than the current view, which is unattractive?

Mr. Nelson thinks the new view is unattractive.

Mrs. Nelson said they could see major trees but those will be gone with the new plan. They will plow mature trees and bushes and replace them with asphalt.

Mr. Nelson said they bought their home with an ugly building next to it. The club did not acknowledge that they would expand and park things in that location. All of the club activity for maintenance happens beyond the shed. He talked about noise, movement, and parking. Now they are bringing 'stuff' next to them. It is beyond them because there is a 23' high building blocking all of that. He does not object to sights, sounds, and smells because they have a buffer. The ugly building shields them.

What will he and his wife get out of this? They are getting more 'stuff' outside. 5,200 square feet is being added but the club needs more space to move things outside. What about the big building? Why does the stuff have to be outside in the northeast corner where they can see it? Why can't it be in the northwest corner, which is the back?

Mr. Kolleng said what will go on in the northwest corner?

Mr. Nelson said he did not know. He said they are getting bushes removed that block the 23' high building. The building is a nice buffer but will be gone and replaced with a concrete pad. There will be more noise and distractions and more people movement and more smells 30' from their patio. They are asking for a variance for every setback, buffer, impervious surface, nonconforming building, and additions for the whole site. Can't they be restricted to something more logical?

Mr. Kolleng talked about the last plan and the current plan. It looks like the applicant has responded to a lot of suggestions. The new setback violations go towards the club.

Mr. Nelson said that John has never spoken with them. They have only met with Dave. The new changes were not discussed with Dave. Dave said they were reducing the pad and moving buildings 25'. There is no symbiotic relationship to talk about the plans. Dave is the only one they have met with.

Mrs. Nelson said they initiate calls with Dave.

Mr. Nelson said they reduced the size of the pad by 40% but it is still there.

Mrs. Nelson said that it still requires a variance and they only have a vague understanding of its use. She does not understand the hardship of why the pad is needed.

Mr. Nelson asked about hardship for this case. To make it look better.

Mrs. Nelson said putting dumpsters on a pad is good. The plan is too incomplete. There is no landscape plan. How the pad will be used is vague. They don't understand the hardship. No one has told them what is going there and how big it is. Does it have a motor or back up lights?

Mr. Surman said if the club was to not have that pocket, would that be acceptable?

Mr. Nelson said that would help.

Chairman Schneider asked about the location of the red bush.

Mr. Nelson showed the board the location on the plan.

Mr. Nelson talked about the 39'. They are not saying it cannot be done, but they believe it should be done in conformity with codes. Don't ask for variances to make it a good 39' for the club. He objects to the

characterization that it is just adding 39' to your backyard. The club has 130 acres and they can give up 1,000 or 2,000 square feet.

Mr. Nelson said he understands that the board can recommend this case but with conditions. He asked that some conditions be put on the recommendation.

Mr. Kolleng said he thought that this could not done. The board tried doing this before.

Mr. Nelson doesn't want manure or tractors there.

Mrs. Nelson said that the applicant noted that they will not store these types of items, but what If someone leaves and what guarantees do, they have going forward that all of the building and asphalt is used in the way it is today?

Chairman Schneider asked the Nelsons to wrap up their presentation.

Mr. Nelson said that the club has to meet the standards of review. They can't be nice to the Nelsons and think that is good enough. The applicant has to satisfy the board and the Village Board. Mr. Surman made a point about a residential property. Mr. Nelson said they bought their home with the club's building there as well as landscaping. They did not anticipate that the property to the north of that would become a part of day to day operations of the club or that all landscaping would be removed. It isn't the same house they bought. If they sold it today, they would have to tell the buyer that things are changing at the club.

Mr. Surman said it is a complicated issue. He said that the Nelsons bought next to an industrial type building. The board can only do so much.

Mr. Nelson said what the club proposes requires variances. What they are doing will negatively impact his property.

Mr. Surman said that the board understands this.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

- 5.1 Mr. Surman reiterated that the applicant has made good changes to the plan by setting the buildings back and lowering roofs. He shares the neighbors' concerns about landscaping. From his experience by driving to the site, organization will help a little bit. In the fall, dump trucks were backed up to the fence line. That cannot happen anymore because

the trucks won't fit in the parking lot. That should help with the view. The landscaping could improve. He said that staggering landscaping on either side of the fence is a good solution. The building is 2,500 square feet, but it has a lower pitch for visibility even than a one-story home. He can support the request, but there needs to be attention put towards concealing the current maintenance building. They did a great job with the new buildings. He suggested trees near the brick patio to help with the view. The view from the first floor of their house and front yard is important. The second-floor view cannot be controlled. He wants to see trees increase in that corner for the Nelsons. Maybe that area needs to be reviewed. Maybe the Village Board would address this and other issues. If the board had known this plan was in place a few years ago, he would have suggested that the fence along Kenilworth Avenue be shifted in from the property line maybe 8-10'. If the fence line to the north had shifted, there would be more greenery before one sees the fence. That would benefit the neighbors. Five to six parking spaces might be lost. He is not at the hearing to design the project although he is an architect. From what was presented in November, the applicant made a lot of improvements and listened to comments. Now it is down to details.

- 5.2 Mr. Kolleng agreed with Mr. Surman's comments. The lot is unique. When the club bought the site there probably were not any houses. If the club wanted to make changes 30 years ago, probably no one would say anything. It looks like a lot of requests, but the applicant was responsive to suggestions at the last hearing. The setback relief is now towards the club. Part of the hardship is the growth of the residential area around the club and all the setbacks. The applicant did a great job in doing that and lowering the height of the employee building to 15'. They got rid of the silo. He drives the area a lot. He doesn't remember seeing the big building. In the summer there is more foliage. They are doing water retention in collaboration with the MWRD so it will be done according to best practices. There are a lot of stockade fences in the village. It has been there all along. It is 2' higher than before which is an improvement. When he looks at everything, he said that standards of review are met, and he can support the request.
- 5.3 Ms. Choca Urban agrees with what has been said about the revised proposal being a significant improvement over the original proposal. She has not heard anything in presentations or Q and A that justifies the need for the pad on the northeast corner. They have a lot of parking in the center part of the site that should accommodate any and all traffic. She went to the site today and realized they had not fenced in the 39' and claimed it. As a result, it is landscaped in a dense manner that shields the view dramatically. Something similar should be done on Kenilworth Avenue for the neighbors to the south. Although there are a

lot of advantages to the revised plan, she cannot support it because she sees no justification for the pad in the northeast corner.

- 5.4 Ms. Norrick said she sees that the proposal is an improvement, but she sees remaining issues as related to landscaping. She would like to see those resolved before the board approves the proposal.
- 5.5 Mr. Pellaton said he is not sure that landscape improvements is a possibility because that is the purview of the ARC. It would be nice if the landscape plan was part of tonight's case. He suggests that the concrete pad area, if the club decides that it is in their best interest to not pave that in order to gain approval, there is nothing to stop them from cutting down all shrubs that the Nelsons are interested in.

There is a lot of parking in the area outside of the fence to the north. Pick up trucks are parked there. He said neighbors discussed benefits as opposed to drawbacks. The club is not doing what they propose to benefit the neighborhood. They are doing it to benefit the club. That is a given. The board would like the club to figure out how to make it as pleasant a view as possible for the neighbors. He suggested to Mr. Talty that landscaping outside the fence area would be great. He said that the outside of the maintenance facility should be attractive. The area to the south and west of the employee center is for water storage. There is piping and they could extend it past the dumpster pads well to the north to add some screening on the south side of the employee center as a buffer. He would also recommend screening on the south side of the storage bins and the north side behind the sand and pesticide storage building. More is better and would help to reduce noise and make the area appear more pleasant. He agreed with the above positive comments about changes made to the proposal. He said that the applicant should try to make the building not look like a maintenance facility.

- 5.6 Mr. Surman said the board's role is to look at zoning and how it is impacted. Then the board makes a recommendation to the Village Board. It is up to the latter to make the decisions on certain things.

Regarding underground storm water management, the board went through this with Loyola Academy. The latter had to work with the village engineer. It has worked out. Regarding landscaping, he can support the case, but the village board needs to make the final decision on landscaping.

- 5.7 Mr. Kolleng said that the Village Board can impose certain conditions.
- 5.8 Mr. Surman said that the Village Board can respond to the neighbors' concerns about landscaping and have more weight than the board. The

board does not have purview to ask the applicant to return with landscaping. There is so much focus on the new loading spot next to the Nelsons home. Maybe the Village Board will say it should be next to the dumpsters. And maybe the latter are shifted slightly and then maybe the whole issue goes away.

- 5.9 Mr. Kolleng said that the board heard that the red bushes would remain. It seems like the building will be blocked. The applicant is reclaiming land that they have not been using. He is not as concerned about the landscaping. The applicant has agreed to reduce the pad size. They are leaving a lot of foliage, which is a positive. The fence went up 2' in height which is a positive. The view that is there has been there for a long time. He does not think the view will get worse. The Village Board can set conditions.
- 5.10 Mr. Surman noted that the Village Board can deal with neighbors' concerns.
- 5.11 Ms. Choca Urban said that there is a material difference between having something as a grassed area versus a paved area regardless of the activity allowed. The board is granting a variation for impervious surface so they can pave that area. She has not heard any justification for that.
- 5.12 Chairman Schneider asked the size of the area.
- 5.13 Ms. Choca Urban said that it is about 600 square feet. It is about 30' x 20'.
- 5.14 Mr. Surman said that is a valuable area. As an architect, he does not see where they could choose another spot in their current paved area.
- 5.15 Ms. Norrick said that the applicant did not specify what they needed.
- 5.16 Chairman Schneider said that part of the variation requests have to do with the area being zoned R, residential. Any other use requires variations. Michigan Shores is in an R1 district. They added an outdoor fire pit and they had 65 variation requests because the whole complex is not in compliance with R1 zoning.

He agrees with Mr. Kolleng who said that all of this is going on now, but it is a big mess. It is a junk yard. All they are doing is organizing it. Based on comments made at the last hearing, they made significant adjustments to move the building facing south and to move it further to the north abutting the golf course. They will have to comply with MWRD requirements regarding storm water management just like every other large project. The applicant has committed to landscaping and this

can be part of village board approval. This proposal makes the club more attractive than it is today. Right now, cars are parked on the south side facing Kenilworth Avenue and they are parked all over. There are piles of dirt and rubble. The proposal is a huge improvement. He can support the request.

6.0 DECISION

6.1 Mr. Surman moved to recommend granting a revised request for a variation to permit the expansion of legal non-conforming uses (Club and Golf Course), a 25.0’ north side yard adjoining a street setback variation (equipment wash/storage, a 30.0’ rear yard of a double-frontage lot setback variation (dumpster pad), a 41.37’ north side yard adjoining a street setback variation (loading), a special use for three accessory buildings each in excess of 200 square feet, a 2,028.25 square foot south side yard adjoining a street impervious surface variation, a 2,631.1 square foot north side yard adjoining a street impervious surface variation, a 2.0’ fence height variation, and a fence openness variation to permit the construction of a one-story employee center, a one-story equipment wash building, parking lot, and other site improvements at 1 Indian Hill Road in accordance with revised plans as submitted. The special use shall run with the use.

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

Chairman Reinhard Schneider	Yes
John Kolleng	Yes
Christine Norrick	No
Ryrie Pellaton	Yes
Bob Surman	Yes
Maria Choca Urban	No

Motion carried.

6.2 Ms. Norrick moved to authorize the chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for the Zoning Board of Appeals for case number 2019-Z-35.

6.21 Mr. Pellaton 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 special use standards of Section 5.3.E and the variation standards of Section 5.4.F of the Zoning Ordinance. The use of the site is proposed to remain largely the same, with new buildings and landscaping and other site improvements. The site has been used as a maintenance yard for decades and the current conditions are an eye-sore to the neighbors as well as a maintenance challenge for the owner. Thus, the proposed expansion will allow for the physical and functional improvement of the site, consistent with the goals and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan. The continued operation of the use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety or welfare. The proposed expansion of the use will not be injurious to the use or enjoyment of other property in the neighborhood. The continued operation of the use with improved facilities will not impede the normal and orderly development of surrounding properties, which are currently all developed. The continued operation will not substantially diminish property values in the neighborhood. Adequate utilities and access already exist and the owner will comply with all applicable drainage and storm water requirements to the benefit of itself and the neighborhood. Adequate ingress and egress exist from Indian Hill Road and will not be altered with this proposal. The improved appearance and function including the revised lower building heights will be consistent with the community character of the neighborhood. The proposed improvements will not substantially adversely affect a known archeological, historical or cultural resource. The applicant is continuing to work with the Appearance Review Commission and the east neighbor to provide adequate landscape buffering and landscaping generally. No additional standards of Article 12 apply.

A minority of the Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the request does not meet the special use standards of Section 5.3.E and the variation standards of Section 5.4.F of the Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the proposed use may be injurious to the use or enjoyment of other property in the neighborhood. Also, the applicant did not adequately explain the necessity for paving at the northeast corner of the lot, which in combination with an apparent reduction in existing landscaping, will impact the neighbor immediately to the east.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a revised request for a variation to permit the expansion of legal non-conforming uses (Club and Golf Course), a 25.0' north side yard adjoining a street setback variation (equipment wash/storage), a 30.0' rear yard of a double-frontage lot setback variation (dumpster pad), a 41.37' north side yard adjoining a street setback variation (loading), a special use for three accessory buildings each in excess of 200 square feet, a 2,028.25 square foot south side yard adjoining a street impervious surface variation, a 2,631.1 square foot north side yard adjoining a street impervious surface variation, a 2.0' fence height variation, and a fence

openness variation to permit the construction of a one-story employee center, a one-story equipment wash building, parking lot, and other site improvements at 1 Indian Hill Road in accordance with revised plans as submitted. The special use shall run with the use.



1200 Wilmette Avenue
Wilmette, Illinois 60091-0040

MEETING MINUTES

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2020

7:30 P.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Members Present: Chairman Reinhard Schneider
Christine Norrick
Ryrie Pellaton
Bob Surman

Members Absent: John Kolleng
Maria Choca Urban

Staff Present: Lisa Roberts, Assistant Director of Community Development

I. Call to Order

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

II. 2020-Z-06 124 4th Street

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

III. 2020-Z-07 507 Lake Avenue

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

IV. Approval of the January 15, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Surman moved to approve the January 15, 2020 meeting minutes.

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

V. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Roberts
Assistant Director of Community Development

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

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

3.11 Mr. Alan Malter, applicant
124 4th Street

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a 2.82' front yard step setback variation and a 35.41 square foot (4.32%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a new stoop and steps. The Village Board will hear this case on March 10, 2020.

3.22 The applicant said that his home is near the corner of 4th and Gregory. They want to replace the front stairs and stoop in front of their house. The house was built in 1914 and the stairs could date back that far. They are rotting and crumbling and are not safe. They want to replace them. There is no stoop. So, one comes out the front door onto the first step. There is no railing.

By putting the 3' stoop at the top of the stairs, the stairs will come forward by 2.5' towards the front setback. The lot is very small at 127' x 36'. There is 850 square feet in front of the house. By making rebuilding the stairs, they will comply with having a stoop at the top but go into the front setback by 2'.

After the installation, their steps will not be furthest forward on the block. Two homes down, their front steps come within 10' of the setback and there are other houses like this on the block. He added that the neighborhood will look better with new stairs.

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

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

5.1 Mr. Pellaton said that one cannot build steps without a stoop at the top. It would not be permitted. The building height will not change so that the steps are pushed out further. He can support the request.

5.2 Mr. Surman agreed and said that the request is reasonable. He can support the request.

5.3 Ms. Norrick agreed with the above comments.

5.4 Chairman Schneider said that there is a clear hardship and agrees with the above comments.

6.0 DECISION

6.1 Mr. Pellaton moved to recommend granting a request for a 2.82’ front yard step setback variation and a 35.41 square foot (4.32%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a new stoop and steps at 124 4th Street in accordance with the plans submitted.

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

Chairman Reinhard Schneider	Yes
John Kolleng	Not Present
Christine Norrick	Yes
Ryrie Pellaton	Yes
Bob Surman	Yes
Maria Choca Urban	Not Present

Motion carried.

6.2 Ms. Norrick moved to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for the Zoning Board of Appeals for case number 2020-Z06.

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 IS BASED

The Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the request meets the variation standards of Section 5.4.F of the Zoning Ordinance. The physical conditions of the property, the lot width and the siting of the house on the lot, impose upon the owner a particular hardship. The plight of the owner was not created by the owner and is due to the original development of the lot and house. The hardship is peculiar to the property in question and is not generally shared by others. The proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent properties nor otherwise injure other property. The proposed variations will allow for safe and code-compliant access into the home. The variation, if granted, will improve the appearance of the front entrance and will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a 2.82’ front yard step setback variation and a 35.41 square foot (4.32%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a new stoop and steps at 124 4th Street in accordance with the plans submitted.

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

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

3.11 Mr. Mike Venechuk, architect
1615 Highland Avenue

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a 146.31 square foot (0.57%) total floor area variation and a 626.01 square foot (2.45%) lot coverage variation to permit the re-construction of a one-story addition on the legal non-conforming structure. The Village Board will hear this case on March 10, 2020.

3.22 Mr. Venechuk said that the applicants were sorry that they could not attend the meeting but had other meetings out of state. The existing home is a local and national landmark and was designed by Frank Lloyd Wright. It is a legal non-conforming structure. It is over the allowable lot coverage and the allowable floor area. They are asking for a variance to allow them to remove and rebuild the existing kitchen. They would not be increasing any non-conformities but rebuilding upon the existing footprint. They meet all setbacks and all required building heights. They have pulled the addition in by 2" from the dimensions that the board has which reduces the lot coverage by about 2 square feet.

Because the home is a landmark, they are limited as to what they can and cannot do without landmark approval. They got a certificate of appropriateness from the landmarks commission. At the meeting, was legal counsel for the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation. He walked through the house with the homeowners. The legal counsel said he would wholeheartedly support what the applicants were doing. He was thrilled with the plans.

The property and home are unique to the village. It is a large lot and the house stretches on the lot. The garage is about 1,300 square feet and is also a landmark. If the garage could be removed and build a smaller garage, there would be no lot coverage issues and no additional square footage. They can't and don't want to remove the garage.

The home is quad level. He described the home's interior. The home has an unfinished basement that is 2,200 square feet. The finished floor of the second floor is 5'8" above grade so the entire basement is counted as floor area. That is another hardship.

They plan to make a lower level family room, but 1,700 square feet is unfinished storage. That is an unusual circumstance.

They are asking to rebuild the existing kitchen in the same location and not add to any non-conformities. Their request will not alter or impair light or air as they are a minimum of 53' on the west from any homeowner. The variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood and is consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the comprehensive plan.

The applicants had a lot of brush and overgrown bushes taken out and the neighbors were happy about this. The applicants have owned the home since October 31, 2019. The plans for the kitchen are created. They appeared before the preservation committee and now they are tonight's hearing. They are altering a legal nonconforming structure, but they are not changing any of the zoning requirements.

- 3.23 Mr. Surman clarified that they are using the same footprint, but from looking at the elevation, it looks like they are raising the roofline.

The architect said that was correct. The existing kitchen is 6'10" to the ceiling. They want to raise the roof and start the height at 9'. The floor line will stay the same. They are not adding anything that the village would count as additional square footage. They got unanimous approval from the Historic Preservation Commission. And the legal counsel from the foundation was fine with them raising the roof.

- 3.23 Ms. Norrick asked if the addition would be visible from the street.

The architect said it was not visible from the street.

- 3.24 Mr. Surman noted that part of an eave could be visible if one looked straight on.

- 3.25 Mr. Surman asked if the owners plan to bring the home back to its original state.

The architect said that is the owners' plan. They are looking at stucco.

- 3.26 Mr. Surman said it looks like the windows in the front are clear glass.

The architect said that someone put on storm waters on the outside of the leaded glass. But the originals were the horizontal diamond leaded glass, single pane. Over time, the windows will be removed one at a time and reset. There are several in the back that are cracked and have missing glass. They will restore those windows. The house is in rough shape.

The home is beautiful with a lot of interesting spaces. He offered the board members an opportunity to see the home's interior if they would like. It was helpful for the preservation board to see the home's interior. It is an interesting home.

4.0 INTERESTED PARTIES

4.1 Persons speaking on the application

4.11 Mr. Tom Tramm
518 Washington Avenue

4.2 Summary of presentations

4.21 Mr. Tramm said he lives across the alley from the applicant's home. He is at the meeting to voice his support for the request. He is happy to see people who want to invest in the house. He saw the plans for the kitchen. The plans look great and will be a valuable for his side of the house, which is the backside. They will add nice windows that will add to the home's appearance from the back.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

5.1 Mr. Surman said that the request is very modest. Given the restraints of the code of counting the basement and square footage and the fact that they are not enlarging the footprint of the building, he thinks it is great that someone wants to preserve a Frank Lloyd Wright home and is excited to see it completed. He can support the request.

5.2 Mr. Pellaton said he could support the request. There is not a tremendous increase in building size. Even if they finished all 2300 square feet of the basement, it is a small addition on an enormous lot. It is a home that people are aware of and it should be maintained.

5.3 Ms. Norrick can support the request. It is a modest request. She is thrilled that someone is doing all that they are.

5.4 Mr. Pellaton noted that the ceiling height is 6'10" and there is not much that can be done with that. If that was the only hardship, he would be inclined to approve the request.

5.5 Chairman Schneider said he hopes that the height is not throughout the entire home.

The architect said that portion is only in that part of the home.

5.6 Chairman Schneider said he can support this and noted that the request was endorsed by the historic preservation omission and the village board. There is not net addition regarding square footage. It is great that someone is stepping forward and will hopefully complete a wonderful renovation to this historic structure.

6.0 DECISION

6.1 Mr. Surman moved to recommend granting a request for a 146.31 square foot (0.57%) total floor area variation and a 626.01 square foot (2.45%) lot coverage variation to permit the re-construction of a one-story addition on the legal non-conforming structure at 507 Lake Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted.

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

Chairman Reinhard Schneider	Yes
John Kolleng	Not Present
Christine Norrick	Yes
Ryrie Pellaton	Yes
Bob Surman	Yes
Maria Choca Urban	Not Present

Motion carried.

6.2 Mr. Pellaton moved to authorize the chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for this case.

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

Motion carried.

7.0 FINDINGS OF FACT UPON WHICH DECISION WAS BASED

The Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the request meets the variation standards of Section 5.4.F of the Zoning Ordinance. The particular physical conditions of the property, the design of the house and its importance as a historic landmark, imposes upon the owner a particular hardship. The plight of the owner was not created by the owner and is due to the unique circumstances of the home and lot. The hardship prevents the owner from making reasonable use of the property with the reconstruction of an existing portion of the house to make the home functional for modern use. The proposed variations will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to or otherwise injure adjacent property. The variations, if granted will not alter the essential character of the

neighborhood. Granting the variations will allow the home to be restored and thereby enhance the neighborhood.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a 146.31 square foot (0.57%) total floor area variation and a 626.01 square foot (2.45%) lot coverage variation to permit the re-construction of a one-story addition on the legal non-conforming structure at 507 Lake Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted.



1200 Wilmette Avenue
Wilmette, Illinois 60091-0040

MEETING MINUTES

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 2020

7:30 P.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Members Present: Chairman Reinhard Schneider
John Kolleng
Christine Norrick
Ryrie Pellaton
Bob Surman
Maria Choca Urban

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Lisa Roberts, Assistant Director of Community Development

I. Call to Order

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

II. 2020-Z-03 3527 Greenwood Avenue

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

III. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Roberts
Assistant Director of Community Development

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

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

3.11 Mr. Gregory Geslicki, architect
OCGG Architects

3.2 Summary of presentations

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a revised request for a 7.14' front yard setback variation, a 4.25' front yard stoop setback variation, a 6.17' front yard step setback variation, and a 138.51 square foot (6.2%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a substantial addition and remodel that is classified as a new home. The Village Board will hear this case on March 24, 2020.

3.22 The architect said they presented at the last meeting and the board suggested modifications to the original plan. They tried to minimize the impact of the addition to the front. They took out the porch. There is an articulated front entry with columns hugging close to the front wall. This creates a better sense of entrance. The front door is recessed 3'. This creates a sense of entry. In some ways, they have kept the same setback lines and the same building lines. The existing stoop is projecting about the same amount as existing. The front dormers are recessed a bit. They have eliminated the shed dormer in the middle. They have redesigned the upstairs. The dormers are smaller in size. There is a shed dormer joining the two dormers together. They put in a lot of effort to incorporate the board's suggestions and he hopes that they can receive positive approval. He said that the project is still very attractive.

3.23 Mr. Surman clarified that the first floor is built over the existing foundation. The front wall of the house stays. Before they had a porch, which is not part of tonight's request.

The architect said that the front stoop has been modified and moved to the center of the building. There are some full-sized pilasters at the front part instead of having a front porch.

3.24 Mr. Surman said that the building is already encroaching. Other people on the street may want to continue what the architect is proposing. They are building straight up from an existing foundation. They are leaving the existing wall.

The architect said they are keeping the same footprint.

- 3.25 Mr. Surman said that the proposed plan is a good improvement.
- 3.26 Mr. Pellaton agreed with Mr. Surman and said that recessing the front door means that the stoop projects out less than it would have if the door was flush. It breaks up the front façade, which makes it look much nicer.
- 3.27 Chairman Schneider said he appreciates the architect's work on the request from the last hearing.
- 3.28 There was no one in the audience to speak on the case.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

- 5.1 Mr. Pellaton said he stated his thoughts about the front door and stoop. The only issue he has is the second-floor gables because that is additional space that is beyond the setback. However, it is minimal and is attractive. He can support the request. Removing the porch has satisfied much of what the board wanted.
- 5.2 Mr. Surman said he really likes the design. He appreciates that the architect listened to the board's recommendations and returned with a better solution. It is more contextual to the neighborhood especially with the homes that are fairly close together. He can support the request.
- 5.3 Mr. Pellaton said that the drawings showing different angles were some of the best he has seen.
- 5.4 Ms. Choca Urban agreed with the above comments. This revised request sticks more closely to the standards of review in terms of addressing issues that are truly a hardship. The porch was not justified under that scenario. She can support the request.
- 5.5 Mr. Kolleng complimented the architect on taking the comments and incorporating them into the plan. The neighborhood was almost entirely ranching home and the proposal is a much better way to create more space and a different look that compliments the neighborhood. He can support the request.
- 5.6 Chairman Schneider talked about the front with the dormers being not as intrusive as going straight up. The architect came up with a good solution. He appreciates that the architect took comments into account. He can support the request.

6.0 DECISION

6.1 Mr. Pellaton moved to recommend granting a revised request for a 7.14’ front yard setback variation, a 4.25’ front yard stoop setback variation, a 6.17’ front yard step setback variation, and a 138.51 square foot (6.2%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a substantial addition and remodel that is classified as a new home at 3527 Greenwood Avenue in accordance with the revised plans submitted.

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

Chairman Reinhard Schneider	Yes
John Kolleng	Yes
Christine Norrick	Yes
Ryrie Pellaton	Yes
Bob Surman	Yes
Maria Choca Urban	Yes

Motion carried.

6.2 Ms. Choca Urban moved to authorize the chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for the Zoning Board of Appeals for case number 2020-Z-03.

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

Motion carried.

7.0 FINDINGS OF FACT UPON WHICH DECISION WAS BASED

The Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the request meets the variation standards of Section 5.4.F of the Zoning Ordinance. The physical condition of the property, the siting of the house on the lot, imposes upon the owner a particular hardship. The plight of the owner was not created by the owner and is due to the unique circumstances of the development of the lot and house. The hardship is peculiar to the property in question. The hardship prevents the owner from making reasonable use of the property with improvements to the home. The proposed variations will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property. The applicant modified the original plan to minimize the impact on the neighborhood. The variations, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. The appearance of the home will contribute to the character of the neighborhood.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a revised request for a 7.14' front yard setback variation, a 4.25' front yard stoop setback variation, a 6.17' front yard step setback variation, and a 138.51 square foot (6.2%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a substantial addition and remodel that is classified as a new home at 3527 Greenwood Avenue in accordance with the revised plans submitted.