



1200 Wilmette Avenue  
Wilmette, Illinois 60091-0040

**MEETING MINUTES**

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

**MONDAY, JUNE 15, 2020**

**4:00 P.M.**

**REMOTE MEETING**

---

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

**Members Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Lisa Roberts, Assistant Director of Community Development  
John Adler, Director of Community Development  
Kate McManus, Planner III

---

**I. Call to Order**

Chairman Schneider called the meeting to order at 4:14 p.m.

**II. Review of Remote Meeting Procedures**

Ms. Roberts reviewed the meeting procedures for upcoming online-only meetings. The chairman will be presented with a new opening script that explains to the audience how to participate in detail. Because the board members may not be able to see each other or an

audience member about to speak, the pace may need to be a little slower to give time for people to unmute themselves and respond. People giving testimony will still be sworn in. Even though we may not see everyone, it is assumed that they have properly sworn in before speaking. Those who join the meeting later, just like in person, may need to swear in before giving their specific testimony.

The order of items will remain unchanged: the applicant will present and the board will ask questions, then interested parties will speak. People can participate through the Teams app as well as posting questions on Youtube Chat and by email. Questions asked this way will be read by staff. Then a board member will make a motion, it will be seconded, and then discussion by the board as normal. As votes will need to be done as a roll call including the vote for the chairman to prepare the report and the vote to adjourn the meeting.

**III. Approval of the February 5, 2020 Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Kolleng moved to approve the February 5, 2020 meeting minutes. Mr. Pellaton seconded the motion. Voting yes: Mr. Kolleng, Ms. Norrick, Mr. Pellaton, Mr. Surman, Ms. Choca Urban, and Chairman Schneider. Voting no: None. Abstaining: Mr. Falkof. The motion passed.

**IV. Approval of the February 19, 2020 Meeting Minutes**

Ms. Choca Urban moved to approve the February 19, 2020 meeting minutes. Ms. Norrick seconded the motion. Voting yes: Mr. Kolleng, Ms. Norrick, Mr. Pellaton, Mr. Surman, Ms. Choca Urban, and Chairman Schneider. Voting no: None. Abstaining: Mr. Falkof. The motion passed.

**V. Approval of the March 4, 2020 Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Kolleng moved to approve the March 4, 2020 meeting minutes. Ms. Choca Urban seconded the motion. Voting yes: Mr. Kolleng, Ms. Norrick, Mr. Pellaton, Mr. Surman, Ms. Choca Urban, and Chairman Schneider. Voting no: None. Abstaining: Mr. Falkof. The motion passed.

**VI. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**VI. Adjournment**

Ms. Choca Urban moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Kolleng seconded the motion. Voting yes: Mr. Falkof, Mr. Kolleng, Ms. Norrick, Mr. Pellaton, Mr. Surman, Ms. Choca Urban, and Chairman Schneider. Voting no: None. The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Roberts  
Assistant Director of Community Development



1200 Wilmette Avenue  
Wilmette, Illinois 60091-0040

**MEETING MINUTES**

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

**WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 2020**

**7:00 P.M.**

**REMOTE MEETING**

---

**Members Present:** Chairman Reinhard Schneider (joined by video later)  
Brad Falkof  
John Kolleng  
Christine Norrick  
Ryrie Pellaton  
Bob Surman  
Maria Choca Urban

**Members Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Lisa Roberts, Assistant Director of Community Development  
Lucas Sivertsen, Business Development Coordinator

---

**I. Call to Order**

Acting Chairman Surman called the meeting to order at 7:13 p.m.

**II. Opening Remarks and Swearing In**

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

**III. 2020-Z-24 1706 Elmwood Avenue**

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

**IV. 2020-Z-23 901 Ridge Road**

See the complete case minutes attached to this document.

**V. Approval of the July 15, 2020 Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Kolleng moved to approve the July 15, 2020 meeting minutes. Mr. Surman seconded the motion. Voting yes: Mr. Falkof, Mr. Kolleng, Ms. Norrick, Mr. Pellaton, Mr. Surman, Ms. Choca Urban, and Chairman Schneider. Voting no: None. The motion passed.

**VI. Approval of the August 5, 2020 Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Kolleng moved to approve the August 5, 2020 meeting minutes. Mr. Pellaton seconded the motion. Voting yes: Mr. Falkof, Mr. Kolleng, Ms. Norrick, Mr. Pellaton, Mr. Surman, Ms. Choca Urban, and Chairman Schneider. Voting no: None. The motion passed.

**VII. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**VIII. Adjournment**

Mr. Pellaton moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Choca Urban seconded the motion. Voting yes: Mr. Falkof, Mr. Kolleng, Ms. Norrick, Mr. Pellaton, Mr. Surman, Ms. Choca Urban, and Chairman Schneider. Voting no: None. The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Roberts  
Assistant Director of Community Development

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

#### **3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant**

3.11 Ms. Nancy Kulick, owner  
1706 Elmwood Avenue

3.12 Mr. Chad Boomgaarden, architect  
Boomgaarden Architects  
1315 Central Avenue

#### **3.2 Summary of presentations**

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a 4.98' front yard porch setback variation, a 7.81' front porch stair setback variation, and a 252.03 square foot (13.44%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a new front porch on the legal non-conforming structure. The Village Board will hear this case on September 22, 2020.

3.22 The owner said that she and her husband have lived in Wilmette for 16 years and in their house for 13 years. Her husband works from home full-time as does she when she is not traveling or in the city. Especially very recently, they have been spending a lot of time outdoors. They are looking to do a front porch addition to their house. The neighborhood is very close-knit. The neighbors on either side of them have lived there longer than she has and her family spends a lot of time in the front yard talking to the neighbors, working on their computer, or just relaxing.

The addition of a front porch would give them some living space that is really usable. The house itself is 125 years old and the front porch they are asking they believe fits very closely into the architectural design of the home itself and will add great curb appeal.

3.23 The only other thing I think that's very important to us right now is taking care of their parents. Her father has dementia and they moved her parents from Virginia up to the north shore. They're living in an assisted living facility and the applicants do spend a lot of time with them at their home. They like to take their parents outside. Her dad loves to see the garden and the kids and dogs walk by. So a front porch also just gives them that additional space to spend some time with their parents.

3.24 The architect said his firm specializes in local renovation and what they call contextual architecture, which they find is an amenity to the village's image and they're more fun to design than new houses.

Their first Wilmette project was back in June of 1998 and over the past 22 years, the firm has completed over 200 projects. They have won 15 architectural awards

including 8 from the Village of Wilmette's Historic Preservation Commission. His firm has only been before the Zoning Board for variances about 10 times, as they try to limit their requests. He said he does not take requests lightly. He only suggests it to the client when he feels like there's no other option available, which brings him to this case.

Like Ms. Kulick said, the house is from 1894. It sits within the front yard setback by about five feet. So for comparison sake, he'll just describe briefly the three things that they're requesting as if the house were at the front yard setback so the board gets a better feel for what they are really asking for if the house was conforming.

The first is the 4.89 front yard setback. If the house were at the front yard setback, that would be a non-request. They wouldn't be here asking for the front yard setback.

Second is the stair setback. If the house were at the setback line, they'd be asking for 30 inches of an extension on the staircase to make the stairs code compliant with a riser height of seven-and-a-quarter inches and a tread length of 10 inches. It's a very steep and very narrow staircase right now.

The third request is for the 252 front yard impervious coverage. This one's a little trickier but the additional square footage they're asking for the porch is only an additional 83 square feet because there is already a stoop that counts. I'm just looking at the portion that we're adding, which is 83 square feet. The house is under the FAR by 300 square feet. It's under on coverage by 500 square feet so the house is not overbuilt either in volume or coverage, which means they could add that 83 square feet anywhere else around the house.

It's just that in this particular location, it crosses the front yard setback so the impervious calculation seems larger than it is because they're having to account for the whole new porch and staircase, part of which already exists. Hopefully that gives the board a better sense of how they would typically look at a project that's asking for variances around the village.

He won't reread his hardship letter. He's known the family for over a decade and their neighbors will tell you that they are not opposed to having them outside more in the front. They're a great family and have been an asset to the school and the community. In addition to that, they're making an attempt to bring back the home to its original appearance by redesigning the whole exterior, siding, trim package, roof lines, and windows. The porch request just helps complete that and what would be a new architectural amenity for the village and the neighborhood.

This project really brings this house back into itself, which as an architect is what he does and why he does what he does. It's one of those gems that we would have in the community if this is approved. He said he would be happy to answer the

board's questions.

- 3.25 Acting Chairman Surman asked the architect to touch on the hardships so the public knows because the request is for impervious coverage but to him the main hardship is the positioning of the house because it was built over 100 years ago. He asked the applicant to summarize this for the public.

Mr. Boomgaarden said that back in the day, these streets that were west of Green Bay Road were dirt. They weren't paved like they are now. That came by some time later. A lot of the houses that they've done from the 1880s and 1890s around here that they've renovated in the last 22 years all seem to have this issue where they were set very close to a lot line, whether it was the front lot line or a side lot line. This house is no different. This house has a lot of other abnormalities or anomalies we'll call it where the first floor height is very high, at five feet. That's not something you see other than 1880s and 1890s homes.

The issue with this particular house, as Mr. Surman mentioned, is its proximity to the front lot line. It crosses the front yard setback, which is determined by the village as an average of the setback of the houses on the block. This house predates the zoning requirement but all the other houses, built from the 1920s to post World War II, are set well back because of the zoning codes at that time, which further penalizes this house. So that's another part of the hardship that exists for this specifically.

- 3.26 Mr. Kolleng said he drove by and looking at it there might be other hardships but by adding the front porch and the stairs, it really seems to throw it out of alignment with the rest of the street. While a front porch might be nice to have, he didn't think it would fit in with the rest of the homes that are close to it.

Mr. Boomgaarden said it was a good point to bring up about the proportion of porches to the front of the house. The house is a Queen Anne Victorian, which is marked by several different styles. This particular type of Victorian would typically have had a wrap around or a larger porch. So contextually, if there would have been more of this type of house along the block or even around in Wilmette, they would have had the larger porch.

The architectural style that's been put on it now is much more contemporary, which you can see in a number of features. You can tell that the porch was either in disarray and was covered up or it was torn down and this was put up at a low cost. It looks not cheap but inexpensively built and it has absolutely no relation to the architectural style of the house.

What they are doing is going back to the stick style pattern books that were published in 1920s, where you come across houses like this, and they take example photos from what would have been built. What you see in their architectural drawings are re-adaptations of the stick style, such as the patternings and the sloped



shakes at the second floor. The proportion of a front porch or even a wrap around, in this case they don't need and aren't requesting but they feel what is proposed is more proportional than the current stoop.

- 3.27 Mr. Falkof said he had one comment and then one question. He thought the design was exceptional and what is proposed will greatly improve the house. His question is about another house that is a couple of houses down to the west that sort of stands proud towards the street. Is the applicant's house going to end up about where that one is or is it going to be even further or closer to the street?

Mr. Boomgaarden said he didn't know the answer to the question. He said the information may be on a document provided from the village where they took average setbacks from the property lines. He asked if Ms. Roberts could provide the setbacks for the houses three, four, and five houses down.

- 3.28 Mr. Falkof said it was a dark brown house and the applicants may know which one he was talking about. It does have a front porch.

Ms. Kulick asked if it was closer to the edge.

Mr. Falkof said it is maybe two homes away from the applicant.

Ms. Kulick said there's a white little colonial that's two houses down. Another two to three houses past that is a brick house that's closer to the street. The one next to them is older like their home but the rest of the houses, other than that little white house and the brick one, have been built relatively recently.

- 3.29 Mr. Falkof said the immediate neighbors would be the most affected. Have the neighbors said anything one way or the other? Have they seen the plans?

Ms. Kulick said the neighbors have seen the plans and they volunteered to support the change to the house. She thinks they're most excited about what the architect talked about, improving the home architecturally. How they are trying to bring it back to the vision of the house as it was. They also spend a lot of time with their neighbors, and this is an additional gathering space for them. If needed, she is glad to bring all of the neighbors who are immediately impacted to talk to the board. They all offered to attend the meeting.

- 3.30 Acting Chairman Surman asked about the neighbors that are to the east. Have the applicants spoken with them because they would be the ones impacted.

Ms. Kulick said Philip White and Mary Dickman live at 1700 Elmwood, directly to the east, and they have spoken to them about this. They also offered to come out and share their support.

- 3.31 Mr. Pellaton said he understands the concern about how far forward this would be,

the net difference between the existing porch and their stoop and steps and the new porch and steps is half a foot. We're talking about less than six inches closer to the property line. For me, that doesn't hold a whole lot of water. He agreed with Mr. Falkof that he thinks the design is good and appropriate for the house. While it would be nice if the house was set farther back, there's really no way to do that. So he is generally in support of this application.

- 3.32 Mr. Kolleng said the length is minimal at the end of the last stair but there's a lot more bulk attached to the house, which will be closer than the short porch that is there today. He thinks that's a legitimate point.
- 3.33 Acting Chairman Surman said the board has experienced these porch projects before. There was a recent case on Highcrest Drive where the board felt the size of the proposed porch had an impact. Each case is individual and no two properties are alike. He thinks there is something to the concern about adding bulk with the additional porch. He understands that the entry needs to be redone and the stairs widened, but he is still on the fence with that.
- 3.34 Ms. Choca Urban said she is not sure she is persuaded that there's a hardship, but she believes that the request is de minimis compared to what's existing. She is very impressed by the quality of the improvements that are being made to the house and the fact that they're hewing to the architectural character of the home. She can see supporting the request.
- 3.35 Acting Chairman Surman asked if there were any other comments.
- 3.36 Ms. Roberts said that there were no comments through Teams and no emails.
- 3.37 Mr. Sivertsen said there were no comments on the YouTube chat.
- 3.38 Acting Chairman Surman asked if the applicants had any additional comments.

Ms. Kulick said she appreciated the board's time and the board taking the request seriously. They have the support of their neighbors. They are excited for this change and the way it will integrate with everything else that they're doing.

Mr. Boomgaarden thanked the board for their time and for stopping by to see the home.

## **5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

- 5.1 Ms. Choca Urban said the proposal is going to be an asset not just to the applicant but to the community at large. The request is small enough in comparison to what currently exists and she can support it.
- 5.2 Mr. Pellaton noted that Ms. Choca Urban had earlier questioned what the hardship

is. For him, the hardship is the fact that the house is already non-conforming and as a result, whatever they do in the front of the house would be an issue even if they were just replacing what was already there. He understands what Mr. Kolleng and Mr. Surman have said about the massing but he still thinks that because it's contextually appropriate, it's not going to overwhelm neighboring structures or loom over either the road or the sidewalk. As Ms. Choca Urban said, it will be an asset to the neighborhood and to the village. Because it's not projecting considerably further towards the right-of-way, he can support it.

- 5.3 Mr. Kolleng said that one of the things they've tried to do over the years that he has been on the board at times like this is to grant some leeway to make sure we have the homes stay, that there's not a reason to tear it down. That's not being discussed here, but Mr. Boomgaarden has a great track record in front of the board and creating designs and architectural drawings that bring these houses back to their original state. This lets Wilmette continue to have some of these older homes, and I think that's a big plus here.

He said he does have a hard time with the hardship. The Zoning Board has had other cases where somebody wanted to turn a walk into a porch at ground level and the board denied that. There was more of a hardship there than there is here, but on balance, there is value to preserving this type of a home and bringing it back to some of its original kind of glory in the Queen Anne style that Mr. Falkof was talking about. Overall, he can support the request.

- 5.4 Ms. Norrick said she too can support the project. It's a nominal request. It's a nice design. It'll should be good.
- 5.5 Mr. Surman said he thinks because the applicant is doing a whole house renovation of the exterior, that's very important. If the applicant had just come and said, "We want to add a porch to an existing home," that might have been a different situation. He thinks they are trying to bring the house back to an earlier state.

## 6.0 DECISION

- 6.1 Ms. Choca Urban moved to recommend granting a request for a 4.98' front yard porch setback variation, a 7.81' front porch stair setback variation, and a 252.03 square foot (13.44%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a new front porch on the legal non-conforming structure at 1706 Elmwood Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted.

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

Chairman Reinhard Schneider	Not Present (Not on video)
Acting Chairman Bob Surman	Yes
Brad Falkof	Yes
John Kolleng	Yes

Christine Norrick	Yes
Ryrie Pellaton	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-17.

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

Chairman Reinhard Schneider	Not Present (Not on video)
Acting Chairman Bob Surman	Yes
Brad Falkof	Yes
John Kolleng	Yes
Christine Norrick	Yes
Ryrie Pellaton	Yes
Maria Choca Urban	Yes

Motion carried.

**7.0 FINDINGS OF FACT UPON WHICH DECISION WAS BASED**

The Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the request meets the variation standards of Section 5.4.F of the Zoning Ordinance. The physical conditions of the property, the siting of the home on the lot, impose upon the owner a practical difficulty. The plight of the owner was not created by the owner and is due to the unique development of the lot and home. The difficulty is peculiar to the property in question and is not generally share by others on the block. The difficulty prevents the owner from making reasonable use of the property with code-compliant steps and a front porch that is function and more appropriate for the style of home. The proposed variations will not impair an adequate supply of light and air or otherwise injure other property or its use. The variations, if granted, will improve the appearance of the home and enhance the essential character of the neighborhood.

**8.0 RECOMMENDATION**

The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends granting a request for a 4.98’ front yard porch setback variation, a 7.81’ front porch stair setback variation, and a 252.03 square foot (13.44%) front yard impervious surface coverage variation to permit the construction of a new front porch on the legal non-conforming structure at 1706 Elmwood Avenue in accordance with the plans submitted.

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

#### **3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant**

3.11 Ms. Bo Yang, representing the applicant, Lisa Liu  
901 Ridge Road

#### **3.2 Summary of presentations**

3.21 Ms. Roberts said that this is a request for a 2 space parking variation to permit the operation of a small medical clinic. The Village Board will hear this case on September 22, 2020.

3.22 Ms. Yang said she is representing the applicant, Lisa Liu, who is her mother. Ms. Liu is at the meeting but because of the English situation, Ms. Yang will be making the presentation.

As for the small medical clinic, it's more like a holistic health practice. They will provide herbal medicine and acupuncture and stuff like that. They bought the property in 2013 and during that time it was an antique shop. They researched the property before buying it and believe that prior to the antique shop, it had been a pharmacy and also it had been a fitness center. There was no known issue with the parking spaces. They want to open the medical clinic. They plan to have three parking spaces to use.

The documents say the property is about 2,000 square feet but from what they have calculated, the space is only about 1,600 square feet.

3.23 Chairman Schneider said the plans that have been shared with the Zoning Board say that they are an existing floor plan. Is that what you're going to use? You're not proposing to change the existing floor plan?

Ms. Yang said that this is the space. The floor plan that was submitted is the total space that they will be using.

3.24 Chairman Schneider said this was an antique store, and he didn't recall it being divided like this. Have the applicants done some work?

Ms. Yang said yes, just inside. Before the antique shop was a fitness business. When they bought the location in 2013, the antique shop was open. She is not sure what work they had done. They had small windows.

3.25 Chairman Schneider said the floor plan that the board has is what the applicants are using, the layout that is in place right now. Is that correct?

Ms. Yang said yes.

- 3.26 Chairman Schneider asked if they needed a building permit and if they had gotten a building permit.

Ms. Roberts said she was not sure work had already been done. It was her understanding that this is a proposed plan.

- 3.27 Ms. Yang said her mother said that after the antique shop was closed down in 2018, she went back to do some repair to the walls. They were covered before and they wanted to see what shape they were in. She went to ask the city if permits were needed to do that and they said she didn't need the permit to do that.

- 3.28 Ms. Choca Urban said in the applicant's letter, it says there will be 8.7 visitors a day. There are seven offices shown on the space plan. It's possible that the applicants might have seven visitors at once. She assumes that would be controlled by how many practitioners work at this address. Her first question is how many practitioners will be practicing at the center.

Ms. Yang said one of the rooms is for staff. The remaining six rooms can be used for business. They won't be using all the rooms because some rooms can be used to store equipment or some rooms can be for different types of treatment. They will have on site one to two practitioners a day. Someone can work in the morning hours and someone in the evening hours or afternoon hours. Usually for one visitor or one patient it will take about one and a half hours including the waiting time for one practitioner.

- 3.29 Ms. Choca Urban said they are thinking now there will be one to two practitioners at any given time. What is the projection for growth and do the applicants envision having more than one practitioner, adding additional practitioners?

Ms. Yang said no, they are not thinking of doing that. They want to control the patient number to 20 per day. They don't want to exceed that because it'll cause a traffic or parking issue and also the practitioner won't have the time.

- 3.30 Mr. Falkof said he is trying to understand how many parking spaces there are. In their presentation, they note that in the written materials there are eight parking spaces but in the materials from staff, it says there are seven legal parking spaces. Are there seven spaces from the village's standpoint or are there eight spaces there?

Ms. Yang said she can only answer their part of that question. When her parents were buying the property, they wanted to check if there were any violations or anything. The previous owner and the agent when we were buying the property said there was eight parking spaces.

- 3.31 Mr. Falkof asked Ms. Roberts to explain why there's only seven legal spaces.

Mr. Sivertsen said the last approved site plan, which was in the 1990s, shows seven parking spaces. Between that time and now, the parking lot has been restriped and the current configuration has a parking stall that is parallel to the south lot line. That parking space is not considered a legal parking space. It's not conforming with setbacks and it's not conforming for aisle width so for those reasons, it's not considered a legal parking space.

Mr. Falkof said clarified that the village only considers there to be seven spaces there currently.

Ms. Sivertsen said that was correct.

3.32 Mr. Falkof clarified that the applicant said there could be 20 patients a day?

Ms. Yang said 20 patients a day is the maximum.

3.33 Mr. Falkof asked if the parking is shared with the barbershop. This is where the people who go into the barbershop also use those parking spaces.

Ms. Yang said yes.

3.34 Mr. Falkof said the applicants indicated in their letter that some employees, if needed, will park their cars in private locations. He asked what they meant by that.

Ms. Yang said she is studying to be a practitioner, too. People who will help her will be working there. They will hire people they know. They don't live that far from the property. Employees can park at their house and they can drive the car to the location together or something like that.

3.35 Mr. Falkof asked when those decisions would be made. Will they be asking their employees in the dead of winter to park offsite somewhere?

Ms. Yang said employees can park at their other property, their home, and they can drive the car together to there.

3.36 Mr. Falkof asked how many employee parking spaces they need.

Ms. Yang said it depends.

3.37 Mr. Falkof asked what the maximum number of spaces that the applicants would need for their employees. He clarified that he was just asking about parking for employees.

Ms. Yang said they were planning to have a total three parking spaces for the business. They weren't thinking to have both of the practitioners, all of them at the same time. They will have a morning and an afternoon shift. With one or two

practitioners or employees, it's one space in the morning and one space in the afternoon. They will need just one parking space for the employee.

- 3.38 Ms. Norrick clarified that they don't plan to have a receptionist or anyone who greets people when they come in.

Ms. Yang said patients make an appointment either online or by phone. The practitioner can be the person to greet the person because this is a small business. It's not like a big clinical setting like a medical setting. It's only a small business. They want to have a calm and peaceful space for their patients. They don't need as many people to work there. Most things they can do through the phone and the website.

- 3.39 Mr. Pellaton said he would like to go back to Ms. Choca Urban's comment. They have a significant number of offices, which far exceeds the number of patients that they have stated they're going to be seeing at any one time. If you have one practitioner and you have three patients, what are the rest of the rooms for? It would seem that they are setting up for additional practitioners and additional patients.

Ms. Yang said no, that's not what they're doing. The floor plan shows two small rooms and four big rooms. Some of the rooms they might use to store equipment.

- 3.40 Mr. Pellaton asked how many rooms of equipment they anticipated needing.

Ms. Yang said they will be offering a variety of treatments, acupuncture and herbal remedies. Each room can be set for a different treatment. A patient is seen in one room when they do the diagnosis and then the person is sent to another room for that treatment. They're not going to use each room for all the same things.

- 3.41 Mr. Pellaton said asked if they would only have one set of acupuncture needles and one set of cups. Each room will be dedicated to one particular remedy?

Ms. Yang said not exactly. The two small rooms, which one of the small rooms has a window and is next to the wall. They need some good air circulation and everything. In the four big rooms, they need to clean in between patients, so they will have another clean room for when the next patient comes.

- 3.42 Mr. Kolleng asked if the applicants own the building.

Ms. Yang said yes.

- 3.43 Mr. Kolleng said the space has been empty so the applicants haven't been getting any rent.

Ms. Yang said yes, they have been waiting for this request.



- 3.44 Mr. Kolleng summarized by saying they are moving this business in there so they can generate some income out of this space. They're will be generating income from this space and there is currently no income coming because they don't have a tenant.

Ms. Yang said yes.

- 3.45 Mr. Surman said he used to live a few blocks from there and the building has been vacant for a long time. Something needs to go in there. To him, it doesn't sound like it's a heavy use. For many years, it was an antique store. Being on the board for many years, you see a lot of these type of projects in the Village Center or other areas where there's not any off-street parking available. It's all reliant on street parking. It's always been very difficult to meet the requirements that the village has for these locations.

- 3.46 Mr. Kolleng said he agrees with Mr. Surman. A lot of the village's retail areas have gone to service. This is a difficult area; there's not a lot of parking in front, there's not a lot of parking behind. It's a service use. They're trying to figure out a way to generate income out of a property.

- 3.47 Mr. Surman asked if there is street parking currently available, across the street in front of the cemetery. He thought there was open parking there but it's never utilized.

Ms. Yang said there's no street parking. There's the parking lot for the church and the cemetery, but she didn't think that was for public use.

- 3.48 There were no further comments, no comments through Teams or email, and no comments on the YouTube chat.

## **5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

- 5.1 Mr. Kolleng said the building has been there for a long time. There was an antique store, which generated some traffic. There's the barbershop and another little store there. There is some parking on Ridge. There are the seven spaces on the property. They're averaging 8.7 customers a day over the course of a day; that's probably around one an hour. Here we have an owner who's trying to figure out a way to utilize space that's been unrented for a long period of time. Trying to generate some revenue. He thinks this is going to be a pretty low-density type of thing where they're not looking to grow their business; they're just looking to utilize the space in a way where they can generate some income from it. He doesn't think it will generate the traffic that the antique store did. He can support the request.

- 5.2 Mr. Surman said he concurs with Mr. Kolleng. He thinks it's really a low density type use. Given the parking even on Ridge as it goes down, if you had an additional car or two at a time, it really would impact the area. It would be great to get

somebody in there to get that space livened up again. He can support the request.

- 5.3 Ms. Choca Urban said she is concerned about the vagueness of the business plan but she thinks that the variation request is small enough and in the best interest of the village to get the space productive, so she can support this.
- 5.4 Mr. Falkof said he agreed with what Ms. Choca Urban said. He is concerned about whether or not there will ultimately be adequate parking there, but the good news is that all the neighbors, including the barbershop are okay with it; that's the one he's most concerned about. If he's okay with it and everybody else is okay with it, it will naturally sort out, either the applicant is going to lose patients because there's no parking or it's going to work. He's willing to let the chips fall where they may. He agrees with Ms. Choca Urban that it's better to have this place filled. It looks like it's a small request at this point, but he has no problem putting this risk on the owner.
- 5.5 Ms. Norrick said she agrees that things will work themselves out with the various tenants. It is good to get a business in a prominent corner.
- 5.6 Mr. Pellaton said he appreciates what Mr. Kolleng and Mr. Surman said and he agrees with them. He has a real reservation about the vagueness of the business plan and the setup of the space, which lends itself to changing the business plan after they've received their variance. He sees this with private houses as well where people are adding space that they insist is only going to be used for storage or it's unused attic space but it seems in excess of what's actually necessary. He is a little skeptical that it be as low as 8.7 customers per practitioner per day. He said he has a lot of experience with dropping off and picking up rowers from one of their neighbors He spoke to them about it and they said they don't have any problems with it. In the end, he can support this but he wanted also to point out that all of their letters in favor come from tenants of the owners who are making the application.
- 5.7 Chairman Schneider said he agreed with the comments about the business plan. He wanted to point out that south, you have the Ridgeview Restaurant, the laundry, and an antique store. Then you have Zier's Meats, the plumbing shop, and State Farm. To his knowledge, none of those have parking. There is parking across the street in the public half of the Atrium parking lot. This is not as distant as, for example, the underground parking lot in the Village Center in terms of walking distance. There's more on-street parking south of Lake. With three dedicated spaces on site, he thinks there will be capacity in the area to handle whatever traffic this may generate. He can support it although he questions as other have, whether it turns out that parking is not the biggest issue.
- 5.9 Mr. Pellaton said he had one more comment. The reason for his questions about the layout is from his experience with a practitioner in the city who does all of these traditional medicines. This practitioner has two treatment rooms for one

practitioner. You make an appointment ahead of time. He meets and greets, he does it all. He has another person that works when he's not working there, but only two treatment rooms. While one is occupied, the other is being cleaned, that sort of thing. Based on that, the number of rooms in this request seems excessive.

## 6.0 DECISION

6.1 Mr. Kolleng moved to recommend granting a request for a 2 space parking variation to permit the operation of a small medical clinic at 901 Ridge Road in accordance with the plans submitted.

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

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

Motion carried.

6.2 Mr. Pellaton moved to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for the Zoning Board of Appeals for case number 2020-Z-23.

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

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

Motion carried.

## 7.0 FINDINGS OF FACT UPON WHICH DECISION WAS BASED

The Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the request meets the variation standards of Section 5.4.F of the Zoning Ordinance. The physical conditions of the property, the lot size and the siting of the building on the lot, impose upon the owner a practical difficulty. The plight of the owner was not created by the owner and is due to the lot size and existing building uses. The difficulty is peculiar to the property in question and is not generally shared by others. The difficulty prevents the owner from making reasonable use of the property to fill a

vacant space with a business use that is permitted in the zoning district. The proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent properties. The applicants believe that the staffing and client volume can be accommodated on site and with on-street parking and will not have a negative impact on nearby businesses. The variation, 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 2 space parking variation to permit the operation of a small medical clinic at 901 Ridge Road in accordance with the plans submitted.