



MINUTES
VILLAGE OF GLENCOE
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING

Village Hall Council Chamber and Videoconference
675 Village Court
Monday, January 24, 2022 – 6:30 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The Regular Meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Village of Glencoe was called to order by Interim Chairman John Satter at 6:30 p.m. on January 24, 2022, held virtually via Zoom web videoconference.

Attendee Name	Title	Status
Zoning Board of Appeals		
Scott Novack	ZBA Chairman	Absent
Sara Elsasser	Member	Present
Alex Kaplan	Member	Present
John Satter	Interim ZBA Chairman	Present
Debbie Ruderman	Member	Present
Michael Koppersmith	Member	Present
Village Staff		
Taylor Baxter	Development Services Manager	Present
Richard McGowan	Planner	Present

2. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 13, 2021, ZBA MEETING

The minutes were accepted with the condition that Board Member Sara Elsasser was present at the meeting. The minutes stated that she was absent when she was present. Interim Chairman John Satter abstained since he was not present for that meeting.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED
AYES:	Elsasser, Kaplan, Ruderman, Koppersmith
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	Novack
ABSTAIN:	Satter

3. CONSIDER VARIATION REQUEST AT 345 JEFFERSON AVE

Taylor Baxter gave a brief overview of the case, stating that the applicants are seeking one variation to allow for an addition to encroach into the setback plane to an extent greater than allowed by the Zoning Code at an existing single-family residence at 345 Jefferson Avenue:

1. Section 3-111(G)(14)- To increase the allowable intersection with the setback plane below the roof from 0 feet to 8.0 feet

Mr. Baxter explained that the existing two-story house meets the required eight-foot side setback but is non-conforming to the required setback plane requirement and that no intersection with the setback plane is permitted below the roof eaves. Mr. Baxter added that the existing house has approximately 26.6 feet of intersection, and the applicant is proposing a second-story addition to the east side of the home that would include 8.0 feet of new intersection. Additionally, Mr. Baxter noted that the existing structure was built in the early 1900s and the applicant has stated that the proposed renovation and addition would allow it to remain a usable residence. Interim Chairman Satter stated that the request appeared to be pretty straightforward.

Mr. Baxter then swore in the applicant's Architect, Sue Auerbach of 5215 N. Ravenswood Avenue in Chicago. Board Member Koppersmith asked Ms. Auerbach to explain how this addition would work without encroaching into the setback plane. Ms. Auerbach stated that due to the existing conditions of the home that was constructed in the early 1900s, constructing an addition that did not encroach into the setback plane would not be as aesthetically pleasing, it would create more noise for the neighbors with the air conditioning units, and it would be more difficult to build. Board Member Alex Kaplan asked if the Village received any objections and Mr. Baxter stated that the Village had received two letters of support and no objections. Interim Chairman Satter asked about a shed on the plans and Ms. Auerbach confirmed that they will not be doing any work to the existing shed. Interim Chairman Satter added that he appreciates that another Sears Home will survive. Mr. Baxter then read the two letters of support from neighbors at 335 and 352 Jefferson Avenue.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Interim Chairman Satter thanked the applicants and asked the audience if there are any public comments. Mr. Baxter then swore in those looking to speak. Kristi Rubenstein of 401 Randolph stated that she is in favor of the requested variance. Richard Bair of 335 Jefferson provided a letter of support and added that he is in favor of the requested variance. A motion was made and seconded to approve the requested variance as submitted.

FINDINGS

1. The requested variation is within the jurisdiction of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

2. Based on the totality of the relevant and persuasive testimony heard and presented, the Zoning Board determines that:
 - a. The requested variation is in harmony with general purpose and intent of the Glencoe Zoning Code.
 - b. There are practical difficulties and there is a hardship in the way of carrying out the strict letter of Section 3-111(G)(14) of the Glencoe Zoning Code as applied to the lot in question.
 - c. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances.
 - d. The requested variation will not alter the essential character of the locality.
 - e. The requested variation will not set a precedent unfavorable to the neighborhood or to the Village as a whole.
 - f. The spirit of the Zoning Code will be observed, public safety and welfare will be secured, and substantial justice will be done if the requested variation is granted.

RESOLUTION

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the request to increase the allowable intersection with the setback plane at 345 Jefferson Avenue be granted as shown in the drawings or plans submitted by the owner and made part of the record.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the decision of the Development Services Manager is hereby reversed insofar as he denied the issuance of a building permit on the aforesaid property for the aforesaid construction;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this variation shall expire and be of no further force or effect at the end of twelve (12) months unless during said twelve-month period a building permit is issued, and construction begun and diligently pursued to completion; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution shall be spread upon the records of the Board and shall become a public record.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED
AYES:	Elsasser, Kaplan, Satter, Ruderman, Kuppersmith
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	Novack

4. CONSIDER VARIATION REQUEST AT 570 LINCOLN AVENUE

Mr. Baxter gave a brief overview of the case, stating that the applicants are seeking five variations to allow for an addition to an existing single-family residence at 570 Lincoln Avenue in the RA zoning district:

1. Section 3-111(C) - To reduce the required rear setback from 40.43 feet to 32.41 feet, a reduction of 19.8%;
2. To reduce the combined side setback from 26.5 feet to 31.37 feet, a reduction of 19.4%;
3. Section 3-111(C) - To reduce the required side setback from 12 feet to 9.84 feet, a reduction of 18%;
4. Section 3-111(C) - To reduce the required side setback from 12 feet to 7.5 feet, a reduction of 37.5%, to allow for the replacement of an AC unit; and
5. Section 3-111(C) - To reduce the combined side setback from 26.5 feet to 25.58 feet, a reduction of 3.5%, to allow for the replacement of an AC unit.

Mr. Baxter explained that typically, the ZBA may only grant setback variations by up to 20% but the Zoning Code states that a nonconforming accessory structure may be replaced in the same location if the ZBA grants a variation. Mr. Baxter added that this project would also include the demolition of a small part of the existing house and the replacement of air conditioning units and that the existing house extends into the required side, combined side, and rear setbacks. Mr. Baxter added that in summary, the project includes:

- Removing a 194-square-foot part of the house in the required rear setback and replacing it with 111 square feet of new space in the rear setback at approximately the same distance from the rear property line;
- Adding approximately 55 square feet of space on the east side of the house within the required combined side setback;
- Enclosing an existing alcove within the required west side setback; and
- Replacing existing AC units within required setbacks on both sides of the house.

Interim Chairman Satter thanked Mr. Baxter and asked the Board Members if they had any questions. No questions were asked at this time. Mr. Baxter then swore in the applicants, Celeste Robbins (Architect), and the homeowners, Chris and Beth Glass. Ms. Robbins stated that the home is a mid-century style and the older triangular addition that was made to the home is not working from a utility and practical space. Ms. Robbins added that they are giving new life to an older home and the new addition will have a smaller footprint and will be parallel to the existing home. Mr. and Ms. Glass added that they are looking forward to moving to Glencoe and want to do everything possible to avoid tearing down the home. Mr. Baxter then read a letter of support from the resident at 780 Valley Road, who is located directly south of 570 Lincoln Avenue. Interim Chairman Satter said that he understood the complexity of the living situation and though that it was great that the owners are saving another home in Glencoe. Board Member KupperSmith asked if anyone had talked to 560 Lincoln Avenue and Mr. and Ms. Glass said that they did and he may have special needs. Board Member Sara Elsasser agreed with Interim Chairman Satter's points that the request

makes sense from a practical perspective. Interim Chairman Satter asked the Board if they had any additional questions for the applicants – no additional questions were asked.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Interim Chairman Satter thanked the applicants and asked the audience if there are any public comments. No questions or comments were made. A motion was made and seconded to approve the requested variance as submitted.

FINDINGS

1. The requested variation is within the jurisdiction of the Zoning Board of Appeals.
2. Based on the totality of the relevant and persuasive testimony heard and presented, the Zoning Board determines that:
 - a. The requested variation is in harmony with general purpose and intent of the Glencoe Zoning Code.
 - b. There are practical difficulties and there is a hardship in the way of carrying out the strict letters of Section 3-111(C) of the Glencoe Zoning Code as applied to the lot in question.
 - c. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances.
 - d. The requested variation will not alter the essential character of the locality.
 - e. The requested variation will not set a precedent unfavorable to the neighborhood or to the Village as a whole.
 - f. The spirit of the Zoning Code will be observed, public safety and welfare will be secured, and substantial justice will be done if the requested variation is granted.

RESOLUTION

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the request to reduce the required rear yard setback, side yard setback, and combined side yard setback at 570 Lincoln Avenue be granted as shown in the drawings or plans submitted by the owner and made part of the record.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the decision of the Development Services Manager is hereby reversed insofar as he denied the issuance of a building permit on the aforesaid property for the aforesaid construction;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this variation shall expire and be of no further force or effect at the end of twelve (12) months unless during said twelve-month period a building permit is issued, and construction begun and diligently pursued to completion; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution shall be spread upon the records of the Board and shall become a public record.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED
AYES:	Elsasser, Kaplan, Satter, Ruderman, Koppersmith
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	Novack

5. CONSIDER VARIATION REQUEST AT 174 MARY STREET

Richard McGowan gave a brief overview of the case, stating that the applicants are seeking one variation to increase the allowable gross floor area to allow for an addition to an existing single-family residence at 174 Mary Street:

1. Section 3-111(E)- To increase the allowable gross floor area from 4,693.88 sq. ft. to 5,040.37 sq. ft., a variation of 6.87%.

Mr. McGowan explained that the house on the property was completed in 2019 and the applicant has stated that the sunroom addition addresses a growing family as well as work-from-home requirements due to the pandemic. Mr. McGowan added that the applicant has also noted that the sunroom addition will have little impact from an external perspective as it will not be tall and will be constructed in a similar location to their existing patio, and that the owners of 174 Mary have also met with or left a note with each neighbor that could potentially be visually impacted.

Mr. Baxter then swore in Scott Renken (Architect) and the homeowners, Chad and Leah Gruen. Mr. Renken added that with the pandemic there is a growing need to feel more connected to the landscape and outdoor space that the homeowners could utilize all year round. Mr. Renken concluded that he feels that they meet the conditions for a variance and that it is a low 1-story element that would not be visible from the front of the house and will have materials that match the existing character of the home and neighborhood. Interim Chairman Satter asked if the homeowners would like to speak. Mr. Gruen added that outdoor space is now a premium with COVID, and that they do not have a traditional neighbor next door due to the way the lots are orientated, so it would be much further from their properties than a traditional interior lot. Mr. Baxter then read a letter of support from Paul Zulkie of 187 Mary Street. Interim Chairman Satter asked Mr. Baxter to confirm that neighbors were notified and Mr. Baxter confirmed that neighbors within 200 feet of the property were notified. Interim Chairman Satter asked if there were any questions from the Board and no additional questions were asked.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Interim Chairman Satter thanked the applicants and asked the audience if there are any public comments. No questions or comments were made. A motion was made and seconded to approve the requested variance as submitted.

FINDINGS

1. The requested variation is within the jurisdiction of the Zoning Board of Appeals.
2. Based on the totality of the relevant and persuasive testimony heard and presented, the Zoning Board determines that:
 - a. The requested variation is in harmony with general purpose and intent of the Glencoe Zoning Code.
 - b. There are practical difficulties and there is a hardship in the way of carrying out the strict letter of Section 3-111(E) of the Glencoe Zoning Code as applied to the lot in question.
 - c. The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances.
 - d. The requested variation will not alter the essential character of the locality.
 - e. The requested variation will not set a precedent unfavorable to the neighborhood or to the Village as a whole.
 - f. The spirit of the Zoning Code will be observed, public safety and welfare will be secured, and substantial justice will be done if the requested variation is granted.

RESOLUTION

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the request to increase the allowable gross floor area at 174 Mary Street be granted as shown in the drawings or plans submitted by the owner and made part of the record.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the decision of the Development Services Manager is hereby reversed insofar as he denied the issuance of a building permit on the aforesaid property for the aforesaid construction;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this variation shall expire and be of no further force or effect at the end of twelve (12) months unless during said twelve-month period a building permit is issued, and construction begun and diligently pursued to completion; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution shall be spread upon the records of the Board and shall become a public record.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED
AYES:	Elsasser, Kaplan, Satter, Ruderman, Kuppersmith
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	Novack

6. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Interim Chairman Satter asked the audience if there are any public comments. No questions or comments were made.

6. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 7:22 p.m.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED
AYES:	Elsasser, Kaplan, Satter, Ruderman, Kuppersmith
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	Novack