



**MINUTES
VILLAGE OF GLENCOE
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING**

Village Hall Council Chamber and Videoconference
675 Village Court
Monday, February 1, 2021 – 7:30 PM

MI1. 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 the Chairman, at 7:30 p.m. on the 1st day of February 1, 2021, held virtually via Zoom web videoconference.

Attendee Name	Title	Status
Village Board		
Howard Roin	ZBA Chairman	Present
Sara Elsasser	Member	Present
David Friedman	Member	Present
Alex Kaplan	Member	Present
Scott Novack	Member	Present
John Satter	Member	Present
Village Staff		
Taylor Baxter	Development Services Manager	Present
Rich McGowan	Planner	Present

2. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2020 ZBA MEETING

RESULT:	ACCEPTED
AYES:	Roin, Elsasser, Friedman, Kaplan, Novack, Satter
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	None

3. CONSIDER VARIATION REQUEST AT 772 GROVE STREET

Taylor Baxter gave a brief overview of the case, stating that the applicants are seeking three variations from the zoning code to allow an attached garage addition to an existing single-family home:

1. Section 3-111(E) – To increase the allowable gross floor area from 3,718.44 square feet to 4,088.54 square feet, a variation of 9.95%.

2. Section 3-111(C) – To reduce the required front yard setback from 50 feet to 40 feet, a variation of 20%.
3. Section 3-108(C)(1) – To increase the allowable width of a garage door along a building front from 25% of lot width (13.53 ft.) to 29.56% lot width (16 ft.).

Mr. Baxter clarified that the ZBA may grant garage door width variations not to exceed 27 feet in width, and then provided pictures and a table of the existing front setbacks along the block of Grove Street:

Address		Front Setback
720	Grove Street	44.08'
730	Grove Street	50.1'
742	Grove Street	67.13'
746	Grove Street	~48' (no survey)
750	Grove Street	50'
760	Grove Street	66.05'
766	Grove Street	61.43'
772	Grove Street	51.21' (subject property)
780	Grove Street	50.16'
790	Grove Street	50.75'
800	Grove Street	52.1'
808	Grove Street	50.0'
814	Grove Street	51.92'

Mr. Baxter then proceeded to swear in Scott Javore, the Architect representing the homeowner of 772 Grove Street, Michael Teplitsky. Chairman Howard Roin then asked Mr. Javore to proceed with his presentation.

Mr. Javore stated that their goal was to design an attached garage to match the existing character of the neighborhood, with an intentional flat roof to make it as unobtrusive as possible. Mr. Javore continued, stating that the hardships include the practical difficulty of accessing their existing, detached one-car garage with a narrow driveway and tight turning radius, limited space in the rear yard, and their legal non-conforming lot size. Mr. Javore then brought up general examples from past ZBA meetings where a one-car garage had been determined to be a hardship. Per Mr. Javore, the applicants also dropped off informational packets to neighbors at 775, 776, 779, and 780 Grove Street.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Roin then asked if Village Staff received any comments from the public. Mr. Baxter confirmed that the Village had not received any public comments, though there were members of the public in attendance. Chairman Roin then opened the discussion up for public comment, and Mr. Baxter then swore in those who would be speaking.

John Lindauer of 789 Grove Street asked the applicants why the garage couldn't be built in the rear yard of the home. Mr. Javore replied that it would eliminate significant living space in the

home and rear yard, and it would be difficult to maneuver with a tight turning radius. Mr. Lindauer then asked what the distance of the existing home to the rear/west property line. Mr. Baxter stated that he is not certain but estimated it to be about 100 feet. Mr. Javore added that there is a curved room in the rear of the home that also makes it difficult to reconfigure and accommodate a tight squeeze. Mr. Lindauer then asked the applicants if there is room in the rear yard. Mr. Javore confirmed that from a setback perspective, there is room. Mr. Lindauer stated that he is concerned about the proximity (of the proposed garage) to the street, and that he would like to maintain the existing consistency of the front yard setbacks.

Mr. Baxter then swore in the homeowner of 772 Grove Street, Michael Teplitsky. Mr. Teplitsky stated that had there been enough room in the rear yard then he would not be here tonight, and he noted that part of the issue is getting out of the garage and turning around to exit the property. Mr. Teplitsky also added that there is an existing deck, patio, fire pit, detached garage, landscaping, and green space that they would have remove in order to construct a new garage in the rear.

Mr. Baxter then swore in the applicant's other Architect, Karl Sponholtz. Mr. Sponholtz then proceeded to share his screen with visuals of the existing interior layout and property at 772 Grove Street, providing an example of how 24 feet is needed for a turning radius, and how difficult it would be to maneuver a vehicle with the existing conditions.

Board Member Scott Novack then asked if this variation request would be necessary if there were two smaller garage doors proposed instead of one, or perhaps if the proposed structure was shifted over the basement. Mr. Javore responded that they did assess this option but ultimately it could increase the overall size of the garage, it would be tough structurally, and much more expensive. Board Member Novack then noted that if the neighbor to the south is supportive and the neighbor to the north is silent, he is surprised that a neighbor would be silent to this. Chairman Roin mentioned that the Village also notifies all neighbors within 200 feet in addition to a public notice.

Chairman Roin then added that he cannot remember the last time there was a requested variance for a garage door, but he is persuaded that it is a small and narrow lot and that people ought to have room in their backyards. Board Member John Satter stated that if we breach the standard front yard setback requirements, the trend could become that it is a less honored design element for the Village. Board Member Satter then asked what the maximum eligible width the ZBA can grant for garage doors. Mr. Baxter confirmed that it is 27 feet. Board Member Satter then stated that there is a clear hardship and that he is inclined to vote yes.

Board Member David Friedman stated that he understands the concerns brought forward by the neighbor and appreciates the thought that went into the feasibility of a garage in the rear yard, and that he is in support of the proposed variance.

Board Member Sara Elsasser stated that she is in support of the proposed variance.

Board Member Novack stated that he is uncomfortable trying to persuade people on this proposed variance, and that we have setbacks for a reason. Board Member Novack continued,

stating that he understands the hardship, but the proposed garage is significantly closer to the street than the other homes on the block. Board Member Novack stated that he is hesitant to set a precedent and that he does not think this is an easy variance request.

Chairman Roin stated that Board Member Novack and Mr. Lindauer both bring up great points, but every decision the ZBA makes is an individual decision and that he does not want to make any decisions bound by precedent. Chairman Roin added that the applicants also agreed this one was tough, that there is no magic to a 50-foot front yard setback, and that once it has been built it will be hardly noticeable.

Board Member Novack added that a sight line rendering of how the proposed garage would look in comparison to the adjacent homes on Grove Street would be beneficial.

Mr. Lindauer then followed up with his previous public comment and asked Mr. Teplitsky to not think of him as the devil, and that he is not opposed to the proposed variance. Mr. Lindauer added that moving this front yard setback up may allow for his family to move their front yard setback up in the future. Mr. Lindauer concluded that he just wants to make sure everyone is thinking collectively.

Chairman Roin thanked Mr. Lindauer for his comments and stated that the ZBA is interested in making life better for residents without trampling on their neighbors. Board Member Friedman added that he did not take this decision lightly, and also appreciates Mr. Lindauer's input.

Mr. Sponholtz then provided a zoning map for a better visual to help everyone see that 772 Grove Street is one of the narrowest lots in the area.

Following consideration of the testimony and discussion, a motion was made and seconded, that the variance request be granted per the drawings presented, making findings and resolving as follows:

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(C)(2) 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 maximum allowable gross floor area, reduce the required front yard setback, and to increase the allowable width of a garage door along a building front at 772 Grove 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 [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Roin, Elsasser, Friedman, Kaplan, Novack, Satter
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	None

5. ADJOURN

Chairman Roin asked if there was any further public comment. Hearing none, the meeting was adjourned at 8:34 p.m.