

VILLAGE OF GLENCOE
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

REGULAR MEETING
February 4, 2013

1. CALL TO ORDER

A meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Village of Glencoe was called to order at 7:35 P.M. Monday, February 4, 2013 in the Council Chamber of the Village Hall, Glencoe, Illinois.

2. ROLL CALL.

The following were present:

Jim Nyeste, Acting Chair

Members: Deborah Carlson, Ed Goodale, and Howard Roin and Steven Ross.

The following were absent:

David Friedman and Barbara Miller

The following Village staff was also present:

John Houde, Building and Zoning Administrator

3. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 7, 2013 MINUTES.

The minutes of the January 7, 2013 meeting were approved by unanimous voice vote.

4. APPROVE RAESE APPEAL AT 609 WASHINGTON.

The Chair stated that this was a continuation of the January 7, public hearing on the appeal by TR Raese of 609 Washington. The owner TR Raese and his architect, Steve Munson, noted the following additional information and testimony which is being preserved as part of the record in this matter.

A. Neighbor's Input

At the January meeting, their neighbor to the north, Mrs. Laurence Parfitt, spoke and presented some concerns about the project. In response to the neighbor's questions the owners were willing to meet and discuss the project, answer questions and talk through the issues. Mrs. Parfitt then sent a letter to the owner summarizing her opinion, a copy of which is on record. At the same time the owner thought it would be important to discuss the proposal with their other neighbors. All neighbors expressed support and copies of their responses were placed in the record.

B. Project Options

During this time the owners met with their Architect to go back to the

beginning and reassess the thought process that brought them to their proposal. Originally, they had considered excavating the shorter old portion of the basement to improve the laundry situation. They quickly realized that they could not just improve the height in the laundry, but would have to excavate the entire basement area. This quickly became prohibitively expensive, and with potential risk damage to the large trees in front of the house. For these two reasons the owners realized they would have to resolve the laundry problem some other way. They considered converting the existing garage into more useful interior space (laundry and mudroom), and adding an improved garage somewhere on the property. With 6 foot side yards this would require removal of the west sunroom to place a detached garage at the back of the property. Several significant trees and the screening along the property line would be taken out in the process, and the potential second floor space over the sunroom would be lost. So accepting the short basement, the limited garage space, continuing to use the shed as storage for all of the things that don't fit in the garage, and preserving the potential second floor space seemed a more appropriate option.

- C. Based on the board's request to look at the size of the floor area variance, they have considered several options for tweaking the shape of the additions to reduce their number. Simple sketches of those attempts were received. In the end, they felt that the reduction in floor area numbers resulted in a loss of visual simplicity. The additions no longer looked like they belonged over the original parts of the house. This would be at the detriment of the neighbors, as this is their view of the house.
- D. There was also discussion of the screen porch as a possible location to improve the floor area numbers. The location of the porch, north of the existing chimney, makes it difficult to be efficiently useful. The porch is notched around one of their significant trees, which would be impacted by any work in this location, and any new second floor space would be over unheated space and would be very difficult to condition. There was also discussion of converting the porch to an open pergola space to reduce the floor area calculation. A reduction in floor area numbers should provide a reduction in overall bulk of the house. However, the location of the screen porch, tucked into the back corner of the house and screened by trees and plantings, make the porch essentially invisible to their neighbors. The reduction in floor area numbers would not provide the intended result of reducing bulk, only a reduction in the number.
- E. The owners hope that this illustrates their thought process has been inclusive of all options. They have weighed the benefits and negative impacts of each for the house and the neighbors. In the end, they felt their best approach in correcting the deficiency of their house was to accept the limited basement, accept the limited garage, accept the limited mudroom, and concentrate on the second floor where potential space was already defined by the first floor. In using this space they could provide simple additions that fit proportionately with the original

symmetrical design of the home, and have the least impact on the site and trees. It is for these reasons that they are backing their original proposal as the simplest, most efficient, and respectful means of making this home work for current family life and viable for the next 80 years.

Letters from L. Parfitt, 586 South; Kathy and Chris Deveny, 612 Washington; and Martha and Adam Metz, 600 Valley, all in favor of the variation were entered into the record.

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 particular hardship in the way of carrying out the strict letter of Section 7-403-E-1-(j), 7-403-E-1-(n) and 7-403-E-1-(i) 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 for the following variations for the property at 609 Washington be granted as shown in the drawings or plans submitted by the owner and made part of the record and with the previously noted conditions: a variation be granted reducing the required east side yard setback to 6.1 feet for a 2nd floor addition over the existing 1st floor area of the house located 6.1 feet from the east lot line where a 12.66 foot setback is required. The addition also requires a setback plane variation where the top of the roof meets the exterior wall of the house from the required 14.89 feet to 27 feet. A proposed west 2nd floor addition over the existing 1st floor area of the house located 5.78 feet from the west lot line requires a variation for the 5.78 foot setback where a 13 foot setback would be required. This addition also requires a setback plane variation where the top of the

roof meets the exterior wall from the allowed 14.58 feet to the proposed 20 feet. Both additions require a 10.4% increase in the allowed floor area ratio (F.A.R.) from 4229 square feet to 4669.7 square feet.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the decision of the Building and Zoning Administrator 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.

Adopted by the following vote of the Zoning Board members present:

AYES: Carlson, Goodale, Roin, Ross (4)

NAYS: Nyeste (1)

ABSENT: Friedman and Miller (2)

5. APPROVE BURNHAM/BRANDNER APPEAL AT 404 WOODLAWN.

The Chair stated that the purpose was to conduct a public hearing on the appeal by James Burnham and Lisa Brandner of a decision by the Building and Zoning Administrator in denying a permit to construct a room addition at their home at 404 Woodlawn in the "R-C" Residence District. The project requires that a variation be granted reducing the required west side yard for a 2nd floor addition over an existing first floor area of the house located 5.73 feet from the west lot line where an 8-foot setback would be required. This variation is authorized by Section 7-403-E-1-(j) of the Zoning Code. The addition also requires a setback plane variation where the top of the roof meets the exterior wall of the house from the allowed 18.73 feet height to 29.25 feet high. This variation is authorized by Section 7-403-E-1 (n) of the Zoning Code.

The Chair reported that notice of the public hearing was published in the January 10, 2013 GLENCOE NEWS and 9 neighbors were notified of the public hearing by mail and that no letters or verbal inquiries had been received. The Chair then swore in those in attendance who were expecting to testify.

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY

The Chair then asked the owners, James Burnham and Lisa Brandner, and their architect Kathy O'Brien to proceed. They noted:

1. The existing rear portion of the house was built with a 5.73 setback. The owners wish to extend the house but the existing building location and interior

bearing wall/openings restrict how the addition can be built. If the owners cannot match the existing building wall hallway/access to the existing house the design will not work. The hardship is created by the existing building location and structure; certain walls cannot be relocated which limit access to the addition.

The Chair made part of the record, as additional testimony the Agenda Supplement which the Secretary was directed to preserve as part of the record in this matter.

Following consideration of the testimony and discussion, a motion was made and seconded, that the request for a variance in the west sideyard and west setback plane for a 2nd floor over an existing first floor area of their house 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 particular hardship in the way of carrying out the strict letter of Section 7-403-E-1-(j) and 7-403-E-1-(n) 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 for a variation reducing the required west side yard for a 2nd floor addition over an existing first floor area of the house located 5.73 feet from the west lot line where an 8-foot setback would be required and for a setback plane variation from the allowed 18.73 feet high to 29.25 feet high for the property at 404 Woodlawn be granted as shown in the drawings or plans submitted by the owner and made part of the record and with the previously noted conditions;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the decision of the Building and Zoning

Administrator 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.

Adopted by the following vote of all the Zoning Board members present:

AYES: Carlson, Goodale, Roin, Ross and Nyeste (5)

NAYS: None (0)

ABSENT: Friedman and Miller (2)

There being no further business to come before the Zoning Board of Appeals the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.


Secretary
John Houde