



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

Village Hall Council Chamber
675 Village Court
Monday, October 1, 2018 - 7:30 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 the Chair, at 7:30 p.m. on the 1st day of October, 2018, in the Village Hall Council Chamber.

Attendee Name	Title	Status
Zoning Board of Appeals		
Howard Roin	Chair	Present
Deborah Carlson	Member	Present
Sara Elsasser	Member	Present
David Friedman	Member	Absent
Alex Kaplan	Member	Present
Scott Novack	Member	Present
John Satter	Member	Present
Village Staff		
Nathan Parch	Community Development Administrator	Present
Stewart Weiss	Village Attorney	Present

2. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 6, 2018 ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING

RESULT:	APPROVED
AYES:	Carlson, Elsasser, Kaplan, Novack, Roin, & Satter (6)
NAYS:	None (0)
ABSENT:	Friedman (1)

3. CONTINUE BURTON APPEAL AT 481 GROVE STREET

The Chair stated that the purpose of this portion of the meeting was to conduct a public hearing on an appeal of Justin Burton from a decision by the Community Development Administrator in denying a permit for the construction of a one car attached garage at 481 Grove Street. The appeal requests that approval be granted to increase by 6.54% the maximum gross floor area from 5,508.00 square feet to 5,868.10 square feet, a total increase of 360.10 square feet. The subject property is located in the R-B Single Family Residential Zoning District. The variation is authorized by Section 7-403(E)(1)(i) of the Zoning Code.

The Chair reported that notice of the public hearing was published in the September 13, 2018 issue of the Glencoe Anchor and six neighbors were notified by mail. Staff then swore in those in attendance expecting to provide testimony on this matter.

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY

Property owner Justin Burton along with his architect, Edward Twohey of BBA Architects, were in attendance. Both Mr. Burton and Mr. Twohey provided an overview of the requested variation. The following points were noted in favor of the request:

1. The purposes of the new one car garage and covered walkway are for the owners to have access to the main floor of the home so they may accommodate for visiting grandparents, older family members, and future plans for their home to be accessible to them as they age in place.
2. The existing home was built in 2014 with an attached three garage located entirely in the basement level of the home. Access between the existing garage and the first floor is by an interior stairway.
3. The lot has hardship because of exceptional topographical features. There is a significant drop in elevation from north to south and from the adjacent neighbors.
4. Because of the existing topography and how it relates to neighboring properties, it is not feasible to build a detached garage in the rear half (south portion) of the property. The Village's gross floor area regulations allow for an exclusion of 400 square feet for a detached garage located in the rear half of the lot, but it is not feasible to qualify for this exclusion.
5. The only option is to pursue an attached garage at the north end of the lot. An attached garage fully counts in the gross floor area and results in an increase of 360.10 square feet above the maximum allowable of 5,508.00 square feet.

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.

David Hays of 508 Jefferson Avenue distributed a letter to members of the Zoning Board of Appeals dated October 1, 2018. Mr. Hays proceeded to read the letter voicing his opposition to the requested variation due to lack of hardship, the additional FAR proposed given the home's current size, the existence of a three-car garage at the rear of the house accessible from Grove Street, loss of green space, and the proposed addition of a curb cut on Jefferson Avenue where one currently does not exist.

Josh Rinkov of 510 Jefferson Avenue stated his concerns with the proposed variation, including lack of hardship, fourth garage and associate driveway negatively impact aesthetics, loss of open space due to garage addition, and the additional curb cut on Jefferson Avenue that will diminish street parking availability.

Mr. Burton addressed the concerns raised by the two neighbors. He stated the proposed garage and color scheme will match the original design of the house. He has elderly parents who have difficulty traversing the interior stairs from the current basement level garage to the first floor. He has explored adding an elevator, but it does not work due to the existing interior layout of the home.

Mr. Twohey spoke about the hardship of the property being its existing topography - slope from north to south - and distributed photos showing existing conditions. Due to the topography, Mr. Twohey stated that it wasn't feasible to add a detached garage at the rear of the property, which would otherwise be permitted with no need for a zoning variation.

Several members shared a concern about lack of hardship.

Chair Roin suggested that Mr. Burton may want to review the comments voiced at the meeting with his architect, evaluate possible options, and return next month. Mr. Burton agreed.

A motion was made and seconded, that the request for a variation to increase the maximum gross floor area at 481 Grove Street be continued for further consideration at the next meeting.

RESULT:	APPROVED
AYES:	Carlson, Elsasser, Kaplan, Novack, Roin, & Satter (6)
NAYS:	None (0)
ABSENT:	Friedman (1)

4. APPROVE RAGINS APPEAL AT 573 WESTWOOD LANE

The Chair stated that the purpose of this portion of the meeting was to conduct a public hearing on an appeal of Michael Ragins from a decision by the Community Development Administrator in denying a permit for the construction of an addition to the existing garage at 573 Westwood Lane. The appeal requests that approval be granted to reduce by 14% the front yard setback from 40 feet to 34.54 feet. The subject property is located in the R-B Single Family Residential Zoning District. The variation is authorized by Section 7-403(E)(1)(a) of the Zoning Code

The Chair reported that notice of the public hearing was published in the September 13, 2018 issue of the Glencoe Anchor and seven neighbors were notified by mail. Staff then swore in those in attendance expecting to provide testimony on this matter.

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY

Property owners Michael and Linda Ragins along with their architect, Thomas Budzik of Thomas Architects, were in attendance. Mr. Budzik provided an overview of the requested variation. The following points were noted in favor of the request:

1. The home was built in 1954. The existing garage is too narrow to be functional as a two car garage. It is only 19 feet wide and does not allow for two cars to be parked within the garage with adequate room to maneuver in/out and around the cars.
2. The garage has a full basement below which adds structural limitations to how and where the garage can be expanded.
3. The owners have investigated several alternatives for expansion including adding to the side of the garage or converting from a side load to a front load garage, all of which have their own significant downsides, including additional cost, greater disruption of the property, and increased impervious lot coverage.
4. The requested variation is modest in scale. The addition is proposed to be one story with a low slope roof to match the existing home.
5. The addition will be significantly far away from the neighbors on either side. Also, given that Westwood Lane curves at this location, the difference in the proposed front setback is less obvious.

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 requested variation for the required front yard setback 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)(a) of the 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; and
- 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 by 14.0% the required front yard setback from 40 feet to 34.54 feet for the property at 573 Westwood Lane 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 Community Development 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 Zoning Board of Appeals and shall become a public record.

RESULT:	APPROVED
AYES:	Carlson, Elsasser, Kaplan, Novack, Roin, & Satter (6)
NAYS:	None (0)
ABSENT:	Friedman (1)

6. PUBLIC COMMENT TIME

None

7. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Zoning Board of Appeals the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.