WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 9, 2023

Zoning Board Members Present:	Matt Bradley, Chairman Kate Casale MacNally Mark Haller Lynn Hanley Mike Nielsen Todd Vender
Zoning Board Members Absent:	Max Weigandt
Village Staff:	David Schoon, Director of Community Development Ann Klaassen, Assistant Director of Community Development

Call to Order & Roll Call:
Chairman Bradley called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Public Comment:
No comments were made at this time.

Approval of Minutes:

a. December 12, 2022, Regular Meeting Minutes

Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to approve the December 12, 2022, meeting minutes. A motion was made by Ms. Casale MacNally and seconded by Ms. Hanley. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

AYES: Bradley, Casale MacNally, Haller, Hanley, Nielsen, Vender
NAYS: None

Community Development Report:
Mr. Schoon provided the Board with an update with regard to 484 Elder Lane and 488 Elder Lane as well as the status of the Comprehensive Plan draft document, a copy of which he would provide a weblink to everyone. He also stated that next week, the Village Council would be reviewing an amended, revised concept plan for the One Winnetka property before it went through the formal planned development process.

Continued Cases:

a. **Case No. 22-30-V2: 232 Sheridan Road (Continued from the December 12, 2022, meeting): An amended application submitted by Amy and William Franzen seeking approval of zoning variations to allow construction of an addition to the existing residence at 232 Sheridan Road. The requested variations would permit the addition to (i) exceed the maximum permitted roofed lot coverage; (ii) exceed the maximum permitted gross floor area; (iii) provide less than the minimum required corner yard setback from the private road easement along the north property line; (iv) provide less than the minimum required rear yard setback from the west property line; (v) exceed the maximum permitted width for a front-facing attached garage; and (vi) exceed the maximum permitted width for a front-facing attached garage door. The plans have been amended to reduce the requested variations for**

roofed lot coverage, gross floor area, rear yard setback, and front-facing attached garage width. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.
Ms. Klaassen noted the plans were amended to reduce roofed lot coverage (RLC), gross floor area (GFA), rear yard setback and the width of the front-facing garage and identified the Board's concerns from the December 2022 meeting. She referred to the amended plans and explained in detail the proposed plan changes and reductions in the variations being requested. Ms. Klaassen then identified the net increase in RLC and GFA for the current proposal when compared to the original proposal.

Ms. Klaassen informed the Board of two additional emails received from neighbors, which were distributed to the Board. She then stated following the applicant's presentation, the Board may wish to make a motion to recommend approval or denial of the request with a draft motion provided on page nos. 14 and 15. Ms. Klaassen then asked if there were any questions.

Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. Ms. Hanley asked for further explanation regarding the second floor addition which Ms. Klaassen provided to the Board. Ms. Casale MacNally referred to the proposed home gym and master bedroom on the second floor and questioned the deck's structural integrity and whether structural engineering plans were available. Ms. Klaassen responded they do not have that level of detail for a variation application and suggested that the applicant may be able to address those questions. No additional questions were raised at this time.

Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. William Franzen, the applicant, and John Franzen, the architect, introduced themselves to the Board. John explained the property's history to the Board and the reasoning for certain aspects of the request along with the property's difficulties and hardships. He also addressed the standards. John then described the reductions in the proposal which reduced the amount of the GFA and RLC variations as well as the reductions made to the garage. He concluded the request would not affect many people, improve the home and create reasonable return.

William Franzen noted four of the requests are due to the easement and if the garage was not considered front-facing, they would get the 200 square-foot bonus. He added that the flag pole portion of an adjacent lot between their lot and the property to the south would never be developed. William noted the home gym would be built over the additional garage bay as well as the master bathroom and would not be a problem structurally.

Chairman Bradley asked if there were any questions. Ms. Casale MacNally clarified her question in terms of building the master bath and home gym where the existing porch trellis is. John Franzen explained how that alternative would not make the home symmetrical with the home to the south and would not align with the surrounding homes. Mr. Haller questioned certain measurements on the Mitchell's property to the south, and John Franzen responded the coping and block on the applicant's home is 9 inches higher than the Mitchell's.

Ms. Hanley asked William Franzen if he considered not having the home gym and William responded they did not and noted it can be used in the future as a master bedroom. Ms. Hanley stated the home gym elimination would only result in a variation for the garage. William described how they view that space as important to their reasonable return. Ms. Hanley stated the lot is small and the applicant has to work with the amount of space they have when the home gym can be considered a fifth bedroom. William further explained how the easement portion of their lot is not counted toward their buildable lot area.

Chairman Bradley described the applicant's revised plans and concessions as well done and addressed the concerns in reducing the variance amounts. He then described the property as extraordinarily unique and referred to the neighbors' endorsements of the project. Chairman Bradley referred to the applicant's phrasing of the home gym and stated he appreciated the considerable pare back from the previous request. He then asked the applicant if he would consider further reducing the home gym's GFA although its proposed measurements are not oversized. John Franzen responded by describing the applicant's desire in choosing to lay out the space that way. William Franzen informed the Board they discussed several options in attempts to reduce the amount of space to the bare minimum needed.

Chairman Bradley asked if there were any other questions. No additional questions were raised at this time. He then called the matter in for discussion noting no members of the public are present to comment.

Mr. Haller stated he appreciated the adjustments made and the description of the home gym as important as it would be if it was classified as a home office. He stated the home's character would remain and referred to the fact the neighbors are in support of the request. Mr. Haller then stated he is sympathetic in terms of the private easement issue and would be in favor of the request. Mr. Nielsen also stated he would be in favor of recommending approval and referred to the amount of the GFA overage. Ms. Hanley referred to her issue in connection with GFA while she appreciated the garage situation she was concerned with the bootstrapping in of additional square footage with the garage addition. The Board Members discussed treating easements as not being unique. Ms. Hanley reiterated her concern related to the GFA overage.

Ms. Casale MacNally stated the applicant intentionally purchased this particular property and she is aware of the difficulties in maneuvering with regard to parking, garage access, etc. She agreed with Ms. Hanley's comments with regard to the GFA variation and stated the applicant was aware of the property's limitations. Ms. Casale MacNally added the property is not atypical when compared to the surrounding properties and stated she also had difficulty with the GFA variation.

Mr. Vender described the property as very unique although he was not aware of the easement issue. He stated the combination of old and historic and preserving such homes although the description of the space as a home gym may seem to make it not necessary. Mr. Vender also referred to the neighbors' support of the project which would be an improvement and fit in with neighboring properties. He concluded he would be in favor of the request.

Mr. Haller noted the existing bedrooms are not gracious in terms of size and commented on the reference to the additional space as a home gym. Ms. Hanley confirmed she is not opposed to the home gym and added the home is not small and the applicant should work within the limits given.

Chairman Bradley took a straw poll with Ms. Hanley and Ms. Casale MacNally leaning toward against recommending approval. He then asked for a motion to recommend approval of the request as noted on page no. 14. A motion to recommend approval was made by Mr. Vender and seconded by Mr. Nielsen. A vote was taken and the motion passed, 4 to 2:
AYES: Bradley, Haller, Nielsen, Vender
NAYS: Casale MacNally, Hanley

New Business

a. February 13, 2023, Meeting - Quorum Check

The Board Members discussed their availability.

Adjournment:
Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Casale MacNally and seconded by numerous Board members. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

AYES: Bradley, Casale MacNally, Haller, Hanley, Nielsen, Vender
NAYS: None

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Antionette Johnson
Recording Secretary