WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 12, 2024

Zoning Board Members Present: Matt Bradley, Chairman
Lynn Hanley
Mark Haller
Kathryn Leister
Kate Casale MacNally
Mike Nielsen

Zoning Board Members Absent: Todd Vender

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 7:03 p.m. Roll call was taken of the Board Members present.

November 13, 2023, Regular Meeting Minutes:
Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to approve the November 13, 2023, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the November 13, 2023, meeting minutes 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, Haller, Hanley, Leister, Casale MacNally, Nielsen
NAYS: None

Community Development Report:
Mr. Schoon provided the Board Members with an update for 717 Park Avenue, 84 Abbottsford and 808 Oak Street. He also provided an update in connection with the pickleball court application.

Public Comment:
No comments were made at this time.

New Cases:

a. **Case No. 24-01-SU: 1095 Gage Street - Sacred Heart School: An application seeking approval of an amendment to an existing Special Use Permit, which allowed construction of an addition on the west side of the existing school building at 1095 Gage Street and zoning variations. The requested amendment would allow improvements to the existing playground located on the north side of the existing school building. The variations would permit the proposed improvements to (i) exceed the maximum permitted impermeable lot coverage; (ii) provide less than the minimum required rear yard setback from the northerly property line; (iii) provide less than the minimum required side yard setback from the westerly property line; and (iv) exceed the maximum permitted height for a fence. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**

Chairman Bradley and Ms. Hanley noted for the record that they have children who attend the school but they have no conflict and would provide fair and accurate assessments of the application. Ms. Klaassen identified the property's location, zoning classification and the limited special uses allowed in the B-1

Multifamily Residential zoning district. She referred to current photos of the site photos and noted the items to be removed and replaced.

Ms. Klaassen explained the existing play area's proposed redevelopment and improvements in various areas on the site. She identified the proposed fencing installation and replacement as well as the asphalt replacement with an artificial turf field, its measurements and setbacks from the north and west property lines. Ms. Klaassen identified the location of the proposed equipment's placement and referred to the zoning matrix showing impermeable lot coverage percentages. She noted the applicant intends to provide the necessary infiltration system under the proposed artificial turf and rubberized play surface to qualify for a 25% impermeable lot coverage allowance for both surfaces. Ms. Klaassen explained that once the final design of the infiltration system has been determined, the Village Engineering Department will verify whether the proposed system meets the required standards to quality for the 25% allowance. She then explained that if the allowance applies the proposed impermeable lot coverage would be a reduction from the existing nonconforming impermeable lot coverage.

Ms. Klaassen referred to the play equipment renderings and rubberized play surface. She stated the Design Review Board and Plan Commission would consider the request at their upcoming meetings and noted one written public comment was received and included in the agenda packet. She then stated following the applicant's presentation and the Board's review, a Board Member may wish to make a motion as indicated on page no. 19 of the agenda packet. Ms. Klaassen asked if there were any questions.

Ms. Casale MacNally referred the impermeable lot coverage and if the Board approved the request including the impermeable lot coverage, would the applicant be permitted to pull the request for evaluation to include the infiltration system. She questioned why the Board is hearing the request prior to the infiltration system approval. Ms. Klaassen explained that the surfaces were included at 100% since a final determination cannot be made on whether the allowance applies until the final design is presented to the Village Engineering Department. She confirmed the applicant is currently working with the Village Engineering Department. Ms. Klaassen indicated the Board's motion can include a condition.

Chairman Bradley referred to the 25% qualification. Ms. Hanley had a question regarding the fence height exception for which Ms. Klaassen provided clarification.

Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Matt Cronin, the architect for the project, and John Gross, the civil engineer for the project, introduced themselves to the Board as project managers from the applicant's architectural design and civil engineering team. Mr. Gross explained to the Board how they would be held to MWRD standards in terms of the infiltration system and described the various site improvements. Mr. Cronin explained that the existing playground is essentially a large parking lot that they want to turn into a better place for kids to play. He noted that the neighbors have provided positive feedback regarding the project.

Chairman Bradley asked if there were any questions. Mr. Haller asked if the applicant would be required to meet the Village's requirements along with MWRD requirements. Mr. Gross responded the requirements are the similar for both entities. Mr. Haller asked if they met with the north neighbors. Mr. Cronin responded that open houses were held to inform the neighbors of the project and to obtain feedback. He added the north neighbors liked the fence and would have preferred a taller fence. Ms. Hanley asked if four trees in an area she identified would be kept. Mr. Cronin stated they met with the Village Forester regarding the trees and that two trees will be removed and two will be kept. He also explained that two trees will be planted. He added there would no longer be vehicular parking in that area with only emergency vehicle access. Mr. Cronin confirmed there would be no change in the drop-off and pickup functions.

Chairman Bradley referred to the differing fence heights and asked for the rationale. Mr. Cronin explained the difference in the fence height due to the topography and that the differing heights was out of respect for the neighbors. Chairman Bradley asked if there is a need for the 8 foot fence as far eastward as it is [along the north property line]. Mr. Cronin identified the basketball play area and the fence height was adjusted to keep balls from entering neighboring properties and explained why an existing basketball hoop was moved. Chairman Bradley referred to Figure 9. Mr. Cronin informed the Board the tallest equipment piece would be 16 feet in height. Chairman Bradley asked where the drainage system would be located and its capacity. Mr. Gross identified its location as underneath the synthetic turf and described how it would function. Chairman Bradley questioned the project's construction timing. Mr. Cronin stated the goal is to begin construction in June with completed in the fall and for all of the construction equipment to be stored onsite. No additional questions were raised at this time.

Chairman Bradley asked if there was any public comment. No public comments were made at this time. He then called the matter in for discussion.

Chairman Bradley referred to the project's similarity to that at Hubbard Woods and asked if Hubbard Woods required the same infiltration system. Ms. Klaassen stated an infiltration system was not proposed for that project since they weren't trying to qualify for the 25% allowance. Mr. Schoon explained the difference between storm water detention requirements and how credit for permeable surface is achieved.

Ms. Hanley stated she is in favor of the project and the proposed fence height is reasonable for the use intended. She also stated she did not have an issue with the side yard and rear yard setbacks which would primarily remain the same and with regard to impermeable lot coverage, they have to consider the request being from an institutional use in a residential zone. Ms. Casale MacNally agreed with Ms. Hanley's comments and stated she would be in favor of approval with conditioning additional impermeable lot coverage on the applicant's completing the infiltration system design and working with the Village Engineering Department to qualify for the 25% bonus. She stated they need to be careful that water from this project does not flow unreasonably on neighboring properties.

Mr. Nielsen stated he is in favor of the project and commented on the multiple open houses held with the neighbors. He referred to the fence height and suggested consideration be given that it is minimal. He concluded he is in favor of the request. Mr. Haller stated he is also in favor of the request and agreed with the comments made. He stated for a special use of this type, he referred to the applicant's consideration of the neighbors. Chairman Bradley read the special use standards and stated they have been met. He stated with regard to the zoning relief standards, he referred to the fence height standard and recent variations from it. Chairman Bradley also stated no neighbors complained about the fence height. He commended the applicant on installing an infiltration system which would benefit the school, the children and would reduce the existing nonconformity and he would not condition its approval. Ms. Leister stated she had no objection and described the project as a great solution which would benefit the school and neighbors as a whole.

Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to recommend approval with the condition as stated by Ms. Casale MacNally. The motion was not seconded. The motion failed.

Chairman Bradley then asked for a motion to recommend approval as indicated on page 19. A motion was made by Ms. Hanley to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Nielsen. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Leister, Casale MacNally, Nielsen

NAYS: None

New Business:

a. March 11, 2024 - Quorum Check.

The Board Members discussed their availability.

Mr. Schoon provided the Board Members with an update regarding the Indian Hill streetscape concept plan open house to be held on February 15, 2024.

Adjournment:

Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by several Board Members and seconded. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Leister, Casale MacNally, Nielsen

NAYS: None

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Antionette Johnson

Recording Secretary