# WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES
## MAY 13, 2024

| | |
|---|---|
| **Zoning Board Members Present:** | Matt Bradley, Chairman<br>Mark Haller<br>Lynn Hanley<br>Kate Casale MacNally<br>Kathryn Leister<br>Mike Nielsen |
| **Zoning Board Members Absent:** | Todd Vender |
| **Village Staff:** | David Schoon, Director of Community Development<br>Ann Klaassen, Assistant Director of Community Development |

**<u>Call to Order & Roll Call</u>:**
Chairman Bradley called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Roll call was taken of the Board Members present.

**<u>Approval of Meeting Minutes</u>**.
Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to approve the March 11, 2024, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the March 11, 2024, meeting minutes was made by Ms. Casale MacNally and seconded by Ms. Hanley. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:
AYES: Bradley, Casale MacNally, Haller, Hanley, Nielsen
NAYS: None

**<u>Community Development Report</u>**.
Mr. Schoon informed the Board the Village Council approved the Hubbard Woods playground request.

**<u>New Cases:</u>**

a. **<u>Case No. 24-10-V - 680 Locust Street</u>: An application seeking approval of a variation to allow construction of a one-story addition to the existing residence at 680 Locust Street. The requested variation would permit the proposed addition to exceed the maximum permitted gross floor area. The Zoning Board of Appeals has final jurisdiction on this request.**

Ms. Klaassen identified the property's location, size and zoning classification along with its zoning characteristics. She referred to site photos and identified the proposed addition at the home's rear corner for a mudroom and covered entry. Ms. Klaassen stated the proposed one story addition would represent a net increase of 162 square feet of GFA and identified the sizes of the mudroom and covered porch. She then referred to proposed elevations. Ms. Klaassen stated draft resolutions, one approving the request, the other denying the request, are included in the packet for the Board's consideration and that following the applicants' presentation, public comment and Board discussion, a Board Member may wish to make a motion as indicated in the packet. She noted no public comment was received and asked if there were any questions. Ms. Leister arrived at the meeting at this time.

Chairman Bradley questioned the lot percentages and nonconforming lot area. Ms. Klaassen responded the permitted GFA is based on the lot area, whether it is conforming or not. Chairman Bradley also asked if the lot was always nonconforming. Ms. Klaassen responded it may have become nonconforming when the Zoning Ordinance was adopted because this subdivision likely existed prior to the adoption of the Zoning Ordinance. Chairman Bradley referred to Figure 7 on page 6/11 of the proposed mudroom addition and asked if the yellow area is being added. Ms. Klaassen confirmed that is correct and referred to the existing first floor plan. Chairman Bradley then referred to the bay window allowance. Ms. Klaassen stated once the bay window is more or less enclosed with the proposed addition, the allowance no longer applies. A Board Member questioned if the proposed porch would be open. Ms. Klaassen confirmed that is correct. No additional questions were raised at this time.

Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Jeff Harting of GTH Architects introduced himself to the Board and stated he had been working with the prior and current owners since 1996. Mr. Harting referred to the difficulty of the site and its practicality and identified prior renovations. He also explained how the home's existing rooms are situated and the difficulties in not having a mudroom. He explained the rationale for creating the mudroom and porch in the area he identified with an attempt to keep it as minimal as possible and the loss of the bay window with the creation of an area over it resulting in GFA loss. He added they also attempted to keep the historic style of the home intact and that it was their plan to make the proposed porch not as formal as the front porch.

Chairman Bradley asked if there were any questions. Ms. Hanley asked if thought was given to using the den or other existing space as a mudroom. Mr. Harting responded the den is used as the applicants' office and referred to the proposed mudroom addition which he identified as the yellow area and which is not as large as shown in the diagram. Chairman Bradley questioned the rationale for the mudroom width and asked why a mudroom had been contemplated before. Mr. Harting responded it is due to the bay window protruding into that space. He informed the Board that prior owners had no need for the mudroom which is why it was not included in prior renovations. Mr. Haller asked if the porch were brought in and the bay window was removed, would it affect the ability to get around the corner and have a reasonably sized mudroom. Mr. Harting confirmed that is correct and stated there would also be less usable space. No additional questions were raised at this time.

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

Mr. Nielsen described the situation as difficult in terms of the standards as opposed to the figures and whether a mudroom is needed. He stated the request is otherwise basic and he is on the fence in terms of support. Mr. Haller referred to the proposed addition being contained within the home's current footprint and would not further encroach on the neighbors and also referred to the current door's access point which he described as awkward. He stated he is also on the fence in terms of support and would lean more toward being in favor of the request. Mr. Haller stated reducing the mudroom and porch size did not seem practical. He asked Ms. Klaassen if the current bay window size related to the variation amount. Ms. Klaassen confirmed that is correct and confirmed the bay window allowance would no longer apply.

Ms. Casale MacNally stated she would be in favor of the request and she was swayed by the applicants' plan to keep the historic home intact with keeping the bay window. She described the request as a modest ask and the Locust Street window being changed to a more appropriately styled window was also an improvement. Ms. Casale MacNally concluded by stating she is in support. Ms. Hanley stated she would lean toward not being in favor and that the request did not meet the standards although she sympathized with the applicants' position. Ms. Leister stated she would lean toward not being in favor and if the request only related to the mudroom, she would be in favor. She questioned whether the choice should be made between the covered walkway and bay window. Chairman Bradley agreed with Ms. Leister's comments noting these types of requests are not made specific to the owners and mudrooms are not a right for a home. He referred to the nonconforming lot and ability to preserve what is there and make good use of the property. Chairman Bradley stated the choice should be made to either have a den or mudroom and if the request is allowed, it would serve as a precedent for future applicants. He stated although the amount being requested is minimal, mitigation can be done and the standards have not been met. Chairman Bradley concluded he would lean toward being in favor of the request relating to the applicants' efforts to maintain the home's character and style although a mitigating concession on the overage is possible.

Mr. Haller asked Ms. Klaassen with regard to the calculations, if the porch extension were reduced by the bay window distance, would that be one way to allow the same amount of walking room and serve to reduce the variation amount being requested. Ms. Klaassen stated the bay window measured 34 square feet and projected 2.7 feet from the family room's east wall. Mr. Haller asked if the amount would make a difference in terms of the porch's size noting a portion of the existing den would be reduced by the mudroom size.

Chairman Bradley took a straw poll of the Board. The Board Members further discussed their positions in detail.

Chairman Bradley asked the Board if their positions would change if the applicants were willing to reduce the covered porch size as opposed to denying the request. He informed the applicants that rather than voting against the project, he offered the ability to delay the vote to a subsequent meeting and for them to take the comments into consideration as to whether the covered porch as designed could be mitigated or removed. Mr. Harting asked Ms. Klaassen if the 96 square feet of porch includes the bay window. Ms. Klaassen responded it does not. Mr. Harting asked the Board for clarification in terms of their options and explained the challenges in terms of modifying the existing elevations. Chairman Bradley asked the Board Members if they would be in favor of a change to the front porch. The Board Members agreed.

Chairman Bradley then asked for a motion to approve the request with the condition that the front porch width be pulled in 2 feet from the eastern elevation. A motion as stated by Chairman Bradley was made by Ms. Casale MacNally and seconded by Ms. Leister. A vote was taken and the motion passed, 4 to 2:
AYES: Bradley, Casale MacNally, Haller, Leister
NAYS: Hanley, Nielsen

b. **<u>Case No. 24-12-V - 1108 Spruce Street</u>: An application seeking approval of variations to allow construction of a second floor addition and structural changes necessary for new window openings in the legally nonconforming south side building wall of the existing residence at 1108 Spruce Street. The requested variations would permit the proposed improvements to (i) provide less than the minimum required side yard setback from the south property line; and (ii) perform structural changes necessary to provide new window openings in the legally nonconforming south side building wall. The Zoning Board of Appeals has final jurisdiction on this request.**

Ms. Klaassen identified the property's location, size and zoning classification and referred to the site's elevation photos. She stated the variations are being requested to construct a second floor addition which she identified in an illustration. Ms. Klaassen stated the home is legally nonconforming and identified its setbacks with the proposed addition being set back 7.74 feet. She then outlined the second floor rooms' planned reorientation along with new windows in the nonconforming south side building wall and an explanation of the reasoning the request required a variation. Ms. Klaassen also referred to the proposed side and rear elevations as well as proposed plan perspectives. She then stated resolutions were drafted for the Board's consideration noting no public comment was received and asked if there were any questions.

Chairman Bradley asked what the Zoning Administrator's opinion would be on the request aside from the side yard setback. Mr. Schoon responded the Zoning Administrator would have authority on the windows only and it would have been a standard approval if there were no objections from the neighbors. Ms. Hanley referred to the zoning matrix and asked for an explanation for the minimum side yard setback calculations which Ms. Klaassen provided for the Board. Reference was made to Figure 9 on page 56 showing the dormers being set back from the sidewall. Ms. Klaassen then identified a side entrance to the first floor, as well as a covered entry down to the basement that is closer to the south property line than the proposed addition.

Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Gary Frank introduced himself as the architect and further explained the reasoning for the 5.9-foot figure and referred to the site plan. He stated the home is 7.74 feet with the proposed addition and dormers not representing a full second floor. Mr. Frank stated the requested variation would be less if the home's stairways were eliminated. He also identified several homes he designed in the area and stated they planned to leave the large gable and have dormer extensions. Mr. Frank referred to Sheet Z1.3 which represented the existing second floor plan and great room noting the home was built in the 1920's. He also described the existing small bedrooms, bathrooms and dormer configurations. Mr. Frank stated they planned to extend the existing dormers and described the proposed primary bedroom suite. He then referred to Sheet Z1.2 and identified the home's entrance off Spruce Street.

Chairman Bradley asked if there were any questions. Ms. Casale MacNally referred to Sheets Z1.3 and Z1.4 and questioned the window removal and wall placement which Mr. Frank clarified for the Board. Chairman Bradley noted there is no one in the audience to comment and called the matter in for discussion.

Mr. Nielsen stated the standards have been met and he would be in favor of the request. Ms. Leister agreed with Mr. Nielsen's comments and described the request as a clever solution to improve the home's value. Ms. Hanley stated she is also in favor of the request. Ms. Casale MacNally stated she is in favor of the request and referred to the two new windows that would provide more light over those being removed. Mr. Haller and Chairman Bradley also agreed they are in favor of the request.

Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to approve the request as presented. A motion to approve the requested variations was made by Ms. Casale MacNally and seconded by Mr. Nielsen. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:
AYES: Bradley, Casale MacNally, Haller, Hanley, Leister, Nielsen
NAYS: None

**<u>New Business</u>**:
a. <u>June 10, 2024 Meeting - Quorum Check.</u>

The Board Members discussed their availability.

**<u>Public Comment:</u>**
No comments were made at this time.

**Adjournment**:

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

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

NAYS: None

The meeting adjourned at 8:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Antionette Johnson

Recording Secretary