

**SITE PLAN AND APPEARANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE (SPAARC)
MEETING NOTES
February 24, 2010**

Attendees:

- Committee Members:** P. D'Agostino, D. Argumedo, B. Dunkley, I. Eckersberg, W. Hallen, D. Marino
- Citizen Member:** None
- Other Staff:** Dean Mosca
- Presiding Member:** W. Hallen

A quorum being present, acting Chair Hallen called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m.

Projects Reviewed:

| SPAARC | 1033 Darrow Avenue | Recommendation to ZBA |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Request for variation to allow Air Conditioner side interior yard | | |

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Christen Perry Property owner

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

Ms. Perry requested the air conditioner installed by the previous owner be legally established in its current location. The following was discussed:

- The applicant purchased the home in August of 2008 with A/C units existing on the north side of the lot
- Upon city inspection it was determined the A/C units were not compliant with City Code
- The House had been vacant for 2 years previous to owners purchase
- The variance seeks to keep an existing condition
- Movement of the A/C units would cost the owners 'substantial' money
- Neighbors to the north of the property submitted letter saying they have no objection to the proposal

Action:

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the request.

| SPAARC | 1811 Greenwood Street | Recommendation to ZBA |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Request for variation to allow side yard dormer on existing 2 nd story: | | |

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Susan Rundle Architect, representing owner

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

Ms. Susan Rundle requested, on behalf of the property owners, that a variation be granted to build dormers on the west portion of the structure:

- Ms Rundle is the architect for the property owners
- The proposed dormer is in line with the existing house, proposal will not encroach anymore into the interior side yard setback
- The distance to the side yard setback is 2.29'
- Bill Dunkley stated type of condition is one that caused zoning ordinance to be changed to allow second floor additions in line with the current house 3' from the setback to be categorized as a minor variance rather than major variance. This project does not fit unfortunately.
- Walter Hallen concurred that this type of case often comes before SPAARC, where a building was built to meet a certain zoning setback provision that has since been changed which causes any second floor addition to require a variance
- Bill Dunkley asked if there is anyway to redesign the proposal.
- Rundle stated that due to mechanical equipment in the attic, to succeed in the intent of the plan to provide additional space the dormers must be on the west side
- Walter Hallen inquired if this project would meet building code with the proposed windows
- Dean Mosca stated that the windows would have to be removed, and it would then be building code compliant
- Applicant stated that would not be a problem, that sky lights could then be provided

Action:

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the request.

SPAARC 2408 Orrington (Former Kendal College Site) Recommendation to P&D

Proposal to subdivide site into 19 single family parcels

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Bob Burk & Bob Kuker

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

Bill Dunkley provided case background, applicants provided project details, motion was granted to allow public comment. The following was discussed:

- Mr. Dunkley explained that under consideration before SPAARC was the application of subdivision. The site's proposals for single family lots met all zoning requirements, that the proposed alleys would have public access with 2' no build easements on each side. There are other reviews that will need to be conducted before construction can begin, but again, this item is for consideration of the subdivision only. The Preservation Commission previously gave a positive recommendation to the proposal
- Dennis Marino clarified that the process is from SPAARC the subdivision proposal goes before the Planning & Development Committee.
- Alderman Judy Fiske stated she appreciated the work the applicants had done but still had standing issues with the proposal as drawn
 - She would like to see homes face in different orientation
 - One fewer home on Colfax that would increase the width of the lots to about 50' wide as are common in this neighborhood
- Applicants stated they considered many permutations before this one. The blocks in the neighborhood are different, not solely one design. They have taken neighbors concerns into account by placing lots that face Orrington and reducing the number of lots by 2

- A citizen stated that while he understands the lots meet zoning compliance, they would create long skinny houses out of proportion with the neighborhood. He further stated his belief that a wider lot would bring in more money for the developer. A second citizen stated that the homes have large footprints
- Another citizen asked if one person could buy two lots and build a single home on it?
- Applicant stated the goal of the project is to sell lots, perhaps build a home or two, but to sell lots. To answer the citizen's question, someone could buy two lots to build a home.
- Applicant reiterated some neighbors concerns were taken into consideration due to reduced lots and lots facing Colfax. Also, the alley mid block for the proposal matches up with the alley behind Colfax. The applicants stated they understand it is hard to please everyone but they have made an effort, and in the end the proposal must work economically
- Alderman Fiske reiterated the adjustments she would like to see in the proposal. She would like one less lot on Colfax and an orientation of lots that face all four streets
- In response to an inquiry by Dennis Marino, the applicant stated that yes—the primary reason to not make those adjustments is economical. They plan to return to the underlying zoning district because the adopted PD is not economically feasible. The margins diminish even by 1 lot is difficult, and again they have made concessions. They believe the proposal is consistent with the historic district, that there are many opinions and can be debated by many voices—but their proposal has taken into account several considerations
- Walter Hallen inquired about the reason for no build easements
- Applicants stated that from an appearance standpoint there was no visible difference between 45' and 50' wide lots.

ACTION:

The Committee unanimously voted to transfer consideration of the subdivision to the Planning & Development committee with concerns of the Alderman and public comments.

SPAARC 2675, 2709, 2713, 2723 Prairie Avenue

Process Approval

The applicant, ComEd, presented plans for the installation of new overhead equipment adjacent to the properties listed above. The following was discussed:

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Ferdie Reyes & Eric Duray

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

- Ingrid Eckersberg stated they are before SPAARC due to an appearance issue. The polls will be five feet higher and one will be moved
- The applicant stated the northern most pole would be moved due to delivery trucks having difficulty maneuvering. The poll would be moved into the parkway and have an arm extended to not disrupt service
- Dennis Marino asked if there were any alternative to such a move, staffs desire is to keep the pole in the alley. Can it just be adjusted?
- If the pole is slid toward the property it borders there are concerns if would come too close to property line
- SPAARC members stated a general wish to move the pole north
- Applicant wishes to not block that property's garage
- SPAARC members inquired as to alternatives to protect the pole such as a pole and one bollard

- Applicant remarked a bollard takes 2' distance
- A citizen inquired as to the reasons for the poles being moved
 - Staff again details poles being replaced and adjusted 5' in height, one pole proposed to be moved due to ComEd concern of delivery trucks damaging pole all to improve better service
- Committee member asks if this is new equipment and if there will be any noise
- Applicant says this is new equipment and does not believe there will be any noise
- Dennis Marino asks if the alley will be open to traffic during the replacement and how long work will take
- The applicant says the alley will be open to traffic and the work will take 2 days—always done during the workday
- Due to the question of the north pole's location and other alternatives and agreement with the applicant coming back before SPAARC in a few weeks would not delay their project a motion was made to table the item for two weeks.

ACTION:

The Committee unanimously voted to table the item.

SPAARC

3200 Grant

Pre-Application Conference

The applicant, Presbyterian Homes, presented plans for the redevelopment of their current site which will require a Planned Development Application. The following was discussed:

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Nancy Tolan, Scott Frekes, Howard Zwell & Gary Cooper

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

- Bill Dunkley provided an overview. Presbyterian Homes proposes replacing 59 duplex cottages with 54 cottages and building a 4 story multi-family building that will contain 36 units. Due to the number of units and square footage a planned development application is required
- Nancy Tolan stated the campus is 88 years old and the present cottages do not have garages. They have held meetings with the neighbors and input from these meetings have led to the redesign presented before SPAARC. The redesign was also presented to the neighbors and was well received
- Scott Frekes stated the main differences between 2008 proposal and today's. The proposal has removed the corner lots, there is now an interior circulating road, there are 2 less units and no units outside the interior circulation road, 3 Arbor Lane is higher but now shaped like a 'wedding cake' and set back further.
- He also identified that the neighboring properties enjoyed the openness of the current setup rather than proposed landscaping
- Walter Hallen asked if any garage doors now face the street
 - While some do, they will be concealed through screening. The neighbors were more concerned with cottages outside interior street and the placement of 3 Arbor Lane further back
- Walter Hallen asked if the interior street on the east could have curves in it
- Applicant stated they are looking at it
- Dennis Marino asked if there could be a greater green space buffer in the NE corner
- Applicant stated they can consider that with a larger radius road corner

- Alderman Mark Tendem stated he has been working with them since his election and understands how much they have listened. He would like to see more green on the outside of the far eastern interior road, and concern about the time-frame completion of this project, any insight into time frame would be appreciated. And finally the neighbors are quite 'delighted' with the general idea.
- Nancy Tolan stated Presbyterian Homes would come back to neighborhood with an overall redevelopment strategy. They will work on several units at one time, when a group of properties are vacant, etc.
- Walter Hallen asked where does 3 Arbor Lane fit in the timeframe
- NT stated in the middle of the overall redevelopment. Presbyterian Homes seeks to work on interior south cottage group first.
- Dennis Marino stated his appreciation on their work so far and inquired as to when the City would receive the planned development application
- NT stated they are working on it.

No Motions are offered on Pre-Application Conferences.

Other Business:

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m. The next SPAARC meeting will take place on Wednesday, March 3, 2010 unless otherwise noted.

Respectfully submitted,
Dominick Argumedo