Zoning Board of Appeals  
Tuesday, July 17, 2018  
7:00 P.M.  
Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, James C. Lytle City Council Chambers

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES of June 19, 2018

3. OLD BUSINESS

4. NEW BUSINESS

A. 710 Main St.  
Adam Paronto, lessee, applies for a special use permit for a Type 2 Restaurant, Reprise Coffee Roasters, in the B2 Business District (Zoning Code Section 6-9-3-3). The Zoning Board of Appeals makes a recommendation to City Council, the determining body for this case.

B. 3318 Grant St.  
Phil & Marcia Vickman, property owners, apply for major zoning relief to enlarge a one-car attached garage into a two-car attached garage in the R1 Single Family Residential District. The applicants request 32.1% building lot coverage where 30% is allowed and 30.7% currently exists (Zoning Code Section 6-8-2-7), a 0.82' west interior side yard setback where 5' is required and 0.82' currently exists (Zoning Code Section 6-8-2-8-A-3), and a 26.5' rear yard setback where 30' is required and 28.7' currently exists (Zoning Code Section 6-8-2-8-A-4). The Zoning Board of Appeals is the determining body for this case.

C. 2118-2120 Ashland Ave., 1625 Payne St., & 2147-2149 Dewey Ave.  
Kathy Lichtenstein, lessee, applies for special use permits for a Daycare Center – Domestic Animal, and a Kennel, Rex’s Place, in the MXE Mixed-Use Employment District (Zoning Code Section 6-13-4-3). The applicant proposes a special use

Order & Agenda Items are subject to change. Information about the ZBA is available at:  
Questions can be directed to Melissa Klotz at 847-448-8153. The City of Evanston is committed to making all public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. Any citizen needing mobility or communications access assistance should contact the Community Development Department 48 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting so that accommodations can be made at 847-448-8153 (Voice) or 847-448-8064 (TTY).

La ciudad de Evanston está obligada a hacer accesibles todas las reuniones públicas a las personas minusválidas o las que no hablan inglés. Si usted necesita ayuda, favor de ponerse en contacto con la Oficina de Administración del Centro a 847/866-2916 (voz) o 847/448-8052 (TDD).
permit to expand the current Daycare Center – Domestic Animal at 2120 Ashland Ave. to include 2118-2120 Ashland Ave., and to include 2147 Dewey Ave. as the manager’s residence with outdoor animal space and 2149 Dewey Ave. as the business owner’s residence with outdoor animal space. The applicant also proposes a special use permit to expand the existing Kennel at 1625 Payne St. (that was previously approved as an accessory use to the Daycare Center – Domestic Animal at 2120 Ashland Ave.), and to include a Kennel at 2118 Ashland Ave. with outdoor animal space at 2147-2149 Dewey Ave. The Zoning Board of Appeals makes a recommendation to City Council, the determining body for this case.

D. 90-92 Kedzie St. 18ZMJV-0059
Matt Rodgers, zoning consultant, appeals the Zoning Administrator’s decision to deny minor zoning relief (case number 18ZMNV-0046) to construct a 6’ fence in the front yard where 6’ front yard fences are not permitted (Zoning Code Section 6-4-6-7-F). The Zoning Board of Appeals is the determining body for this case.

5. DISCUSSION

6. ADJOURNMENT

The next Zoning Board of Appeals meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, August 28, 2018 at 7:00pm in James C. Lytle City Council Chambers of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Tuesday, June 19, 2018
7:00 PM
Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Council Chambers

Members Present: Lisa Dziekan, Mary McAuley, Violetta Cullen, Kiril Mirintchev, Mary Beth Berns

Members Absent: Scott Gingold, Myrna Arevalo

Staff Present: Melissa Klotz, Scott Mangum

Presiding Member: Mary Beth Berns

Declaration of Quorum
With a quorum present, Vice Chair Cullen called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Minutes
Ms. Cullen motioned to approve the meeting minutes of May 15, 2018, which were seconded by Ms. McAuley and approved 4-0 with one abstention.

New Business
2901 Central St. ZBA 18ZMJV-0037
Kathia Jones and Ryan Jones, lessees, apply for a special use permit for a Type 2 Restaurant, Gata Bee Karma In. DBA – Gotta B Crepes, in the B1a Business District and oCSC Central Street Overlay District (Zoning Code Section 6-9-5-3). The Zoning Board of Appeals makes a recommendation to City Council, the determining body for this case.

Mr. Mangum read the case into the record.

Kathia and Ryan Jones, applicants, explained the proposal:

- Have been making crepes for 15 years
- Use locally sourced food when possible
- 12 employees; max 6 employees per shift
- 4 parking spaces; 1 is for cargo van
- Some employees use public transit
- Deliveries 3 times per week after 7am in mid to late morning
- Mostly breakfast and lunch hours, evening hours on Thursday - Sunday
- New awnings on existing frame; no other exterior changes
- Will add bench out front on private property

Deliberation:
Ms. Dziekan noted she is excited to see a current Evanston business expand and fill a space that has been vacant for at least two years. Ms. McAuley agreed.

Ms. Cullen agreed that this small business will fit in well on Central Street. Mr. Mirintchev agreed.
Chair Berns discussed hours of operation in the area, noting maximum hours of existing businesses from 6am - 11pm with most businesses closing by 10pm.

Standards:
1. Yes
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Yes
7. Yes
8. Yes
9. Yes

Ms. Dziekan motioned to recommend approval with conditions, seconded by Ms. Cullen, and unanimously recommended for approval.

1. Hours of operation shall not exceed 6am - 10pm
2. Employees shall not park in on-street metered spaces
3. Sustainability Plan
4. Substantial compliance with the documents and testimony on record.

1822 Lyons St. ZBA 18ZMJV-0047
Cooper Kerins, property owner, applies for major zoning relief to establish a third dwelling unit in an existing two-family residence in the R4 General Residential District. The applicant requests a multiple family residence on a lot width of 40’ where a lot width of 50’ is required (Zoning Code Section 6-8-5-5), a total lot size of 2,358 square feet where a lot size of 2,500 square feet per dwelling unit is required (Zoning Code Section 6-8-5-4), and the addition of zero parking spaces where 2 additional parking spaces are required (Zoning Code Section 6-16-3-5). The Zoning Board of Appeals makes a recommendation to City Council, the determining body for this case.

The applicant was not present.

750 Chicago Ave. ZBA 18ZMJV-0044
Thomas Ahleman, architect, applies for major zoning relief to establish an outdoor seating area at FireHouse Grill in the C1a Commercial Mixed-Use District. The applicant requests to eliminate two ADA parking spaces for a total of zero parking spaces where 28 parking spaces were originally required and 2 parking spaces currently exist (Zoning Code Section 6-16-3-5 Table 16B), a 3’ tall wood fence (continuous planter box) that is 1’ behind the front building facade (Chicago Ave.) where fencing must be at least 3’ behind the front building façade (Zoning Code Section 6-4-6-7-F-2-e), and an 8’ tall wood fence with a 0’ street side yard setback (Madison St.) where the maximum allowed fence height is 6’ and a 2’ street side yard setback is required (Zoning Code Section 6-4-6-7-F). The Zoning Board of Appeals makes a recommendation to City Council, the determining body for this case.

Ms. Klotz read the case into the record.
Pat Fowler, restaurant owner, explained the proposal:

- Purchased restaurant last year
- 8’ fence is needed due to fire and safety concerns and was reviewed by DAPR
- Want the taller fence to obscure the train embankment
- Currently the restaurant has seating for 100 on the first floor (second floor rarely used but for special events) and the patio holds 36. The expanded outdoor seating will increase the patio to 76 seats.
- Trash enclosure is 6’ tall and wood.

Ms. Dziekan asked how the proposed 8’ fence is keeping with the intent of the Zoning Ordinance and if there are other restaurants with similar situations that have been allowed an 8’ fence.

Chair Berns asked why additional patio seating is needed, and the applicant responded the current area is not attractive and would be better utilized as an outdoor space for more people to enjoy, and with the new residential high rises in the area there are more restaurant patrons. The applicant pointed out the site plan that shows nearby on-street ADA spaces.

Ms. Dziekan asked how most Evanston restaurants handle ADA parking and Ms. Klotz explained if a business has any on-site parking then they must provide ADA parking as well. However, many Evanston restaurants do not have any on-site parking therefore they are not required to have any ADA parking on site. Ms. Dziekan noted it seems this restaurant is being penalized for having on-site parking that limits the patio size, whereas other restaurants do not have that issue.

Ms. McAuley noted the canopy over the seating area should help mitigate noise concerns from nearby residents. Ms. Dziekan explained there is a noise concern beyond the patio - that when the front restaurant door is propped open the noise from inside travels down the Chicago Ave. corridor.

The applicant clarified:
- Restaurant and patio are open from 11:30am - 11pm at the latest.
- Will make sure not to prop the door open any more to mitigate noise from traveling out of the building.

Mary Goering, 715 Madison St., brought 2 letters from neighbors who will unable to attend; marked Neighbor Exhibits 1 and 2. The main concern is visibility from the corner - many bicyclists take this route to the lake and many children take the route to travel to Lincoln School. An 8’ fence will block visibility near the corner, which will be even more problematic when delivery trucks are there. Ms. Goering recommended improving the embankment with landscaping and/or public art instead. There are also concerns about adequate parking in the area, and often there are 4-5 vehicles parked on the property even though there are officially only 2 parking spaces.

Steve Goering, 715 Madison St. noted he recently saw a ComEd truck working that was parked in the area of the proposed fence and it had a surprisingly large impact on visibility. Mr. Garing submitted a letter Neighbor Exhibit #3.
The applicant responded they can lower the wood fence to 6’ and pull it away from the property line to increase visibility around the corner, and could add one more planter in the area instead. Ms. Klotz clarified the reduced fence size and location is code compliant if it is set 2’ north of the street side yard (Madison St.) property line.

Deliberation:
Ms. Dziekan noted it is the minimum change necessary to pull the fence 2’ away from the property line and lowering it to 6’, which would then be compliant, and asked if the patio hours should be limited to earlier than 11pm due to the noise concerns. Chair Berns suggested a condition to keep the main restaurant door closed, and that the restaurant owner will likely patrol the patio noise himself to maintain a good relationship with the neighborhood.

Ms. McAuley noted the canopy is desirable to neighboring residents since it will mitigate noise.

Chair Berns stated she is against taking away any ADA parking stalls because it marginalizes one group over another. Ms. Cullen agreed.

Standards:
1. Yes
2. Yes
3. No (Chair Berns, Ms. Cullen - since 2 ADA spaces already exist, that is the minimum change)
   Yes (Ms. McAuley, Ms. Dziekan - because most restaurants in the area do not have on-site ADA parking so it is unfair to this business. There is ADA parking on the street, one on-site, and the area is transit oriented)
4. No (Chair Berns, Ms. Cullen - because there is no practical difficulty if the patio area is not expanded)
   Yes (Ms. McAuley, Ms. Dziekan - because the additional seating is needed for the business to remain competitive and be able to grow)
5. No (Chair Berns, Ms. Cullen - because the outdoor seating benefit is at the expense of ADA individuals). Ms. McAuley suggested the applicant speak with Inclusion Solutions, a local company that finds solutions to issues such as this to find a way ADA patrons can utilize the restaurant appropriately i.e. to call ahead and have the restaurant ready with valet to park for ADA individuals.
6. No (Chair Berns, Ms. Cullen)
   Yes (Ms. Dziekan, Ms. McAuley)
7. No (Chair Berns, Ms. Cullen)
   Yes (Ms. Dziekan, Ms. McAuley)

The case was separated into 3 motions:

Ms. McAuley motioned to recommend approval of the amended site plan with 1 on-site ADA parking space, which was seconded by Ms. Dziekan and recommended for approval 3-2 with one condition, and with Chair Berns and Ms. Cullen dissenting:
1. The restaurant shall seek help from Inclusion Solutions regarding additional parking for ADA patrons.
Ms. McAuley motioned to recommend approval of the 3’ tall planter box fence, which was seconded by Ms. Dziekan and unanimously recommended for approval.

Ms. McAuley motioned to recommend denial of the 8’ wood fence, which was seconded by Ms. Dziekan and unanimously recommended for denial.

2112 Ewing Ave.
Margaret Henz, property owner, applies for major zoning relief to eliminate conditions imposed on granted variation case ZAR 01-33-M to allow the coach house to be legally occupied and rented by persons who are not members of the family occupying the principal dwelling unit (as would otherwise be allowed by City Code if not for the variation conditions) (Zoning Code Section 6-3-8-14). The Zoning Board of Appeals is the determining body for this case.

Ms. Klotz read the case into the record.

Margaret Henz, property owner, explained the request:
- **Density** - Will increase the total density of the block to 20, which is still appropriate. The Kendall College block has 19 homes with 11 coach houses, which brings the total number of families up to 30.
- **Parking** - would likely add 1 vehicle which will not change the character of the neighborhood or increase parking issues.
- There is a 2-flat on the block that is a rental and not owner occupied and has existed for over 100 years.
- The coach house is tucked in the back of a double lot and has a fence on both sides.
- If the coach house can be properly maintained due to normal rent, it will benefit the neighbor rather than the structure becoming dilapidated.
- The property is taxed as having 2 dwelling units.
- The suggested Affordability clause will reduce the property income by ⅓ even though it is fully taxed, which is a large tax burden that could then not be recouped.
- City Council unanimously approved the rental of coach houses this year, and this coach house is now the only one in Evanston that cannot be rented out due to the variation condition.
- The Affordability condition from DAPR is not what the neighborhood wants - instead it is much preferred to have a condition for Owner Occupied within one of the units instead.
- The neighborhood is expensive and the tax bill is high. At 80% AMI the rent would be $1523/month which is 66% of market value. The coach house is worth $250,000 per the tax bill.
- Property was purchased 5 years ago and is currently owner occupied. It was fine to not rent out the coach house based on the old tax bill. Now that the new tax bill reflects a second dwelling unit, the coach house needs to be rented to cover that tax. When the property was purchased it was valued at $300,000.
- For 2 weeks the previous house tenants (3 people) and the property owner lived at the property.
• Was under the impression the coach house could be rented out after a discussion with the Zoning Administrator a few months earlier.

Chair Berns asked what the public benefit is since the request will extract additional income from the property, and explained the staff recommendation to provide an affordable unit at this location is a good public benefit since there is a need for affordable housing and it is difficult to find affordable housing in the 6th Ward. The applicant responded that it would be a benefit to provide affordable housing, and is better than not being able to rent it out at all, but none of the other coach houses in the city are required to be affordable.

Chair Berns clarified the property owner received a benefit when the height variation was approved since the height allowed for a substantially larger second floor. The condition was in return for that benefit. If the condition is removed, the benefit to the property owner still exists. Chair Berns suggested the owner has an issue with the Cook County Assessor rather than the ZBA.

Ms. McAuley clarified the hardship is due to the Cook County Assessor, but getting the property reassessed due to a zoning condition is unlikely.

The property owner clarified she understands the affordable requirement, but feels this coach house is being singled out compared to other coach houses that do not have the requirement. Also, the pricing of an affordable unit is a difference of about $700 a month.

Ms. Dziekan noted this would provide a smaller housing unit in the 6th Ward, where this type of housing is not often available, which is therefore a public benefit.

Ms. McAuley noted she is troubled that staff recommended an affordable requirement be placed on this coach house when not placed on other coach houses - it seems inequitable. However, it would be great to have an affordable unit in that area.

Abbey Pruja, 2108 Ewing Ave., explained when the original variation was granted, it was explained the second story would be used as a home office or in-law apartment. It was never supposed to become a rental dwelling unit. Ms. Pruja noted she only supported the original variation because it included that condition and would never have supported it without that condition. The structure would not exist today if not for the original variation and condition.

Jeanne Laseman, 2116 Ewing Ave., supports the rental of the coach house because it is important to have this type of small and nice housing in Evanston.

Brad Knight, 2109 Forestview, stated he is against rental of the coach house, and that it is unfortunate that this issue has divided the neighborhood multiple times. The argument that this coach house should be treated the same as other coach houses in Evanston is not valid because this structure is large and imposing and was granted a variation. The windows all face away from the main house and towards Mr. Knight’s childrens’ bedroom windows instead. Mr. Knight submitted photos of the coach house from his property’s view, labeled Neighbor Exhibits 1-6.
Tanya Knight, 2109 Forestview, agreed with Mr. Knight and Ms. Prujan.

Laura Biandri, 2800 Payne, agreed that the coach house should be allowed as a rental, and noted she previously lived in a coach house elsewhere in Evanston and was very happy to be able to enjoy Evanston from that coach house.

Kinella Fabbri, 2111 Ewing agreed with Ms. Laseman in support of the rental.

Ms. Henz affirmed she only requests to rent the coach house due to the new high tax bill and recent change the City made that allows all other coach houses to be rented out. The coach house never should have been built as it was, but since it is now there, it is wasteful not to utilize it. The area is zoned R1 but there is a full rental 2-flat on the same street, and that property is not detrimental to the neighborhood. The neighbors that oppose the coach house have other houses closer to them. The property is currently listed with the coach house as having the potential to be rented, and is clarified to anyone showing serious interest in the property. One offer was received and then withdrawn once the potential buyer learned the coach house’s current status.

Deliberation:
Ms. McAuley noted this is a difficult case, and is troubling since the City recently approved the rental of all coach houses that are smaller and more affordable than other Evanston housing stock. It is understandable that someone would seek this type of housing in northwest Evanston to take advantage of the schools. It also seems reasonable of the City to require the affordable housing public benefit to encourage someone who is in need of affordable housing since there is not a lot of affordable housing in that area of the city.

Ms. Dziekan agreed, but noted she struggles with whether or not there should be an affordability clause since all other coach houses do not have that requirement. Ms. Dziekan noted her family lived in a coach house for 1.5 years in Evanston until her family was able to buy a single family home in that same neighborhood.

Chair Berns added this particular structure only exists because of the original height variation, which included the condition. Since the property owner received the benefit of constructing the building, the City should receive a benefit such as affordable housing as well. Chair Berns clarified to neighbors that any single family residence in the City can now construct a coach house and rent it out so long as they meet the zoning requirements. Since the City recently approved coach house rentals, it is appropriate to allow this coach house as a rental, and the rent basically pays the high tax bill.

Mr. Mirintchev agreed that the coach house should be a rental and affordable for 10 years since the City recently approved coach house rentals and the property owner that constructed the coach house received a benefit when the height variation was granted. Ms. Arevalo agreed.

Ms. Dziekan asked when the 10 year affordability begins, and ZBA Members agreed it starts right away, whether the structure is actually rented out or not, and sunsets 10 years from now.
Standards:
   1. Yes
   2. Yes
   3. Yes
   4. Yes
   5. Yes
   6. Yes
   7. Yes

Ms. Dziekan motioned to approve removal of the rental conditions with the new condition that the coach house shall be an 80% AMI affordable unit for 10 years.

Ms. McAuley asked if the property should be conditioned that one unit on the property be owner occupied, and ZBA Members concurred that should not be a condition. Ms. McAuley amended the current motion to include a condition to prohibit the coach house as a Vacation Rental. The amended motion was seconded by Mr. Mirintchev and unanimously approved.

1822 Lyons St.
With the applicant now present, Ms. Klotz read the case into the record.

Cooper Kerns, property owner, explained the proposal:
   ● Purchased the property with a fully finished basement set up for laundry facilities.
   ● Since the space is finished, it is a waste not to put a dwelling unit down there.
   ● Will dig down about 1 foot to achieve the necessary ceiling height, build new walls, and finish out the basement as a dwelling unit.
   ● Property is owner occupied and intends to stay that way.
   ● There is no parking on site for any of the units.
   ● Owner currently parks on Lyons or Darrow and is always able to find parking.
   ● Basement would be a 2 bedroom unit at $1200 per month (which is below the 80% AMI. Rent of the second floor unit is $1250).

Ms. McAuley stated that in her experience street parking is difficult to find on Lyons and the surrounding area. Ms. Cullen agreed, noting she lives near there.

Ms. Cullen noted this area of the city has more than its share of affordable units.

Carlis Sutton, 1821 Darrow Ave., stated it is encouraging that this property would be owner occupied, and there is one building nearby with a basement unit. However, there are three affordable buildings in the vicinity and one is extremely problematic. Parking is very difficult in the area and vehicles often block Mr. Sutton’s driveway. Recently a fire truck could not get through the street and had to back up.

Mr. Kerins noted the parking issues on Lyons stem from residents that live on Emerson St. and park on Lyons because it is not permit parking.

Deliberation:
Ms. Cullen clarified many residents in that area do not want to have to pay for permit parking, and noted there was a large drug problem on that block as little as one year ago but the area is doing much better now.

Ms. McAuley noted she is supportive of the proposal but does understand parking is a concern. Ms. Dziekan agreed, and asked if it is possible to condition the approval on the property being owner occupied.

Mr. Mangum suggested owner occupancy could be a condition included in the ZBA recommendation and then staff can confirm if the condition is legally acceptable prior to City Council.

Mr. Mirintchev noted his support for the request, even given the parking concerns. He also stated that the proposed site plan of the basement unit is not laid out well so consideration to changing the layout should be given.

Chair Berns explained her support including the owner occupancy condition.

Ms. Cullen was happy to see the building occupied since it previously sat vacant, and really likes the owner occupancy because that is what keeps bad tenants who sell or buy drugs away.

Standards:
1. Yes
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Yes
7. Yes

Ms. Cullen motioned to recommend approval with conditions, which was seconded by Ms. Dziekan and unanimously recommended for approval:
1. Basement unit shall be an affordable unit for 10 years at 80% AMI.
2. Property shall be owner occupied for 10 years.
3. City Council should explore making Lyons and/or surrounding streets permit parking zones.

Other Business
There was no other business.

Discussion
There was no additional discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 9:54pm.
710 Main St.
18ZMJV-0055

ZBA Recommending Body
Memorandum

To: Members of the Zoning Board of Appeals
From: Johanna Leonard, Director of Community Development
       Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Administrator
       Cindy Plante, Economic Development Coordinator

Subject: 710 Main St. – ZBA 18ZMJV-0055
          ZBA Recommending Body
          City Council Determining Body

Date: July 13, 2018

Notice – Published in the June 21, 2018 Evanston Review:
Adam Paronto, lessee, applies for a special use permit for a Type 2 Restaurant, Reprise Coffee Roasters, in the B2 District (Zoning Code Section 6-9-3-3). The Zoning Board of Appeals makes a recommendation to City Council, the determining body for this case.

Recommendation
City Staff and DAPR recommend approval for a special use permit for a Type 2 Restaurant, Reprise Coffee Roasters in the B2 District and oDM Dempster-Main Overlay District. The applicant has complied with all zoning requirements, and meets all of the standards of a special use for this district.

Site Background
710 Main St. is located on the south side of Main Street, between Custer Street and Sherman Avenue in the B2 Business District. It is immediately surrounded by the following zoning districts:

North: B2 & oDM Business District, Dempster-Main Overlay District
South: R4 Residential District
East: B2 & oDM Business District, Dempster-Main Overlay District
West: B2 & oDM Business District, Dempster-Main Overlay District

Currently empty, the 710 Main Street storefront was most recently occupied by a toy store.
Proposal
The applicant proposes to operate Reprise Coffee Roasters, a Type 2 restaurant, at 710 Main Street. The Zoning Ordinance defines a Type 2 restaurant as:

An establishment in which the principal use is the service of prepared food and/or beverages for consumption on and/or off the premises and that is not a "restaurant, type 1" as defined herein. This definition shall not include establishments where incidental prepared food and beverage service is accessory to a bakery, food establishment, convenience store, food store establishment, meat market, or similar principal use nor shall it include cafeterias that are accessory to hospitals, colleges, universities, schools or other similar principal uses. (Ord. 9-0-10)

The business proposed for 710 Main Street will be the third location for Reprise Coffee, which has other shops located in Lake Forest and Winnetka. The proposed menu consists of coffee and other beverages as well as retail sale of coffee beans and bakery items prepared off site. The applicant is proposing to operate seven days a week, from 6am to 5pm on weekdays, and from 7am-6pm on weekends.

Proposed Floor Plan:

![Proposed Floor Plan](image)

The total staff roster is expected to include 5 or 6 people, with 2-3 working at any given time. Employees will be encouraged to walk, bike or use transit; any employees who drive will park at the rear of the building. The rear entrance and alley will also be used for supply deliveries.

Ordinances Identified for Requested Relief:
The following uses may be allowed in the B2 Business District, subject to the provisions set forth in Section 6-9-3-3, “Special Uses,” of this Title:
Type 2 Restaurant (among other listed uses)

Comprehensive Plan:
The Evanston Comprehensive General Plan encourages the utilization of vacant storefronts along existing commercial corridors that can add sales tax revenue and encourage economic vitality. The Comprehensive Plan specifically includes:

Objective: Promote the growth and redevelopment of business, commercial, and industrial areas.

Objective: Retain and attract businesses in order to strengthen Evanston’s economic base.

Reprise Coffee will use a currently vacant commercial space to open a locally owned and operated business that will draw additional foot traffic to Main Street.

Design and Project Review (DAPR) Discussion and Recommendation:
On June 27, 2018 the Design and Project Review Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Special Use Standards:
For the ZBA to recommend that City Council grant a special use, the ZBA must find that the proposed special use:

a) Is one of the listed special uses for the zoning district in which the property lies;
   Type 2 restaurants are allowed under the special use section for the B2 district.

b) Complies with the purposes and the policies of the Comprehensive General Plan and the Zoning ordinance;

The use is compliant with the Zoning ordinance and the Comprehensive General Plan because the project promotes growth and redevelopment of business and a commercial area, in addition to attracting business in order to strengthen Evanston’s economic base.

c) Does not cause a negative cumulative effect in combination with existing special uses or as a category of land use;

Staff has not received any comments opposing the project, and it is complementary to nearby commercial and residential uses.

d) Does not interfere with or diminish the value of property in the neighborhood;

The proposed business would occupy a vacant space, which would add to the value of the property and the neighborhood and draw additional foot traffic to neighboring businesses.

e) Is adequately served by public facilities and services;

The building is served by adequate sidewalks, streets, two metered surface parking lots, and close proximity to both CTA and Metra stations, as well as Divvy Bike Share.

f) Does not cause undue traffic congestion;

The business location adjacent to CTA and Metra facilities as well as on and off-street
parking make it reasonable to expect minimal impact to traffic in the area.

g) Preserves significant historical and architectural resources;
The site itself is not a landmark or otherwise historically or architecturally significant building, and alterations to the exterior are expected to be minimal.

h) Preserves significant natural and environmental resources; and
No significant natural or environmental resources exist on site. The sustainability practices worksheet submitted provided for garbage, recycling and composting, as well as use of reusable flatware and straws.

i) Complies with all other applicable regulations.
The project complies with all other applicable regulations to move forward with the next steps in the special use process.

Attachments
Special Use Application – submitted June 6, 2018
Business Summary
Sustainability Practices Worksheet
Plat of Survey
Image of Property
Aerial View of Property
Zoning Map of Property
DAPR Meeting Minutes Excerpt – June 27, 2018
### Formstack Submission For: Zoning Special Use
Submitted at 06/06/18 3:59 PM

| Address: | 710 Main St  
|          | Evanston, IL 60202 |
| Permanent Identification Number (PIN) 1: | 60202 |
| Permanent Identification Number (PIN) 2: |  |
| Name: | Adam Paronto |
| Organization: | Reprise Coffee Roasters |
| Address: | 710 Main St  
|          | Evanston, IL 60202 |
| Home or Office Phone Number: | (847) 951-0419 |
| Cell Phone Number: |  |
| Email: | adam@reprisecoffee.com |
| Please choose primary means of contact: | Home or Office Phone |
| Is applicant also the property owner?: | No |
| Name: | Shaun Chinsky |

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&amp;k=4762073d7a&amp;jsver=etgpxYX_4_c.en&amp;ui=2&amp;fs=y&amp;tf=0&pli=1&amp;continuation=D2OyegQFADgA%3D%3D&amp;pli=1&amp;gti=0&tbm=sa&source=mf&client=chrome&retored=gb&followup_session_id=180524.11_p15&search=pt&search_inbox=163d6e566c67bd4d&
Organization: GTC, Main Street, Inc

Address: 714 Main St
          Evanston, IL 60202

Home or Office Phone Number:

Cell Phone Number: (847) 854-0001

Email: shaun@gtcmain.com

What is the relationship of the applicant to the property owner?: Lessee

Briefly describe the proposed Special Use: Opening a Coffee Shop on 710 Main St. We need to add a bathroom and a bar.

Is the requested special use one of the special uses specifically listed in the Zoning Ordinance? What section of the Zoning Ordinance lists your proposed use as an allowed special use in the zoning district in which the subject property lies?: Zone 2 Restaurant

Will the requested special use interfere with or diminish the value of property in the neighborhood? Will it cause a negative cumulative effect on the neighborhood?: No. It will increase property value.

Will the requested special use be adequately served by public facilities and services?: Yes

Will the requested special use cause undue traffic congestion?: No

Will the requested special use preserve significant historical and architectural resources?: Yes

Will the requested special use preserve significant natural and environmental features?: Yes

Will the requested special use comply with all other applicable regulations of the district in which it is located and other applicable ordinances, except
to the extent such regulations have been modified through the planned development process or the grant of a variation?:

Is applicant acting as an agent or designee for the proposed user of the land for which this application for zoning relief is made?:

Yes

List the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of the proposed user of the land.: Adam Paronto, 710 Main St. Evanston IL 60202, (847) 951-0419

Does the proposed land user own or control the land for which this application for zoning relief is made?:

No

List the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of the person or entity that has constructive control of the proposed land user.: Shaun Chinsky, shaun@glcmain.com 714 Main St. Evanston 60202, (847) 864-0001

Does the proposed land user hold the title to the subject property?:

Yes

Is the person or entity that holds the title the same as the one listed in the previous question?:

List the name, address, phone, fax, and other contact information of the person or entity holding the title to the subject property.: Reprise Coffee, LLC 33678 N Lake Shore Dr. Grayslake IL 60030

Is the Applicant or Proposed Land User a Corporation?:

Yes

A. Names and addresses of all officers and directors.: Reprise Coffee, LLC 33678 N Lake Shore Dr. Grayslake IL 60030

B. Names, addresses, and percentage of interest of all shareholders. If there are fewer than 33 shareholders, or shareholders holding 3% or more of the ownership interest in the corporation or if there are more than 33 shareholders.: 100%
mortgage, contract to purchase, closing documents, etc.:

Document Submitted: Jesse White Proof of Ownership

Quantity: 1

Price: 660

Credit Card: **********0024

Card Verification Code: ***

Expiration Date: Apr 2021

I certify that all of the above information and all statements, information, and exhibits that I am submitting in conjunction with this application are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

[Signature]

Direct Link to Image
Reprise Coffee Roasters
710 Main Street Evanston, IL

Summary of Business Operations

Store Hours

*Monday-Friday: 6am-7pm*

*Saturday & Sunday: 7am-6pm*

Employee Logistics

There will be 2 employees on staff per shift. One employee will commute via bicycle/walking and the other will occupy the allocated parking space behind the shop.

Incoming deliveries will occur through the front door of the shop (i.e. UPS & Milk Delivery 1/week)

We plan to implement composting and recycling as allowed by the city’s infrastructure.
Sustainability Practices for Type 2 Restaurants

The City of Evanston prides itself on its commitment to environmental excellence through outstanding and innovative sustainability practices that promote a positive example throughout the community.

Environmental sustainability may be promoted in a variety of ways. In an effort to ensure Type 2 Restaurants do not negatively impact the environment, the following sustainable practices are suggested:

**Litter Collection Plan:**
The applicant shall implement and adhere to a Litter Collection Plan requiring the policing of an area located within a two hundred fifty-foot (250') radius of the space in which the use is located. This area shall be patrolled once every three (3) hours during the hours the use is in operation, and shall be kept free of all litter of any type emanating from any source. For the purpose of this requirement, “litter” shall include, but is not limited to: putrescible animal and vegetable waste resulting from the handling, preparation, cooking, and consumption of food; other putrescible waste, including animal waste, dead animals, yard clippings and leaves; nonputrescible solid waste, including rubbish, ashes, abandoned automobiles, solid waste, paper, polystyrene, wrappings, cigarettes, cardboard, tin cans, glass, bedding, and similar materials; and all other waste material which, if thrown or deposited as herein prohibited, may create a danger to public health, safety, or welfare.

**Litter Pick-Up Plan:**
The applicant shall provide and maintain exterior litter receptacles such as dumpsters, in sufficient number and type to adequately contain all litter collected pursuant to the Litter Collection Plan. Collections shall be a minimum of three (3) times a week, including collections on Sundays to the extent necessary to comply with this condition. All litter receptacles shall be maintained in clean condition with tight-fitting lids, and shall be placed on Code-compliant surfaces at the rear of the property or in an otherwise City-approved location. Within seven (7) days of written notice from the City, the number of litter receptacles and/or the number of collections from each shall be modified or increased as necessary.

**Customer Recycling:**
The applicant shall provide recycling receptacles within the space in which the use is located and shall be available for customer use. The recycling receptacles shall be maintained and emptied as necessary to ensure adequate recycling receptacles are available for use during the hours the use is in operation. Recycling containers shall be co-located with garbage containers and labeled for recycling.
Business Recycling:
The applicant shall provide recycling receptacles within the kitchen area and shall recycle restaurant waste including, but not limited to, cardboard and paper products.

Tap Water:
The applicant shall make tap water available to all customers and provide appropriate signage indicating the availability of tap water.

Reusable Flatware and Dishware:
The applicant shall provide reusable flatware and dishware to customers who opt to eat on premises.

100% Recyclable Carry-Out Packaging:
The applicant shall utilize 100% recyclable packaging for all carry-out/delivery orders. Note: Evanston’s solid waste hauler Groot Industries recycles rigid plastic numbers 1-5 and 7. Plastic number 6 (rigid or foam) is not recyclable in Evanston’s program even though it has the recycling symbol. See attached recycling flyer for details.

Delivery Method:
When possible, the applicant shall utilize environmentally friendly modes of transportation, such as bicycle delivery, when transporting delivery orders to customers.

Other Environmentally-Friendly/Sustainable Practices

Direct Trade & Translucent Coffee Buying - Better than Fair Trade practices with an emphasis on sustainability - utilizing our partner in Nicaragua - Gold Mountain Coffee Growers, winner of the 2016 Sustainability Award for best agricultural and organic practices in the coffee industry - bar none.

Reusable Straws & Returnable Silverware to Cut Plastic Out.

I certify that I have checked the appropriate boxes that best describe the sustainability practices that will be adhered to at the Type 2 Restaurant in question.

6/13/18

[Signature]
Applicant Signature

[Date]
Date
PLAT OF SURVEY

Lot 3 (except the East 23.0 feet thereof) and all of Lot 4 in Block 1 in Adam's and Brown's Addition to Evanston, in the North half of the North half of the Southwest quarter of Section 19, Township 31 North, Range 14 East of the Third Principal Meridian, in the City of Evanston, Cook County, Illinois.

Line 60.0 feet South (record) of the North line of Main Street as per City Survey of 1895, 30.0 feet South of the East/West line from old stone monument at East line of the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad, to the West quarter corner of Section 19-41-14.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
COUNTY OF COOK

CITORBA, SPIES, GUSTAFSON & CO.
CONSULTING ENGINEERS—LAND SURVEYORS
1216 CENTRAL AVENUE
WILMETTE, ILLINOIS 60091

ILLINOIS REGISTERED LAND SURVEYOR NO. 36-407

SIGNATURES:

RECORDING OFFICER, OAKTON 9-30-77
DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE ABOVE DESCRIBED PROPERTY HAS BEEN SURVEYED UNDER MY SUPERVISION, IN THE MANNER REPRESENTED ON THE PLAT HEREON DRAWN.

DIMENSIONS ARE SHOWN IN FEET AND DECIMAL PARTS THEREOF.

WILMETTE, ILLINOIS — May 31st 1977

ILLINOIS REGISTERED LAND SURVEYOR

SCALE: 1" = 20'
This map is not a plat of survey. This map is provided "as is" without warranties of any kind. See [www.cityofevanston.org/mapdisclaimers.html](http://www.cityofevanston.org/mapdisclaimers.html) for more information.
DESIGN AND PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DAPR) MINUTES
June 27, 2018


Staff Present:

Others Present:

Presiding Member: J. Leonard

A quorum being present, Ms. Leonard called the meeting to order at 2:32 pm.

Approval of Minutes
June 20th, 2018 DAPR committee meeting minutes.

Ms. Biggs makes a motion to approve the minutes from June 20th, 2018, seconded by Mr. Nelson.

The Committee voted, 9-0, to approve the minutes of June 20th, 2018, with two abstentions.

New Business

2. 710 Main Street Recommendation to ZBA
Adam Paronto, applicant, submits for special use permit to establish a type-2 restaurant, Reprise Coffee Roasters, in the B2 Business District and oDM Dempster Main Overlay District.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Adam Paronto, applicant

DISCUSSION:
- Intent is to put in an extra restroom and a coffee bar with sale of cafe items produced at another location, with seating and improved aesthetics
- Ms. Leonard asked about recycling compartments
- Mr. Jensen asked about composting. The applicant is exploring composting.
- Mr. Mangum asked about hours of operation and number of employees per shift. The applicant stated 5-6 a.m. opening and 5-6 p.m. closing times anticipated with 3 employees per shift
- Mr. Jensen asked if there were any interior work that was needed
- Mr. Mangum asked if they anticipated any outdoor seating
- Mr. Gerdes noted that outdoor seating and signage require separate approvals
Mr. Gerdes made a motion to recommend approval of the project to ZBA, seconded by Ms. Biggs.

The Committee voted, 11-0, to recommend approval of the project to ZBA
3318 Grant St.
18ZMJV-0054

ZBA Determining Body
To: Members of the Zoning Board of Appeals
From: Johanna Leonard, Director of Community Development
      Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Administrator
      Melissa Klotz, Zoning Planner
Subject: 3318 Grant St - ZBA 18ZMJV-0054
         ZBA Determining Body
Date: July 12, 2018

Notice - Published in the June 28, 2018 Evanston Review
Phil and Marcia Vickman, property owners, apply for major zoning relief to enlarge an existing one-car garage to a two-car garage in the R1 Single-Family Residential District. The applicant requests to allow 32.1% building lot coverage where 30% is allowed (Zoning Code Section 6-8-2-7), a rear yard setback of 26.5' where a minimum of 30' is allowed (Zoning Code Section 6-8-2-8-A), and an interior side yard setback of .82' where a minimum of 5' is allowed (Zoning Code Section 6-8-2-8-A). The Zoning Board of Appeals is the determining body for this case.

On July 2, 2018, the applicant submitted revised plans that propose the same variations, but reduce the impervious surface on the property and add drainage measures as requested by DAPR.

Recommendation
City staff and DAPR recommend approval of major zoning relief to enlarge an existing one-car garage to a two-car garage with 32.1% building lot coverage, a 26.5' rear yard setback, and a .82' interior side yard setback in the R1 Single Family Residential District. The applicant has complied with all other zoning requirements and meets all of the standards for major variations for this district.

Site Background
3318 Grant St. is located on the south side of Grant St. adjacent to the alley between Prospect Ave. and Crawford Ave. The property is located in the R1 Single-Family Residential District, and is surrounded by the following:

  North: R1 Single-Family Residential District
  East:  R1 Single-Family Residential District
  South: R1 Single-Family Residential District
  West:  R2 Single-Family Residential District
The property features a single family residence with an attached garage and is surrounded by similar single family residences.

Property History
In 1999, the current property owners submitted for major zoning relief to connect an existing one-car detached garage to the house. The property owners proposed a one-story addition at the front of the residence, and a 15' x 22' two-story addition at the rear of the house to connect to the existing detached garage. Relief was needed for the rear addition due to the existing location of the garage, which featured an existing nonconforming .82' side yard setback where 3' was required, and complied with the required 3' rear yard setback. By connecting the garage, the relief was needed for a .82' side yard setback where 5' was required (as part of the principal structure) and a 28' rear yard setback where 30' was required (as part of the principal structure). The garage itself was not enlarged. Relief was granted by the ZBA on November 23, 1999 (documents attached for reference).

Proposal
The property owners now request to enlarge the attached garage to create a two-car garage. The existing garage features a parking area of 12' x 27' with a vehicular door facing north. The proposed garage expansion creates a parking area of 19' x 19' plus a 10' x 12' area within the garage where it connects to the house. The property owners propose to remove the existing vehicular door that faces north and establish a solid wall facing north, remove portions of the west wall that faces the alley to add a double vehicular door with entry from the west, and remove the south and east walls to enlarge the garage space towards the east and south.

The enlarged garage aligns with the existing west wall that is .82' from the west side (alley) property line, which therefore requires zoning relief since a 5' (principal structure) setback is required. The enlarged garage extends further into the rear yard (principal structure) setback as well, so relief is requested for a 26.5' rear yard setback where 28.7' rear yard setback currently exists and a 30' setback is required.

Although the impervious surface coverage is compliant, the DAPR Committee was concerned about stormwater runoff since the proposed expansion is so close to the alley property line. The alley is improved with concrete and is at a higher elevation than the 3318 Grant St. property, so additional
stormwater runoff from the larger garage will likely pitch towards the house and could create flooding issues. The applicant submitted a revised site plan that removed the existing driveway entrance that is north of the garage, and now proposes French drains from the garage roof into the side yard in front of the garage, and into the rear yard.

The property owners feel an attached garage is necessary, and constructing a compliant detached garage instead of a larger attached garage would be a substantial hardship. The owners feel the hardship was not self-created because when the existing garage was originally built as a detached garage, it was not set back appropriately from the property line. Additionally, the property owners note garbage trucks frequently cut the corner of their property to make the alley turn so a garage could not be constructed in the southwest rear corner of the property, and there are mature trees in the way of any other compliant detached garage locations. The owners do not want to propose an alternative attached garage that is moved further east because an existing door on the house is in the way, and the garage would block the view to the rear yard.

Zoning staff feels there are compliant alternatives available. The rear yard could accommodate at least a one-car detached garage, and likely a two-car garage. A detached garage must be at least 3’ from all side and rear property lines, and can be set back further if needed, so garbage trucks could still make the alley turn with a garage in that vicinity. The property immediately south of 3318 Grant St. features a detached garage at the rear of the property very close to the alley intersection. Additionally, staff feels there is no hardship other than the self-created attached garage setback. The lot is substandard in size at 6,173 sq. ft. so the building lot coverage variation may be appropriate, though the proposed garage features a 10’ x 12’ area that is currently used for parking, but would not be in the proposed garage. For this reason, the proposed configuration is not the minimum change necessary.

The property owners did not work with staff to explore compliant alternatives or minimize variations. The owners did revise the site plan to address drainage concerns stated at DAPR. City staff is not aware of any objections to the proposal.

**Ordinances Identified for Requested Relief**

6-8-2 R1 Single Family Residential District

6-8-2-7 Building Lot Coverage: The maximum lot coverage in the R1 District is 30%.
6-8-2-8 Yard Requirements:

3. Side yard – 5’
4. Rear yard – 30’

**Design and Project Review Committee (DAPR) Discussion and Recommendation**

June 27, 2018 – The DAPR Committee voiced concern about the location of gutters and direction of stormwater runoff near the property line since the proposed addition is so close to the alley, and recommended the applicant explore a different roof style, improved drainage measures, and reducing unnecessary impervious areas. Additionally, staff noted the proposal is not the minimum deviation from the applicable regulations since a detached garage could be compliantly located on the property.

July 11, 2018 – The applicant explained the revised proposal that eliminated the existing driveway to reduce the impervious surface coverage, and the addition of French drains in
the side and rear yards. The City’s Drainage Engineer agreed that the proposed changes mitigate drainage concerns. The Zoning Administrator noted a variation was granted to the same property owner in 1999 to attach the existing one-car garage to the house, therefore the property owner created the hardship. Recommendation: Approval 7-3 (nays: Community Development Director, Zoning Administrator, Zoning Planner).

Variation Standards
For a variation to be recommended for approval, the ZBA must find that the proposed variation:

1. Will not have a substantial adverse impact on the use, enjoyment or property values of adjoining properties: Since the west interior side yard and rear yard both abut the alley, there is no substantial adverse impact on surrounding properties.
2. Is in keeping with the intent of the zoning ordinance: The property features an average sized rear yard with alley access that could easily accommodate a detached two-car garage that complies with the Zoning Ordinance, so the variations are unnecessary. Standard not met.
3. Has a hardship or practical difficulty that is peculiar to the property: The property is substandard in lot size. However, the rear yard is large enough to accommodate a detached garage. Standard not met.
4. Property owner would suffer a particular hardship or practical difficulty as distinguished from a mere inconvenience: While a detached garage may be less convenient for the property owner, there is no hardship or practical difficulty suffered. Standard not met.
5. Is not based exclusively upon a desire to extract additional income from the property or public benefit to the whole will be derived: The applicant does not intend to sell the property following construction.
6. Does not have a hardship or practical difficulty that was created by any person having an interest in the property: The property originally featured a one-car detached garage. The current property owners were granted zoning relief in 1999 to attach that garage to the house. Since the property owners established the increased nonconformity via the granted variation in 1999, the property owners created their own hardship for the current proposal to enlarge the garage. Standard not met.
7. Is limited to the minimum change necessary to alleviate the particular hardship or practical difficulty: The minimum change necessary would be to construct a detached garage in a compliant location at the rear of the property.

Attachments
Variation Application – submitted June 5, 2018
Zoning Analysis
Plat of Survey
Site Plans & Elevations – revised July 2, 2018
1999 Variation Summary
Image of Property
Aerial View of Property
Zoning Map of Property
DAPR Meeting Minutes Excerpt – June 27, 2018
DAPR Draft Meeting Minutes Excerpt– July 11, 2018
MAJOR VARIATION
APPLICATION
CASE # 18ZMJV-0054

1. PROPERTY

Address: 3318 Grant Street
Permanent Identification Number(s):
PIN 1: 10-11-314-009-0000 PIN 2: [blank] (Note: An accurate plat of survey for all properties that are subject to this application must be submitted with the application.)

2. APPLICANT

Name: Phil and Marcia Vickman
Organization: N/A
Address: 3318 Grant Street
City, State, Zip: Evanston, Illinois
Phone: Work: 847-682-5447 Home: Cell/Other: 847-682-5447
Fax: Work: Home:
E-mail: mhvickman@att.net

What is the relationship of the applicant to the property owner?

☑ same ☐ builder/contractor ☐ potential purchaser ☐ potential lessee
☐ architect ☐ attorney ☐ lessee ☐ real estate agent
☐ officer of board of directors ☐ other:

Please circle the primary means of contact.

3. PROPERTY OWNER (Required if different than applicant. All property owners must be listed and must sign below.)

Name(s) or Organization:
Address:
City, State, Zip:
Phone: Work: Home: Cell/Other:
Fax: Work: Home:
E-mail:

"By signing below, I give my permission for the Applicant named above to act as my agent in all matters concerning this application. I understand that the Applicant will be the primary contact for information and decisions during the processing of this application, and I may not be contacted directly by the City of Evanston. I understand as well that I may change the Applicant for this application at any time by contacting the Zoning Office in writing."

Property Owner(s) Signature(s) -- REQUIRED Date

4. SIGNATURE

"I certify that all of the above information and all statements, information and exhibits that I am submitting in conjunction with this application are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge."

Applicant Signature -- REQUIRED Date
5. REQUIRED DOCUMENTS AND MATERIALS

The following are required to be submitted with this application:

☐ (This) Completed and Signed Application Form
✓ Plat of Survey Date of Survey: January 4, 2018
✓ Project Site Plan Date of Drawings: May 1, 2018
✓ Plan or Graphic Drawings of Proposal (If needed, see notes)
✓ Non-Compliant Zoning Analysis
✓ Proof of Ownership Document Submitted: Deed
✓ Application Fee (see zoning fees) Amount $385 plus Deposit Fee $150

Note: Incomplete applications will not be accepted. Although some of these materials may be on file with another City application, individual City applications must be complete with their own required documents.

Plat of Survey
(1) One copy of plat of survey, drawn to scale, that accurately reflects current conditions.

Site Plan
(1) One copy of site plan, drawn to scale, showing all dimensions.

Plan or Graphic Drawings of Proposal
A Major Variance application requires graphic representations for any elevated proposal—garages, home additions, roofed porches, etc. Applications for a/c units, driveways, concrete walks do not need graphic drawings; their proposed locations on the submitted site plan will suffice.

Proof of Ownership
Accepted documents for Proof of Ownership include: a deed, mortgage, contract to purchase, closing documents (price may be blacked out on submitted documents).
• Tax bill will not be accepted as Proof of Ownership.

Non-Compliant Zoning Analysis
This document informed you that the proposed project is non-compliant with the Zoning Code and is eligible to apply for a major variance.

Application Fee
* IMPORTANT NOTE: Except for owner-occupied residents in districts R1, R2 & R3, a separate application fee will be assessed for each variation requested.

The fee application fee depends on your zoning district (see zoning fees). Acceptable forms of payment are: Cash, Check, or Credit Card.
6. PROPOSED PROJECT

A. Briefly describe the proposed project:

The Applicant seeks to enlarge an existing one-car garage to a two-car garage.

B. Have you applied for a Building Permit for this project?  
☑ NO  ☐ YES
(Date Applied: ______________ Building Permit Application #: ______________)

REQUESTED VARIATIONS

What specific variations are you requesting?  For each variation, indicate (A) the specific section of the Zoning Ordinance that identifies the requirement, (B) the requirement (minimum or maximum) from which you seek relief, and (C) the amount of the exception to this requirement you request the City to grant.
(See the Zoning Analysis Summary Sheet for your project's information)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Section</th>
<th>(B) Requirement to be Varied</th>
<th>(C) Requested Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ex. “6-8-3-4”)</td>
<td>(ex. “requires a minimum front yard setback of 27 feet”)</td>
<td>(ex. “a front yard setback of 25.25 feet”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-2-7</td>
<td>Maximum permitted amount of building lot coverage is 30%; existing is 30.7%; proposed is 32.1%</td>
<td>Permit lot coverage of 32.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For multiple variations, see “IMPORTANT NOTE” under “Application Fee & Transcript Deposit” on Page 2.

| 2 |
| 6-8-2-8-A-3 | Minimum required rear yard setback is 30'; existing is 28.7'; proposed is 26.5' | Permit proposed reduction in rear yard from the required 30' to the proposed 26.5 feet |

| 3 |
| 6-3-8-12 | As proposed, approval of a major variation is required due to the proposed setback from the west interior side yard property line, the deviation from the standard is greater than 35% | Permit the proposed interior side yard setback of 0.82 feet (reduced from the required 5.0') |
B. A variation's purpose is to provide relief from specified provisions of the zoning ordinance that may unduly impact property due to the property's particular peculiarity and special characteristics. What characteristics of your property prevent compliance with the Zoning Ordinance requirements?

The property is an existing, owner-occupied home, with an existing garage. In order for the owners to use the property effectively, they would like to expand the existing garage. Expansion of the existing garage requires the proposed variances because of the particular peculiarity of the home and its orientation on the property.

1. The requested variation will not have a substantial adverse impact on the use, enjoyment, or property values of adjoining (touching or joining at any point, line, or boundary) properties.

The proposed variation will not have a substantial adverse impact on the use, enjoyment of property values of adjoining properties. The proposed enlarged garage will extend less than 7 feet east of the current location of the eastern wall, and will maintain substantial separation from the eastern neighbor. The proposed variation is to legalize an existing condition as to the western wall of the garage.

2. The property owner would suffer a particular hardship or practical difficulty as distinguished from a mere inconvenience if the strict letter of the regulations were to be carried out.

The property owner would suffer a particular hardship or practical difficulty if the strict letter of the regulations were to be carried out. The property owner would have to demolish and reconstruct the garage 4.18 feet west of its current location. This is distinguished from a mere inconvenience.

3. Either

(a) the purpose of the variation is not based exclusively upon a desire to extract income from the property, or

(b) while the granting of the variation will result in additional income to the applicant and while the applicant for the variation may not have demonstrated that the application is not based exclusively upon a desire to extract additional income from the property, the Zoning Board of Appeals or the City Council, depending upon final jurisdiction under §6-3-8-2, has found that public benefits to the surrounding neighborhood and the City as a whole will be derived from approval of the variation, that include, but are not limited to any of the standards of §6-3-6-3.

The purpose of the variation is based on a desire to use the existing home/garage more effectively. Granting the variation will not result in any additional income to the Applicant as they intend to continue living on the subject property.

4. The alleged difficulty or hardship has not been self-created, if so, please explain.

The alleged difficulty or hardship has not been self-created as the home was existing when the applicants purchased the property. The location of the existing garage is a result of the original location of the principal structure. Relocating the garage to the rear of the lot and providing access there, would require additional paving to establish access, as the garage is set back significantly from the rear property line. This would be a detriment to drainage in the area and may impact the adjacent neighbors. Instead, using the current access from the alley avoids unnecessarily paving a larger proportion of the lot and allows the applicant to impact the neighborhood as minimally as possible by maintaining access on the shared alley to the west of the home.
5. Have other alternatives been considered, and if so, why would they not work?
Because the existing rear wall of the garage is set back 26.5 feet from the rear property line, accessing the garage from the rear would require paving a large proportion of the rear yard. This would cover permeable surface area of the lot and would be detrimental to the surrounding neighborhood. For this reason, access from the side is necessary. Furthermore, parking is not permitted within any yards, so the garage must be expanded to accommodate the additional desired parking space.

City of Evanston
DISCLOSURE STATEMENT FOR ZONING HEARINGS
(This form is required for all Major Variances and Special Use Applications)

The Evanston City Code, Title 1, Chapter 18, requires any persons or entities who request the City Council to grant zoning amendments, variations, or special uses, including planned developments, to make the following disclosures of information. The applicant is responsible for keeping the disclosure information current until the City Council has taken action on the application. For all hearings, this information is used to avoid conflicts of interest on the part of decision-makers.

1. If applicant is an agent or designee, list the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of the proposed user of the land for which this application for zoning relief is made:
   Does not apply.
   
   N/A

   

2. If a person or organization owns or controls the proposed land user, list the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of person or entity having constructive control of the proposed land user. Same as number _____ above, or indicated below. (An example of this situation is if the land user is a division or subsidiary of another person or organization.)

   N/A

   

3. List the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of person or entity holding title to the subject property. Same as number _____ above, or indicated below.
   Marcia and Phil Vickman, 3318 Grant Street, Evanston, Illinois 60201; 847-682-8447
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4. List the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of person or entity having constructive control of the subject property. Same as number _____ above, or indicated below.

If Applicant or Proposed Land User is a Corporation

Any corporation required by law to file a statement with any other governmental agency providing substantially the information required below may submit a copy of this statement in lieu of completing a and b below.

a. Names and addresses of all officers and directors.
   N/A

b. Names, addresses, and percentage of interest of all shareholders. If there are fewer than 33 shareholders, or shareholders holding 3% or more of the ownership interest in the corporation or if there are more than 33 shareholders.

If Applicant or Proposed Land User is not a Corporation

Name, address, percentage of interest, and relationship to applicant, of each partner, associate, person holding a beneficial interest, or other person having an interest in the entity applying, or in whose interest one is applying, for the zoning relief.

N/A
Zoning Analysis
Summary

Case Number: 17ZONA-0303 – 3318 GRANT STREET
Case Status/Determination: NON-COMPLIANT

Proposal:
ENLARGE EXISTING 1-CAR ATTACHED GARAGE TO A 2-CAR ATTACHED GARAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Section</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposed site plan shows existing roofed rear porches not indicated as such on the plat of survey.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-2-7</td>
<td>Non-compliant: Maximum permitted amount of building lot coverage is 30%; existing is 30.7%, proposed is 32.1%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-2-8-A-3</td>
<td>Non-compliant: Minimum required interior side yard setback is 5'; existing is 0.82, proposed is 0.82. For existing structure non-compliant as to bulk, any addition whether horizontal or vertical is required to comply with current standards, Section 6-6-5-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-2-8-A-4</td>
<td>Non-compliant: Minimum required rear yard setback is 30'; existing is 28.7', proposed is 26.5'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building elevation drawing notes the existing roof overhang is 4.5&quot; (0.38') with an existing 0.44' setback from the west interior property line. Where an existing roof overhang is non-compliant concerning a setback, the overhang on the addition may be constructed to match the existing roof overhang provided that such projection does not encroach upon an adjacent property line.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-3-8-12</td>
<td>As proposed, approval of a major variation is required due to the proposed setback from the west interior side yard property line, the deviation from the standard is greater than 35%. Major variations are heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals. Variations may or may not be approved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updated 7/6/18 Mehne Klotz
City of Evanston
ZONING ANALYSIS REVIEW SHEET

APPLICATION STATUS: December 14, 2017
RESULTS OF ANALYSIS: Non-Compliant

Z.A. Number: 17ZONA-0303
Address: 3318 GRANT ST
Applicant: Nancy Schlosberg
Phone: 

Purpose: Zoning Analysis without Bld Permit App
District: R1
Overlay: None
Preservation: Not Within
Reviewer: Michael Griffith

THIS APPLICATION PROPOSES (select all that apply):
New Principal Structure
New Accessory Structure
X Addition to Structure
Alteration to Structure
Retention of Structure

ANALYSIS BASED ON:
Sidewalk Cafe
Change of Use
Retention of Use
Other
Plans Dated: 12-14-17
Prepared By: S2 ARCHITECTS
Survey Dated: 01-04-18
Existing Improvements: SFR WITH ATTACHED GARAGE

Proposal Description:
ENLARGE EXISTING 1-CAR ATTACHED GARAGE TO A 2-CAR ATTACHED GARAGE

ZONING ANALYSIS
RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT CALCULATIONS

Front Porch Exception (Subtract 50%)  
Total Eligble Front Porch
Total Paver Area
Paver Regulatory Area

Open Parking Debt (Add 200sqf/open space)
# Open Required Spaces
Addtn. to Bldg Lot Gov.

PRINCIPAL USE AND STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling - SF Detached</td>
<td>Dwelling - SF Detached</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Lot Width (LF)

35

Minimum Lot Area (SF)

7,200 sqft

USE: Single Family Detached

Dwelling Units:

1

Rooming Units:

Building Lot Coverage (SF) (defined including subtractions & additions):

1851.9

1854.6

1983.1

32.7%

32.1%

Non-Compliant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impervious Surface Coverage (SF, %)</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2777.9</td>
<td>2254.9</td>
<td>2094.2</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**Accessory Structure Rear Yard Coverage:**

**Comments:**

**Gross Floor Area (SF)**

**Use:**

**Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height (FT)</th>
<th>35 OR 2.5 STORIES</th>
<th>ADDITION = 13.3</th>
<th>Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front Yard(1) (FT)</th>
<th>24.0</th>
<th>24.0</th>
<th>No Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direction: N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Front Yard(2) (FT)**

**Direction:**

**Street:**

**Comments:**

**Street Side Yard (FT)**

**Direction:**

**Street:**

**Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interior Side Yard(1) (FT)</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>0.82</th>
<th>ADDITION = 0.82</th>
<th>Non-Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direction: W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interior Side Yard(2) (FT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>5.1</th>
<th>ADDITION = 5.0+</th>
<th>Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direction: E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rear Yard (FT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30.0</th>
<th>26.7</th>
<th>ADDITION = 26.5</th>
<th>Non-Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direction: S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parking Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use(1): Single-family Detached</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**Use(2):**

**Comments:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use(3):</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REQUIRED:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap Parking Spaces:</td>
<td>Sec. 6-16-2-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access:</td>
<td>Sec. 6-16-2-2</td>
<td>ALLEY</td>
<td>ALLEY</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Clearance (LF)</td>
<td>7&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfacing:</td>
<td>Sec. 6-16-2-6 (E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Sec. 6-4-5-2</td>
<td>ATACHED GARAGE</td>
<td>ATACHED GARAGE</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angle(1):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width(W) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth(D) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aisle(A) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angle(2):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width(W) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth(D) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aisle(A) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Setback from Alley Access (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS AND/OR NOTES**

**Analysis Comments**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Results of Analysis: This Application is **Non-Compliant**

Site Plan & Appearance Review Committee approval is:

See attached comments and/or notes.

[Signature]

[Date]: 7/6/18
EXIST. (2) STORY RESIDENCE

EXIST. ROOFED OPEN PORCH
AREA = 76.57 SF

EXIST. ON GRADE DECK
INCLUDING ROOFED AREA
(224 SF)

EXIST. ROOFED OPEN PORCH
AREA = 76.57 SF

EXIST. (1) CAR GARAGE
AREA = 334.80 SF

TOTAL AREA OF EXIST.
GARAGE & ROOFED
PORCH = 411.77 SF
FIRST FLOOR PLAN - PROPOSED
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

VICKMAN RESIDENCE
3318 GRANT ST. - EVANSTON, IL
**City of Evanston**

**ZONING RELIEF RECORD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Philip and Marcia Vickman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIN</td>
<td>10113140900000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zone</td>
<td>R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property address</td>
<td>3318 Grant Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE OF ZONING RELIEF:</td>
<td>Major Variance (ZBA Final)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zoning docket</td>
<td>ZBA 99-52-V(F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED PROJECT:</td>
<td>Construct wood framed front entry four addition and a 2-story wood framed rear addition attaching existing 1 car garage to the existing residence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| REQUESTED/NOTICED/GRANTED ZONING RELIEF: | An application by Philip and Marcia Vickman, property owners, for variations to Sections 6-8-2-8 (A) 1, 3, and 4 of the Zoning Ordinance regulating the front, side, and rear yard setbacks of a principal structure within the R1 Single-family Residential district, respectively. The variations are necessary to permit the construction of an approximately 3-foot by approximately 8-foot, 1-story foyer at approximately the same location as an existing concrete stoop at the front of residence and an approximately 15-foot by approximately 8-foot, 2-story addition to the rear of the residence, connecting to the existing 1-story garage. The foyer would be approximately 25 feet from the front lot line whereas the Zoning Ordinance requires a 27-foot setback. The existing garage is approximately 1 foot from the side lot line along the alley and approximately 25 feet from the rear lot line whereas the Zoning Ordinance requires a 5-foot and 30-foot setback, respectively. The variations for the garage are necessary because of...
| CONDITIONS ON ZONING RELIEF: | Construction and operation of the additions shall be in substantial compliance with the testimony and documents placed on file in connection with this case. |

| hearing dates | 11/23/99 |
| City Council Dates | Grant D | Date 11/23/99 |
| ZBA/PCZFA decision | ZBA-V-F | Zoning docket #99-52 |
| Type case |  |
| Rpt to Council |  |
| Council decision |  |
| Ord # |  |
| Covenant # |  |
| app received | 10/25/99 app perfected 11/16/1999 |
| Notice published | 11/4/99 |
| Date property posted |  |
| Neighbors noticed 1 | 11/8/99 Neigh # mailings 86 |
| Neighbors noticed 2 | 12/22/99 |
| Decision to applicant |  |

**Zoning relief occasion**

- Yard, prin struct, no ftpt add'n
- Yard, prin struct, ftpt add'n
- Yard, attached garage
- Yard, pk's space
- Yard, garage (detached)
- Yard, Ac Unit
- Yard, attached acc struct
- Yard, other acc struct
- Yard, Front Yd Setback Exception
- Yard, Build to Lot line
- Separation of Structures
- Dormers
- Fence Variance - Front
- Fence Variance - Front & Street Side Yard
- Fence Variance - Street Side Yard
- Fence Variance - Other
- Bld: height
- Bld lot coverage
- Bld lot coverage, accs struc detached
- Impervious surface
- Coverage In rear,yard
- Floor area ratio
- Lot area
- Lct width
- Twixtseas not-facing street
- M’tg spaces
- Parking berth
- PK's space dimensions
- PK's other
- Accessory Structure other
- Special Use
- Substitution for Existing SU
- Release/Change of Condition/Covenant
- Map Amendment
- Text Amendment
- Planned Development
- Appeal - Minor Fencing/Sub
- Appeal - Other
- Interpretation

| Transcript Deposit |  |
| Transcript Am't Owed City |  |
| Filling Fee |  |
| Transcript Fee |  |
| Type fees paid |  |

- variance
- special use, hospital
- PD
- special use, map amend't
- special use, substifbth
- text amend't
- appeal
- transcript fee
- transcript refund
An application by Philip and Marcia Vickman, property owners, for variations to Sections 6-8-2-8 (A) 1, 3, and 4 of the Zoning Ordinance, regulating the front, side, and rear yard setbacks of a principal structure within the R1 Single-family Residential district, respectively. The variations are necessary to permit the construction of an approximately 3-foot by approximately 8-foot, 1-story foyer at approximately the same location as an existing concrete stoop at the front of residence and an approximately 15-foot by approximately 22-foot, 2-story addition to the rear of the residence, connecting to the existing 1-story garage. The foyer would be approximately 25 feet from the front lot line whereas the Zoning Ordinance requires a 27-foot setback. The existing garage is approximately 1 foot from the side lot line along the alley and approximately 28 feet from the rear lot line whereas the Zoning Ordinance requires a 5-foot and 30-foot setback, respectively. The variations for the garage are necessary because, by connecting to the residence via the 2-story addition, the garage ceases being an accessory structure and becomes part of the principal structure.
This map is not a plat of survey. This map is provided "as is" without warranties of any kind. See www.cityofevanston.org/mapdisclaimers.html for more information.

Copyright 2018 City of Evanston
DESIGN AND PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DAPR) MINUTES EXCERPT
June 27, 2018


Staff Present:

Others Present:

Presiding Member: J. Leonard

A quorum being present, Ms. Leonard called the meeting to order at 2:32 pm.

3318 Grant Street
Recommendation to ZBA
Phil and Marcia Vickman, property owners, submit for major zoning relief to enlarge an existing attached 1-car garage into an attached 2-car garage with 32.1% building lot coverage where 30% is permitted, a 0.8’ interior side yard setback where 5’ is required, and a 26.5’ rear yard setback where 30’ is required, in the R1 Single-Family Residential District.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Phil & Marcia Vickman, applicants, Bernie Citron, attorney

DISCUSSION:
- Would have to remove existing sliding glass door which would obstruct use backyard according to applicant.
- Mr. Mangum asked if they have considered building a detached garage.
- Mr. Mangum asked if they are keeping some of the walls of existing garage.
- Applicants are extending west wall of garage - applicant not sure if they are keeping or rebuilding whole garage.
- Mr. Gerdes asked how much square footage would be added with new garage.
- They will be removing roof overhang and covered walkway.
- Ms. Biggs has concerns with infiltrating water in the area and based on design not clear on how water will remain contained on their property.
- Ms. Eckersberg stated downspouts can’t be drained into alley due to condition of alley.
- Ms. Biggs concerned about south side of garage due to hipped roof and how water would run-off.
- Ms. Biggs recommends drainage plan before approval.

Ms. Biggs made a motion to hold item asking applicant to come forth with drainage plan, seconded by Mr. Gerdes.

The Committee voted, 11-0, to hold item in committee.

Staff Present: J. Velan,

Others Present:

Presiding Member: J. Leonard

A quorum being present, Ms. Leonard called the meeting to order at 2:32 pm.

3318 Grant Street

Recommendation to ZBA
Phil and Marcia Vickman, property owners, submit for major zoning relief to enlarge an existing attached 1-car garage into an attached 2-car garage with 32.1% building lot coverage where 30% is permitted, a 0.8’ interior side yard setback where 5’ is required, and a 26.5’ rear yard setback where 30’ is required, in the R1 Single-Family Residential District.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY:
Marcia Vickman, applicant,
Nancy Schlosberg, architect
Bernie Citron, attorney

DISCUSSION:
- Applicant claims would need to remove trees in rear yard to put garage back there
- Garbage trucks cut the alley corner so detached garage would be in the way according to applicant
- Applicant will be removing walk & driveway
- Decrease amount of impermeable surface to property applicant claims
- They are working to keep as much of the existing garage as possible.
- Mr. Mangum cited the issue of not conforming due being an attached garage
- Variation granted in 1999 to connect (garage was already there)

Ms. Biggs made a motion to recommend approval of the project to ZBA, seconded by Mr. Gerdes.

The Committee voted, 8-3, to recommend approval of the project to ZBA.
2118-2120 Ashland Ave., 1625 Payne St., & 2147-2149 Dewey Ave.
18ZMJV-0058

ZBA Recommending Body
Memorandum

To: Members of the Zoning Board of Appeals

From: Johanna Leonard, Director of Community Development
Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Administrator
Melissa Klotz, Zoning Planner

Subject: 2118-2120 Ashland Ave., 1625 Payne St., 2147-2149 Dewey Ave.
– ZBA 18ZMJV-0058
ZBA Recommending Body
City Council Determining Body

Date: July 12, 2018

Notice – Published in the June 28, 2018 Evanston Review:
Kathy Lichtenstein, lessee, applies for special use permits for a Daycare Center – Domestic Animal, and a Kennel, Rex’s Place, in the MXE Mixed-Use Employment District (Zoning Code Section 6-13-4-3). The applicant proposes a special use permit to expand the current Daycare Center – Domestic Animal at 2120 Ashland Ave. to include 2118-2120 Ashland Ave., and to include 2147 Dewey Ave. as the manager’s residence with outdoor animal space and 2149 Dewey Ave. as the business owner’s residence with outdoor animal space. The applicant also proposes a special use permit to expand the existing Kennel at 1625 Payne St. (that was previously approved as an accessory use to the Daycare Center – Domestic Animal at 2120 Ashland Ave.), and to include a Kennel at 2118 Ashland Ave. with outdoor animal space at 2147-2149 Dewey Ave. The Zoning Board of Appeals makes a recommendation to City Council, the determining body for this case.

Recommendation
City Staff and DAPR recommend approval for a special use permit to expand a Daycare Center – Domestic Animal, and a Kennel, Rex’s Place, in the MXE Mixed-Use Employment District. The applicant has complied with all zoning requirements, and meets all of the standards of a special use for this district.

Site Background
2118-2120 Ashland Ave., 1625 Payne St. and 2147-2149 Dewey Ave. are all located within a two block radius between Simpson St. and the canal, and between Ashland Ave. and Dewey Ave. The properties are located within the MXE Mixed-Use Employment District, and are surrounded by the following zoning districts:

North: MXE Mixed-Use Employment District
South: MXE & B1 Mixed-Use Employment District & Business District
The properties are surrounded by a mixture of light industrial, commercial, and residential uses and structures.

In 2010, the City did not have specific zoning regulations for doggy daycares or animal boarding. The City approved the operation of a doggy daycare with no overnight boarding allowed, and considered the business to be a Retail Services Establishment. The approval was granted for 2118-2120 Ashland Ave. and 1625 Payne St., with outdoor animal space at 2147 Dewey Ave. The zoning approval included the following conditions:

Determination of Retail Services Establishment is contingent upon there being no overnight boarding of animals and no veterinary services provided, and that outdoor running of animals is limited to the hours of 8am – 5pm. During times when animals are outdoors a staff member must be in attendance outside and animals must be supervised and under voice command. The outdoor facility must be cleaned each day that animals are run, and all excrement, pet waste, food, toys, litter, trash, and
similar must be removed the same day by 5:30pm. Overnight boarding of animals is not permitted by right. Overnight boarding requires a special use permit granted by City Council.

In 2011, the City approved accessory overnight boarding limited to holiday seasons and including the following conditions:

Accessory limited overnight stay deemed compliant. Overnight stay will be limited to Thanksgiving, December Holiday Season, Evanston School District Spring/Easter Breaks, month of July. This provision is compliant as accessory under the following conditions: defined day to day operating conditions of 10ZONA-0375 [previous approval noted above], plus all dogs being supervised 24 hours a day. Only dogs that are regular clients of the facility may be housed overnight (defined as use of the facility no less than 4 times a month). Animals will not have group play time outside after regular hours. Overnight stay for only time periods of Thanksgiving, December Holiday Season, Spring Break March 20-April 15, month of July.

The application for overnight boarding was initiated prior to the creation of specific zoning regulations for Kennels, and as an accessory use. In conjunction with the submitted applications, the applicant worked with the City to establish appropriate zoning regulations for Daycare Center - Domestic Animals, and Kennels (overnight boarding) so that such uses now require special use approval. The current operations of Rex's Place are therefore legally-nonconforming and require special use approval for any change in operation or expansion.

Proposal
The applicant requests a special use permit for a Daycare Center – Domestic Animal, and a Kennel, which are defined by the Zoning Ordinance as:

Daycare Center – Domestic Animal: Any establishment for which the principal use or purpose is the housing of domestic animals for periods of time that shall neither exceed twelve (12) hours in any twenty-four (24) hour period, nor include overnight stays. Multiple animals shall be permitted outside on the premises when accompanied by staff and only between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. on any day. Individual animals shall be permitted outside on the premises to relieve themselves at any time during the Center's hours of operation when accompanied by staff. Prior to beginning operation of any such Center, the operator shall submit to the Zoning Administrator a contingency plan for those times when an owner fails to claim his/her animal(s) before the Center closes for the day, and, thereafter, comply with said plan. The operator of any such Center shall comply with the applicable regulations of Title 8, Chapter 4, and Title 9, Chapter 4 of the City Code, as amended.
Kennel: Any establishment for which the principal use or purpose is the housing of domestic animals, including overnight stays. Multiple animals shall be permitted outside on the premises when accompanied by staff and only between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. on any day. Individual animals shall be permitted outside on the premises to relieve themselves at any time during the Center’s hours of operation when accompanied by staff. Prior to beginning operation of any such Kennel, the operator shall submit to the Zoning Administrator a contingency plan for those times when an owner fails to claim his/her animal(s), and, thereafter, comply with said plan. The operator of any such Kennel shall comply with the applicable regulations of Title 8, Chapter 4, and Title 9, Chapter 4 of the City Code, as amended.

The applicant proposes to expand Rex’s Place as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Current Operations</th>
<th>Proposed Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2120 Ashland Ave.</td>
<td>Doggy Daycare – all units</td>
<td>Doggy Daycare – all units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2118 Ashland Ave.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Kennel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625 Payne St.</td>
<td>Kennel (limited accessory use)</td>
<td>Kennel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2147 Dewey Ave.</td>
<td>Outdoor area for Doggy Daycare</td>
<td>Outdoor area for Doggy Daycare and Kennel (and manager’s residence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2149 Dewey Ave.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Outdoor area for Doggy Daycare and Kennel (and owner’s residence)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2120 Ashland Ave.: 
Rex’s Place currently operates the doggy daycare with a staff of 4-5 employees at a time and a maximum of 100 dogs in groups of 30-35 animals each. The main location of Rex’s Place is 2120 Ashland Ave., which is one large open area within the building where the dogs interact with each other. Dogs are walked from the indoor facility to the outdoor play area currently at 2147 Dewey Ave. as needed. Dogs are dropped off at the facility between 6:30am – 11am, and are picked up between 3pm – 6:30pm. The facility operates Monday – Friday only. A professional cleaning crew cleans the facility daily with environmentally friendly cleaning supplies that also kill potential airborne illnesses such as the dog flu. There are no changes to the facility or operations at 2120 Ashland Ave., but the proposed special use will bring the use status into special use compliance. The applicant is currently working with the City to establish an official drop-off vehicle zone for customers.

2118 Ashland Ave.:
The applicant proposes to add a kennel for overnight boarding at 2118 Ashland Ave., which is within the same building as the doggy daycare at 2120 Ashland Ave. The kennel will feature 28 animal cages and an accessible path around the cages. Walls surrounding the unit will be soundproofed. Drop-offs and pick-ups will not be permitted after 6pm. Since animals will reside overnight, heat sensors will be installed with a direct connection to the Fire Department to ensure adequate fire/life safety.

1625 Payne St.:
The applicant currently operates a kennel for overnight boarding at 1625 Payne St., which is limited to dogs that are regular clients of the doggy daycare facility and only for use during specific holiday times as an accessory use to the doggy daycare. The applicant proposes to eliminate the accessory use conditions and instead operate under a special use permit. The kennel currently features 15 cages. No changes are proposed to the kennel facility. However, the intensity of the use will increase by eliminating the accessory use conditions.

2147 Dewey Ave.:
The rear yard of 2147 Dewey Ave. is currently used as an outdoor play area for the doggy daycare as well as the accessory kennel. With expanded operations for the doggy daycare and the kennel, which include an increase in intensity of the uses, special use approval is also needed for the outdoor play area. The applicant recently purchased the home on the property, which the manager will live in so that the dogs can be quickly reached in case of an emergency. No commercial/business operations will occur within the house. There are no changes proposed to the property.

2149 Dewey Ave.:
The rear yard of 2149 Dewey Ave. is currently rented out for truck parking for other businesses. The applicant recently purchased the home on the property, which the business owner/applicant will live in. No commercial/business operations will occur within the house. The rear yard will be used to expand the outdoor play area that is currently at 2147 Dewey Ave., which will then be used for both the doggy daycare and the kennel.

Although the special use requests feature a total of five properties, the only changes that will increase the intensity of any uses are the new kennel proposed at 2118 Ashland Ave. and the expanded kennel at 1625 Payne St. All five properties are included in one request to ensure all aspects of the business model are brought into full zoning compliance with special use approval rather than the current legally-nonconforming status. City staff is not aware of any objections to the proposal, and is aware of wide support by clients who frequent the facility and feel there is a large demand for this type of use/expansion of use in Evanston.

Ordinances Identified for Requested Relief:
6-13-4 MXE Mixed-Use Employment District

6-13-4-3 Special Uses: The following uses may be allowed in the MXE district, subject to the provisions set forth in Section 6-3-5, "Special Uses," of this Title:
Daycare Center – Domestic Animal
Kennel
(among others listed)

Comprehensive Plan:
The Evanston Comprehensive General Plan recognizes the importance of enhancing the existing assets of neighborhoods while recognizing how each neighborhood contributes to the overall social and economic quality of Evanston. The Comprehensive Plan specifically includes:

Objective: Maintain the appealing character of Evanston’s neighborhoods while guiding their change.

Objective: Recognize the benefits of mixing residential, commercial, and institutional uses in neighborhoods.

The proposed special use permits for Rex’s Place will allow a locally owned business to expand operations within the same neighborhood and continue to provide a needed service for the community.

Design and Project Review (DAPR) Discussion and Recommendation:
The Committee found the proposed expansion of Rex’s Place and new kennel appropriate uses for the subject properties, and that the proposed business expansion would not cause negative effects or problems to surrounding properties in the area. The Committee asked for clarification via a diagram or chart describing each property and proposed operations prior to ZBA.
Recommendation: Unanimous recommendation for approval

Special Use Standards:
For the ZBA to recommend that City Council grant a special use, the ZBA must find that the proposed special use:

1. Is one of the listed special uses for the zoning district in which the property lies: A Daycare Center – Domestic Animal, and Kennel are listed special uses in the MXE District.
2. Complies with the purposes and the policies of the Comprehensive General Plan and the Zoning ordinance: The use is compatible to the surrounding neighborhood subject to special use conditions. The Comprehensive Plan recognizes the importance of enhancing the existing assets of neighborhoods and encouraging a mixture of commercial and residential uses in mixed-use neighborhoods.
3. Does not cause a negative cumulative effect in combination with existing special uses or as a category of land use: There are a variety of uses in the area with a mixture of intensity and impact on surrounding properties. There are no other animal related uses in the immediate area.
4. Does not interfere with or diminish the value of property in the neighborhood:
With appropriate conditions regulating the use of the proposed outdoor animal spaces similar to the current approval, the use should not diminish the value of surrounding properties.

5. Is adequately served by public facilities and services: The property is adequately connected to public utilities.

6. Does not cause undue traffic congestion: The area features moderate automobile traffic for the surrounding residential and commercial uses, which will not significantly change with the proposed expansion to Rex’s Place.

7. Preserves significant historical and architectural resources: NA

8. Preserves significant natural and environmental resources: NA

9. Complies with all other applicable regulations: The proposal will comply with all other applicable regulations, including applicable regulations regarding animals within Title 8, Chapter 4, and Title 9, Chapter 4 of the City Code

Attachments
Special Use Application – submitted May 24, 2018
Operations Summary
2010 Approval
2011 Approval
Plats of Survey
Site Plans
Letter of Support
Image of Property
Aerial View of Property
Zoning Map of Property
DAPR Draft Meeting Minutes – July 11, 2018
1. PROPERTY

Address: 2137 1/2 118th St Ashland, 1635 Payne 1477 3/19 104 Out Side
Permanent Identification Number(s):
PIN 1: [Redacted] PIN 2: [Redacted]
(Note: An accurate plat of survey for all properties that are subject to this application must be submitted with the application.)

2. APPLICANT

Name: [Redacted]
Organization: Red's Place
Address: 3120 Ashland Avenue
City, State, Zip: Evanston, IL 60201
Phone: Work: [Redacted] Home: [Redacted] Cell/Other: 647-430-6298
Fax: Work: [Redacted] Home: [Redacted]
E-mail: [Redacted]

What is the relationship of the applicant to the property owner?
☐ same ☐ builder/contractor ☐ potential purchaser ☐ potential lessee
☐ architect ☐ attorney ☐ lessee ☐ real estate agent
☐ officer of board of directors ☐ other:

3. PROPERTY OWNER (Required if different than applicant. All property owners must be listed and must sign below.)

Name(s) or Organization: Robinson Rental
Address: [Redacted]
City, State, Zip: Evanston, IL 60201
Phone: Work: [Redacted] Home: [Redacted] Cell/Other: [Redacted]
Fax: Work: [Redacted] Home: [Redacted]
E-mail: [Redacted]

"By signing below, I give my permission for the Applicant named above to act as my agent in all matters concerning this application. I understand that the Applicant will be the primary contact for information and decisions during the processing of this application, and I may not be contacted directly by the City of Evanston. I understand as well that I may change the Applicant for this application at any time by contacting the Zoning Office in writing."

Property Owner(s) Signature(s) – REQUIRED
Date

4. SIGNATURE

"I certify that all of the above information and all statements, information and exhibits that I am submitting in conjunction with this application are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge."

Applicant Signature – REQUIRED
Date
The following are required to be submitted with this application:

☒ (This) Completed and Signed Application Form
☐ Plat of Survey  Date of Survey: ____________________
☐ Project Site Plan  Date of Drawings: N/A
☐ Plan or Graphic Drawings of Proposal (If needed, see notes) N/A
☐ Non-Compliant Zoning Analysis
☐ Proof of Ownership  Document Submitted: N/A
☐ Application Fee  Amount $ ______

Notes: Incomplete applications will not be accepted. Although some of these materials may be on file with another City application, individual City applications must be complete with their own required documents.

Plat of Survey
(1) One copy of plat of survey, drawn to scale, that accurately reflects current conditions.

Site Plan
(1) One copy of site plan or floor plans, drawn to scale, showing all dimensions.

All proposed changes will be strictly internal

Plan or Graphic Drawings of Proposal
A Special Use application requires graphic representations for any elevated proposal—garages, home additions, roofed porches, etc. Applications for a/c units, driveways, concrete walks do not need graphic drawings; their proposed locations on the submitted site plan will suffice.

Proof of Ownership
Accepted documents for Proof of Ownership include: a deed, mortgage, contract to purchase, closing documents (price may be blacked out on submitted documents).
- Tax bill will not be accepted as Proof of Ownership.

Non-Compliant Zoning Analysis
This document informed you that the proposed change of use is non-compliant with the Zoning Code and requires a variance.

Application Fee
The application fee depends on your zoning district (see zoning fees). Acceptable forms of payment are: Cash, Check, or Credit Card.
A. Briefly describe the proposed Special Use:

We are planning to open a 2-7 day kennel in Evanston. We are currently providing day care for dogs in the North Shore area. Our business will provide care for dogs from 5 to 15 people per day. In our current location, we can accommodate up to 30 dogs. This would allow us to serve more clients in Evanston rather than send them elsewhere.

APPLICANT QUESTIONS:

a) Is the requested special use one of the special uses specifically listed in the Zoning Ordinance? What section of the Zoning Ordinance lists your proposed use as an allowed special use in the zoning district in which the subject property lies? (See Zoning Analysis Review Sheet)

Yes, working with animals is special use.

b) Will the requested special use interfere with or diminish the value of property in the neighborhood? Will it cause a negative cumulative effect on the neighborhood?

We have existed within the neighborhood since we opened our doors in March 2010. Many of our neighbors are clients. It should not have a negative effect on the neighborhood.

c) Will the requested special use be adequately served by public facilities and services?

Yes, no additional services will be required.
d) Will the requested special use cause undue traffic congestion?

No, it should have little impact. We are a drop off business which equates within specific time frames.

---

e) Will the requested special use preserve significant historical and architectural resources?

Yes

---

f) Will the requested special use preserve significant natural and environmental features?

Yes

---

g) Will the requested special use comply with all other applicable regulations of the district in which it is located and other applicable ordinances, except to the extent such regulations have been modified through the planned development process or the grant of a variation?

Yes

---
The Evanston City Code, Title 1, Chapter 18, requires any persons or entities who request the City Council to grant zoning amendments, variations, or special uses, including planned developments, to make the following disclosures of information. The applicant is responsible for keeping the disclosure information current until the City Council has taken action on the application. For all hearings, this information is used to avoid conflicts of interest on the part of decision-makers.

1. If applicant is an agent or designee, list the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of the proposed user of the land for which this application for zoning relief is made: Does not apply.

   Lichtenstaon 111 Monroe St Evanston, IL 60201

2. If a person or organization owns or controls the proposed land user, list the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of person or entity having constructive control of the proposed land user. Same as number above, or indicated below. (An example of this situation is if the land user is a division or subsidiary of another person or organization.)

   N/A

3. List the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of person or entity holding title to the subject property. Same as number above, or indicated below.

   Robinson Rental 7500 N Ave Evanston, IL 60201

4. List the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of person or entity having constructive control of the subject property. Same as number above, or indicated below.

   Lichtenstaon 111 Monroe St Evanston, IL 60201
If Applicant or Proposed Land User Is a Corporation

Any corporation required by law to file a statement with any other governmental agency providing substantially the information required below may submit a copy of this statement in lieu of completing a and b below.

a. Names and addresses of all officers and directors.

b. Names, addresses, and percentage of interest of all shareholders. If there are fewer than 33 shareholders, or shareholders holding 3% or more of the ownership interest in the corporation or if there are more than 33 shareholders.

If Applicant or Proposed Land User Is not a Corporation

Name, address, percentage of interest, and relationship to applicant, of each partner, associate, person holding a beneficial interest, or other person having an interest in the entity applying, or in whose interest one is applying, for the zoning relief.

[Handwritten text: Babylon Lichtstein, 131 Monroe St, Elgin, IL 60120]
Permit Application for 2120, 2118-1 Ashland, 1625 Payne, 2147-2149 Dewey (outdoor)

Contingency Plan for dog not picked up after daycare

All owners are required to complete our daycare application, which spells out our hours of information and closing time for picking up their dog. They are informed there is a late fee after 6:45 and required to provide us with an emergency contact we can call if we don’t hear from the owner. We cannot reach anyone by phone, dogs are taken to our annex (1625 Payne) and kept overnight. If owner still fails to show up, dogs are taken to the Evanston Animal Shelter. (FYI in 10 years, we have never had this happen)

Proposed Plan for dog not picked up after daycare

All will continue as above; however, with the kennel operating, dogs will be placed in a kennel until the next morning. If the dog is abandoned, they will be taken to the Evanston Animal Shelter.

Proposed Property

The proposed property is an empty shell of space. It is currently being fitted with central air conditioning and plumbing is being checked with compliance. There are several large drains within the floor so that all plumbing should be adequate for proposed usage.

A smoke alarm will be installed and the daycare has a fire evacuation plan in place. We will be making a doorway between this proposed space and the adjacent ball room so that we have a play area for the boarding dogs. It will also provide us with a front and back space.

We have four parking in the back alley and we are proposing to do a fenced run in those spaces to give the dogs a quick out. We will have staff on hand to take them to walks or the yard as well.

The floor will be poured epoxy and kennels will be supplied and installed by Mason Company, considered the leader in the industry. They are in the process of designing a couple of options for us based on the room size,
Dear Dog Owner,

Thank you for your recent inquiry about our dog enrichment center. At Rex’s Place, we partner with owners who have a lifelong commitment to socialization, training, and relationship learning with their dog(s). Our mission is simple: to enrich the lives of dogs and the families they live with. We are focused on creating and maintaining relationships based on trust — between our dogs, their humans, and us.

At Rex’s we do more than provide care during the day. We provide enrichment. We don’t just have happy dogs; our dogs are content. Throughout the day, we use a number of obedience techniques to create an atmosphere where dogs co-exist, are stimulated, engaged, and do what they want to do most — be with other dogs. Along the way, they learn to adapt, thrive, and grow into confident, social, mindful, and content canine companions.

Our values are simple. We believe in:

- Responsible dog ownership
- Social responsibility
- Etiquette and wellbeing
- Dedication
- Safety

It’s easy to enroll. Just complete this form to start the process. Then, call us to arrange for your dog to come in and take a temperament test while s/he plays for the day. At the end of that day, when you pick your dog up, you will receive a report detailing the day. Should you decide to enroll, you will be asked to bring your dog a minimum of one day per week for the first three months in order to ensure that your dog will settle in, rather than being a new dog each and every time they come. If you purchase a package within one week of your temperament test, you will be credited for your first day. Dogs who want to board overnight are required to attend day care a minimum of twice a month.

All dogs must be spayed/neutered (with the exception of puppies younger than 7 months). You must provide complete veterinary inoculation records, including rabies, distemper, bordetella, and a fecal exam for parasites and giardia. These records must be updated annually.

If you want us to feed your dog during the day, just provide us with his/her food in a plastic resealable bag or a container that can be returned to you.

If you have any questions, please call us at 847-920-8739.
Dog's Name: ________________________

This page intentionally left blank
Dog’s Name: ______________

I understand that before dogs can play at Rex’s Place, the following requirements must be met:

- I understand that my dog must pass a temperament test to ensure that s/he is not aggressive toward people or other dogs.
- I hereby certify that my dog is in good health and has not had a communicable disease within the last thirty (30) days.
- I certify that my dog has never bitten or harmed a human or another domestic animal with malicious intent.
- I am aware that Rex’s Place is open from 6:00 AM to 6:30 PM Monday through Friday. If I am late picking up my dog, I understand that I will pay a late fee of minimum $15.
- I understand that all dogs are on probation/observation for a period of 12 weeks in order for Rex’s Place to better understand me and my dog’s needs. During that time, I commit to bringing my dog to Rex’s Place a minimum of one day per week so that s/he will become familiar with the rules of the facility.
- I understand that my dog must be on monthly heartworm and flea/tick preventive.
- I understand that no refunds are given for expired services or in cases where a dog is expelled due to behavior or injury to another dog or staff.
- I understand that my dog must be spayed/neutered unless younger than seven months of age.
- I agree to allow Rex’s Place to photograph my dogs for use in promotional materials including but not limited to Facebook, Google+, Twitter, www.rexsplace.com, the Rex’s Place blog, or any other media appearances.

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

OWNER INFORMATION

First Name: ___________________________ Last Name: ___________________________

Spouse/Partner First Name: ___________________________ Last Name: ___________________________

Address: ________________________________________________ Unit/Apt: _________

City, State, ZIP: ________________________________________________

Primary Email: ___________________________ Other email: ___________________________

Home Phone: ___________________________ Cell Phone: ___________________________ Work: ___________________________

Spouse/Partner Cell Phone: ___________________________ Spouse/Partner Work: ___________________________

Emergency Contact: ___________________________ phone: ___________________________

How did you find out about Rex’s Place? ________________________________________________

Your birthday: ___________________________ Spouse/Partner’s birthday: ___________________________
Dog’s Name: __________________________

**DOG INFORMATION**
Please submit one application for each dog you would like to bring for off-leash play.

Dog’s Name: __________________________ Breed: __________________________
Description/Coloring: ________________________________________________
Gender: _______________ Spayed/Neutered? (Circle one) Y / N
Weight: __________________________
Date of Birth / Adoption: __________________________ Dog’s current age: __________________________

**Authorized to pick up dog:**
Name: __________________________ Best Phone to Reach: __________________________
Relationship to owner: __________________________

Does your dog ever exhibit, or has your dog ever exhibited, any of these behaviors/conditions?
Aggression toward people or dogs
Biting
Coprophagia (eating poop)
Digging
Excessive Barking
Excessive Marking
Excessive Mounting
Food Aggression
Food Allergy
Jumping
Long nails
Needing naps
Problems with house training
Separation anxiety
Toy possessiveness
Problems with leashes or collars

**YOUR VETERINARIAN**
Hospital/Office Name: __________________________ Vet’s Name: __________________________
Office Address: __________________________ Phone: __________________________

Please attach a copy of your dog’s inoculation record, including rabies, distemper, and bordetella, to this application. Thank you!
Dog’s Name: ____________________________

How long have you owned your dog? ________ years, _________ months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where did you get your dog?</th>
<th>What knowledge do you have of your dog’s past history?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Newspaper Ad □ Breeder □ Pet Store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Animal Shelter □ Animal Rescue Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Found as a stray □ Friend □ Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Has your dog had any problems in the past in an off-lease environment?

□ No □ Yes (check all that apply)

□ Altercation or fight at public dog park
□ Altercation or fight with a neighbor’s or friend’s dog
□ Fearful reaction in a group of dogs
□ Dismissed from a prior dog daycare or social playgroup program
(complete the item below)
□ Other (please describe): ______________________________________

If your dog was dismissed from a prior daycare, please tell us what reason you were given for the dismissal:

Please check each statement that applies to the situation resulting in your dog’s dismissal.

□ My dog was injured, no medical treatment required
□ My dog was injured and required medical treatment
□ Another dog was injured, no medical treatment required
□ Another dog was injured and required medical treatment
□ A person was injured, no medical treatment required
□ A person was injured and required medical treatment

Please provide us with any other information you want us to have about the situation.
Dog's Name: ____________________________

Why are you considering our off-leash play program for your dog? (check all that apply)

☐ Play with other dogs
☐ So not home alone; check if
  ☐ exhibits symptoms of separation anxiety
☐ Exercise:
  ☐ Primary source or
  ☐ Additional source of exercise
☐ Recommended by other pet professional (trainer, vet, etc.);
  Reason: ______________________________
☐ Other: ______________________________

Which of the following best describes your dog’s level socialization with other dogs:

☐ None – No knowledge of other dog interaction
☐ Minimal – On leash encounters only
☐ Moderate – Some off-leash playtime on occasion with visitor’s/neighbor’s/friend’s dog(s)
☐ Extensive – Regular visits to dog social events, off-leash dog parks, dog daycare, etc.

HEALTH HISTORY

Please describe your dog’s flea/tick control and prevention program:

Does your dog have any allergies? ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, please explain:

Does your dog have any physical disabilities? ☐ Yes ☐ No
  Please explain disability & cause:

If yes, what restrictions need to be placed on your dog’s activities or movements?
  ☐ No jumping ☐ No running ☐ No hard play ☐ No contact with other dogs
  ☐ Other (Please explain)
Dog's Name: ____________________

| Does your dog have any medical conditions? □ Yes □ No If yes, please explain: |
| If medication is used to control the condition, please provide name and dosage. |

| Provide details of your dog's diet – |
| a. type (kibble, canned, raw/natural): |
| b. brand (Innova, Iams, Purina, etc.): |
| c. primary protein source: |
| d. feeding schedule: |

| On what type of surface does your dog generally go to the bathroom (e.g., grass, mulch, pee pads)? |

| Does your dog have any bathroom-related issues or concerns? |

| How often do you brush or comb your dog's coat? | How does your dog react to having his/her nails clipped? |

| Does your dog like to be brushed? □ Yes □ No If no, what have you tried to make it more enjoyable? |

| Does your dog have any sensitive areas on his/her body? □ Yes □ No If yes, where? |

| Where are your dog's favorite petting spots? |

| How frequently is your dog walked outside? |

| How long are your walks? |
Dog's Name: _______________________

Please check the box below that best represents your dog's overall level of exercise routine:

☐ Couch Potato: spends days sleeping, occasional walks and/or playtime with humans or other dogs.
☐ Mild Exerciser: short daily walks and/or regular playtime with humans or other dogs.
☐ Moderate Exerciser: long or multiple walks daily, and/or regular playtime with humans or dogs.
☐ Athlete: regular jogs/runs and/or regular participation in a dog sport activity such as agility, flyball, frisbee, etc.

HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION

Please complete this table with information on other pets in your household:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breed</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Spayed or Neutered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Male</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Male</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Male</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Male</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have cats? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, how many cats do you have? __________

How does your dog get along with your cats?
How does he react to unfamiliar cats he sees on walks?

Does your dog like children? ☐ Yes ☐ No

How does your dog behave around children?
How does your dog get along with other household animals?

Do any visitors bring their dog(s) to your house? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, how do they get along?

How does your dog react to a stranger coming into your home or yard?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your dog ever bark or growl at anyone passing outside your home or yard?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>If yes, please explain:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any types and/or breeds of dogs your dog seems to automatically fear or dislike?</td>
<td>Yes  No, If yes, please describe:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does your dog react to puppies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| How does your dog react to another dog approaching him/her in a park, at the beach, or on a walk? | a. On Leash:  

b. Off Leash: |
| Does your dog play with other dogs?  Yes  No | If yes, which type?  

Male and females  
Only males  
Only females  
Please describe size, breed, & temperament of the other dogs. |
| What kinds of games does your dog play with other dogs?                   |                |
| What kinds of games does your dog play with people?                      |                |
Has your dog ever shared his/her food or toys with other animals? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, how does your dog react to another dog approaching his/her food or toys?

Which commands does your dog know? (please check all that apply)
☐ Sit ☐ Stay ☐ Down ☐ Come ☐ Heel ☐ Roll over ☐ Kisses
☐ High Five ☐ Other: ________________________________

How did your dog get his/her obedience training? (Please check all that apply)
☐ Attended one group class
☐ Attended more than one level of group classes (beginner and intermediate, etc.)
☐ Dog was sent to a board and train program
☐ Private sessions in home
☐ Other, please explain:

Which of the following best describes the use of obedience cues with your dog at home?
☐ Key part of daily communication
☐ Used when we go on walks or have people over
☐ Used occasionally to better control behavior
☐ Rarely used
☐ Not applicable

What kind of a collar do you use to walk your dog?
☐ Buckle ☐ Nylon/Chain Choke Collar ☐ Harness – Leash Clips on Back
☐ Harness – Front Clip ☐ Head Collar ☐ Prong/Pinch Collar ☐ Other:

Is it effective at keeping him/her under control? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Dog’s Name: ____________________________

Has your dog ever gotten away from someone when out for a walk?  □ Yes  □ No
If yes, please explain circumstances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where does your dog sleep?</th>
<th>Where in the room does your dog sleep?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Inside the house  □ Outside the house  □ Inside/Outside—varies</td>
<td>□ Crate  □ Owner’s bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Dog Cushion/Bed on floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Other (please describe)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Has your dog ever jumped up on someone?  □ Yes  □ No
If yes, what were the circumstances?

How does your dog act when you get home at the end of the day?

How does your dog show s/he is happy?

How does your dog show s/he is upset?

Is your dog allowed on the furniture at home?  □ Yes  □ No

Does your dog have any problems in any of the following areas?  If yes, please explain.

☐ Mouthing ____________________________

☐ Housetraining: ______________________

☐ Barking: ____________________________

☐ Digging: ____________________________

☐ Ignoring commands: __________________
**Dog's Name:** ______________________

Does your dog know any tricks?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  
If yes, please describe.

**DOG BEHAVIOR INFORMATION**

Are there any particular types of people your dog seems to automatically fear or dislike?

Has your dog ever growled at someone?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  
If yes, what were the circumstances and how did you respond?

Has your dog ever bitten a person?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  
If yes, what were the circumstances and how did you respond? Please describe injuries (if any).

Has your dog ever bitten another animal?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  
If yes, what were the circumstances and how did you respond? Please describe any injuries if there were any.

To the best of your knowledge, what does your dog do when you're not at home?

Has your dog ever climbed/jumped a fence?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  
If yes, what were the circumstances?

How high was the fence?

Has your dog ever escaped from your house or yard?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No  
If yes, please explain the circumstances:

How would you describe your dog's energy level?  
☐ Low  ☐ Medium  ☐ High
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has your dog ever chased or tried to chase a small animal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, what were the circumstances?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your dog ever chased someone (or wanted to) on a skateboard or bicycle?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, what were the circumstances?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is your dog frightened by thunderstorms?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, describe typical behavior &amp; what specifically helps to relax your dog or calm his/her fear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is your dog frightened or nervous around anything else?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, please explain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your dog play with any toys?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, what kinds of toys does your dog like?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your dog ever growled or snapped at a person who has taken food or toys away from him/her?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, what were the circumstances and how did you respond?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your dog ever growled or snapped at another dog who has taken food or toys away from him/her?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, what were the circumstances and how did you respond?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever noticed your dog stopping and staring at another animal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, what were the circumstances?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there anything else about your dog that you feel might be helpful for us to know?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOG DAYCARE MEDICAL RELEASE FORM

This is a required form for all Rex’s Place participants receiving services. The safety and well being of your pet(s) is of the highest importance. We consider your pet’s safety and well being to be our first responsibility. As such, we take it very seriously. We do our best to have our pet parents screen for pre-existing health conditions but some factors may be beyond our control. In the event that a medical emergency arises while a pet is at our facility or participating in a service that we provide, it is imperative that we are immediately able to get them medical treatment at the closest available facility. We will call ahead to the veterinary offices in closest proximity geographically to us to insure they can handle the present emergency. Your pet will be rushed to the closest available facility for treatment. We notify the owner after we have secured medical treatment for the animal. Our goal is to get your pet medical attention as quickly as humanly possible, and any distractions may interfere with this process.

For that reason, Pet Parents are required to sign this form. In the event of a medical emergency that Rex’s Place deems to need the immediate attention of a licensed veterinarian, I authorize Rex’s Place to seek medical attention at the closest available veterinary facility. I further agree that I am financially responsible for any medical treatment my pet(s) receives as a result of a medical emergency while attending services provided by Rex’s Place.

Signature of Owner ___________________________ Date _______________

Printed Name ________________________________
DOG DAYCARE PET CARE AGREEMENT

Your Name: ________________________________
Address: ________________________________ City ___________ Zip ________
Home Phone (____) __________ Work Phone (____) __________
Dog Name: ________________________________ Age: ______ Breed: __________

Client Agreement and Release of Liability

I hereby release Rex's Place, its agents, officers, sub-contractors, and employees from any and all liabilities, financial, and otherwise, for injuries to myself, my dog, or any other property of mine, which arise in any way from services and/or products provided by or as a consequence of my association with Rex's Place.

I agree to assume all liabilities and responsibilities, financial and otherwise, for the behavior and health of my dog. In consideration of the services rendered by Rex's Place, I waive any and all claims, actions, or demands of any nature, foreseen or unforeseen, that I may have against Rex's Place relating to the care, control, health, and/or safety of my dog arising during pick-up, transport, drop-off, and stay at the facilities.

I authorize Rex's Place to do whatever it deems necessary for the safety, health, and well-being of my dog while under the care of Rex's Place, including seeking professional veterinary treatment for my dog.

Due to the many outstanding benefits of dog socialization and Rex's Place's commitment to the safety and well-being of my dog, I agree that the benefits of dog socialization outweigh the risks. Furthermore, I request a socialized environment for my dog while under the care of Rex's Place. I understand by allowing my dog to participate in services offered by Rex's Place, I hereby agree to allow Rex's Place to take photographs or use images of my pet in print form or otherwise for publication and/or promotions.

I understand that Rex's Place has the right to refuse service to me and/or my dog at any time for any reason. I understand that if my dog has a history of or repeatedly demonstrate aggression or biting of humans or animals, Rex's Place reserves the right to refuse service. I understand that all bites will be reported to the local authorities as required by law.

I hereby declare to Rex's Place that I am the legal owner of my dog; that my dog has not been exposed to distemper, rabies, or parvovirus within the past thirty (30) days; and that my dog has been inoculated as indicated by records presented.

Signature of Owner: ________________________ Date: _________________

Printed name: ________________________________________________
Dog's Name: ________________________________

**DOG DAYCARE PET CARE AGREEMENT**

**Payment Requirements**

I understand that the hours of operation at Rex's Place are 6:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. Monday-Friday. A minimum late fee of $15, applies after 7 p.m.

If I purchase a half-day service and fail to pick up my dog after six (6) hours, I will be charged the full-day fee.

I authorize Rex's Place to charge my credit card for any outstanding balance on my account. I understand that I will be charged a $25 handling fee for returned checks.

By signing below, I acknowledge that I have read this Daycare Agreement in its entirety and agree to the terms. This agreement shall be binding for a period of ten (10) years from the date of signature below.

Signature of Owner: ________________________ Date: ________________

Printed name: ________________________________
Dog's Name: ________________________

PAYMENT INFORMATION

Owner Name: ________________________  Dog Name: ______

E-mail address for mailing of receipt: ________________________

Our packages are designed to facilitate your visits to Rex's Place and provide you with daycare at a reduced price and two options available: cash/check or charge. If you would like us to keep your payment information on file to facilitate the quick processing of charges, please complete the information below. A receipt for all charges will be emailed to you at the time of purchase. Please note that if you choose the cash option, or choose not to purchase a package, payment for all services are due at time of pick-up.

Please indicate if you would like us to use this information to automatically charge/renew your services:  Yes  No

☐ Discover  ☐ Master Card  ☐ VISA

Card Number: ________________________  Expires: (mm/yyyy) ____________________

Rex's Place, 2120 Ashland, Evanston IL 60201 847.920.8739  www.RexsPlace.com
Modular 2-Story Double Deck™ Kennels

**BUILDING REQUIREMENTS**
- Height: 14' or higher (standard), 12' - 14' (low headroom)
- Width: 12' Minimum for single row system
- 20' Minimum for standard back-to-back system

**STANDARD FEATURES**
- First-Floor Run
- Sani-Kenel System
  - Mason transfer door on common back panels
- Upper-Level Run
- UltraBase™ with built-in floor drain

**AVAILABLE SIZES**
- First-Floor Run
  - Length: 6'-10'
  - Width: 3', 4', 5', 6', 7', and 8'
- Upper-Level Run
  - Length: 4'-8' (depending on lower level)
  - Width: 3' or 4'
- Upper Aisle
  - Width: 4'
- Typical Stairway Unit(s)
  - Width: 4' (to be provided by another manufacturer)

**OPTIONS**
- Swing-up rest bench
Range Pet Lodge

Providing Flexible Doggie Day Care & Quality Boarding with Mason Company Housing Solutions

MASON COMPANY
Trusted Animal Housing Solutions
SINCE 1892
Solution

The Range Pet Lodge partnered with Mason Company to provide solutions for a variety of boarding as well as doggie day care. With a total of 132 kennels, there is room for approximately 165 dogs for boarding, including the option for multiple dogs in a family to share suites. Customers can choose the housing solution that best fits their four-legged family members.

The Range Pet Lodge selected Mason Company’s Sani-Kennels with tempered glass gates and configured them in a variety of sizes and side panels. With the exclusive patented Silvis Seal cross contamination barrier, the Sani-Kennels reduce the change of a sick dog spreading disease from one kennel to another. The fully customizable system is configured in both 4’ x 5’ and 4’ x 6’ with brown wood grain side panels as well as larger 4’ x 8’ kennels with cream side panels. An additional 30 3’ x 5’ kennels were also added about a year and a half after the facility opened to provide more boarding options for customers with smaller dogs.

Additionally, the Range utilizes concrete walls with Mason Company’s tempered glass gates to provide more boarding. Dimensions available with this configuration include 4’ x 6’, 6’ x 6’, 6’ x 7’, and 6’ x 9’.

The Range Pet Lodge also provides doggie daycare services daily from 7 a.m. until 7 p.m. The large room has capacity for approximately 55 dogs. Durable Dog Daycare Room Dividers from Mason Company enable the dogs to be separated based on their energy level so that higher energy dogs can play together without interacting with calmer or older dogs. A gate in the divider system enables staff to easily move from one side to the other. The system also has the flexibility to be folded away, turning the space into one big room to create a multi-purpose space used at night for larger training classes. The system’s stall fronts and gates create separate entrances for large and small dogs, enabling staff to provide dogs with time to acclimate before they enter the daycare play area.

Results

All of the housing solutions from Mason Company are working great for the Range Pet Lodge. The facility opened before the holiday rush in December 2014 followed by the daycare in March 2015. In 2016 when the 3’ x 5’ kennels were added, the Range Pet Lodge selected Mason Company’s trusted partner, Kennel Installations, to provide professional installation from factory-trained technicians.

“Mason Company has consistently been a great partner and the installation crew with Kennel Installations was awesome and worked around the best time for the facility and dogs,” said Amanda Wolfia, assistant manager at the Range Pet Lodge.

All of the kennels are set up to feel like a home away from home for the dogs.

“The boarding presents so like a suite and the dogs a not a traditional look and I see the dogs and the dogs. The kennels are versatile raised or lowered to enable expanded space or be seg.”

“Mason Company’s solution as there are no spaces for sealed. People feel comfort environment with no stank we are boarding 150 dogs even smell like dogs.”
Sani-Kennels™

Mason's Sani-Kennel™ system is a fully customizable modular kennel design. Materials available include stainless steel, galvanized steel, FRP and Wilsonart. Panels can be made to any height and dimension. Isolation materials available include tempered glass, bonegrid, FRP and Wilsonart. Colorful murals are even available. Available with Mason Company's full line of kennel gates (see specifications). Drawings are for illustrative purposes only.
City of Evanston, Illinois

CERTIFICATE OF
ZONING COMPLIANCE

ZONING CERTIFICATE NUMBER: 10ZONA-0375

DATE ISSUED: 30 November, 2010

In accordance with Section 6-3-2 of the Zoning Ordinance, the building, structure, and/or use described below complies with the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance governing the proposed use:

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 2118 ASHLAND AVE, 1625 PAYNE, 2147 DEWEY

ZONING DISTRICT: MXE

OVERLAY DISTRICT: None

USE: Pet/Doggie Daycare -- See Statement of Prospective Use

CONDITIONS OR COMMENTS:
Determination of Retail Services Establishment is contingent upon there being NO OVERNIGHT BOARDING OF ANIMALS and NO VETERINARY SERVICES provided, and that outdoor running of animals is limited to the hours of 8am to 5pm. During times when animals are outdoors a staff member MUST BE IN ATTENDANCE OUTSIDE and animals MUST BE SUPERVISED AND UNDER VOICE COMMAND. The outdoor facility MUST BE CLEANED EACH DAY THAT ANIMALS ARE RUN, and all excrement, pet waste, food, toys, litter, trash, and similar MUST BE REMOVED THE SAME DAY BY 5:30PM. Overnight boarding of animals IS NOT PERMITTED BY RIGHT. Overnight boarding REQUIRES A SPECIAL USE PERMIT granted by City Council.

CERTIFICATE BASED ON:

Plans Prepared As: Statement of Prospective Use

Plans Dated: 10-22-10

Plans Prepared By: Applicant

Plat of Survey Dated: N/A

Plans Originating As: Zoning Analysis Application

Related Application ID:

Miscellaneous:

ISSUED BY:

[Signature]
Zoning Administrator
Bill Dunkley
City of Evanston, Illinois

CERTIFICATE of
ZONING COMPLIANCE

ANALYSIS OF:
Existing Improvements/Use

CERTIFICATE NUMBER: 11ZONA-0198
DATE ISSUED: October 26, 2011

In accordance with Section 6-3-2 of the Zoning Ordinance, the building, structure, and/or use described below complies with the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance governing the proposed use.

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 2120 Ashland
ZONING DISTRICT: MXE
OVERLAY DISTRICT:
USE or PROJECT: Accessory overnight care to an existing Dog Day Care Facility

CONDITIONS OR COMMENTS:

Accessory limited Overnight Stay deemed compliant. Overnight stay will be limited to Thanksgiving, December Holiday Season, Evanston School District Spring/Easter Breaks, Month of July. This provision is compliant as accessory under the following conditions: defined day to day operating conditions of 10ZONA-0375, plus all dogs being supervised 24 hours a day, only dogs that are regular clients of the facility may be housed overnight (defined as use of the facility no less than 4 times a month). Animals will not have group lay time outside after regular hours, Overnight Stay for only time periods of Thanksgiving, December Holiday Season, Spring Break March 20-April 15, Month of July. Application initiated before new ordinance defining Dog Day Care approved.

CERTIFICATE BASED ON: Plans Prepared As:
Dated:
Prepared By:
Plat of Survey Dated:
Analysis Originating As: Zoning Analysis
Application Number: 11ZONA-0198
Miscellaneous:

ISSUED BY: Zoning Planner
PLAT OF SURVEY
B. H. SUHR & COMPANY
627 DEMPSTER ST., EVANSTON, ILLINOIS 60201

CHICAGO TELEPHONE BR 30398
EVANSTON TELEPHONE UN 44318

BOOK 65 PAGE 287
DATE OF SURVEY JULY 25, 1945

Lot 1 in Block 6 in Ayers' Addition to Evanston in the Southeast Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 18, Township 44 North, Range 23 East of the Third Principal Meridian, in Cook County, Illinois.

Commonly Known As: 2147 DEVON AVENUE, EVANSTON, ILLINOIS.
PLAT OF SURVEY

B. H. SUHR & COMPANY

ESTABLISHED IN 1911

527 DEMPSTER ST., EVANSTON, ILLINOIS 60201

CHICAGO TELEPHONE 273-5315

Evanston Telephone 864-6315

BOOK 84 PAGE 1012 ORDER NO. 84-1012 EVANSTON JUNE 28 19 56

FOR

LOT 9 AND 10 IN BLOCK 6 IN PAYNE'S ADDITION TO EVANSTON, BEING A SUBDIVISION OF THE SW 1/4 OF THE SE 1/4 OF SECTION 12, TOWNSHIP 13 N., RANGE 13 E., EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS, COMMONLY KNOWN AS 1025 PAYNE STREET EVANSTON, ILLINOIS.

PAYNE 22.65 MILES AVENUE ST.

STATE OF ILLINOIS

COUNTY OF COOK

We hereby certify that the buildings on lot shown are within property lines and that the adjoining improvements do not encroach on said premises.

SURVEYOR

STATE OF ILLINOIS

COUNTY OF COOK

This is to certify that we have surveyed the above described property and the above plat correctly represents said survey.

B. H. SUHR & COMPANY SURVEYORS

Scale, 1" = 25 ft. Top of plat is north.

Payne 22.65 Miles Avenue St.
Rex's Place
2120 Ashland

Proposed use of 2118 Ashland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2120 Ashland Ballroom</th>
<th>approx 1500 sq ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2120 Ashland Big dog playroom</td>
<td>approx 2500 sq ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hallway</th>
<th>Hallway</th>
<th>Bathroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storage feed door</th>
<th>Proposed Kennel 2118-1</th>
<th>approx 1900 sq ft</th>
<th>See attached sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
<td>x x x x x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play area</th>
<th>x x x x x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2120 Ashland</th>
<th>Small dog playroom</th>
<th>approx 1500 sq ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front lobby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am writing in support of the application being considered by the Zoning Board on July 17 by Rex’s Boarding House. Unfortunately, I cannot attend the meeting, but as a long standing resident, wanted to voice my strong support for this application.

For the record, I have resided at 2607 Park Place (6th Ward) since 2001, and have previously served as chair of the Evanston Preservation Commission and am quite familiar with Evanston’s zoning policies and challenges. Our family has utilized Rex’s Place daycare services for 7 years and have found this facility to be exceptional in every way. The owner, Kathy Lichtenstein, comes from a business background prior to starting Rex’s Place and is a conscientious owner. She runs a well-staffed, clean, safe environment for the many dogs entrusted to her care. Her business has brought some very much needed vitality to the 5th Ward where her business is located. Indeed this female-owned establishment serves a vital need for our community and is a shining example of local entrepreneurship.

The present application to establish a boarding facility will fill a local need, as I am unaware of any other such business in the city. Presently, dog owners have to bring their dogs to facilities outside of Evanston for this service. Also, assuming Ms. Lichtenstein operates her new facility in the same manner as her existing one, the neighborhood will benefit from visitors from all over the city, and a well-run operation that will not interfere with the other business and residences in the area. I am unaware of any negative impact such a business would have to the neighborhood and surrounding areas.

I hope the Board will give strong consideration to Rex’s Boarding House’s application and bring this much-needed type of business to our city.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jordan M. Cramer
2607 Park Place
Evanston, IL 60201
847.373.9388
Rex's Place (proposed)

This map is not a plat of survey. This map is provided "as is" without warranties of any kind. See www.cityofevanston.org/mapdisclaimers.html for more information.

Copyright 2018 City of Evanston

Staff Present:  J. Velan,

Others Present:  

Presiding Member:  J. Leonard

A quorum being present, Ms. Leonard called the meeting to order at 2:32 pm.

2118-2120 Ashland Ave.,  
1625 Payne and 2147-2149 Dewey Ave.  

Kathy Lichtenstein, lessee, applies for special use permits for Daycare Center - Domestic Animal, and a Kennel, Rex’s Place, in the MXE Mixed Use Employment District.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY:  Kathy Lichtenstein, applicant

DISCUSSION:  
- Applicant says the residential houses are staying exactly the same and will be providing sound proofing of the walls at 2118 Ashland Ave.
- Only interior change will be the kennel being added and they want to make a loading zone at 2118-2120 Ashland Ave
- Mr. Gerdes asked if they have direct access already to rear yard at the properties at Dewey
- Applicant is buying the Dewey houses in order to keep the yards
- Mr. Mangum asked the existing capacity for animals
- Applicant says they could take in 100 but splits them into groups
- Applicant says they could have 41 dogs in the kennel
- Applicant says they will be open until 6:30pm at night and opening at 6:30 am Monday-Friday
- Mr. Mangum asked if the dog daycare number would expand. Applicant says no.
- Mr. Mangum requests a table summary from client regarding the project
- Ms. Leonard asked for summary of what each property of this project will be used for
- Mr. Nelson asked how the clean-up process will occur. Client will be using cleaning service.
- Mr. Nelson asked to do a building survey on the properties of where dogs will be housed
- Mr. Tristan requested to review the fire plans for the building
- Proper backflow preventers and water services and equipment requested by Mr. Nelson

Ms. Biggs made a motion to recommend approval of the project to ZBA, seconded Mr. Mangum.

The Committee voted, 10-0, to recommend approval of the project to ZBA.
90-92 Kedzie St.
18ZMJV-0059

ZBA Determining Body
MEMORANDUM

To: Members of the Zoning Board of Appeals

From: Johanna Leonard, Director of Community Development
Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Administrator
Melissa Klotz, Zoning Planner

Subject: 90-92 Kedzie St. - ZBA 18ZMJV-0059
ZBA Determining Body

Date: July 12, 2018

Notice - Published in the June 28, 2018, Evanston Review
Matt Rodgers, zoning consultant, appeals the Zoning Administrator’s decision to deny minor zoning relief (case number 18ZMNV-0046) to construct a 6’ fence in the front yard where 6’ front yard fences are not permitted (Zoning Code Section 6-4-6-7-F). The Zoning Board of Appeals is the determining body for this case.

Recommendation
City staff affirms the determination that zoning relief to construct a 6’ fence in the front yard does not meet the Standards for Fences. Specifically, the proposed fence location will not assist in reducing noise, screen incompatible adjacent uses or increase safety to the owners of the subject property or abutting properties. Staff determined a compliant fence location (3’ back from the front façade of the house) would achieve the objective sought by the applicant to provide privacy and safety at the property.

Site Background
90-92 Kedzie St. is located on the south side of Kedzie St. and abutting Lake Michigan to the east, in the R1 Single-Family Residential District and the Lakeshore Historic District, and is surrounded by the following:

North: OS Open Space – Clark Square Park
East: Lake Michigan
South: R1 Single-Family Residential District
West: R1 Single-Family Residential District

The subject property features a single-family residence abutting Lake Michigan on a dead end street and is surrounded by similar single family residences and a City park to the north.
Proposal
The property owners request to install a 6’ tall fence surrounding the properties at 90-92 Kedzie St. One owner is well known nationally and has had security issues in the past due to his public recognition. The appellant believes a 6’ tall fence is necessary to ensure proper safety for the family by deterring persons from being able to approach the house or outdoor living space behind the house, and the front yard fence is necessary to deter persons from approaching the property or owners when they are in the front yard, driveway, or entering the garage. The proposed fence features a 1’ brick base and then a 5’ metal fence, as well as brick piers. The fence will extend across the driveway with a gate.

The appellant believes a 6’ fence in the front yard will not negatively impact adjacent property owners because there is already a 6’ metal fence on the City right-of-way slightly north of the front yard property line that extends to Lake Michigan east of the existing driveway. The existing fence was approved by the City and installed by a previous owner with an easement agreement for $1 per year over 30 years ago. The current property owners are exploring the possibility of requesting a vacation and purchasing the right-of-way area that the fence is on and replacing it with the proposed fencing. If the owners are not able to vacate and purchase the right-of-way, the front yard fence is proposed right at the existing front property line. All fencing will be heavily landscaped to blend into the rest of the property. The appellant notes landscaping details will be discussed with adjoining neighbors whose back yards abut the subject property’s side yard, and that there are no properties on the block that directly face the front yard of 90-92 Kedzie St.
The property currently features a temporary wood and chain link fence located in zoning compliant locations that will remain while a moderate addition is constructed in the fall. After construction ends, the wood and chain link fencing will be replaced with metal fencing.

**Staff Determination**

The Zoning Administrator found the proposed fence does not meet all Standards for approval because the additional screening, additional height, or requested location achieved through the variation would not sufficiently assist in reducing noise, screening incompatible adjacent uses, or increasing safety to the owners of the subject property or abutting properties. The proposed fence will not assist in reducing noise since it is not a solid fence and the property is located on a quiet dead-end street. There are no incompatible uses in the surrounding area since the property abuts the lake, park land, and other similar single family residences.

A compliant fence location, where the fence would be located 3’ back from the front façade and could then be 6’ in height, would allow increased safety to the owners in a similar manner to what is proposed since the fence would enclose the rear and side yards. In a compliant location such as the aforementioned, the fence could be solid to provide additional safety and privacy.

Staff noted 6’ front yard fences are uncommon in residential areas of Evanston and are rarely approved by variation. The few 6’ front yard fences that exist are primarily adjacent to Ridge Ave., where single family residences meet an incompatible use - a busy and dangerous vehicular thoroughfare.

Since the Standards for Fence Variations were not met, the fence variation was denied by staff.

**Ordinances Identified for Requested Relief**

6-4-6-7-F Special Regulations for Fences Accessory to All Uses

- **6-4-6-7-F-2 Permitted Fence Location:** The permitted locations for fences accessory to the uses listed in this Subsection are: Required front yard, provided the required front yard is adjacent to a type 1 street...
- **6-4-6-7-F-3 Permitted Fence Height:** Fences accessory to the uses listed in this Subsection shall not exceed 6 feet in height, except: Fences shall not exceed 4
feet in height when located within the area between a front lot line and 3 feet behind any front-facing facade of the principal building;

Preservation Commission Recommendation
At its June 12, 2018 meeting, the Preservation Commission voted to recommend denial of the fence variation, noting 6’ front yard fences do not keep with the intent of the Zoning Ordinance, and tabled the application for the fence design to obtain a Certificate of Appropriateness to allow the applicant time to finalize design details if zoning relief is granted. Two neighbors spoke in opposition to the fence requests at the Preservation Commission meeting.

Appeal Procedure
Pursuant to Section 6-3-8-6-E of the Zoning Ordinance (Procedure for Minor Variations and Fence Variations), the applicant filed an appeal within 10 working days of the Zoning Administrator’s mailing of the notification. Section 6-3-11-B (Appeals) states that “the appeal procedure is provided as a safeguard against arbitrary, ill-considered, or erroneous administrative decisions. It is intended to avoid the need for legal action by establishing local procedures to review and correct administrative errors. It is not, however, intended as a means to subvert the clear purposes, meanings, or intent of this Ordinance or the rightful authority of the Zoning Administrator to enforce the requirements of this Ordinance. To these ends, the reviewing body should give all proper deference to the spirit and intent embodied in the language of this Ordinance and to the reasonable interpretations of that language by those charged with the administration of this Ordinance.” Further, Section 6-3-11-D states “The Zoning Board of Appeals may reverse or affirm, wholly or partly, or may modify the order or final decision as in its opinion ought to be made in the premises, and to that end has all the powers of the officer from whom the appeal is taken.”

Variance Standards
Since the appealed determination is for a Fence Variation, the Standards for Fence Variations should be utilized for determining the appeal. For the Zoning Administrator to grant approval of a fence variation, the Zoning Administrator must find that the proposed variation(s) meet the following standards:

1. The requested variation will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the use, enjoyment or property values of adjoining neighbors. If the public right of way were to be vacated by the City, the fence is proposed where an existing similar metal fence already exists that may not be detrimental to the public welfare or surrounding properties. The additional fencing proposed at the existing front property line is less impactful than the fence that is already in place within the right of way, however, both fences may reduce the public viewshed to the Lake from a public park and right of way.
2. The additional screening, additional height, or requested location achieved through the variation will assist in reducing noise, screening incompatible adjacent uses, or increase safety to the owners of the subject property or abutting properties. The proposed fence will not assist in reducing noise since it
is not a solid fence and the property is located on a quiet dead-end street. There are no incompatible uses in the surrounding area since the property abuts the lake, park land, and other similar single family residences. A compliant fence location would allow increased safety to the owners in a similar manner to what is proposed. The Standard is not met.

3. In no event shall a variation be granted that would permit a fence taller than 30 inches to be located within 20 feet of the corner curb line of an intersection. Not Applicable.

Attachments
Appeal Application – submitted June 21, 2018
Fence Variance Application – submitted May 22, 2018
Plat of Survey
Site Plans
Elevations/Renderings
Existing Fence Easement Documents
Fence Variation Public Notice
Fence Variation Final Determination Notice
Letters of Objection
Images of Property
Aerial View of Property
Zoning Map of Property
Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes Excerpt – June 12, 2018
| **Formstack Submission For:** Zoning Appeal Application |
| Submitted at 06/21/18 1:40 PM |

| **Address:** | 90 KEDZIE AVENUE  |
|             | EVANSTON, IL 60202 |

| **Permanent Identification Number (PIN) 1:** | 11-20-102-020-0000 |

| **Permanent Identification Number (PIN) 2:** | 11-20-102-021-0000 |

| **Name:** | MATT RODGERS |

| **Organization:** | KBGA RODGERS LLC |

| **Address:** | 133 CLYDE AVENUE UNIT 2S  |
|             | EVANSTON, IL 60202-4012 |

| **Home or Office Phone Number:** | (847) 864-2603 |

| **Cell Phone Number:** | (773) 848-8372 |

| **Email:** | matt@kbgarodgers.com |

| **Please choose primary means of contact:** | Cell Phone |
Address (or location) of property to which pertains the decision you are appealing:

90-92 KEDZIE AVENUE

Describe the Zoning Administrator's decision that you are appealing:

The homeowner is appealing the decision of the zoning administrator to deny the construction of a 6' wrought iron and masonry fence in the front yard of the subject property.

The standards for fence variations are simple and straightforward.

Being directly across from Clark Square Park and the only house facing Kedzie Street, no abutting property has a direct view of the front yard and a 6' front yard fence will not be detrimental to the use, enjoyment or property values of the neighbors. The style of fence proposed is of high quality and historically appropriate constructed of wrought iron and masonry. When the fence, if approved, and landscaping is completed, the fence will blend into the landscape similar to the 4' side yard fence at 747 Sheridan Rd.

As permitted by variance under Standard 2, the placement and height of the fence will provide additional safety to the owners of the property, their children and dogs. A front yard fence provides the owner with a defined space in front of their home, that they can manage. An existing 6' wrought iron fence stands in the public right of way that was temporarily the front yard of subject property from 1983 to 1993. It was approved administratively in 1984 on land leased from the City to increase the safety of the previous owner and his family. However, the City can remove that fence when it chooses.

While it is possible to install landscaping at the front property line to screen from the activity at the adjacent park, it would not provide the desired safety for the owners and their children.

Describe in what manner you believe to be the correct zoning ordinance interpretation or what you believe to be the correct facts related to this particular zoning decision:

The owner has installed a temporary fence in a zoning compliant location. In its current and legal location, the fence sits almost 50' from the front sidewalk. By placing the fence at the front property line, the fence would sit 18' from the sidewalk while permitting the homeowners’ safe use of area in front of the garage and not encroaching on the sidewalk.

There are challenges to increasing safety in front of the proposed garage if the fence were required to sit in the side yard setback. The homeowner desires to build a multi-car garage on the adjoining lot at 92 Kedzie. A 1950 sight line easement for 741 Sheridan prohibits a building from encroaching in the southernmost 70' of the property, which keeps the garage toward the front of the property.

Quantity: 1

Price: 275

Credit Card: **********6825

Card Verification Code: ***
Expiration Date: Apr 2021

I certify that all of the above information and all statements, information and exhibits that I am submitting in conjunction with this application are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge:

[Signature]

Direct Link to Image
FENCE VARIATION
APPLICATION
CASE #: 18 ZMVV-0046

1. PROPERTY

Address: 90-92 KEDZIE STREET
Permanent Identification Number(s):
PIN 1: 11-20-102-020-000000 PIN 2: 11-20-102-021-000000
(Note: An accurate plat of survey for all properties that are subject to this application must be submitted with the application.

2. APPLICANT

Name: MATT RODGERS
Organization: KBGA RODGERS LLC
Address: 133 CLYDE AVENUE
City, State, Zip: EVANSTON IL 60202-4012
Phone: Work: ______ Home: ______ Cell/Other: 773-848-8372
Fax: Work: ______ Home: ______
E-mail: MATT@KBGARODGERS.COM

What is the relationship of the applicant to the property owner?

☐ same ☐ builder/contractor ☐ potential purchaser ☐ potential lessee
☐ architect ☐ attorney ☐ lessee ☐ real estate agent
☐ officer of board of directors ☑ other: ZONING CONSULTANT

3. PROPERTY OWNER (Required if different than applicant. All property owners must be listed and must sign below.)

Name(s) or Organization: DARAX LLC
Address: NATIONAL REGISTERED AGENTS INC, 208 S LASALLE ST, SUITE 814
City, State, Zip: CHICAGO IL 60604
Phone: Work: ______ Home: ______ Cell/Other: ______
Fax: Work: ______ Home: ______
E-mail: ______

"By signing below, I give my permission for the Applicant named above to act as my agent in all matters concerning this application. I understand that the Applicant will be the primary contact for information and decisions during the processing of this application, and I may not be contacted directly by the City of Evanston. I understand as well that I may request the Applicant for this application at any time by contacting the Zoning Office in writing."

[Signature]

Property Owner(s) Signature(s) -- REQUIRED Date

4. SIGNATURE

"I certify that all of the above information and all statements, information and exhibits that I am submitting in conjunction with this application are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge."

[Signature] 5-22-2018
Applicant: Signature -- REQUIRED Date
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5. REQUIRED DOCUMENTS AND MATERIALS

The following are required to be submitted with this application:

- ✔ (This) Completed and Signed Application Form
- ✔ Plat of Survey  Date of Survey: 27 APRIL 2018
- ✔ Site Plan  Date of Drawing: 18 MAY 2018
- √ Project Zoning Analysis  Date: ___________  ID#: ___________
- ✔ Proof of Ownership  Document Submitted: CONTRACT TO PURCHASE
- ✔ Application Fee  Amount $_________  Check # ___________

(if applicable)

Notes:

- Incomplete applications will not be accepted. Applications lacking any required documents or materials will not be accepted. Incomplete applications cannot be "held" at the zoning office.
- Documents, drawings, or other materials submitted as part of other applications (for example, building permit applications, or applications for Certificates of Appropriateness [Preservation Commission]) cannot be copied by the Zoning Office for submission with this application. You must provide separate copies.
- Plats of survey must accurately and completely reflect the current conditions of the property, must be dated and legible, and must be stamped by a licensed surveyor. Surveys must include dimensions of the property boundaries, the exteriors of all existing improvements, dimensions between structures and from structures to property boundaries.
- Site Plan should indicate the location of the proposed fence with "x"s. The site plan may be a notated copy of the plat of survey. The height of the proposed fence must be noted, as well as the linear dimensions of the segments. Dimensions must be legible when reproduced on letter-size paper. A drawing of the type of fence proposed would be helpful.
- Project Zoning Analysis - Prior to filing for a variance, you must have first have had a zoning review (zoning analysis or by way of a building permit application), and received a "non-compliant" result that identified all non-complying elements of the proposed plan. You will need to submit a copy of that document.
- Proof of Ownership - Accepted documents for proof of ownership include: deed, mortgage, contract to purchase, closing documents (price may be blacked out on submitted documents). A tax bill cannot be accepted as proof of ownership.
- Application Fees may be paid by cash, check, or credit card.
- Return this form and all required additional materials in person to:

  City of Evanston, Zoning Office  
  2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 3202  
  Evanston, IL 60201

  Hours of Operation:  
  Monday – Friday, 8:30am – 5:00 pm  
  Excluding holidays
6. PROPOSED FENCE

A. Briefly describe the location and type of the proposed fence:

The owner is proposing a 6-foot fence to surround the entire property, observing the utility easement along the south property line. The front yard portion would be wrought iron atop a masonry wall with 6.5-foot masonry piers located at all corners on the north property line. There is an elevation shift from the west to east of the front property line, with a portion of the yard along the lake being 28 inches higher. We request that the fence height follow this grade change.

B. Have you applied for a Building Permit for this project?

☑ NO  ☐ YES (Date: ________________  Building Permit Application ID: __________________)

C. Is the property a corner lot? ☐ Yes ☑ No

D. Does the proposed fence replace an existing fence or one removed in the last 12 months? ☐ Yes ☑ No

8. REQUESTED VARIATIONS

What specific variations are you requesting? For each variation, indicate (A) the specific section of the Zoning Ordinance that identifies the requirement, (B) the requirement (minimum or maximum) from which you seek relief, and (C) the amount of the exception to this requirement you request the City to grant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Section (e.g. 6-8-3-4, see Zoning Analysis)</th>
<th>(B) Requirement to be Varied (e.g., “requires a minimum front yard setback of 27 feet”)</th>
<th>(C) Requested Variation (e.g., “a front yard setback of 25.25 feet”)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-4-6-7 (F) 2</td>
<td>Fences are only permitted in front yard on a Type 1 street</td>
<td>Construction of a fence in the front yard on a non-Type 1 street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-4-6-7 (F) 3</td>
<td>Fences are limited to four (4) feet in a front yard, where they are permitted in a front yard</td>
<td>Construction of a six (6) foot fence in the front yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. PRACTICAL DIFFICULTY

What characteristic(s) of the property prevent compliance with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance?

The front yard on the east property abuts a city park with no clear boundary between the subject property and public way. In addition, the property is unique in how far back the lot line sits from the public right of way—almost 18 feet. Locating a fence with the permitted setback would place it almost 40 feet from the sidewalk, creating a large unused front yard that would not align with anything on the only other residence on that block of Kedzie. In fact it will split that back yard almost in half. By moving it to the proposed location it creates a more natural flow with the neighboring property.

10. ALTERNATIVES

A. If you are requesting a variation for fence height above what is permitted, please explain why a fence of the permitted height is not adequate.

The owners of the subject property are seeking to increase their personal safety and to secure their property. One owner is well known nationally and has had security concerns in the past due his public recognition. The extra height of the fence, while not preventing trespass, will serve to better deter persons from being able to approach the house or outdoor living spaces behind the house.

B. If you are requesting a variation for fence location, please describe the characteristics of your property that necessitate a fence in the requested location.

A fence that does not enclose the front yard does little to deter persons from approaching the property or the owners when they are in front of their property or in the driveway. There also is an existing six (6) foot wrought iron fence and shrubs on the public right of way that appears to most people as the front yard of subject property. We are exploring the possibility of the city vacating this property and to allow the owner to attach his new fence to the existing one. Even if this is not possible, it would still be our desire to build along the existing property line.

C. In your opinion, why do you believe that your fence will not have an adverse impact on your neighbor's property values, and enjoyment of their property?

The subject property faces a public park, is located on a cul-de-sac and is the only home which faces the street on that block of Kedzie. Although we are requesting a wrought iron fence of five (5) feet atop a one (1) foot masonry wall, the fence will be placed between two layers of landscaping (a gradual increase in height with smaller plantings in front of the fence and larger evergreens behind). This will soften and screen the fence, and for most of the year, the fence will be difficult to see because of the landscape plan, but still provide the necessary security. We will also discuss landscaping with the adjoining neighbors whose back yards abut subject property's side yard to lessen the impact on them.
PLAT OF SURVEY

of

LOTS 3 AND 4 IN HARRY A. SWIGER'S RESUBDIVISION OF LOTS 1, 2 AND 3 (EXCEPT THE SOUTH 10 FEET THEREOF) IN BLOCK 2 IN ADDITION TO EVANSTON AND NACHTEGAL ADDITION EAST OF SAID PRECEDING ALSO LOTS 24, 25 AND 26 (EXCEPT THE SOUTH 10 FEET THEREOF) IN BLOCK 2 IN THE SUBDIVISION OF BLOCK 1 AND THE NORTH 560 FEET OF THE EAST HALF OF BLOCK 2 IN ADJOIN AND HENDERSON'S ADDITION TO EVANSTON, TOGETHER WITH RIPARIAN RIGHTS THERE TO PERTAINING IN FRACTIONAL SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 41 NORTH, RANGE 14 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

ADDRESS: 99-99 KEDZIE STREET, EVANSTON, ILLINOIS
P.I.N. 13-23-102-021
13-23-102-022

GENERAL NOTES:

1) THE LEGAL DESCRIPTION HAS BEEN PROVIDED BY THE CLIENT OR THEIR AGENT.
2) THIS SURVEY SHOWS THE BUILDING LINES AND EASEMENTS AS INDICATED BY THE MEASURED PLAT. THIS PLAN DOES NOT SHOW ANY RESTRICTIONS ESTABLISHED BY LOCAL ORDINANCES UNLESS SUPPLIED BY THE CLIENT.
3) BASIS OF Bearings FOR THIS SURVEY IS AS ASSUMED NORTH.
4) MONUMENTS WERE NOT SET, AT THE CLIENT'S REQUEST.
5) LOCATION OF SOME FEATURES MAY BE EXAGGERATED FOR CLARITY. NO INTERPOLATIONS MAY BE MADE FROM THE INFORMATION SHOWN HEREON.
6) ONLY COPIES WITH AN ORIGINAL SIGNATURE AND SEAL ARE OFFICIAL LEGAL DOCUMENTS. ALL SURVY IS COPYRIGHTED MATERIALS WITH ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

MICHAEL J.
LOPEZ

RECOMMENDED NO. 114

Survey prepared by: PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR INC.

Preferred Survey, Inc.
7845 W. 79TH STREET, DRESDEN, IL 60455
Phone 708-410-7646 / Fax 708-410-7850
www.preferedsurvey.com

Professional Design Registration 8162-11066

State of Illinois
County of Cook

Survey ordered by: PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR INC.

L. MICHAEL J. LOPEZ, AS AN EMPLOYEE OF PREFERRED SURVEY INC. DO HEREBY STATE THAT THIS PROFESSIONAL SURVEY COMPLIES WITH THE CURRENT ILLINOIS MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR A BOUNDARY SURVEY. PROPERTY CLOSERS MAY BE SET OUT IN ACCORDANCE WITH CLINTY AGREEMENT. DIMENSIONS ARE SHOWN ON FED AND DEEDLAPES THEREOF AND ARE CORRECT TO A TOLERANCE OF 0.5 DEGREES PREFERENCE.

GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL THIS 27TH DAY OF APRIL, 2018

AD. 2018

IN ALDERMANN BOOK ON 11/30/18

P.R.I. NR. 181042
1.2/ FENCE PLAN
USING EXISTING PROPERTY LINES
90-92 KEDZIE STREET, 05.18.2018

KEDZIE STREET

6.0' MASONRY PIER w/5' FINIAL

5.0' WROUGHT IRON FENCE ON 1.0' MASONRY WALL (66.18)

20.0' SLIDING GATE

5.0' WROUGHT IRON FENCE ON 1.0' MASONRY WALL (66.3)

2 STORY BRICK & FRAME RESIDENCE

6.0' WROUGHT IRON FENCE (145.48)

6.0' WROUGHT IRON FENCE (175.48)

6.0' DOUBLE GATE

5 FT. PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT (115.48)
FENCE STYLE. THIS IS NOT THE SUBJECT PROPERTY.

ELEVATION

6' HIGH FENCE
6' HIGH ENTRY GATE
2' WIDE PIER
2' WIDE PIER

5' HIGH SERVICE GATE
2' WIDE PIER

6.0' SWING GATE
BLACK WROUGHT IRON

6.0' FENCE
BLACK WROUGHT IRON

0.5' PIER CAP
LIMESTONE OR CONCRETE

5.0' MASONRY PIER
BRICK TO MATCH FAÇADE OF RESIDENCE

1.0' MASONRY WALL
LIMESTONE OR CONCRETE

1.0' MASONRY WALL
LIMESTONE OR CONCRETE

4/ FENCE STYLE
STYLE & MATERIALITY OF FENCE
93-92 KEDZIE STREET, 05.19.2016
2.1/ EXISTING YARD
EXISTING CONDITIONS OF PROPERTY
99-92 KEDZIE STREET, 05.18.2018
City of Evanston

May 1, 1984

Mr. & Mrs. T. Boyle
90 Kedzie Street
Evanston, IL 60201

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Boyle:

The information you have submitted in regard to a fence permit for the above property has been reviewed.

I regret to inform you that the permit cannot be issued at this time for the portion of the proposed fence closest to your home (on your private property). This fence is in the required front yard and such fences are not permitted in residential districts.

I feel that your replacing a 3"6" cyclone fence on City property with a 6 feet iron fence meets the terms of your lease of City property and a permit for this fence on the leased property can be issued.

If you wish to proceed with the portion of the fence on private property as proposed you will have to apply for a zoning analysis and then file for a variation from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

For the purpose of filing for a zoning analysis and/or a variation, or if you have any questions please contact Mr. David Rasmussen at 866-2930.

I am returning the material which you submitted for review.

[Signature]

Director, Building & Zoning

RC: am
cc: R. Rudd
    E. Nehring
    D. Rasmussen
    V. Odom
LEASE

TERM OF LEASE: Ten Years
DATE OF LEASE: BEGINNING
December 1, 1983
ENDING
November 30, 1993

LOCATION OF PREMISES:
As set forth in Exhibit A hereto, property located at and adjacent to 90 Kedzie Street, Evanston, Illinois

PURPOSE:
Utilization of public property for the reconstruction of an existing fence at 90 Kedzie Street, Evanston, Illinois

LESSEE:
TERRENCE G. and STELLA BOYLE

LESSOR:
CITY OF EVANSTON

Address: 90 Kedzie Street
Address: 2100 Ridge Avenue
City: Evanston, Illinois
City: Evanston, Illinois

IN CONSIDERATION of the agreements herein stated LESSOR hereby leases to LESSEE the property as described in Exhibit A hereto to be used for landscaping and no other purposes.

1. The LESSEE shall pay to the CITY OF EVANSTON One Dollar ($1.00) per year payable annually as rental for subject property. Payment shall be on the first day of December of each year.

2. This lease may not be assigned or subleased as it is for the mutual benefit solely of the CITY OF EVANSTON and TERRENCE G. and STELLA BOYLE. Any attempted assignment or sublease by LESSEE shall automatically terminate this lease.

3. The LESSEE shall maintain and repair said premises in a good state of repair, appearance and order corresponding to the standards that apply to public grounds otherwise owned by the City. LESSEE shall not post, paint or place or cause others to post, paint or place on subject property any advertisement or signs of any kind.
4. LESSEE shall hold harmless and indemnify the LESSOR against all liability imposed by law and against all loss, liability, damage, and expense, including attorney's fees, incurred by the LESSOR, on account of any injury to or death of any person or persons whomsoever, including employees of the LESSEE, of carriers, and of the LESSEE's subcontractors, or on account of damage to property sustained by any person, persons, firm or corporation caused by or connected with the exercise of rights or the discharge of obligation by the LESSEE hereunder. If requested by the LESSOR, the LESSEE at its own expense, cost and risk shall defend any pay all costs, including attorney's fees, of any and all suits or other legal proceedings that may be brought or instituted against the LESSOR, or any such claim or demand, and pay and satisfy any judgement that may be rendered against them in any such suit or legal proceeding or the amount of any compromise or settlement that may result therefrom.

5. LESSEE shall maintain liability insurance on subject property in an amount acceptable to the City Manager. Such policy shall name the CITY OF EVANSTON as an insured and shall specifically include the Hold Harmless provisions of this lease agreement.

6. Either party hereto may terminate this lease at any time upon the prior service of ninety (90) days written notice of said termination. The LESSOR may terminate this lease with seven (7) days written notice in the event LESSOR initiates a vacation or title transfer of the premises to the LESSEE. All notices required shall be by registered mail and shall be addressed as set forth in the preamble of this lease.

7. The LESSEE shall use the premises for no other purposes than stated herein. LESSOR hereby reserves unto itself and to all public utilities owning public service facilities such rights-of-way, easements and license rights to equipment presently installed and located on the premises and further reserves the right of ingress and egress for the maintenance, renewal, and reconstruction thereof.
8. LESSEE shall not make any additions or improvements on the premises without the prior written approval of the LESSOR. Any improvements made shall, upon the termination of this lease, remain for the benefit of the LESSOR unless LESSOR directs LESSEE to remove any or all of said additions or improvements. In the event LESSOR directs the removal of such additions or improvements, LESSEE shall remove same at its own cost and shall restore the premises to a condition equal to that at the time of initial leasing.

WITNESS the hands and seals of the parties hereto, as of the date of this lease stated above.

LESSOR: CITY OF EVANSTON

LESSEE: TERRENCE G. BOYLE
STELLA BOYLE

ATTEST:

ATTEST:
PUBLIC NOTICE OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE VARIATION

You are receiving this notice because, according to our records, you own property within 250 feet of the subject property:

90-92 Kedzie St., Case #18ZMNV-0046
Minor Variation
Zoning District: R1
Preservation/Landmark: Lakeshore
Applicant: Matt Rodgers

Requested variation is: From Section 6-4-6-7-F-3, that states that fences are not permitted within the front yard
For the purpose of: Constructing a 6 foot fence in the front yard to an existing single-family residence
Notice Date: June 4, 2018
Comments Accepted Through: June 14, 2018

The full application is available at the Zoning Office during regular business hours Monday thru Friday (8:30am-5:00pm) for review and comment. For consideration, the Zoning Office must receive written comments by the date indicated above. Send your comments/questions to Michael Griffith, Zoning Office, via e-mail at mgriffith@cityofevanston.org or by mail to Zoning Office, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, IL 60201, (847) 448-4311.
PUBLIC NOTICE OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE VARIATION DENIAL

You are receiving this notice because, according to our records, you own property within 250 feet of the subject property:

90-92 Kedzie St., Case #18ZMNV-0046 Notice date: June 28, 2018

Fence Variation
Zoning District: R1
Preservation/Landmark: Lakeshore
Applicant: Matt Rodgers

The fence variation from the zoning ordinance requirement has been DENIED. The variation requested placing a fence within the front yard of the subject property noted above, a location not permitted by the zoning ordinance, Section 6-4-6-7-F.

The application has been DENIED because the standards for granting a fence variation were not met, specifically, the proposed fence location will not assist in reducing noise, screen incompatible adjacent uses or increase safety to the owners of the subject property or abutting properties, Section 3-8-12-B-2.

The applicant or an adjacent property owner may appeal a decision of the Zoning Administrator to the Zoning Board of Appeals within 10 working days of the date of this notification.

The full application is available at the Zoning Office during regular business hours Monday thru Friday (8:30am-5:00pm) for review and comment. For consideration, the Zoning Office must receive written comments by the date indicated above. Send your comments/questions to Michael Griffith, Zoning Office, via e-mail at mgriffith@cityofevanston.org or by mail to Zoning Office, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, IL 60201, (847) 448-4311.
Dear Mr. Griffith,

Attached is a letter from me and my husband addressing the application submitted on Mr. Darvish's behalf requesting a zoning variance at 90-92 Kedzie. While I recognize that some of the issues fall under the terms of the easement that exists protecting both our access to the lake, as well as our views of the lake, it is our request that until we are satisfied that the terms of our easement are being protected, along with satisfactory resolution of security concerns since these concerns are the reason Mr. Darvish states he is applying for the variance, that the city of Evanston not approve any request that would potentially be in violation of this easement.

In addition, it has come to our attention that Mr. Darvish applied for and was granted a permit to erect a construction fence around the property. We have been informed that this fence is not for construction, but is serving as a temporary fence until a permanent fence can be installed. This, according to Mr. Darvish's representative, would not happen until the Darvish family returns to Japan following the end of the baseball season. Given the nature of the fence they want to build, along with the unpredictability of Chicago weather, this means that neighbors will have to deal with an ugly construction fence through the summer and, possibly, well into next year. Since the fence is, according to their representative, only intended to contain their dogs and children, we are asking that the city review the permit for the construction fence.

Kind regards,

Alexis Eyler

Darvish Letter.pdf
57K
June 12, 2018

Dear Mr. Ruiz & Mr. Griffith,

Per the postcards that we received in the mail, we are responding with our concerns regarding the variances and exceptions that Mr. Yu Darvish, the owner of 90-92 Kedzie, is requesting. While some of our concerns may be outside the zoning/preservation commission’s purview as directly related to Mr. Darvish’s requests, it is our position that his requests violate the spirit of the neighborhood, the zoning guidelines of the Lakeshore Historic District and will compromise property values and quality of life for those of us who live in the district, utilize the park and enjoy views of Lake Michigan.

In responding directly to the application, here are our comments:

1. Other homes in the Lakeshore Historic District have 4’ fences, not 6’ fences in their front yards and they predate the zoning change of 1999. Erecting a fence compromises the character of the local historic district, specifically Swigert’s Subdivision, in which no other homes have fences excepting a likely-original 4’ fence along the sidewalk of 745 Sheridan Rd.

2. A 6’ fence around the entire property will be detrimental to property values of other homes bordering the property, specifically 741-747 Sheridan Rd. An easement exists dated 4/14/1950 requiring an unobstructed view of the lake be maintained. A 6’ fence and accompanying landscaping will violate that easement and drastically diminish property values of the neighboring properties.

3. Granting the requested variance violates the spirit of Swigert’s Subdivision. As new owners in the subdivision, we recognized the value and beauty of the open, fence-less plan. Our neighbors all know each other well, socialize together and support each other, connecting in a way that isn’t seen a lot these days. Allowing the applicant to build a 6’ fence around the entire property destroys the essence of the neighborhood. Having recently moved from a neighborhood where everyone surrounds themselves by 6’ fences, this open plan was a welcome change and a big part of why we chose to move.

4. A 6’ fence, as acknowledged by the applicant on Page 4, #10, will not prevent a determined person from accessing the property. While we do not necessarily object to additional security at the front of the house bordering the park, a 6’ fence, while possibly permitted around the entire property, seems excessive and potentially violates the easement dated 4/14/1950 requiring an unobstructed view for the 70’ of the property line with 741 Sheridan Rd. Additionally, a similar easement exists for 94 Kedzie, the property owned by 747 and 741 Sheridan Rd.

5. If there are legitimate safety concerns causing Mr. Darvish to feel the need to request a variance allowing him to erect a 6’ fence at the front of the property, and, subsequently
around the entire property, then we, by extension, have serious concerns about our family’s safety as the implication is that people will trespass across our property to access Mr. Darvish’s property, thus his reasoning for requiring a 6’ fence. We have concerns about the safety of our children and pets and would like to know what, if anything, the applicant proposes so that his moving in does not adversely affect the safety and security of my family and the families of our neighbors.

6. We object to the sale of public parkland to a private citizen. Particularly when this citizen has no ties to Evanston or its community and, based on his desire to enclose himself on his property, is not likely to engage with the community during his time here.

7. While we recognize that the city does not require zoning approval for the installation of landscaping, we object to the proposed landscape plan detailing “smaller plantings in front of the fence with larger evergreens behind” as these will, with absolute certainty, obstruct our view of the lake. Not only will this negatively impact our property values, but it will diminish quality of life for those of us living in Swigert’s Subdivision.

8. We would ask that the city not approve any variances until the above issues are resolved in compliance with the existing easement, and to the satisfaction of the neighbors impacted; along with satisfactory resolution of safety concerns.

In closing, it saddens us that Mr. Darvish and his wife opted to pursue these changes without reaching out to their new neighbors first. Finding out about these impactful changes via a postcard in the mail dismays us. We certainly welcome the Darvish family to Evanston and have every intention of being good neighbors, but being neighborly is a two-way street. And last, as you are well aware, there are numerous famous, prominent and/or wealthy individuals who live in Evanston and manage to do so without requesting special treatment. We hope that the city will opt to support the existing zoning requirements and deny Mr. Darvish’s requests.

Many thanks for your consideration of this matter.

Kind regards,

Alexis & Craig Eyler
Re: Zoning variance for 90 Kedzie case#18ZMNV-0046 (for Zoning Board of Appeals)

Michael Griffith <mgriffith@cityofevanston.org>
To: "Pierre E. Durand" <pierre@durand-nyborg.net>
Cc: Scott Mangum <smangum@cityofevanston.org>, Melissa Klotz <mklotz@cityofevanston.org>

Pierre,

Thank you for your comments. We will include your comments in the information provided to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Respectfully,
Michael Griffith
Development Planner
Planning & Zoning Division
Community Development Department
Morton Civic Center
City of Evanston

2100 Ridge Ave. | Evanston, IL 60201 | 847-448-8230
mgriffith@cityofevanston.org | cityofevanston.org

Call 311 to make an appointment, or available for walk-ins at the Building Permit Desk on Thursdays

On Wed, Jul 4, 2018 at 6:27 PM, Pierre E. Durand <pierre@durand-nyborg.net> wrote:

Dear Mr. Griffith,

If Mr. Darvish is so concerned about deranged people that would try to invade his privacy, maybe direct neighbors of 90 Kedzie (such as myself) should be very concerned as well. So, if we neighbors should also think about installing tall fences in order to be protected from the same deranged people. Personally, I would not be happy to be surrounded by tall fences but maybe seriously. If the city sets a precedent for Mr. Darvish, why wouldn't we be allowed to protect ourselves as well from the so-called deranged people.

Mr. Darvish has lived in this house for a few weeks and I have never noticed groupies in the area. Maybe they will show up one day and I should also be prepared.

If Mr. Howard Van Doren Shaw (the architect of my house) were to come back to life, he would think that the world has gone mad. Evanston has been able to preserve its charm from another more grace and common sense. Why don't we try to hold on to the common sense and grace that we have been able to preserve on the lake front of Evanston so far?

Sincerely,
Pierre E. Durand

PS: Please, look at this picture below with an open mind. As of July 5, we have three rows of fences that have been installed so far. Is this the frame of mind that made Evanston should adjust to Evanston's way of living, or else, he should contemplate a tall gated community in a western suburb (such as Burr Ridge) where he could find all the protection without ever thinking about being part of his neighborhood.
This sense of openness (see below), which contributed to make Evanston so appealing, will be gone for a long time...
On Jun 11, 2018, at 10:28 AM, Michael Griffith <mgriffith@cityofevanston.org> wrote:

Hi Pierre,

I've put a copy of your email in the file for when staff meets to discuss this case, thank you for your input.

It is my understanding the new owner is proposing to buy a portion of the public street right-of-way in front of the property, selling public right-of-way is not considered by zoning, the way would start with the Public Works Agency and is likely up to the City Council. I'll forward your comments to the Public Works Agency.

Assuming the right-of-way is sold and now becomes private property, placing a fence in that location is a zoning consideration and included in their variation request.

Planting trees, shrubs, etc, on private property, does not require zoning approval.

Proposed site plan attached. The gray area is the proposed right-of-way the applicant is proposing to buy from the City.

Respectfully,
Michael Griffith
Development Planner
Planning & Zoning Division
Community Development Department
Morton Civic Center
City of Evanston

2100 Ridge Ave. | Evanston, IL 60201 | 847-448-8230
mgriffith@cityofevanston.org | cityofevanston.org

Call 311 to make an appointment, or available for walk-ins at the Building Permit Desk on Thursdays
On Sat, Jun 9, 2018 at 9:25 AM, Pierre E. Durand <pierre@durand-nyborg.net> wrote:

Dear Mr. Griffith:

I have been the owner of 747 Sheridan Road for the past 18 years. All along, I have been trying to bring back the spirit that the architect of my house, Howard Van Doren Shaw, had it. Originally, the Swaggart lot had two houses (747 and 741). I was able, in 2010, to remove a house that had been built in 1978 at 94 Kedzie because I had almost no backyard and the new owner of 90 Kedzie wants to make a compound with tall bushes and iron fences out of 90 and 92 Kedzie. This goes clearly against the spirit of this district. We unde owner wants a maximum amount of privacy. The accepted fence height at the street level is four feet for this district. I could accept that he goes higher for the height of his fence at totally opposed to the idea that he would take over the parkway in order to plant tall evergreen bushes and further block my view of the lake in the public park. We are supposed to society that values good neighborly attitudes.

These tall evergreens planted parallel to the lake on the public parkway of Kedzie is an arrogant childish idea (see below):

I could come over to your office to discuss this matter further. Feel free to contact me about setting up an appointment.

Sincerely,

Pierre E. Durand
747 Sheridan Road
Evanston, IL 60202
Tel: 847 328 6128

<SITE PLAN - 90-92 KEDZIE ST.pdf>
90-92 Kedzie St.
90-92 Kedzie St.

User drawn points

Tax Parcels

July 13, 2018

This map is not a plat of survey. This map is provided "as is" without warranties of any kind. See www.cityofevanston.org/mapdisclaimers.html for more information.
MEETING MINUTES (EXCERPT)
EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Tuesday, June 12, 2018,
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 2800
7:00 P.M.

Members Present: Robert Bady, Elliott Dudnik, Ken Itle, Suzi Reinhold, Tim Schmitt, Mark Simon, and Diane Williams

Members Absent: Julie Hacker, Jamie Morris, Sally Riessen Hunt, and Karl Vogel

Staff Present: Scott Mangum, Planning & Zoning Administrator
Carlos Ruiz, Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator

Presiding Member: Diane Williams, Chair

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM 7:04 pm

3. NEW BUSINESS

E. 90 Kedzie St. (LSHD) – Matt Rogers, applicant. 6-foot fence around the entire property, observing the utility easement along the south property line. This would include a fence in the front yard, which is not permitted under City Code 6-4-6-7. The front yard portion would be a 5-foot wrought iron atop a 1-foot masonry wall with 6-foot masonry piers located at all corners on the north property line. There is an elevation shift from the west to east of the front property line, with a portion of the yard along the lake being 28 inches higher. We request that the fence height follow this grade change. Fence Variation: 6-4-6-7 (F) 2 Fences are only permitted in front yard on a Type 1 street; request for construction of a fence in the front yard on a non-Type 1 street; 6-4-6-7 (F) 3 Fences are limited to four (4) feet in a front yard, where they are permitted in a front yard; request for construction of a six (6) foot fence in the front yard. Applicable standards: [Construction 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12 and 13]; [Zoning Variation A, B and C].

Matt Rogers, zoning consultant presented the application. There are two lots in common ownership. The applicants are seeking a 6’ fence around the property and landscaping. There are two different plans, because the applicants is seeking a vacation of some of the right of way. The property sits 18’ back from the sidewalk. There is an existing 6’ fence that they hope to tie in with that fence to create more of a front yard. Without that, the front porch sits 9’ from the property line. There is a proposal to purchase that land from the City. They submitted two plans to Zoning, one includes the vacation, and the other
does not. The existing fence is on a higher elevation with plantings behind it. The side lot is empty.

Matt Rogers said the east side of the property fronts the Lake with a boat lift. There is 5’ easement that runs across the back of property. The 5’ easement is being observed to grant one of the neighbors access to the Lake. A utility easement for 741 Kedzie could not be found. The fence is proposed on the north side of that easement. The proposed fence along the Lake has masonry piers with a wrought iron fence in between and a 1’ high masonry wall at the base with a 5’ tall wrought iron fence. A 4’ high fence is also being considered. The rest will be a 6’ high wrought iron fence.

A sample of a fence wrought iron fence with a pier system, illustrated what might be the proposed fence. Matt Rogers handed out photos to show that the properties at 741 and 747 Sheridan Road will not have obstructed views to the Lake.

Chair Williams asked why the Commission would approve a fence on land that the applicant does not own. Matt Rogers said the applicants are in negotiations with the City to purchase the land. Commissioner Itle asked where is a 6’ high fence allowed without a variance? Matt Rogers those fences are allowed on the side, and rear yards and need to be setback 3’ from the front of the house. They are seeking a 6’ high fence on the front yard for security reasons. Commissioner Dudnik questioned how we could be asked to approve the design of the fence if the sample did not reflect the actual proposed fence but rather a “placeholder.” Matt Rogers said what he showed is not exactly the design of the fence, but the style of the fence and that, once they obtained approval by ZBA, they would return for approval of the actual proposed design. Commissioner Williams noted that there are too many unknowns about the design of the fence.

Scott Mangum said the Commission could make a recommendation on the fence variation and ask the applicant to come back for the fence design. Commissioner Schmitt noted that earlier Matt Rogers mentioned a 4’ high fence along the Lake. Matt Rogers said yes. Commissioner Itle referred to some of the letters from the neighbors about the easement that requires the view to the Lake be unobstructed. Matt Rogers said they are doing what they can to not impact their views. Commissioner Itle said the Commission needs to know the wording on the easement and what it really says.

Alexis Ayler of 741 Sheridan Rd. is a type 1 street such Sheridan Road have 4’ high fences, nobody has a 6’ high fence. A 6’ high fence will impact views. The utility easement dates 4/14/1950. The only exception was for the boat launch. Alexis Ayler has security concerns, the owners of 90 Kedzie desire for privacy and safety, the implication is that people will be accessing their property by trespassing across her property. She also has children and dogs, she did not put a fence, and she installed electronic fencing for her dogs. She needs to be convinced more about the necessity for a 6’ fence around the property.
Pierre Durand of 747 Sheridan designed by Howard Van Doren Shaw, said he lives in his house since 2000. He was able to expand his backyard in 2009. He wants to preserve the vision of Van Dore Shawn of open space.

Commissioner Reinhold asked about the memorandum on the agenda about Zoning variations, how does that affect this decision. Scott Mangum said it does not affect this decision.

Scott Mangum said is up the Commission to make a recommendation on the Zoning variance. The recommendation to the Zoning Administrator could be to approve or approve with conditions, or deny. The variation is for the location of the fence, the 6' portion of the fence, the Zoning Ordinance requires a 3' from the front façade. The portion that is requested for the variation is along the north property line, and anything in front of 3' behind the front façade.

Commissioner Simon made a motion recommendation to approve the Zoning variation for construction of a fence in the front yard and for the fence to be 6' instead of 4' in accordance to standards A, B and C, seconded by Commissioner Itle. Vote: 1 aye (Simon), 5 nays 1 abstention (Bady).

Matt Rogers asked the Commission table the decision on the fence design. Commissioner Schmitt made a motion to table the application for 90 Kedzie St. for COA, specifically for the fence design until 7/10/18, seconded by Commissioner Reinhold. The motion passed 7 ayes, 0 nays.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Simon made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 pm, seconded by Commissioner Schmitt. The motion passed 7 ayes, 0 nays.

Respectfully submitted,

Carlos D. Ruiz  
Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator

Next Meeting: TUESDAY, September 11, 2018 at 7:00 P.M. (Subject to change)