Zoning Board of Appeals  
Tuesday, September 4, 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 the August 28, 2018 meeting.

3. OLD BUSINESS

4. NEW BUSINESS

A. 514 Custer Ave.  
William Lensky, project manager, applies for a special use permit for a Public Utility, ComEd, in the R3 Two-Family Residential District (Zoning Code Section 6-4-6-7-F-1). The applicant also requests zoning relief for a concrete wall (fence) that is 20’ in height where concrete material is not permitted for fences (Zoning Code Section 6-4-6-7-F-1) and a maximum fence height of 8’ is allowed (Zoning Code Section 6-4-6-7-F-3). The Zoning Board of Appeals makes a recommendation to City Council, the determining body for this case.

B. 413 Grove St.  
Jeffrey K. & Janet H. Clements, property owners, appeal the Zoning Administrator’s decision to partially deny minor zoning relief (case number 18ZMNV-0029) to construct a one-story addition with 34.6% building lot coverage where 30% is allowed (Zoning Code Section 6-8-2-7). The appellant was granted approval for 33.1% building lot coverage to allow a smaller one-story addition. The Zoning Board of Appeals is the determining body for this case.

C. 2626 Reese Ave. (rescheduled and re-noticed to Sept. 25, 2018)  
William James, contractor, applies for major zoning relief to construct a single family residence and detached garage in the R1 Single Family Residential District. The applicant requests 42.5% building lot coverage where a maximum 30% is allowed.
(Zoning Code Section 6-8-2-7), a 3’ south interior side yard setback where 5’ is required for the principal structure (Zoning Code Section 6-8-2-8-A-3), a 3.5’ street side yard setback (Hartzell Street) where 15’ is required for the principal structure (Zoning Code Section 6-8-2-8-A-2), an 8.5’ street side yard setback where 15’ is required for a deck, 10’ street side yard setback where 15’ is required for the accessory structure (detached garage) and a 1’ street side yard setback where 15’ is required for open parking (Zoning Code Section 6-8-2-8-C-2). The Zoning Board of Appeals is the recommending body, and the City Council is the determining body for this case.

D. 2415 Wade St. 18ZMJV-0076
Phillip Kupritz, applicant, applies for major zoning relief to construct a 1-car attached garage, a rear addition and deck to an existing single-family residence in the R2 Single-Family Residential District. The applicant requests building lot coverage of 50% where 40% is permitted (Zoning Code Section 6-8-3-6), to reduce the minimum required front yard setback from 25.9’ to 19.8’ (Zoning Code Sections 6-8-3-7 and 6-4-1-9), to reduce the required west interior side yard setback from 5’ to 0’ and to reduce the required east interior side yard setback from 5’ to 2.9’ (Zoning Code Section 6-8-3-7), to reduce the required off-street parking from 2 spaces to 1 space for a single-family residence (Zoning Code Section 6-16-3-5, Table 16-B). The Zoning Board of Appeals is the recommending body, and the City Council is the determining body for this case.

5. DISCUSSION

6. ADJOURNMENT
The next Zoning Board of Appeals meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 25, 2018 at 7:00pm in James C. Lytle City Council Chambers of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.
MEETING MINUTES
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
Tuesday, August 28, 2018
7:00 PM
Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Council Chambers

Members Present: Lisa Dziekan, Violetta Cullen, Mary Beth Berns, Myrna Arevalo, Scott Gingold

Members Absent: Mary McAuley, Kiril Mirintchev

Staff Present: Scott Mangum, Melissa Klotz

Presiding Member: Mary Beth Berns

Declaration of Quorum
With a quorum present, Chair Berns called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

Minutes
Ms. Cullen motioned to approve the meeting minutes of the Joint Meeting with the Plan Commission, and the ZBA hearing of August 8, 2018, which were seconded by Ms. Arevalo and approved 4-0, with one abstention.

Old Business
3318 Grant St. 18ZMJV-0054
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.

Ms. Arevalo acknowledged she reviewed the meeting minutes and video of the July 17, 2018 public hearing, and voted to approve the zoning relief. With a final vote of 4-3, the zoning relief was approved.

Mr. Mirintchev arrived.

2004 Central St. 18ZMJV-0065
John Kim, property owner, applies for a special use permit to expand a Type 2 Restaurant, Backlot Coffee, from 2006 Central St. to include 2004 Central St. 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.
John Kim, operator, explained the proposal:
- Want to expand existing business into the space next door.
- Will add more seating (from approximately 30 to 60 seats).
- The expansion will allow some baked items to be made in-house, and some other ready-to-go foods will be added to the menu.
- Will add a doorway between the two spaces to combine them.
- No black-iron ventilation is needed.
- Deliveries to the restaurant occur daily during business hours. Deliveries will be less frequent than they are currently since the kitchen will produce more items.
- Ok with all conditions listed in 2006 Central special use ordinance.
- Plan to add a deck behind 2006 Central that will be constructed as part of the buildout of 2004 space for outdoor dining.

Deliberation:
Ms. Dziekan asked if staff prefers outdoor seating along sidewalks to encourage active frontages, and Mr. Mangum responded storefront windows are encouraged as active uses, and outdoor seating is desirable where there is enough space.

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

Mr. Gingold motioned to recommend approval with the conditions listed within the 2006 Central St. special use ordinance, which was seconded by Ms. Arevalo and recommended for unanimous approval.

New Business
1724 Sherman Ave. 18ZMJV-0072
James Shepherd, lessee, applies for a special use permit for a Type 2 Restaurant, Kilwins Chocolates, in the D2 Downtown Retail Core District (Zoning Code Section 6-11-3-4). The Zoning Board of Appeals is the recommending body, and the City Council is the determining body for this case.

Mr. Mangum read the case into the record.

Jeff Snyder, operator, explained the proposal:
- Kilwins offers fine chocolates, ice cream, caramel apples, fudge, chocolate dipped items, and take home items.
- 30% of items are made in the front window of the store.
Nearest Kilwins is on Michigan Ave., and there is also one in Hyde Park, and Elmhurst.
Operator does not operate another Kilwins and has no experience in this type of business, but is being trained by Kilwins on how to operate a franchise.
Hours of operation will be 10am - 11pm maximum, adjusted seasonally.
A maximum of 5 employees will work at one time.
Deliveries occur every 2 weeks (ice cream and baking ingredients), and smaller other deliveries are more frequent.
Deliveries must go through the front door in the early morning hours. The alley is not usable for truck deliveries and not allowed per the lease.
Will have 5 seats in the facility. Most customers do not stay within the store after purchasing items.
Agrees to follow the Sustainability Plan, and tap water will be offered for customers who ask for it as requested by DAPR.
Exterior of the building will be painted (likely beige), and then new signage will be added. No changes will be made to windows or doors.

Deliberations:
Mr. Gingold noted the proposed use fits with the character of the neighborhood and will occupy a vacant space. Ms. Dziekan agreed.

Mr. Gingold also noted that it is acceptable that the operator does not have experience in the field since the store is a franchise and he will be appropriately guided. Ms. Cullen agreed.

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, which was seconded by Ms. Cullen and unanimously recommended for approval:

1. Hours of operation shall not exceed 10am - 11pm.
2. Deliveries shall ideally be before 7am, and shall be no later than 9am.
3. Employees shall not utilize on street parking.
4. Sustainability practices including offering tap water and using recycling.

2200 Main St.
DonnaLee Floeter, architect, applies for a special use permit and major zoning relief to expand a Daycare Center – Child, Infant Welfare Society of Evanston, in the R2 Single Family Residential District (Zoning Code Section 6-8-3-3), and a west interior side yard setback of 6.1’ where 15’ is required for non-residential structures (Zoning Code Section
The Zoning Board of Appeals is the recommending body, and the City Council is the determining body for this case.

Ms. Klotz read the case into the record.

Steven Vick, Executive Director, and DonnaLee Floeter, architect, explained the proposal:
- The facility serves 80% low income children; many who have special needs.
- Currently the facility does not have an indoor gross motor play area, which is problematic during inclement weather.
- Building footprint will increase by 653 sq ft.
- No increase is proposed to the number of children or teachers.
- The space where the addition is proposed is currently outdoor space and is already impervious.

Ms. Dziekan asked how parking and the drop off works, and Mr. Vick explained:
- 7:30-9am is the busy drop off time and 4-5:30 is the busy pick up time.
- Parents park and come in; there is no curbside drop off.
- There are typically available parking spaces in the parking lot.
- Employees usually park throughout the neighborhood so that the parking lot is available for quick drop off and pick up.
- Ward Manufacturing President (submitted Applicant's Exhibit A) letter submitted noting there is ample parking in the area, but Ward Manufacturing will allow 2 of their spaces to be leased to the IWSE if needed.

Susan Skully, 836 Hartrey, who lives immediately south of the daycare center, has concerns about parking since her 86 year old mother has caretakers that regularly look for parking since the IWSE staff often park in front of her house. Chair Berns noted the Alderman can help obtain a handicap parking space on the street right in front of the house.

Janice Chateman, 832 Hartrey, agrees that the IWSE is a great neighbor, but parking is extremely difficult. Also, how will garbage pickup be done?

Mr. Vick responded there will be no change to garbage pickup since the addition does not impact the location of the garbage near the alley, and IWSE employees can be told to park on the other side of Main St., or Lee St., to alleviate the Hartrey parking issue.

Typically no more than 20 staff are on site at a time. Many staff use public transportation.

Ms. Dziekan noted there is a church on the north side of Main St. that may be able to share parking for IWSE employees. Mr. Vick responded Alderman Braithwaite is currently reaching out to Food 4 Less to see if some of that large parking lot could be used for some employee parking. Chair Berns encouraged the Food 4 Less parking, and Mr. Gingold added the 2 spaces from Ward Manufacturing should be used.

Deliberation:
Ms. Dziekan noted the IWSE is a great and needed service in the community, and Mr. Gingold noted the proposal is not an increase in the number of children or staff. Ms. Cullen agreed.

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

Ms. Cullen motioned to recommend approval of the special use with conditions, which was seconded by Ms. Dziekan and unanimously recommended for approval.
1. Hours of operation shall not exceed 6am - 8pm.
2. IWSE should continue to explore alternative staff parking options that can alleviate the parking demand on Hartrey Ave.
3. Substantial compliance with the documents and testimony on record.

Standards for Major Variation:
1. Yes
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Yes
7. Yes

Mr. Gingold noted the variation is a setback that is adjacent to an alley and then an industrial use, therefore the intent of the regulation is not needed.

Mr. Gingold motioned to recommend approval of the major variation, which was seconded by Ms. Dziekan and unanimously recommended for approval.

348 Custer Ave. 18ZMJV-0060
Graciela Lopez, property owner, applies for major zoning relief to convert an existing 2-flat to a 3-dwelling unit, multi-family dwelling in the R5 General Residential District. The applicant requests a lot area of 3,993 sf (existing) where 4,500 sf is required (Zoning Code Section 6-8-7-4-D), a lot width of 33’ (existing) where 50’ is required (Zoning Code Section 6-8-7-5-D), and to provide 3 off-street parking spaces (existing) where 4 are required (Zoning Code Section 6-16-3-5, Table 16-B) for a 3-dwelling unit, multifamily dwelling. The Zoning Board of Appeals is the recommending body, and the City Council is the determining body for this case.

Mr. Mangum read the case into the record.
Graciela Lopez, property owner, explained the proposal:

- There was a fire last November, and during the fire inspection it was suggested that the basement (which previously featured a bedroom in conjunction with the first floor unit) be made into a one bedroom dwelling unit.
- Current owned the property for about 30 years.
- Currently, one unit is owner occupied (along with her adult son who sometimes used the basement bedroom, and the other 2-bedroom unit is rented out for $1200 per month.
- There is a 2-car garage on-site that the owner parks in. The tenant is allowed to park in the garage but prefers to park on the street. There is also one open parking space next to the garage.
- Property is near the Howard CTA and South Blvd. CTA stations, but is not considered a TOD property.

Chair Berns asked if staff asked for the basement unit to be an affordable unit, and the applicant responded it was not brought up. Chair Berns explained staff can help explain the details and set it up so that the unit is considered an affordable unit.

The applicant continued:

- There are 3 vehicles total associated with the property owner, her son, and the current tenant.
- Two vehicles are typically parked on the street because it is more convenient than using the garage or parking pad.
- Alderman Rainey confirmed there is adequate street parking in the neighborhood.

Deliberation:
Chair Berns explained the added unit should be an affordable unit, as precedent has recently been established when zoning relief is requested.

Mr. Gingold noted he does not like the precedent to allow a 2-unit building to convert to a 3-unit building when all zoning regulations cannot be met. The fact that it does not comply with parking is a big concern that may outweigh the public benefit of an affordable unit.

Ms. Klotz noted the City is currently considering revisions to the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, which includes no parking requirement for affordable units that are required by the IHO (which would not include this proposal, but iterates the low need for parking for affordable units).

Standards:
1. Yes
2. Yes
3. Yes; No (Gingold - because the hardship is specific to the owner, not the property)
4. Yes
5. Yes, No (Gingold - because the public benefit does not outweigh the zoning relief requested, specifically the lack of parking)
6. Yes
Ms. Dziekan motioned and Ms. Cullen seconded the proposal with the following condition:

1. The basement unit shall be an affordable unit for 10 years at 80% AMI.

The proposal was recommended for approval 5-1.

1943 Sherman Ave. 18ZMJV-0073

Angie Radman, property owner, applies for major zoning relief to convert a single family residence to a 3-unit multiple family residence in the R5 General Residential District. The applicant requests a 22’ rear yard setback for a three-story stair (yard obstruction) where 22.5’ is required (Zoning Code Section 6-4-1-9), and an increase of zero additional parking spaces where 3 additional parking spaces are required, for a total of 1 parking space on-site where 5 parking spaces are required for a 3-unit multiple family residence (Zoning Code Section 6-16-3-5 Table 16-B). The Zoning Board of Appeals is the recommending body, and the City Council is the determining body for this case.

Ms. Klotz read the case into the record, and explained the previous proposal that included adding parking but was opposed at DAPR by neighbors.

Shawn Jones, attorney, explained the proposal:

- The property has not been used as a single family residence in decades and has been student housing for over 20 years.
- The property is currently in court with the City regarding the occupancy and property conditions, and City Attorney Michelle Masoncup suggested the property owner either apply to convert the structure to a legal rooming house or a multiple family residence.
- The previous proposal included adding a driveway on the north side of the house and a parking lot in the rear that would cover the entire rear yard, and was opposed by neighbors at DAPR.

Mr. Gingold asked how much repair is needed to the house and what that cost is, and Mr. Jones explained the repairs needed are exterior cosmetic repairs. The large cost is the conversion to a multiple family residence. Mr. Gingold explained his concern that the property might be converted to a 3-flat but the exterior cosmetic repairs may not be done. Mr. Jones agreed a date certain could be set for repairs after consulting with contractors.

Mr. Jones noted the structure currently features 9 bedrooms, and will have 7 bedrooms after conversion.

ZBA Members felt the property owner should be present to answer questions about maintenance, repairs, timing, and property income.

Mr. Gingold motioned to continue the case to September 25, 2018 with testimony open, which was seconded by Ms. Cullen and unanimously continued.

Ms. Cullen motioned to reopen testimony to allow the neighbor present to speak, which was seconded by Mr. Gingold and approved.
John Carver, President of condo association to the south, explained neighbors have had concerns with the property condition and life safety for a long time. Mr. Carver noted a parking lot to add parking in the rear of the property would have to include significant drainage measures that would likely be cost prohibitive to the owner. The concern is that history has shown there is either not capital available to make the improvements, or that the work done is substandard and done by unqualified workers. The issue has been ongoing for nearly 15 years, and some work is done here and there, but not the extensive work that is needed.

ZBA Members requested the property owner be prepared with the following information for the September 25, 2018 ZBA hearing: timeframe for completion of work, estimated construction costs including interior renovations, and a digital file of the submitted building permit.

Mr. Jones responded the building will be sprinkled, the water service may be upgraded (if needed), and the other requested information will be provided at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00pm.
Memorandum

To: Members of the Zoning Board of Appeals

From: Johanna Leonard, Director of Community Development
       Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Administrator
       Bill Dunkley, Zoning Planner (seasonal)

Subject: 514 Custer Avenue - ZBA 18ZMJV-0062
          ZBA - Recommending Body
          City Council - Determining Body

Date: September 4, 2018

Notice - Published in the August 16, 2018, Evanston Review:
William Lensky, project manager, applies for a special use permit for a Public Utility, ComEd, in the R3 Two-Family Residential District (Zoning Code Section 6-8-4-3). The applicant also requests zoning relief for a concrete wall (fence) that is 20' in height where concrete material is not permitted for fences (Zoning Code Section 6-4-6-7-F-1) and a maximum fence height of 8’ is allowed (Zoning Code Section 6-4-6-7-F-3). The Zoning Board of Appeals makes a recommendation to City Council, the determining body for this case.

Recommendation
City staff and DAPR recommend the Zoning Board of Appeals provide a favorable recommendation to City Council for approval of the special use for a Public Utility for ComEd and a variation from fencing for a 20’ concrete wall (fence) in the R3 Two-Family Residential District. The applicant has complied with all other zoning requirements, and meets all of the standards for a special use and variation in this district.

Site Background
514 Custer Avenue is located on the west side of Custer Ave. adjacent to the mid-block alleyway between South Blvd. and Oakton St. The property is within the R3 Two-Family Residential District and is surrounded by the following:

North: R3 Two-Family Residential District
East: R5 General Residential District
South: R3 Two-Family Residential District
West: R3 Two-Family Residential District

The site fronts along both Custer Avenue and an alley, with access to the site currently
via a curb cut and driveway on Custer Avenue. The property features ComEd electrical distribution equipment surrounded by a chain link fence.

**Existing Site with ComEd Equipment**

Proposed

ComEd proposes to replace the existing distribution center with a smaller, more reliable and higher efficiency “DC-in-a-box” distribution center similar to proposals previously implemented at 1919 Church Street and 2506 Green Bay Road. The new equipment will increase capacity, reliability, and will provide better back-up abilities should other distribution centers fail during inclement weather. The new equipment is smaller in size than the existing, and will be obscured from some views by the proposed concrete walls.

The property is located in the R3 Two-Family Residential District, which requires special use approval for a Public Utility when it is the principal use on a property. The Zoning Ordinance defines a Public Utility as:

A building or portion thereof used for providing, monitoring, and housing utilities for public consumption or use. This term shall include, but will not be limited to, operations providing water, sewer, gas, public works facilities, and other uses similar in nature and impact.

The new utility equipment includes transformers, regulators, and switch gears. All new
equipment is smaller than the existing equipment, with the largest transformer at 12’ in height and the remaining equipment 8.5’ or less. Per typical ComEd requirements, the equipment is placed on concrete pads and then surrounded by gravel with a concrete perimeter for grounding purposes.

Recently updated ComEd standards now require a fireproof wall surrounding the equipment when anything flammable is located within 25’ of the equipment. Concrete walls are proposed along the south and west sides of the equipment. The walls act as barriers and are therefore considered fencing by zoning regulations. ComEd proposes the wall be 20’ in height. A maximum 8’ fence height is permitted in the R3 district when a non-residential use abuts a residential use. The proposed concrete material, which will be poured in place and stamped with a pattern, such as brick, is not a permitted fencing material by zoning regulations. The walls are placed 3’ from all property lines, and are at least 3’ from the equipment. Walls are not necessary along the north and east portions of the property.

*Rendering of Proposal, looking Southwest, with landscaping shown*

The applicant proposes to move the vehicular access to the property from Custer Avenue to the alley, removing the current driveway and curb cut on Custer and providing a contiguous sidewalk along the Custer frontage. The existing chain link fence will be removed.

ComEd will plant and maintain native grasses in the right-of-way along Custer between the concrete pad and the sidewalk to provide some screening of the equipment.
City staff is not aware of any objections to the proposal, and finds the increased utility reliability beneficial to the community. The stamped concrete walls will improve the aesthetics and will shield the industrial equipment from view of the adjacent residential uses.

**Ordinances Identified for Requested Relief**

6-8-4: R3 Two-Family Residential District  
6-8-4-3: Special Uses: The following uses may be allowed in the R3 Two-Family Residential District, subject to the provisions set forth in 6-3-5 “Special Uses” of this title:  
- Public Utility (among others listed)

6-4-6-7: Fencing Regulations  
6-4-6-7-F-1: Permitted fencing materials include chain-link, metal, wood, or PVC.  
6-4-6-7-F-3-b: Maximum allowed fence height – 8'

**Comprehensive Plan**

The Evanston Comprehensive General Plan encourages the redevelopment of blighted properties that promote neighborhood desirability. The Comprehensive Plan specifically includes:

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

Policy: Preserve neighborhood character while supporting redevelopment efforts that add to neighborhood desirability.

The proposed Public Utility is beneficial to the immediate neighborhood and community as a whole as it will increase ComEd reliability and ameliorate the aesthetics of the current site.

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

The applicant explained the need for the equipment upgrade and ComEd’s new requirement for the concrete walls with the specific locations and heights. The DAPR Committee requested the applicant consider low-height (maximum 30 in.) landscaping between the sidewalk and the site, and at the northeast corner of the site.

Recommendation: Unanimous 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:

a) Is one of the listed special uses for the zoning district in which the property lies: Public Utility is one of the eligible special uses in the R3 district.

b) Complies with the with the purposes and the policies of the Comprehensive General Plan and the Zoning ordinance: Increasing the effectiveness of public
service delivery is in keeping with the purposes and policies of the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance.

c) Does not cause a negative cumulative effect in combination with existing special uses or as a category of land use: This proposal will decrease the cumulative aesthetic effect of similar existing uses.

d) Does not interfere with or diminish the value of property in the neighborhood. This proposal will ameliorate the aesthetics of the current installation and will therefore have a positive effect on the value of property in the neighborhood.

e) Is adequately served by public facilities and services: The use will require minimal public facilities and services to function.

f) Does not cause undue traffic congestion: The use will have no impact on traffic.

g) Preserves significant historical and architectural resources: This standard is not applicable.

h) Preserves significant natural and environmental resources: This standard is not applicable.

i) Complies with all other applicable regulations: With the approval of the requested fence variation, the proposal will comply with all applicable regulations.

**Variation Standards:**

For the ZBA to recommend that City Council grant a variation, the ZBA must find that the proposed variation:

a) Will not have a substantial adverse impact on the use, enjoyment or property values of adjoining properties: The proposal will shield adjoining properties both visually and physically from the site, thereby positively impacting the use, enjoyment and values of adjoining properties.

b) Is in keeping with the intent of the zoning ordinance: The proposal is in keeping with the intent of the zoning ordinance in that it adequately and appropriately provides for public utilities.

c) Has a hardship or practical difficulty that is peculiar to the property: Utility standards require shielding as proposed to protect surrounding properties and the equipment located on the site.

d) Property owner would suffer a particular hardship or practical difficulty as distinguished from a mere inconvenience: Utility standards require shielding as proposed to protect surrounding properties and the equipment located on the site.

e) Is not based exclusively upon a desire to extract additional income from the property or public benefit to the whole will be derived: There is significant public benefit in replacing the existing equipment and fencing as proposed.

f) Does not have a hardship or practical difficulty that was created by any person having an interest in the property: The shielding is a requirement of the utility.

g) Is limited to the minimum change necessary to alleviate the particular hardship or practical difficulty: The shielding as proposed is a requirement of the utility.
Attachments

Special Use Application- submitted June 14, 2018
Fence Variation Application – submitted June 14, 2018
Standards Forms
Zoning Analysis
Plat of Survey
Site Plan
Renderings
Image of Property
Aerial View of Property
Zoning Map of property
DAPR Meeting Minutes excerpt– July 25, 2018
1. PROPERTY

Address: 514 CUSTER AVE, EVANSTON, IL, 60202
Permanent Identification Number(s):
PIN 1: [1][1][1][9][3][2][9][0][2][6][0][0][0][0] PIN 2: [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
(Note: An accurate plat of survey for all properties that are subject to this application must be submitted with the application.

2. APPLICANT

Name: William Lenski
Organization: ComEd
Address: 1 Lincoln Centre
City, State, Zip: Oakbrook Terrace, IL, 60181
Phone: Work: (630) 386-0849 Home: Cell/Other: 
Fax: Work: __________ Home: __________
E-mail: William.Lenski@ComEd.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: ComEd Project Manager for subject project

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

Name(s) or Organization: ComEd
Address: 1 Lincoln Centre
City, State, Zip: Oakbrook Terrace, IL, 60181
Phone: Work: (630) 386-0849 Home: __________ Cell/Other: __________
Fax: Work: __________ Home: __________
E-mail: William.Lenski@ComEd.com

“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.”

William Lenski
Property Owner(s) Signature(s) -- REQUIRED
Date: June 12, 2018

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.”

William Lenski
Applicant Signature – REQUIRED
Date: June 12, 2018
The following are required to be submitted with this application:

- (This) Completed and Signed Application Form
- Plat of Survey  Date of Survey: 10/10/2017
- Project Site Plan  Date of Drawings: 06/15/2018
- Plan or Graphic Drawings of Proposal (If needed, see notes)
- Non-Compliant Zoning Analysis
- Proof of Ownership  Document Submitted: Deed
- Application Fee  Amount $660

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.

**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.
6. PROPOSED PROJECT

A. Briefly describe the proposed Special Use:

Replacing existing conventional open-air distribution center equipment with state-of-the art self-contained compartmental distribution center equipment (DC-in-a-box), similar to recently completed ComEd DC-in-a-box installations in central and north Evanston. This work will include removing the substation fence and equipment and replacing it with new fully enclosed, tamper-resistant equipment. This project will increase electrical service reliability and the overall substation aesthetics.

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. Zoning section 6-8-4-3: In the R3 zoning district, public utility facilities require special use approval.

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?

No, it will significantly increase electric service reliability for the surrounding area.

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

N/A. The property will only need to be accessed by ComEd sporadically.
d) Will the requested special use cause undue traffic congestion?

No, the property will only need to be accessed by ComEd sporadically.

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________


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

N/A. There is nothing on the property other than electrical equipment.

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________


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

N/A. Existing substation yard is gravel.

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________


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?

A Fence Variation Application has been submitted for relevant variations. Apart from the special use approval, the only other zoning non-compliance is 6-8-4-11. Access to the site has been re-located to the alley. Additionally, the city has recommended consideration of the addition of landscaping around the property; due to the proximity of the wall to the property line and below grade wall footing between the wall and PL, ComEd is instead proposing to stamp the wall with a brick-like form liner and stain the concrete a color like the nearby buildings.
City of Evanston
DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

(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.

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

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.)
   Exelon Corporation
   P.O. Box 805398
   Chicago, IL, 60680-5398
   Phone: 1-800-483-3220

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

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.

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

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.

Carlo F. Cavallaro  
ComEd - External Affairs Manager  
5190 Church St  
Skokie, IL, 60077

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.

____________________________________________________________________  
____________________________________________________________________  
____________________________________________________________________  
____________________________________________________________________  
____________________________________________________________________  
____________________________________________________________________  
____________________________________________________________________  

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. What projects are eligible for a Special Use Permit?
Projects are eligible per zoning District. Please check the Zoning District to see if your proposed project is listed as a permitted Special Use per zoning District. The Allowed Uses by Zoning District handout is also another way to access information to see if your project is eligible to apply.

2. Who can submit an application?
The applicant must either own, lease, or have legal or equitable interest in the subject property, or must be the representative of such a person. All persons or parties which have an ownership interest in the affected properties must be identified and must sign the application. The Property Owner(s) may, at their discretion, designate another person as Applicant to act on their behalf in processing this application. In that case, the designated Applicant will be considered the primary contact, until the application is closed or the Property Owner changes the designated Applicant by contacting the Zoning Office in writing. Standing (§6-3-8-4):

3. How do I submit an application?
Applications must be submitted in person to the Zoning Office, City of Evanston, Civic Center Room 3700, 2100 Ridge Avenue. Our office hours are Monday through Friday (excluding Holidays) from 8:30 am until 5:00 pm. Evanston.
Applications must be complete, including all required documentation and fee.
Applications are not accepted by mail or e-mail.
Application materials cannot be returned.

4. What forms of payment are accepted?
Cash, Credit Card, Check.

5. Can I withdraw my application?
Yes, an application may be withdrawn any time prior to a vote.

6. Who has access to my application materials?
The application is a public document, and as such, may be reviewed by the general public upon request.

B. INFORMATION ABOUT SPECIAL USES

What is a Special Use Permit?
For each zoning district, the Zoning Ordinance identifies permitted uses (also called “by right” uses) and special uses which may be allowed depending upon the circumstances. In order to legally operate a special use, a property owner must apply for a Special Use Permit from the Zoning Office. The application is reviewed at a public hearing by the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA), which makes a recommendation to the City Council. The ZBA can also recommend conditions on a granted special use. The City Council is the deciding body for all Special Uses in the City of Evanston.
The Special Use Application Process

- The City reviews the project through a Zoning Analysis (applied for separately) and determines it is eligible to apply for a special use
- The Applicant files a Special Use Application
- The City publishes a notice of the hearing in the Evanston Review, between 15 and 30 days prior to hearing.
- The City posts a sign describing the public hearing on the property no less than 10 working days before the hearing.
- The City must mail notification of the public hearing to all properties that are within 500 feet of any point on the subject property. (The applicant is responsible for the accuracy of the list used by the City for mailing this notice. The applicant can either rely on a list the City produces through its Geographic Information System or produce his or her own list of the names and addresses of property owners within 500 feet of the subject property. The Zoning Office will send to the applicant its generated mailing list. The applicant should inform the Zoning Office if any names and addresses are missing.
- The City encourages all applicants to discuss their proposal with their neighbors prior to the public hearing.
- The Zoning Division will schedule the applicant to meet with the Site Plan & Appearance Review Committee; (SPAARC) which provides a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals.
- The ZBA recommends denial, approval, or approval with conditions of the application to City Council;
- The Planning and Development Committee of the City Council considers the ZBA recommendation and forwards it to the full City Council with or without a recommendation;
- City Council considers the ZBA recommendation and may introduce an ordinance granting the requested zoning relief;
- City Council may adopt an ordinance granting the requested zoning relief at the following or any subsequent City Council meeting.

The approximate time from when the Zoning Office receives a complete application to a decision is three to four months.

To recommend approval for a special use, the ZBA must find that the proposed special use meets all of the following criteria:

a) is one of the listed special uses for the zoning district in which the property lies;

b) complies with the purposes and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance;

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

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

e) is adequately served by public facilities and services;

f) does not cause undue traffic congestion;

g) preserves significant historical and architectural resources;

h) preserves significant natural and environmental resources; and

i) complies with all other applicable regulations.

Expiration

Within one year of obtaining a special use permit, the recipient must either obtain a building permit and commence construction, or obtain a certificate of occupancy and commence the use. City Council may extend this one-year limitation upon request.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Community Development Department – Planning and Zoning Division
2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 3202  Evanston, Illinois  60201
P.847-448-4311       F.  847-448-8126       E.  zoning@cityofevanston.org
www.cityofevanston.org/zoning
1. PROPERTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>514 CUSTER AVE, EVANSTON, IL, 60202</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Identification Number(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN 1:</td>
<td>1 1 1 9 3 2 9 0 2 6 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN 2:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (Note: An accurate plat of survey for all properties that are subject to this application must be submitted with the application.)

2. APPLICANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>William Lenski</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>ComEd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>1 Lincoln Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State, Zip:</td>
<td>Oakbrook Terrace, IL 60181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: Work:</td>
<td>630-386-0849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: Home:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: Cell/Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: Work:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: Home:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:William.Lenski@ComEd.com">William.Lenski@ComEd.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the relationship of the applicant to the property owner?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ same</td>
<td>□ builder/contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ architect</td>
<td>□ potential purchaser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ officer of board of directors</td>
<td>□ potential lessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ other: ComEd Project Manager for subject project</td>
<td>□ real estate agent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name(s) or Organization:</th>
<th>ComEd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>1 Lincoln Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State, Zip:</td>
<td>Oakbrook Terrace, IL 60181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: Work:</td>
<td>630-386-0849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: Cell/Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:William.Lenski@ComEd.com">William.Lenski@ComEd.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“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.”

William Lenski  
Property Owner(s) Signature(s) -- REQUIRED  
June 12, 2018  
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.”

William Lenski  
Applicant Signature – REQUIRED  
June 12, 2018  
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: 10/10/2017
- **Site Plan**
  - Date of Drawing: 06/15/2018
- **Project Zoning Analysis**
  - Date: 11/30/2017
  - ID#: 17ZONA-0260
- **Proof of Ownership**
  - Document Submitted: Deed
- **Application Fee**
  - Amount: $275
  - 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 fence under consideration consists of cast in place concrete fire walls on the south and west sides of the property. The wall on the west side is 14’ tall, 20’ long, and 10” thick. The wall on the south side is 20’ tall, 52’ long, and 10” thick. All walls are at least 2.5’ set back from the property line. Refer to drawings for details.

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</th>
<th>(B) Requirement to be Varied</th>
<th>(C) Requested Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-4-6-7-F-1</td>
<td>The permitted materials for fences accessory to the uses listed in this Subsection (F) are [as listed]</td>
<td>The walls are made of concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-4-6-7-F-3-b</td>
<td>Maximum permitted fence height in the R3 zoning district is 8’ (non-residential use abutting residential use)</td>
<td>The walls are 14’ tall on the west side and 20’ tall on the south side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. PRACTICAL DIFFICULTY

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

The concrete walls are designed to protect the people and property adjacent to the site, in the event of an equipment failure. As such, they must be made of a material, height, and located on the west and south sides of the property to prevent such damage from occurring.

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.

An 8’ high wall will not adequately protect the building on the property to the south nor any property or vehicles on the west side.

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.

N/A

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 walls will increase the safety to the abutting properties. The west wall will not extend as far north as to affect the line of sight or turn for the parking spaces of the property west of the substation. The south wall will only impede view into the substation for safety precaution.
A. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Who can submit an application?

In order to submit an application for zoning relief, an applicant must either own, lease, or have legal or equitable interest in the subject property, or must be the representative of such a person (§6-3-8-4).

All persons or parties which have an ownership interest in the affected properties must be identified and must sign the application. The Property Owner(s) may, at his/their discretion, designate another person as Applicant to act on their behalf in processing this application. In that case, the designated Applicant will be considered the primary contact, until the application is closed or the Property Owner changes the designated Applicant by contacting the Zoning Office in writing.

2. How do I submit an application?

Applications must be submitted in person Monday through Friday (excl. holidays) from 8:30am until 5:00pm at the Zoning Office of the City of Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 3202.

Applications must be complete, including all required documentation and fee. Applications are not accepted by mail or e-mail, and Application materials cannot be returned.

3. What forms of payment are accepted? Cash, Credit Card, Check.

B. INFORMATION ABOUT FENCE VARIATIONS IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS

Where Can I Put a Fence? Per Section 6-4-6-7(F) of the Zoning Ordinance, fences are not permitted in the front yard i or the “street side” yard ii of any lot in a residential zoning district. iii Fences of up to 6 feet in height are permitted in the rear and interior side yards. Fences in existence prior to April 1, 1999 that do not meet the current fence regulations, and that have not been removed since that date may be repaired or replaced “in kind” (same height, same material, same opacity) (Section 6-4-6-7(D).

Are there Exceptions? You may apply for a Fence Variation (“variance”) to put a fence in the front or street side yard if you believe that you have exceptional circumstances with regard to:

- noise or safety,
- to visually screen an adjacent “incompatible use” (industrial, commercial, etc.), or
- to provide a degree of privacy for the rear part of a corner lot (see “Corner Lots” below).
**Corner Lots** – Variances to place a fence in the front or street side yard of a corner lot are not given for fences over 4 feet tall or having an “opacity” of more than 70% (for example, solid stockade fences, board-on-board fences, etc.), unless the applicant can demonstrate truly exceptional need or circumstances with regard to safety, noise, or screening.

**Under no circumstances** are fences higher than 30 inches allowed within 20 feet of an intersection (see diagram).

**What is the Process?**

- Once the application is complete, the Zoning Office sends notification of the application to property owners within 250 feet.
- Property owners have 10 working days to submit public comments in writing to the Zoning Office.
- Following the review period, the Zoning Administrator denies, approves, or approves with conditions the application;
- A notice of the determination is mailed to the applicant and property owners within 250 feet.

**What is the timeframe?** The **approximate** time from completed application to determination is 4 weeks.

**What standards are used to decide?** Per §6-3-8-12(A), a fence variance may be granted if:

- It will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the use, enjoyment or property values of adjoining neighbors.
- It will assist in reducing noise, screening incompatible adjacent uses, or it will increase safety to the owners of the subject property or abutting properties, and
- It will not be located within the 20’ sight triangle of an intersection.

**Can I Appeal?** (§6-3-8-6(E)): The applicant or an adjacent property owner may appeal the decision to the Zoning Board of Appeals within 10 working days of the date of mailing of the notification.

---

1. “Opacity” refers to the “solidness” or “non-transparency” of the fence. For instance, a picket fence with 2” wide pickets spaced 1” apart has an opacity of roughly \((2 / (2+1)) = 2/3 = 67\%\).
FINDINGS
FOR STANDARDS OF
SPECIAL USE PERMITS

In the case of

Case Number: 18ZMJV-0062
Address or Location: 513 Custer Ave.
Applicant: William Lenski, Project Manager, ComEd
Proposed Special Use: Public Utility, ComEd Distribution Center

After conducting a public hearing on September 4, 2018, the Zoning Board of Appeals makes the following findings of fact, reflected in the audio-visual recording of the hearings, based upon the standards for special uses specified in Section 6-3-5-10 of the Zoning Ordinance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) It is one of the special uses specifically listed in the zoning ordinance;</td>
<td>_____ Met _____ Not Met Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) It is in keeping with purposes and policies of the adopted comprehensive general plan and the zoning ordinance as amended from time to time;</td>
<td>_____ Met _____ Not Met Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) It will not cause a negative cumulative effect, when its effect is considered in conjunction with the cumulative effect of various special uses of all types on the immediate neighborhood and the effect of the proposed type of special use upon the city as a whole;</td>
<td>_____ Met _____ Not Met Vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) It does not interfere with or diminish the value of property in the neighborhood;</td>
<td>_____ Met _____ Not Met Vote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(E) It can be adequately served by public facilities and services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(F) It does not cause undue traffic congestion;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(G) It preserves significant historical and architectural resources;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(H) It preserves significant natural and environmental features; and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(I) It complies 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

and, based upon these findings, and upon a vote

____ in favor & ____ against

Recommends to the City Council

_____ approval without conditions

_____ denial of the proposed special use

_____ approval with conditions specifically:

1. TBD
2. Substantial compliance with the documents and testimony on record.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attending</th>
<th>Vote:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Beth Berns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrna Arevalo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Gingold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violetta Cullen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Dziekan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary McAuley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiril Mirintchev</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zoning Analysis

Summary

Case Number: 17ZONA-0260  
Case Status/Determination: Non-Compliant

Proposal:
DEMO EXISTING SUBSTATION, REBUILD SUBSTATION WITH NEW EQUIPMENT, 14' TALL FIRE PROTECTION WALL, REMOVE 14' WIDE DRIVEWAY AND REPLACE WITH 16' WIDE DRIVEWAY

Site Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address:</th>
<th>514 CUSTER AVE</th>
<th>Zoning District:</th>
<th>R3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overlay District:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Preservation District:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicant: A Mohit

Phone Number:  

[Signature]  
[Date: 11-30-17]

Zoning Section

Comments

Recommendation(s): Click on the link(s) below to access online application(s)
## Zoning Analysis
### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number:</th>
<th>Case Status/Determination:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17ZONA-0260 – 514 CUSTER AVENUE</td>
<td>NON-COMPLIANT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposal:
DEMEO EXISTING SUBSTATION, REBUILD SUBSTATION WITH NEW EQUIPMENT, 14' TALL FIRE PROTECTION WALL, REMOVE 14' WIDE DRIVEWAY AND REPLACE WITH 16' WIDE DRIVEWAY

### Zoning Section: Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-8-4-3</td>
<td>In the R3 zoning district, public utility facilities require special use approval. Rebuilding the existing facility triggers a special use. Special uses are considered by the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA), City Council's Planning &amp; Development Committee, then City Council. The ZBA holds a public hearing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-4-6-7-F-2</td>
<td>Non-Compliant: Fences are not permitted within front yard, proposed wall located within front yard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-4-6-7-F-3-b</td>
<td>Non-Compliant: Maximum permitted fence height in the R3 zoning district is 8' (non-residential use abutting residential use), 14' proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-4-6-7-F-1</td>
<td>Non-Compliant: Concrete is not a permitted fence material, concrete wall proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicate site surface material on site plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide elevation details on proposed wall, posts, chain-link and barbed wire gate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For gate, consider wrought iron style fence rather than a chain-link fence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-4-11</td>
<td>Access is currently off Custer Avenue. Legally established access off a street may continue even when an alley is available. However, staff recommends relocating access off alley near northwest corner of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape screening should be considered along all sides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design and Project Review Committee (DAPR) review required before Zoning Board of Appeals hearing. DAPR is a staff level committee which provides a recommendation to the ZBA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# City of Evanston
## ZONING ANALYSIS REVIEW SHEET

**APPLICATION STATUS:** October 17, 2017

**RESULTS OF ANALYSIS:** Non-Compliant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z.A. Number:</th>
<th>17ZONA-0260</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>514 CUSTER AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>A Mohit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose:** Zoning Analysis without Bid Permit App

**District:** R3

**Overlay:** None

**Preservation District:**

**Reviewer:** Michael Griffith

### THIS APPLICATION PROPOSES (select all that apply):

- New Principal Structure
- New Accessory Structure
- Addition to Structure
- Alteration to Structure
- Retention of Structure

- Change of Use
- Retention of Use
- Plat of Resubdiv./Consol.
- Business License
- Home Occupation

**Sidewalk Cafe**

**Other**

### ANALYSIS BASED ON:

- Plans Dated: 10-13-17
- Prepared By: PRIMERA
- Survey Dated: 10-10-17
- Existing Improvements: COMED SUBSTATION

**Proposal Description:**

DEMO EXISTING SUBSTATION, REBUILD SUBSTATION WITH NEW EQUIPMENT, 14' TALL FIRE PROTECTION WALL, REMOVE 14' WIDE DRIVEWAY AND REPLACE WITH 18' WIDE DRIVEWAY

## ZONING ANALYSIS

### 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>USE:</td>
<td>Public Utility</td>
<td>Public Utility</td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Comments:** SPECIAL USE APPROVAL REQUIRED

### Minimum Lot Width (LF)

- Minimum Lot Width (LF): 35 LF
- USE: Other

#### Minimum Lot Area (SF)

- Minimum Lot Area (SF): 7,200 sq ft
- USE: Nonresidential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE: Nonresidential</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,850.5</td>
<td>2,850.5</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dwelling Units

#### Rooming Units

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

- Building Lot Coverage: 12,827 sq ft

#### Impervious Surface Coverage (SF, %)

- Impervious Surface Coverage: 17.103%
- Coverage (SF, %): 529.8

- **Comments:**

---

**LF:** Linear Feet  **SF:** Square Feet  **FT:** Feet

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Floor Area (SF)</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height (FT)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front Yard(1) (FT)</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>Direction: E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front Yard(2) (FT)</th>
<th>Direction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Side Yard (FT)</th>
<th>Direction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interior Side Yard(1) (FT)</th>
<th>15.0</th>
<th>Direction: N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interior Side Yard(2) (FT)</th>
<th>15.0</th>
<th>Direction: S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rear Yard (FT)</th>
<th>30.0</th>
<th>Direction: W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARKING REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use(1):</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: OFF-STREET PARKING NOT REQUIRED

Use(2):

Comments:

Use(3):

Comments:

TOTAL REQUIRED: 0

Comments:

Handicap Parking Spaces: Sec. 6-16-2-6

Comments:

Access: Sec. 6-16-2-2

Comments:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Clearance (LF)</td>
<td>7'</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></td>
<td>Sec. 5-16-2-6 (E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 6-4-6-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>

**MISCELLANEOUS REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement (1):</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FENCE - HEIGHT</td>
<td>MAX 6.0'</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.0'</td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement (2):</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FENCE - MATERIAL</td>
<td>CONCRETE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Requirement (3):**

Comments:  

**COMMENTS AND/OR NOTES**

Analysis Comments
### RESULTS OF ANALYSIS

<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: **Required**

See attached comments and/or notes.

---

**Signature**: [Signature]

**Date**: 11-30-17
Plat of Survey

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

THE NORTH 50.00 FEET OF LOT 18 IN BLOCK 1, IN ISLAND'S ADDITION TO EVANSTON, A SUBDIVISION OF THE SOUTH 12.17 ACRES EAST OF RIDGE ROAD OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 18, TOWNSHIP 41 NORTH, RANGE 14 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, AND THE NORTH 48 LINKS EAST OF RIDGE ROAD OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 41 NORTH, RANGE 14 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

COMMONLY KNOWN AS: COMED DCC03 E 514 CUSTER AVENUE, EVANSTON, ILLINOIS.

LINE TYPE LEGEND

ABBREVIATION LEGEND

SYMBOL LEGEND

NOTES:

1) A CURRENT TITLE REPORT WAS NOT FURNISHED. THEREFORE, ALL RESTRICTIONS, ROAD DEDICATIONS, ROAD VACATIONS, AND EASEMENTS MAY NOT BE SHOWN.
2) ALL UTILITIES MAY NOT BE SHOWN. CALL JULIE AT 1-800-882-0123 FOR FIELD LOCATION OF UNDERGROUND UTILITY LINES PRIOR TO ANY DIGGING OR CONSTRUCTION.
3) PARCEL CONTAINS APPROXIMATELY 2850 SQUARE FEET.
4) ALL BEARINGS SHOWN HEREIN ARE MEASURED TO SHOW ANGULAR RELATIONSHIP AND ARE NOT BASED ON ANY KNOWN BEARING SYSTEM.
5) THIS PROPERTY MAY BE WITHIN THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE CITY OF EVANSTON AND AS SUCH IS SUBJECT TO ZONING AND BUILDING RESTRICTIONS.
6) FIELD WORK COMPLETED ON 10-2-17.
7) PROPERTY CORNER STAKING IS NOT REQUIRED.
Oakton Street and Custer Avenue
Evanston, IL 60202
DCC43 DCIAB visualization
DCC43 DCIAB visualization
DCC43 DCIAB visualization

Staff Present: J. Velan, P. Zalmezak, C. Plant, P. Martinez, E. Golden

Others Present:

Presiding Member: S. Mangum

A quorum being present, Mr. Mangum called the meeting to order at 2:33 pm.

Approval of Minutes

July 18th, 2018 DAPR committee meeting minutes.

G. Gerdes makes a motion to approve the minutes from July 18th, 2018, seconded by J. Nelson.

The Committee voted, 9-0, to approve the minutes of July 18th, 2018 with 1 abstention.

New Business

1. **847 Chicago Ave**  
   Sign Variation  
   James Anderson, applicant, Chicago & Main Planned Development, submits for a sign variation for a new Unified Business Center Comprehensive Sign Plan to establish tenant sign criteria, to permit Wall Sign Zone: The wall sign is proposed to be aluminum channel letters, Halo lit and pin mounted to anchors in masonry joints only with no penetration of brick masonry units. Letter size to be 2’-2” maximum, and be located entered within the sign band, and to permit, Blade Sign Zone: The blade sign is proposed to be a non-illuminated, 2’x3’ blade sign of the Chicago Avenue garage side while the tenant entrance is on Main Street in the C1a Commercial District and Dempster-Main Overlay District.

   APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: James Anderson, applicant

   DISCUSSION:

   - S. Mangum asked about overall height of sign. Applicant was unsure of exact height at present time.
   - S. Mangum asked about any potential tenants. Applicants stated a couple of tenants.

   G. Gerdes made a motion to approve the modification to the Unified Business Center Comprehensive Sign Plan, seconded by L. Biggs.
The Committee voted, 10-0, for approval of the modification to the Unified Business Center Comprehensive Sign Plan.

2. 2004 Central St  Recommendation to ZBA
John Kim, applicant, Backlot Coffee, submits for special use permit to expand an existing type-2 restaurant into the adjacent space, in the B1a Business District and Central Street Overlay District.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: John Kim, applicant

DISCUSSION:
- G. Gerdes cited a need for a plumbing review. Also, layout of a combined floor plan before ZBA meeting. Applicant agreed.
- S. Mangum asked where coffee will be roasted. Applicant stated it will be towards rear of building and not visible to street.
- S. Mangum asked about where outdoor seating will be located. Applicant said it would be at previously approved location behind the existing location at 2006 Central St.
- G. Gerdes asked about if they will need a sidewalk cafe permit. Applicant said they are currently not using sidewalk for cafe purposes.
- S. Mangum asked about hours of operation and additional employees. Applicant stated hours will stay same with additional 3-4 more employees.
- K. Jensen asked about what kind of byproducts come from the roasting.
- S. Mangum asked if they went away from plastic straws. Applicant stated yes.
- J. Nelson asked about the plumbing. Recommends a proper backflow preventer on water service and restaurant equipment.
- S. Mangum asked about any changes to facade. Applicant currently says no.

L. Biggs made a motion for a positive recommendation of approval of the project to ZBA with a condition that applicant comes with a revised site plan, seconded by K. Jensen.

The Committee voted, 10-0, for positive recommendation of approval of the project to ZBA with a condition that applicant comes with a revised site plan.

3. 514 Custer Ave  Recommendation to ZBA
William Lensky, project manager, ComEd, submits for a special use permit for a Public Utility, and for major zoning relief for two concrete fire walls (fences) that are 14’ and 20’ in height where concrete material is not permitted for fences and the maximum fence height allowed is 6’, in the R3 Two-Family Residential District.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Carlo Cavallaro, applicant

DISCUSSION:
- G. Gerdes asked if any plantings will be onsite. Applicant stated they don’t think anything will survive thus not worth planting.
- S. Mangum asked about landscaping near sidewalk. Applicant stated the grass strip was not of concern but can utilize a type of species plant that could survive and make grass look nice.
- L. Biggs cited it would be their responsibility to protect the grass nearest to sidewalk from lot.
• L. Biggs is concerned with a corner patch where there is a big rectangular space. Applicant said they were told to keep it for public safety purposes due to visibility for drivers.
• S. Mangum asked if they could still do something more decorative for the rectangular patch as long as it’s around 30 inches or lower due to maintaining visibility.
• G. Gerdes asked if any additional lighting would be added. Applicant stated no.

L. Biggs made a motion for a positive recommendation to ZBA with a request for additional low height landscaping details be developed between sidewalk and site and at northeast corner of site, seconded by G. Gerdes.

The Committee voted, 10-0, for a positive recommendation to ZBA with a request for additional low height landscaping details be developed.

4. 2119-2125 Ashland Ave. Recommendation to Plan Commission & ZBA

Mike Chookaszian, operator, requests a text amendment to permit brewpubs as a Permitted or Special Use in the MXE Mixed-Use Employment District (Zoning Code Sections 6-13-4 & 6-18-3, Title 6 of the City Code), and requests a special use permit for a brewpub and a banquet hall (Zoning Code Section 6-13-4-3), and zoning relief to reduce the required front yard setback from 10’ to 0’, to reduce the required north interior side yard setback from 5’ to 0’, to reduce the required rear yard setback from 5’ to 0’ (Zoning Code Section 6-13-4-6), and to eliminate 1 required short loading dock (Zoning Code Section 6-16-4-5) in order to construct additions at the first floor to an existing building, in the MXE Mixed Use Employment District.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Mike Chookaszian, applicant

DISCUSSION:
• S. Mangum asked about hours of operation and staff. Applicant stated 11am-12am on weekdays and 12pm-1am on weekends but they will comply with liquor license rules on hours. Applicant stated 8-10 employees for brewpub.
• S. Mangum asked about how things will be delivered and at what time. Applicant stated deliveries will go through rear of building for daily deliveries. This will occur between normal business hours. Box truck sizes will be used. Applicant stated distribution will be done in kegs but focus will not be on distribution at location. It will only be 10 percent of service provided.
• L. Biggs asked how the leftover grain will be used. K. Jensen offered recommendations that other businesses use in handling this issue such as donating or composting spent grain.
• S. Mangum asked about if they had any contact with local organizations in the area in terms of potential for additional off-site parking. Applicant has reached out to Alderman and one other business only at present time.
• J. Velan noted that there is additional parking for use in that area that could be utilized.
• I. Eckersberg cited that they may have to consider stormwater control plan regarding potential renovations or additions made to this particular building.
• J. Hyink encourages bicycle parking on their lot due to its location and potential customers. Recommends they follow APBP (Association of Pedestrian & Bicycle Professionals) guidelines when creating bike station or racks.
• J. Nelson cited they will need to have proper backflow preventers on the water service and any equipment; this will need a CCCD Permit. Since they will need to increase the water service for Fire this would need a WSNS permit.
• M. Tristan cited change of use group classification and new building construction will require automatic sprinkler installation.
• Applicant stated exterior renovations will occur. G. Gerdes said they will need to come back and present those plans to DAPR.

G. Gerdes made a motion for a positive recommendation for approval of the project to ZBA & Plan Commission, seconded by L. Biggs.

The Committee voted, 10-0, to recommend positive approval of the project to ZBA & Plan Commission.

5. 1108 Dodge Ave. Recommendation to Plan Commission & ZBA
Steve Tuszynski, property owner, requests a text amendment to permit auto and recreational vehicle sales as a Permitted Use and auto storage lots, auto body repair, auto towing, and auto salvage as Special Uses in the C1 Commercial District. The applicant also requests a special use permit for auto sales with accessory auto repair and towing in the C1 Commercial District.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Uri Adler (representing Steve Tuszynski, applicant)

DISCUSSION:
• S. Mangum cited aesthetically building could be improved. Applicant understands that but says it’s difficult due to being a tenant with a short-term lease.
• S. Mangum recommends more transparency on front facade, removing glass block where customers can see inside and a showroom at the front.
• L. Biggs recommends replacing industrial looking external facade with a more inviting looking facade that makes the building more commercial for the block.
• S. Mangum asked about volume of cars at the site. Applicant said 25-30 cars are on-site.
• S. Mangum asked about hours of operation. 9am -6pm Monday through Friday.
• J. Hyink would encourage a glass overhead garage door facing sidewalk
• J. Nelson will need to have proper backflow preventers on the water service and any equipment. All floor or trench drains must be connected to a gas and oil interceptor.
• Paul Zalmezak (Economic Development Division Manager) cited how historically this building has been an eye sore for residents and an underutilized asset in the community.

L. Biggs made a motion to hold in committee and applicant must come with a revised site plan with a focus on exterior modifications, seconded by S. Mangum.

The Committee voted, 10-0, to hold in committee and applicant must come with a revised site plan with a focus on exterior modifications, seconded by S. Mangum.
Adjournment

S. Mangum moved to adjourn, seconded by G. Gerdes. The Committee voted unanimously, 10-0, to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 3:47 pm.

The next DAPR meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, August 1, 2018, at 2:30 pm in Room 2404 of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.

Respectfully submitted,
Torrence Gardner
413 Grove St.
18ZMJV-0068

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
Bill Dunkley, Zoning Planner (seasonal)

Subject: 413 Grove Street - ZBA 18ZMJV-0068
Appeal of the Zoning Administrator’s Determination
ZBA Determining Board

Date: September 4, 2018

Notice - Published in the August 16, 2018, Evanston Review
Jeffrey K. and Janet H. Clements, property owners, appeal the Zoning Administrator’s decision
to partially deny minor zoning relief (case number 18ZMNV-0029) to construct a one-story
addition to the rear of an existing single-family residence with an existing building lot coverage
of 31.6%. The applicants requested a building lot coverage of 34.5% where a maximum of 30%
is permitted in the R1 Single-Family Residential District (Zoning Code Section 6-8-2-7). The
Zoning Administrator granted a variation of 33.1%. The appellant does not seek an appeal of
the denial of a variation to reduce the side yard setback. The Zoning Board of Appeals is the
determining body for this case.

Recommendation
City staff affirms the Zoning Administrator’s decision to partially deny zoning relief to construct a
one-story addition to the rear of an existing single-family residence. City staff affirms the
determination that the zoning relief sought does not meet the Standards for Minor Variation.
Specifically, the requested zoning relief is not the least deviation from the applicable regulation
among feasible options. Staff determined that a building lot coverage of 33.1% was sufficient to
meet the purpose of the appellant.

Site Background
413 Grove St. is located on the north side of Grove Street between Hinman and Judson
Avenues. It is adjacent to an alley and lies across the street from Congregational Park. The
property is in the R1 Single-Family Residential District and is also within the Lakeshore Historic
District. It is surrounded by the following:

North: R1 Single-Family Residential District / Lakeshore Historic District
East: R1 Single-Family Residential District / Lakeshore Historic District
South: R1 Single-Family Residential District / Lakeshore Historic District
West: R6 General Residential District (not in an historic district)

The subject property features a single-family residence with a detached garage.
Proposal
The appellant originally applied for a minor variation to construct a 6 ft. single-story addition to the rear of their single family residence for the purpose of expanding the kitchen and pantry. Building lot coverage on the existing property is 31.6%, which exceeds the allowable 30% for zoning district R1. The Zoning Administrator found the Standards for Minor Variation were not met for this request, so the full zoning relief for building lot coverage was denied, however a partial variation to 33.1% was granted.

Staff Determination
The proposal submitted for both zoning analysis and minor variation include approximately 70 sf of building lot coverage for an interior planter to be located across the rear of the expansion. The Zoning Administrator determined that the addition of a planter was not necessary to achieve the purpose of providing adequate kitchen and pantry space, and so granted a minor variation for building lot coverage up to 33.1%, which translates into a 70 sf reduction in the proposed addition. The requested building lot coverage amount was not determined to be the least deviation possible from the applicable regulation, section 6-3-8-12.

Note that the plans submitted for the appeal no longer show the planter, however the overall dimensions of the requested addition remain the same.

Evanston Preservation Commission
The original proposal was reviewed by the Evanston Preservation Commission on June 12, 2018. At that time the Commission voted 7-0 to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness to the
The Commission also voted 7-0 to recommend approval of the minor variation request of 34.5% building lot coverage.

**Ordinances Identified for Requested Relief**

6-8-2-7 Building Lot Coverage: The maximum permitted building lot coverage in the R1 Single Family Residential District is 30%.

**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 proposal that is within the threshold of a Minor Variation, the Standards for Minor Variations should be utilized for determining the appeal. For the Zoning Administrator to grant approval of a minor variance, the Zoning Administrator must find that the proposed variance(s) meet the following standards:

a) The practical difficulty is not self-created: Staff found that this standard had been met.

b) The requested variation will not have a substantial adverse impact on the use, enjoyment or property values of adjoining properties: Staff found that this standard had been met.

c) The requested variation is in keeping with the comprehensive general plan and the zoning ordinance: Staff found that this standard had been met.

d) The requested variation is consistent with the preservation policies set forth in the comprehensive general plan: Staff found that this standard was met.

e) The requested variation requires the least deviation from the applicable regulation among the feasible options identified before the Zoning Administrator issues his/her decision regarding said variation: Staff found that this standard had not been met. Elements of the proposal (the planter) were not the minimum required to meet the needs of the applicant.
Attachments
Appeal Application – July 18, 2018
Minor Variance Application – March 6, 2018
Zoning Analysis
Plat of Survey
Site Plans and Elevations
Images of Property
Aerial View of Property
Minor Variation Public Notice
Minor Variation Final Determination Notice
Zoning Map of Property
Evanston Preservation Commission Minutes – June 12, 2018
Neighbor Comments
1. PROPERTY

Address: 413 Grove St
Permanent Identification Number(s):
PIN 1: 1 11 8 4 0 9 0 1 7 0 0 0
PIN 2: ___________________________ ___________________________

2. APPELLANT

Name: Jeffrey K and Janet H Clements
Organization: homeowners
Address: 413 Grove St
City, State, Zip: Evanston, IL 60201
Fax: Work: Home: ___________________________ ___________________________
E-mail: jkc3346@gmail.com

Please circle the primary means of contact.

3. 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]
Applicant Signature – REQUIRED
Date: 7/17/18

4. REQUIRED DOCUMENTS AND MATERIALS

The following are required to be submitted with this application:

☑ (This) Completed and Signed Application Form
☑ Application Fee Amount $275 Check #240 (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.
- 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
5. Address (or location) of property to which pertains the decision you are appealing:

413 Grove St.

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

Request was for a 6' addition across the rear of our home which would have increased lot coverage from pre-existing 31.2% to proposed 34.6%. The Administrator's decision was made to partially approve the addition but to require the removal 70 square feet from the addition to reduce the lot coverage to 33.1%. The other decision to deny the extension of a roof over the proposed new rear porch, is not being appealed since we had already agreed, and had approval from the Historic Preservation Commission, not to include it. Our plans and a recommendation to approve the minor variance were unanimously approved by the HPC at their 6/19/2018 meeting.

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

We expected that the minor variation (under 35% lot coverage) would likely be approved by the ZA, if the Historic Preservation Commission approved the design. We changed the design a few times to gain approval from the HPC and minimize the lot coverage while providing the needed space for the kitchen and pantry. Earlier designs included room for island seating, a planter and a table but we shortened the addition to 6' to keep lot coverage under 35%. We need to have enough room to place a table and chairs in the kitchen and have sufficient storage for food and other supplies on the first floor. Our lot is narrower then most of the homes in the area, and is 6" from the property line/alley to the west. The chimney precludes expanding the kitchen to the south internally and the north/rear is the only direction to go to for an updated kitchen area for our home.

8. Describe in what manner you believe yourself aggrieved or harmed by this zoning interpretation and/or determination:

The decision by the ZA may have been made with incomplete or outdated information. At the 5/8/18 HPC meeting we first presented our plans, including the Zoning Application dated 9/29/17 which was done by an architect we previously had employed. That design included a rear porch roof, extension of the addition to the eastern edge of house, and a 21" planter on the north interior wall of the kitchen. The HPC asked us to reconsider some elements of this design and new architect was engaged. To reduce the lot coverage as much as possible, the addition was narrowed to provide an offset on the east side of the house, the planter was removed since we needed the space for a 30" x 60" table and chairs. The rear porch roof was also removed. This new design was approved by the HPC at their 6/12/18 meeting along with a unanimous recommendation to the ZA to approve the minor variation on the lot coverage. We failed to update the zoning application and submit the new drawings. The HPC admin was not present when the ZA made his decision. As a result, the ZA may have made his decision with incomplete information. A reduction of 70 sq ft is 41% of the proposed 171 sq ft addition rendering the kitchen size too small to accomodate a table and chairs for our family and closet/pantry too small for our basic needs.

This reduction would impact the value of the home compared to others in our neighborhood who have had similar additions and variances approved by the HPC and the ZA. Our next door neighbor at 411 Grove has a "sister" home of the same vintage and size on a small lot. They extended their home to the rear by a similar amount in recent years to accomplish the same goals that we have. Our addition would align with theirs along the rear of both homes. Our neighbors support this addition. There has been no negative feedback.
**Payment Receipt # 94474**

**Property Address:** 413 GROVE ST  
**Parcel Number:**  
**Parcel Owner:** JEFFREY AND JANET CLEMENTS  
**CAP ID:** 18ZMJV-0068  
**Group:** Zoning  
**Type:** Variance  
**Subtype:** Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>Fee Amount</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Invoice N</th>
<th>Amt. Applied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPEAL TO ZBA</td>
<td>275.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>145162</td>
<td>275.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal for Acct. 100.21.2105.53695** 275.00

**Payment Date:** 7/19/18  
**Cashier:** MGRIFFITH  
**Payment:** 275.00  
**Payment Method:** Check  
**Total Receipt Payment:** 275.00

**Paid By:** JANET & JEFFREY CLEMENTS  
**Ref #:** 240
MINOR VARIATION
APPLICATION

CASE #: 182MNW-0029

1. PROPERTY

Address: 413 GROVE STREET

Permanent Identification Number(s):
PIN 1: 17-18409-0112-0008 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: JEFF CLEMENTS & JANET CLEMENTS

Organization: [Blank]

Address: 413 GROVE STREET

City, State, Zip: EVANSTON IL 60201

Phone: Work: (773-383-4432) Cell/Other: [Blank]

Fax: Work: [Blank] Home: [Blank]

E-mail: JKC3346@gmail.com

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

- [ ] same
- [ ] architect
- [ ] officer of board of directors
- [ ] builder/contractor
- [ ] attorney
- [ ] potential purchaser
- [ ] lessee
- [ ] potential lesee
- [ ] real estate agent

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

Name(s) or Organization: [Blank]

Address: [Blank]

City, State, Zip: [Blank]

Phone: Work: [Blank] Home: [Blank] Cell/Other: [Blank]

Fax: Work: [Blank] Home: [Blank]

E-mail: [Blank]

"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."

J Clements

3/29/18

Date

Property Owner(s) Signature(s) – REQUIRED

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."

J Clements

3/29/18

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: 9/21/17
- Project Site Plan Date of Drawings: 10/24/17
- Project Zoning Analysis Date: 10/24/17 ID#: 17ZONA-0249
- Proof of Ownership Document Submitted: 03/25
- Application Fee Amount $_______ plus postage for two public notice mailings

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 extant improvements, dimensions between structures and from structures to property boundaries.

- Site Plans must be legible when reproduced on letter-size paper, must be dated, and must include dimensions of all proposed improvements, dimensions between structures and from structures to property boundaries.

- Project Zoning Analysis - Prior to filing for a variance, you must have first applied for zoning certification (zoning analysis or by way of a building permit application), and received a "non-compliant" zoning analysis result that identified all non-complying elements of the proposed plan. You will need information from that document in order to fill out this application.

- 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.

- Public Notice Mailings - A third party is used to mail notices of the application and of the determination, a total of two mailings. The applicant will be billed for these mailings by the third party.

- 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 PROJECT

A. Briefly describe the proposed project:

**Expanding the small kitchen to include a small eating area & storage through the windows across the back of the house with a relocation of the kitchen door & basement door.**

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

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

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., &quot;requires a minimum front yard setback of 27 feet&quot;)</th>
<th>(C) Requested Variation (e.g., &quot;a front yard setback of 25.25 feet&quot;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-8-2-1</td>
<td>Requires maximum building lot coverage</td>
<td>Increasing building lot coverage from 30.7% existing to 34.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 KITCHEN SPACE IS SMALL & CONstrained BY THE FIREPLACE. THE ONLY PLACE TO GO IS TO ADD SPACE ON THE BACK.**

10. ALTERNATIVES

A. Have you considered revising the proposed project so that a variation is not necessary?

**YES, WE LOOKED AT THE POSSIBILITIES, BUT NONE WERE PLEASABLE. WE ARE LIMITED THE KITCHEN LAYOUT TO THE MINIMAL.**

B. Have you considered revising the proposed project so that a smaller variation can be requested?

**YES, WE REDUCED THE AREA TO THE SMALLEST POSSIBLE INCREASE THAT STILL ENABLE US TO HAVE SPACE FOR ADJOINING EATING & NEEDED STORAGE.**

C. How have you minimized the impact that the variance will have on adjoining property owners?

**YES, THE INCREASE TO THE SIZE OF THE HOUSE IS LESS THAN OUR NEIGHBOR'S RECENT ADDITION. IT WILL HAVE MINIMAL IMPACT. THE NEIGHBOR'S LOT SIZE & HOUSE WAS ORIGINALLY ALMOST THE SAME SIZE AS OURS AND HAS HAD SEVERAL MODIFICATIONS RECENTLY.**
Zoning Analysis

Summary

Case Number: 17ZONA-0249  
Case Status/Determination: Non-Compliant

Proposal:  
1-STORY ADDITION TO REAR OF SFR

Site Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Overlay District</th>
<th>Preservation District</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>413 GROVE ST</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Lakeshore</td>
<td>Ana S Wolfe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zoning Section  
Comments

Recommendation(s): Click on the link(s) below to access online application(s)

- BL+ rear covered stoop = 1839.1
- setback-overhang = 2.5' 1847-2

- 10-24-17
## Zoning Analysis

### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number:</th>
<th>Case Status/Determination:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17ZONA-0279 – 413 GROVE STREET</td>
<td>NON-COMPLIANT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposal:

1-STORY ADDITION TO REAR OF SFR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Section:</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6-8-2-7         | Non-compliant:  
In the R1 zoning district, the maximum permitted amount of building lot coverage is 30%. Proposed addition increases building lot coverage from 31.6% existing to 34.5%. |
|                 | Proposed building lot coverage is within the threshold to be reviewed as a minor variation. |
|                 | Applying for a minor variation does not mean the variation will be approved. When applying for the minor variation, the hardship must be identified and the variation requested is the least deviation feasible among various options. |
City of Evanston  
ZONING ANALYSIS REVIEW SHEET

APPLICATION STATUS: October 02, 2017

Z.A. Number: 17ZONA-0249
Purpose: Zoning Analysis without Bid Permit App
District: R1
Overlay: None
Preservation: Lakeshore
Reviewer: Michael Griffith

Address: 413 GROVE ST
Applicant: Ana S Wolfe

Phone:

THIS APPLICATION PROPOSES (select all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Principal Structure</th>
<th>Change of Use</th>
<th>S concert Cafe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Accessory Structure</td>
<td>Retention of Use</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X Addition to Structure
Alteration to Structure
Retention of Structure

Proposed Description:
1-STORY ADDITION TO REAR OF SFR

ANALYZING BASED ON:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans Dated:</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Prepared By:
AS WOLF DESIGN INC

Survey Dated:
7/27/2017

Existing Improvements:
SFR-DET AND DET-GARAGE

ZONING ANALYSIS

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>USE:</td>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>Dwelling - SF Detached</td>
<td>Dwelling - SF Detached</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Width (LF)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Minimum Lot Area (SF)

| USE: | Single Family Detached | 7,200 sf | 5,337 | 5,337 | No Change |

Comments:

Dwelling Units:

Rooming Units:

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

| 1801 1 | 1,688 9 | 1,830 1 | Non-Compliant |
| 31.6% | 34.5% |

Comments:

Impervious Surface Coverage (SF, %)

| 2401 95 | 2,222 8 | 2,265 2 | Compliant |
| 41.6% | 42.4% |

Comments:

Accessory Structure Rear Yard Coverage:

Comments:

LF Linear Feet  SF Square Feet  FT Feet
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Floor Area (SF)</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>ADDITION = 14</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height (FT)</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>ADDITION = 14</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front Yard(1) (FT)</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32.24</td>
<td>32.24</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front Yard(2) (FT)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Side Yard (FT)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interior Side Yard(1) (FT)</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>ADDITION = 50</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interior Side Yard(2) (FT)</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rear Yard (FT)</strong></td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISCELLANEOUS REQUIREMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requirement (1):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPEN STAIRS/STOOP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requirement (2):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATCH OVERHANG ON EXISTING SFR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requirement (3):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**RESULTS OF ANALYSIS**

<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 **Not Required**

See attached comments and/or notes.

[Signature]  
**10-24-17**  
**DATE**
413 Grove Neighborhood Context

Small, irregular lot size with house abutting alley to the west
413 Grove North/Rear Views with porch and rear door
413 Grove Rear Addition 3D Rendering
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:

413 Grove St., Case #18ZMNV-0029
Minor Variation

Zoning District: R1
Preservation/Landmark: Lakeshore
Applicant: Jeff & Janet Clements

Requested variation is: From Section 6-8-2-7, that states the maximum permitted building lot coverage in the R1 district is 30%, and from Section 6-4-1-9, that states a roof overhang (yard obstruction) is permitted to obstruct up to 10% into the required interior side yard setback (a 4.5’ minimum setback from an interior side property line in this case for the roof overhang).

For the purpose of: Constructing an addition to the existing single-family residence with a proposed building lot coverage of 34.6% and a 2.5’ setback from the west side property line for a roof overhang.

Notice Date: May 21, 2018
Comments Accepted Through: June 5, 2018
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 847-448-8170 (Voice) or 847-448-8064 (TYY).

La ciudad de Evanston está obligada a hacer accesibles todas las reuniones públicas a las personas minusválidas o las quines no hablan inglés. Si usted necesita ayuda, favor de ponérse en contacto con la Oficina de Administración del Centro a 847-448-4311 (voz) o 847-448-8052 (TDD).
PUBLIC NOTICE OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE VARIATION
PARTIAL APPROVAL/DENIAL

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

413 Grove St., Case #18ZMNV-0029                      Notice Date:    July 5, 2018
Minor Variation                                 Applicant:    Jeff & Janet Clements

Zoning District:     R1                  Preservation/Landmark: Lakeshore

The minor variation from the zoning ordinance requirement has been PARTIALLY APPROVED/DENIED, subject to condition. The requested variations provide relief from Section 6-8-2-7, that the maximum permitted building lot coverage in the R1 district is 30%, and from Section 6-4-1-9, that states a roof overhang (yard obstruction) is permitted to obstruct up to 10% into the required interior side yard setback (4.5’ minimum required setback from an interior side property line in this case for the roof overhang).

The applicant has been GRANTED zoning relief to construct an addition with a building lot coverage of 33.1% (34.6% had been requested), finding the standards for minor variation from the zoning ordinance has been met. The applicant has NOT BEEN GRANTED zoning relief to reduce the side yard setback for the roof overhang, finding that the standards for minor variation from the zoning ordinance had not been met.

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.
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 847-448-8170 (Voice) or 847-448-8064 (TYY).

La ciudad de Evanston está obligada a hacer accesibles todas las reuniones públicas a las personas minusválidas o las quines no hablan inglés. Si usted necesita ayuda, favor de ponerse en contacto con la Oficina de Administración del Centro a 847-448-4311 (voz) o 847-448-8052 (TDD).
Subject Property
EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION
Tuesday, June 12, 2018, 7:00 P.M.
Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue
James C. Lytle City Council Chambers, Room 2800

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

2. OLD BUSINESS

A. 413 Grove St. (LSHD) – Jeffrey and Janet Clements, applicants. Add a single story six foot addition to rear of home for new kitchen. The six wood windows are in the same style as the existing kitchen windows. The proposed addition requires a minor Zoning variance for lot coverage from 31.6% to 34.5%. Applicable standards: [Construction 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, and 12-15], [Demolition 1-6], [Zoning Variance A and C].

Action: COAs approved 7 – 0.

Zoning variation recommended 7 – 0.

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. 2341 Pioneer Rd (L) – Lawrence & Ann L. Eiben, applicants. Modification to exterior of dwelling, including changes to the existing kitchen main level roof line and door replacement. Also, door and window modifications to existing family room on the east elevation and windows on the south elevation. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10].

Action: CCA approved 7 – 0.

B. 1625 Judson Av. (LSHD) – Mark Shapiro, applicant. Construction of a wood porch with trellis along the south side yard and east rear yard. Remove rear stairs. Applicable standards: [Construction 1, 7, 8, 10, and 12-15]; [Demolition 1-6].

Action: COAs approved 7 – 0.

C. 1805 Wesley Av. (L/RHD) – Mat Rappaport & Shana Stein, applicants. Construct 2nd story addition on current footprint of existing portion of residence, at north-east corner of structure. Change windows in existing end floor master bedroom, changing double hung windows into French doors in kitchen, new casement window to the north elevation of existing kitchen. Restore cedar siding and trim details. Remove roof and trim over existing one-story kitchen. Applicable standards: [Alteration 1-10]; [Demolition 1-6]

Action: Tabled to July 10, 2018
Hello Michael -

Today I learned from the Clements that their plan was denied and we are discouraged about this news. For years this home (directly next door to us) has sat untouched with minimal maintenance the exterior. NOW that the Clements have moved into the neighborhood, it is greener, flowering and beautiful on the lawn areas. And even on the alley the ugly wooden fence has been replaced with gorgeous, lush arborvitae.

What a nice improvement for neighbors who live within view, pedestrians who stroll by each day and for all of those who use the alley.

The next step in their process is to address the North side of the home which is a hodgepodge combination of added mudroom, small porch, competing roof lines and ground level storm entry door. This is the view we see every single day as we leave our house:

WE SUPPORT THE CLEMENTS PLANS FOR THE VARIANCE AS SUBMITTED and approved by the Historical Preservation Commission.

The plan will clean up this dated exterior look and create a much more streamlined and pleasing design - more in keeping with the historical nature of the neighborhood just as the Historical Preservation Commission voted. We have been through this process before with our home. We, too, had the added on mud room, dated storm entry access and small back porch.

We can say that without a doubt the variance that was granted to us has made a big difference in "livability" for our family in our old home - which now includes an eat-in kitchen with an island and modern appliances!

Please urge the Committee to re-consider and VOTE YES for the 413 Grove Rear Addition.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Jill & Craig Wortmann
411 Grove Street
847-867-7613

--
Jeff Clements
773-383-4432

3 attachments

ClementsNorthSide.jpg
Attention Michael Griffith:

I am supportive of the Clements’ 6’ addition to the rear of 413 Grove. It will update the home in positive way for the neighborhood.

Mary McKenna
425 Grove/1501 Hinman
I support the addition to the home of Mr. and Mrs. Jeff Clements. The home has been improved and is beautiful. Work has been First Class all the way. Please drive by and look. I am grateful for the improvements of this house. Mary Sheridan, neighbor at 425 Grove St. Apt. 6 D. Attention: Michael Griffith
413 Grove St.
1 message

'Jean Kachoris' via Zoning <Zoning@cityofevanston.org>  Wed, Jul 18, 2018 at 8:48 AM
Reply-To: Jean Kachoris <kachjeanie@yahoo.com>
To: zoning@cityofevanston.org
Cc: jkc3346@gmail.com

Attention Michael Griffith:

We are supportive of the Clements' 6' addition to the rear of 413 Grove. It will update the home in positive way for the neighborhood.

Paul & Jean Kachoris
425 Grove St
Apt 6C
Evanston, IL 60201

Sent from my iPhone
413 Grove proposed 6' addition
1 message

'Dane Patterson' via Zoning <Zoning@cityofevanston.org>
Reply-To: Jane Patterson <jrpatterson1959@aol.com>
To: zoning@cityofevanston.org
Cc: jkc3346@gmail.com

Attn: Michael Griffith

I am supportive of the Clements' 6' addition to the rear of 413 Grove. It will update the home in positive way for the neighborhood.

Best regards,

Jane R Patterson
425 Grove St 7d
Fwd: 413 Grove - Clements Addition

Jeff Clements <jkc3346@gmail.com>
To: William Dunkley <wdunkley@cityofevanston.org>

------------ Forwarded message -----------
From: Jon Wachs <jlwachs@comcast.net>
Date: Wed, Jul 18, 2018 at 10:03 AM
Subject: 413 Grove - Clements Addition
To: <zoning@cityofevanston.org>
Cc: <jkc3346@gmail.com>

Zoning Board of Appeals - I am in full support of Jeff Clements' 6' addition to his home at 413 Grove. Jeff has demonstrated exceptional vision for his property. We are most fortunate to have him as a neighbor. - Jon Wachs

Jon Wachs

1501 Hinman Ave. 6B

Evanston, IL 60201

--

Jeff Clements
773-383-4432
Fwd: Addition to your house

Jeff Clements <jkc3346@gmail.com>
To: William Dunkley <wdunkley@cityofevanston.org>  
Mon, Aug 20, 2018 at 10:55 AM

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Ellen Wartella <ewartella@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Jul 18, 2018 at 4:02 AM
Subject: Addition to your house
To: <jkc3346@gmail.com>

I am supportive of your request for this addition. Ellen

Sent from my iPad

--
Jeff Clements
773-383-4432
2415 Wade Street
18ZMJV-0076

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
      Michael Griffith, Development Planner

Subject: 2415 Wade Street - 18ZMJV-0076
          ZBA Recommending Body

Date: August 30, 2018

Notice - Published in the August 16, 2018, Evanston Review
Phillip Kupritz, applicant, applies for major zoning relief to construct a 1-car attached garage, a rear addition and deck to an existing single-family residence in the R2 Single-Family Residential District. The applicant requests building lot coverage of 50% where 40% is permitted (Zoning Code Section 6-8-3-6), to reduce the minimum required front yard setback from 25.9' to 19.8' (Zoning Code Sections 6-8-3-7 and 6-4-1-9), to reduce the required west interior side yard setback from 5' to 0' and to reduce the required east interior side yard setback from 5' to 2.9' (Zoning Code Section 6-8-3-7), to reduce the required off-street parking from 2 spaces to 1 space for a single-family residence (Zoning Code Section 6-16-3-5, Table 16-B).

The Zoning Board of Appeals is the recommending body for this case.

Recommendation
City staff and DAPR recommend approval.

Site Background
2415 Wade Street is located on the north side of Wade Street adjacent to the North Shore Sanitary Canal. The property features a single-family residence with an attached garage at the north end of the residence. The existing driveway from Wade Street to the garage encroaches on the Sanitary Canal property to the west. The property is triangle in shape and narrows from south to north.

Zoning: R2 Single-Family Residential District

Surrounding zoning and land uses:

North: R2 Single-Family Residential District and OS Open Space District
East: R2 Single-Family Residential District
South: R2 Single-Family Residential District
West: OS Open Space District
Property size: 5,345 square feet
60.8’ wide at Wade Street frontage, 11.1’ at north end of property

Property History
Prior to the current owner, in 2009, variations were granted in order to construct a front porch and an addition to the residence, including a 2-car attached garage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front porch setback</th>
<th>22% obstruction where 10% is required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West and east interior side yard setback</td>
<td>3.0’ where 5’ is required, at the attached garage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The approved variations included a plan for vehicles to drive through two overhead doors and maneuver to park in the garage. The ZBA hearing transcript is provided which includes this discussion.

These variations were associated with de-converting the structure from a 2-flat to a single-family home and providing off-street parking.

In 2011, a building permit was issued to construct additions on the west side of the residence, a roof over an existing front stoop and a west side deck. The attached garage was not included on this permit. The garage and driveway were not built to the approved variations. The most recent building inspection on October, 7, 2014, indicates the garage footing was poured without approved plans.

Proposal
The applicant proposes to remove the existing driveway, west side deck and attached 2-car garage at the rear of the residence, and construct a 1-car attached garage on the west side of the residence, an addition to the rear of the residence that would replace the existing garage, and new deck at the rear and west sides of the residence.

The existing garage and driveway layout does not work given the triangular shape of the property, the existing garage is located at the rear of the residence where the property tapers down from a lot width of 60.8’ at the street to an approximate width of 23’ at the north wall of the garage. The driveway encroaches onto the adjacent property, there is no practical way to access the garage without encroaching onto the adjacent property, and the property does not have alley access. The proposed plan addresses this issue as well as addressing living space and ADA needs.
The table below summarizes the requested variations and the minimum standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R2 Single-Family Residential District</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Requested Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building lot coverage</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>50% (44.3% per submitted plans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front yard setback</td>
<td>25.9'</td>
<td>25.9'</td>
<td>19.8'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior side yard setback</td>
<td>5.0'</td>
<td>West - 3' East - 2.9'</td>
<td>West - 0' East - 2.9'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-street parking spaces</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The existing 1st floor includes a living room, dining room, breakfast room, kitchen, family room, guest bedroom, bathroom, mudroom and attached garage. The second floor contains 4 bedrooms including a master bedroom and bath and one additional bathroom.

The proposed 1st floor includes 2 bedrooms, bathroom, living, dining room, kitchen and attached garage. The proposed 2nd floor contains 3 bedrooms including a master bedroom, an office, and an additional bathroom.

The proposed attached 1-car garage will be ADA accessible to accommodate the owner’s parents, it will include an accessible parking space and wheelchair lift. The garage will be located on the west side of the wrap around porch with a hallway connecting the garage to the front entry.

The front entry will be relocated from the front of the house to the north end of the wrap around porch in order to locate bedrooms at the front of the residence, and to provide a central entry point from the front and new attached garage.

The proposed rear addition, a kitchen, will be built on the same footprint as the existing attached garage, with the exception of the northwest corner of the addition which will be modified so the required 5’ setback from the west property line is provided.

The applicant is requesting building coverage of 50%. The zoning analysis shows proposed building lot coverage of 44.3%. The plans note a rear porch at 307 sf which is covered by an open pergola/trellis and not a solid roof; therefore, it is not counted towards building lot coverage by staff but appears to be included in the applicant’s calculations.

A 19.8’ front yard setback and 0’ west interior side yard setback is proposed to accommodate the attached garage. The property to the west is a park, where there are no homes or other structures impacted.

Staff suggested eliminating the west side portion of the porch, shifting the garage north and east to align with the front facing facade and to provide a 5’ setback from the west property line. This alternative maintains the front entry at the front facade and would
require reconfiguring the 1st floor living space by relocating at least one of the bedrooms. The applicant stated this alternative defeats the intent of locating the 1st floor bedrooms away from the social living space and would create a long, narrow living space. This alternative also eliminates a central entry point into the residence, another goal for the resident. The staircase location is an obstacle concerning the floor layout.

Another alternative discussed provides an open parking pad in the west side yard instead of the garage. This option triggers additional variations which have not been noticed as part of the current request, including locating open parking within a side yard where open parking is required to be located within 30’ of the rear property line. Required off-street parking provided by an open parking pad counts toward building lot coverage.

These alternative plans have been provided by the applicant and are included in the packet.

Variations were granted for 3’ setbacks from the west and east property lines for the existing attached garage in order to provide as much space as possible to provide access to the garage via a driveway from Wade Street. The property does not have alley access.

The proposed rear addition will be built using the same footprint as the existing attached garage, with the exception that the northwest corner of the addition will be clipped to comply with the required 5’ setback. Staff suggested relocating the east wall of the addition to align with the main portion of the residence which would increase the setback from 3’ to 4.4’ from the east property line. The applicant indicated this could be achieved but they are proposing to salvage the existing foundation.

The applicant proposes one off-street parking space where 2 are required. While the required parking is met technically by the existing 2-car attached garage currently, it is not feasible to access the garage as constructed due to the triangular shape of the property without encroaching onto the property to the west. The proposed plan provides one garage space and allows for a second vehicle to park on the driveway in front of the garage. The zoning code requires open off-street parking spaces to be located at the rear of the property, therefore, the driveway location is not compliant, thus the variation request to reduce required parking from 2 to 1.

**Ordinances Identified for Requested Relief**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinance Code</th>
<th>Ordinance Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-8-3-6</td>
<td>R2 Single-Family Residential District - Building lot coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-3-7</td>
<td>R2 Single-Family Residential District - Front yard setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-3-7</td>
<td>R2 Single-Family Residential District - Side and Rear yard setbacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-16-3-5, Table 16-B</td>
<td>Off-Street Parking and Loading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design and Project Review Committee (DAPR) Discussion and Recommendation
August 22, 2018 - Held in Committee in order to allow the applicant to provide alternatives.
August 29, 2018 - Recommended approval by a 5-4 vote.

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 abuts a park, the home is the last home on a short dead-end street, and considering the majority of the additional bulk is on the park side of the property, there is no substantial adverse impact on surrounding properties.

2. Is in keeping with the intent of the zoning ordinance:
   The proposed variations maintain adequate light and air to surrounding properties since the majority of the additional bulk is on the park side of the property.

3. Has a hardship or practical difficulty that is peculiar to the property:
   The property is triangular in shape, narrowing from south to north, and does not have alley access which creates practical difficulties providing adequate living space and required off-street parking.

4. Property owner would suffer a particular hardship or practical difficulty as distinguished from a mere inconvenience:
   The existing garage and driveway configuration are not practical, eliminating the proposed attached garage and providing an open parking pad instead decreases building lot coverage and setback issues, but triggers a variation to permit open parking in an interior side yard. Providing no off-street parking alternative is not consistent with the intent of the zoning code.

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 is modifying the residence to accommodate parents with mobility needs (one lives within the home) and to provide additional living space for additional family members who will live at the home.

6. Does not have a hardship or practical difficulty that was created by any person having an interest in the property:
   The lot was platted with an irregular shape and current improvements constructed on the property prior to the current ownership.

7. Is limited to the minimum change necessary to alleviate the particular hardship or practical difficulty:
   The proposed variations are the minimum change necessary to provide an ADA accessible garage and a feasible parking space, to provide an ADA accessible 1st floor of the residence, and reuse an existing foundation location previously approved by a variation.

Attachments
Variation Application – submitted March 30, 2018
Zoning Analysis - revised August 30, 2018
Plat of Survey
Plan – revised July 27, 2018
Transcript - ZBA hearing, August 8, 2009
1. PROPERTY

Address: 2415 WADE STREET, EVANSTON, IL 60201
Permanent Identification Number(s):
PIN 1: 101341-0006000000
PIN 2: 
(Note: An accurate plat of survey for all properties that are subject to this application must be submitted with the application)

2. APPLICANT

Name: PHILLIP KUPRITZ
Organization: K2 STUDIO
Address: 329 W 18TH ST, SUITE 501
City, State, Zip: CHICAGO, IL 60616
Phone: Work: Home: Cell/Other: 312-953-2219
Fax: Work: Home: 
E-mail: MKUPRITZ@K2ARCH.COM

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

☐ same ☐ builder/contractor ☐ contract 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: NICOLE PINKARD
Address: 2415 WADE STREET
City, State, Zip: EVANSTON, IL 60201
Phone: Work: Home: Cell/Other: 773-428-2707
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: 7/24/18

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: 7/24/18
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6. PROPOSED PROJECT

A. Briefly describe the proposed project:

The proposed drawings reflect the addition of a new 1-car, wheelchair accessible garage, a new rear addition, and a remodel of the existing interior of the 2-story residence at 2415 Wade Street.

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>6-8-3-6</td>
<td>Max. [pl coverage (40%)</td>
<td>Proposed lot coverage of 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-3-7; 6-4-1-9</td>
<td>25.9’ Front Yard Setback</td>
<td>19.8’ (New Accessible Garage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-4-1-9</td>
<td>23.3’ Front Porch Setback</td>
<td>19.8’ (Existing Permitted Condition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-3-7</td>
<td>5.0’ Side Yard Setback</td>
<td>2.9’ (Existing Permitted Condition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-16-3-5</td>
<td>Req. 2 Off-street Parking Spaces</td>
<td>1-Car Accessible Garage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

See attached document for response to Zoning Analysis.

See attached document for response to Zoning Analysis.
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 existing garage, built by the previous Owner, is unusable in its current configuration. The garage does not function as intended. The driveway access currently extends over the west angled property line and is required to be removed where encroaching into the adjacent Sanitary District park area. There is not enough width for a driveway to be placed in order to enable a vehicle clear (pinch point reduced to limited 7.75' from house). As such the existing garage built does not function as intended and to date the garage is not utilized for cars. The rear of property is not accessible due to no alley access – no remaining alley in place, blocked by adjacent house to the east and house to the north. Also there is an electric pole with cable stay obstruction. Additionally the rear of property tapers down to a very small width at the north end due to the angled east property line along the park.

Note: Cars from original design submitted to the city did not function for vehicle maneuverability: cars where to (1) drive through garage toward a rear 2nd set of garage doors (2) into rear yard onto concrete pad (3) make multiple point turn so as to reposition the vehicle facing back into the garage (4) re-enter garage and (5) back out to the driveway to the street.

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.

   Not applicable. The project and its requested variations will not have a substantial adverse impact on the use, enjoyment, or property values or adjoining properties.

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.

   Strict adherence to regulations would make the provision of any garage parking impossible. No parking would be provided. As constructed (albeit per an existing permit Nov. 27, 2017- see attached “Previous permit + Zoning reference” sheet) the existing driveway is built over the east property line, and encroaches onto Sanitary District land, making the garage inaccessible via Wade Street (see item ‘B’ above). In addition one of the Owner’s parent lives within the home that has mobility difficulty, while the other Owner’s parent requires wheelchair access. The current configuration of the home and garage do not provide any accessibility through garage or of any kind.

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.

   Not applicable. The project and its requested variations will not generate any additional income to the applicant.

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

   The difficulty for parking is a result of pre-existing conditions created by the previous home owner. These existing non-compliant conditions have previously been approved by the City (see attached previous permit + Zoning reference’ sheet for reference). The proposed variations will enable the provision of parking on the site as sought by the city, while The variations requested will also allow coordination of a new condition, specific to the new home owner, regarding needed accessibility to the home. Both the access from parking into house and access from the interior of the house to exterior rear yard shall be addressed.
5. Have other alternatives been considered, and if so, why would they not work?

Alternate options have been considered, evaluated and determined as not feasible. As described in item 'B' the garage as situated on the property is not accessible for cars due to the inability to get a driveway to the rear from Wade Street, nor access from the rear via some sort of alley access. The only viable positioning of the garage is toward the south, encroaching slightly on the front yard and side yard setbacks due to the angled/ tapering site east property line (i.e. the garage shifts the garage southward to accommodate the garage width).

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.

NICOLE PINKARD
2415 WADE STREET
EVANSTON, IL 60201
1 (773) 428 - 2707

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.)

See Item 1 above.

3. List the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of person or entity holding title

See Item 1 above.
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.

See Item 1 above.

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.

   NOT APPLICABLE

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.

   NOT APPLICABLE

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

See Item 1 above.
2415 WADE STREET
ZONING ANALYSIS RESPONSE
CASE NUMBER: 18ZONA-0056

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>REQ. TO BE VARIED</th>
<th>REQUESTED VARIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-8-3-6</td>
<td>Max. lot coverage (40%)</td>
<td>Proposed lot coverage of 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-3-7; 6-4-1-9</td>
<td>25.9’ Front Yard Setback</td>
<td>19.8’ (New Accessible Garage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-4-1-9</td>
<td>23.3’ Front Porch Setback</td>
<td>19.8’ (Existing Permitted Condition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-3-7</td>
<td>5.0’ Side Yard Setback</td>
<td>2.9’ (Existing Permitted Condition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-16-3-5</td>
<td>Req. 2 Off-street Parking Spaces</td>
<td>1-Car Accessible Garage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 6-8-3-6: Max. permitted amount of building lot coverage is 40% (50% Proposed)**

Lot coverage variance requested to accommodate new 1-car garage and new raised rear porch attached to existing principal house footprint. The increase is necessary in order to provide the requested garage vehicle parking.

The garage is a larger typical single car footprint in order to accommodate handicap accessible clearances. The garage footprint is inclusive of wheel chair lift to get from garage slab on grade to the raised first floor of the house. In order to accommodate minimum workable clearances, the garage is sized at 426 Sq. Ft.

The proposed rear deck is also provided aligned with the first floor elevation to make accessible an outdoor space directly off house at the rear and side yard. New rear porch to be open-joint system with permeable surface below for site drainage.

**Section 6-8-3-7; 6-4-1-9: Min. required front yard setback is 25.9’ (extg) 19.8’(new garage) proposed**

In order to accommodate minimum required workable accessibility clearances, a variance is being sought for the new 1-car garage addition to be positioned to match the existing front porch setback (19.8’ existing).

The west property line boundary is angled in a way that the property tapers significantly towards the north (rear) to a smaller dimension. The property line squeezes the site such that the new proposed garage must be positioned further to the south (into the property frontage) in order to...
allow enough clearance for the garage's full width at the rear of the structure. The width is based on the size needed to enable an accessible parking space and path to wheelchair lift.

**Section 6-4-1-9: Min. required front porch setback is 23.3'. 19.8' (existing condition) proposed.**

19.8' setback at front porch is an existing condition and is to remain as-is with a re-cladding of the existing shingle roof to match the new garage addition. Existing front porch approved (as per Evanston Zoning Board on Aug. 18, 2009, Case: 09ZONA-0262) and permitted (approved July 7, 2013, Permit App. # 11ADDR-0055).

**Section 6-8-3-7: Min. required interior side yard setback is 5'-0". 2.9' proposed**

2'-11" (2.9') is an existing setback (verified via survey dated August 8, 2017 by William R. Webb, Chicago, IL). New rear renovation will match existing side yard setback. (Renovation of the rear coincides with the existing footprint of the rear unusable garage)

**Section 6-4-1-9: Min. required interior side yard setback for a roof is 4.5'. 2.2' proposed**

Roof overhang has been revised to be in compliance as per drawings, shortened so as not to require any variance. Smaller roof overhang condition is to be an open trellis constructed element. NO VARIANCE REQUIRED.

**Section 6-16-3-5, Table 16-B: At least 2 off-street parking spaces are required; 2 existing, 1 proposed.**

2 car parking was initially proposed by way of combining a handicap accessible single enclosed garage space with a second outdoor space parked within the front yard driveway depth. This exterior parking space is not recognized and as such a variance is sought for the single garage parking space only.

Existing rear garage is unusable in its reconfigured orientation as a result of the necessary removal of part of the existing driveway. The driveway extending to the rear existing garage is to be demolished due to its encroachment over the west property line (onto the Sanitary Distract property). The driveway was constructed by the previous Owner. The rear yard of the house is also not accessible through an alley. The inability to park cars at the rear of the property is the generating factor as to why a garage is proposed toward the front of the house (i.e. only feasible means to provide parking to the property)
2415 WADE STREET

PREVIOUS PERMIT + ZONING REFERENCE DOCUMENT

CASE NUMBER: 18ZONA-0056

The following is a general listing of drawing documents in K 2 Studios possession and available for reference. These documents identify house renovation with additions inclusive the front porch and rear garage built and in place on the property.

1. Non-permit approved drawing set (bidding drawing documents) dating from 2008/2009. Date stamp of March 24, 2008 for zoning analysis submit identified. Drawings indicate front porch and rear garage similar to approved permit sets in possession of as referenced above.

2. Zoning variances for side yard, front yard setbacks as granted by Evanston ZBA on August 18, 2009.

3. October 15 2012 Permit Plans: plans for house renovation including 2-story addition and 2nd story addition over bay window along west side of house and roof over front entry stoop.

4. April 10 2013 Permit Plans: plans for rear garage reviewed and approved inclusive of Zoning and planning approval. Set references zoning variances for side yard, front yard setbacks as granted by Evanston ZBA on August 18, 2009. Plans indicate new roofed porch and rear garage.

5. November 27 2017 Permit Plans: plans for rear garage reviewed and approved. Set references same zoning variances for side yard, front yard setbacks as granted by Evanston ZBA on August 18, 2009. Plans depict garage in rear with unworkable new driveway configuration;
   a. New drive along west angled property line to garage through pinch point of 7.75'
   b. Circulation through garage into rear via 2nd set of garage doors onto rear new driveway paving for turn-around. Vehicle maneuverability extremely difficult with required turn radius etc. Also 2 car parking additionally inhibit feasibility of maneuverability in order to exit off property.
   c. East and West side yards reduced to 3' from property line with eave additionally encroaching.
   d. Site plan also indicates 6' height fence to be installed on and along west property line (separation from park) and called out as per zoning administrator- August 18, 2009.
Drawing documentation reflects:

1. House (principal building) footprint  1746 SF approximately
2. Total building footprint (including garage and porch)  1914 SF approximately
3. percentage of lot coverage  36%+
4. Front setback:  26.45' to house
   20.45' to front porch structure
5. side yard setback
   west  reduced to 3' at garage (east +
6. rear setback  40.3' to rear garage
7. impervious surface  65%
WARRANTY DEED

THE GRANTORS, Thomas H. Jenkins, as Trustee, and Sophia C. Jenkins, as Trustee, under the Jenkins Family Living Trust dated July 30, 2010 of the County of Cook, State of ILLINOIS for and in consideration of TEN ($10.00) Dollars, in hand paid, CONVEYS and WARRANTS to Nichole D. Pinkard,* of Chicago, IL, all interest in the following described Real Estate situated in the County of Cook in the State of Illinois, to wit: 

*And Chanta Wade married to each other as tenant by the entirety. See Exhibit 'A' Legal Description attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Subject to: General real estate taxes not due and payable at the time of closing, covenants, conditions, and restrictions of record; public and utility easements; existing leases and tenancies; special governmental taxes or assessments for improvements not yet completed; unconfirmed special governmental taxes or assessments.

hereby releasing and waiving all rights under and by virtue of the Homestead Exemption Laws of the State of Illinois. TO HAVE AND TO HOLD SAID PREMISES FOREVER.

Permanent Real Estate Index Number(s): 10-13-111-006-0000

Address of Real Estate: 2415 Wade St., Evanston, Illinois 60201

DATED this 3rd day of November, 2017.

(SEAL)

Sophia C. Jenkins, as Trustee under the Jenkins Family Living Trust dated July 30, 2010.

(SEAL)

Thomas H. Jenkins, as Trustee under the Jenkins Family Living Trust dated July 30, 2010.
AFFIDAVIT OF TITLE
COVENANT AND WARRANTY
(Illinois)

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
)  
SS.  
COUNTY OF COOK  
)

The undersigned affiant, being first duly sworn, on oath say, and also covenants with and warrants to the grantee hereinafter named:

That affiant has an interest in the premises described below or in the proceeds thereof or is the grantor in the deed dated November 20, 2017 to Nichole D. Pinkard, grantees, conveying the following described premises:

SEE ATTACHED LEGAL DESCRIPTION

Commonly known as: 2415 Wade St., Evanston IL 60201

PINs: 10-13-111-006-0000

Subject to: real estate taxes not yet due and payable; zoning and building laws, ordinances or restrictions; covenants, conditions, restrictions and utility easements of record; roads and highways, if any; title exceptions pertaining to liens or encumbrances of a definite or ascertained amount which may be removed by the payment of money at the time of Closing and which the Seller shall so remove at that time by using the funds to be paid upon delivery of the Deed; matters over which the Title Company (as hereinafter defined) is willing to insure; acts done or suffered by the Purchaser or anyone claiming by, through or under Purchaser.

That no labor or material has been furnished for premises within the last four months that is not fully paid for.

That since the title date of August 9, 2017, in the report on title issued by Chicago Title, affiant has not done or suffered to be done anything that could in any way affect the title to premises, and no proceedings have been filed by or against affiant, nor has any judgment or decree been rendered against affiant, nor is there any judgment note or other instrument that can result in a judgment or decree against affiant within five days from the date hereof.

That all water taxes to date, have been or will be paid.

That this instrument is made to induce, and in consideration of, the said grantee's consummation of the purchase of premises.

Affiants further state: Naught.

Thomas H. Jenkins, as Trustee under the Jenkins Family Living Trust dated July 30, 2010

Sophia C. Jenkins, as Trustee under the Jenkins Family Living Trust dated July 30, 2010

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 3rd day of November, 2017

Notary Public

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 3rd day of November, 2017

Notary Public
Legal Description

Lot 2 (except the East 8 feet) in Block 4 in A.T. McIntosh Church Street Addition to Evanston, being a Subdivision of part of the South West 1/4 of the North West 1/4 of Section 13, Township 41 North, Range 13 East of the Third Principal Meridian, in Cook County, Illinois.

2415 Wade Street, Evanston IL 60201

PIN: 10-13-111-006-0000
Zoning Analysis

Summary

Case Number: 18ZONA-0055  
Case Status/Determination: Non-Compliant

Proposal:
NEW ATTACHED GARAGE (ACCESSIBLE), NEW REAR 1-STORY ADDITION, INTERIOR REMODEL

Site Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address:</th>
<th>2415 WADE ST</th>
<th>Zoning District:</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overlay District:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Preservation District:</td>
<td>Not Within</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicant: Matthew Kupritz

Signature 6-13-18

Date 8-30-18

Zoning Section Comments

SEE FOLLOWING SHEETS FOR SUMMARY COMMENTS.

Recommendation(s): Click on the link(s) below to access online application(s)
## Zoning Analysis

### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number:</th>
<th>Case Status/Determination:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18ZONA-0056 – 2415 WADE STREET</td>
<td>NON-COMPLIANT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposal:

NEW ATTACHED GARAGE (ACCESSIBLE), NEW REAR 1-STORY ADDITION, INTERIOR REMODEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Section:</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-6-5-2</td>
<td>General note: Any noncomplying structure may be repaired, maintained, altered or enlarged; provided, however, that any such repair, maintenance, alteration or enlargement whether in the vertical or horizontal dimension, shall comply with all provisions of the zoning code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-3-6</td>
<td>Non-compliant: Maximum permitted amount of building lot coverage is 40%; 44.3%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-3-7; 6-4-1-9</td>
<td>Non-compliant: Minimum required front yard setback is 25.9'; 19.8' proposed. The required setback is the average of the subject property and the one to the east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-3-7</td>
<td>Non-compliant: Minimum required interior side yard setback is 5'; 0' proposed from west side property line, 2.9' proposed from east side property line (addition).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-16-3-5, Table 16-B</td>
<td>Non-compliant: At least 2 off-street parking spaces are required; 2 existing; 1 proposed. Recommend revising the plan to reduce the number and degree of zoning variations, including but not limited to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Reduce building lot coverage, such as reducing the overall footprint of the structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Reconfigure the proposed attached garage so that both the west interior side yard and front yard setbacks comply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-3-8-3</td>
<td>As presented, major variation approval required. Major variations are considered by the Zoning Board of Appeals. Variations may or may not be approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-3-8-2</td>
<td>Given that one of the variations is related to parking, City Council approval is required to the parking variation. Therefore, City Council is the determining body for all variations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-2-11</td>
<td>The portion of the front porch located between the existing residence and the proposed attached garage is counted towards building lot coverage, porch exemption not applied. Only front porches facing a street receive the exemption.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Evanston
ZONING ANALYSIS REVIEW SHEET

APPLICATION STATUS: Pending Review  May 16, 2018
RESULTS OF ANALYSIS: Non-Compliant

Z.A. Number: 18ZONA-0056  Purpose: Zoning Analysis without Bld Permit App
Address: 2415 WADE ST  District: R2  Overlay: None  Preservation: Not Within
Applicant: Matthew Kupritz  Reviewer: Michael Griffith
Phone:  

THIS APPLICATION PROPOSES (select all that apply):

- New Principal Structure
- New Accessory Structure
- Addition to Structure
- Alteration to Structure
- Retention of Structure
- Sidewalk Cafe
- Change of Use
- Retention of Use
- Plat of Resubdiv./Consol
- Business License
- Home Occupation
- Other

ANALYSIS BASED ON:

- Plans Dated: 04-15-18
- Prepared By: K2 STUDIO
- Survey Dated: 08-09-2017
- Existing Improvements: SFR WITH ATTACHED GARAGE

Proposal Description:
NEW ATTACHED GARAGE (ACCESSIBLE), NEW REAR 1-STORY ADDITION, INTERIOR REMODEL

ZONING ANALYSIS

RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT CALCULATIONS
The following three sections apply to building lot coverage and impervious surface calculations in Residential Districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front Porch Exception (Subtract 10%)</th>
<th>Pavers/Pervious Paver Exception (Subtract 20%)</th>
<th>Open Parking Debt (Add 200sf/open space)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Eligible</td>
<td>Total Paver Area</td>
<td># Open Required Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Paver Regulatory Area</td>
<td>Addtn. to Bldg Lot Cov.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Porch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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></td>
<td>Dwelling - SF Detached</td>
<td>Dwelling - SF Detached</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

- Minimum Lot Width (LF)
  - USE: Single Family Detached
  - 35 60.8  60.8  Compliant

Comments:

- Minimum Lot Area (SF)
  - USE: Single Family Detached
  - 5,000 sq ft 5345  5345  Compliant

Comments:

Dwelling Units:
- 1 1  Compliant

Rooming Units:
- Comments:

Building Lot Coverage
(SF) (defined, including subtractions & additions)
- 2138 2013 37.7%  Non-Compliant

Comments:

LF: Linear Feet  SF: Square Feet  FT: Feet
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impervious Surface Coverage (SF, %)</td>
<td>2939.0</td>
<td>2960.9</td>
<td>2991.3</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: AMOUNT OF IMPERVIOUS SURFACE COVERAGE REDUCED

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>NOT DIMENSIONED</th>
<th>ADDITION - NOT DIMENSIONED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard(1) (FT)</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>ADDITION - 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction: S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street:</td>
<td>STANDARD IS BLOCK AVG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard(2) (FT)</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction: S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street:</td>
<td>FRONT PORCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>CONFIRM IF FRONT PORCH IS BEING RECONSTRUCTED, ENLARGED OR OTHERWISE ALTERED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Side Yard (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard(1) (FT)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>ADDITION - 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction: W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard(2) (FT)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>ADDITION - 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction: E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard (FT)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0+</td>
<td>ADDITION - 30.0+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction: N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: ACCESSORY USE AND STRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use (1)</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Districts:</td>
<td>Deck or Patio (raised)</td>
<td>Deck or Patio (raised)</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Required Yard:</td>
<td>Interior Side Yard</td>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Standards:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LF: Linear Feet   SF: Square Feet   FT: Feet
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance from Principal Building:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard (1A) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction: S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street:</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>Front Yard (1B) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction: S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street: FRONT PORCH</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>Street Side Yard (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street:</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>Interior Side Yard (1A) (FT)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction: W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: DECK LOCATED TO THE SIDE OF THE RESIDENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard (1B) (FT)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction: E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: REAR PORTION OF DECK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard (FT)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0+</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction: N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: PARKING REQUIREMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Use(2):                        |           |          |          |               |
| Comments:                       |           |          |          |               |
| Use(3):                        |           |          |          |               |
| Comments:                       |           |          |          |               |
| TOTAL REQUIRED:                 |           |          |          |               |
| Comments:                       |           |          |          |               |
| Handicap Parking Spaces:        | Sec. 6-15-2-6 |          |          |               |
| Comments:                       |           |          |          |               |
| Access:                         | Sec. 6-15-2-2 | STREET | STREET | No Change |
| Comments:                       |           |          |          |               |
| Vertical Clearance (LF)         | 7        |          |          | NOT DIMENSIONED |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surfaceing:</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Sec. 6-16-2-8 (E)</td>
<td>ENCLOSED</td>
<td>ENCLOSED</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Sec. 6-4-6-2</td>
<td>ATTACHED GARAGE</td>
<td>ATTACHED GARAGE</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments:

- **Angle(1):**
  - **Width(W) (FT):**
    - Comments:
  - **Depth(D) (FT):**
    - Comments:
  - **Aisle(A) (FT):**
    - Comments:
  - **Module (FT):**
    - Comments:

- **Angle(2):**
  - **Width(W) (FT):**
    - Comments:
  - **Depth(D) (FT):**
    - Comments:
  - **Aisle(A) (FT):**
    - Comments:
  - **Module (FT):**
    - Comments:

### Garage Setback from Alley Access (FT)

**Comments:**

---

**COMMENTS AND/OR NOTES**

**Analysis Comments**

**RESULTS OF ANALYSIS**

Results of Analysis: This Application is Non-Compliant

Site Plan & Appearance Review Committee approval is:

See attached comments and/or notes.
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### EXISTING

#### LOT ZONING INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Index Number</th>
<th>10.112.111.000.0000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Code</td>
<td>R2 - Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>5,345 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Dwelling Units</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BUILDING INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Principal Building Footprint</th>
<th>1,748 SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Square Footage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement: 1,569 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Floor: 1,235 SF (1,748 incl. Attached Garage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Floor: 1,177 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dwelling Unit Square Footage:</td>
<td>3,981 (4,454) x 5,000 SF Allowable (R2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Front Porch (50% Exempt)</td>
<td>169 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.5 Afters Exemption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Side Porch (100% Exempt)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Included (Less Than 4% of Lot Area)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Garage</td>
<td>427 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of existing Lot Coverage: 1,748 x 84.5 / 1,823.5 x 34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage = 40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Existing Setbacks

| Front: 26'-6" (27' Min. [Parking Prohibited]) |  |
| Infil Side 1: 3'-9" (15' Min. [Parking Prohibited]) | |
| Infil Side 2: 2'-11" (5' Min.) | |
| Rear: 40'-6" (30' Min.) | |
| Impervious Surface (Extd.) | 3,328 SF (62%) |

### PROPOSED

#### LOT ZONING INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Index Number</th>
<th>10.113.111.000.0000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Code</td>
<td>R2 - Single Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>5,345 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Dwelling Units</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BUILDING INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Principal Building Footprint</th>
<th>1,476 SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Square Footage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement: 1,569 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Floor: 1,235 SF (1,748 incl. Attached Garage)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Floor: 1,177 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dwelling Unit Square Footage:</td>
<td>4,376 x 5,000 SF Allowable (R2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch: Front Porch Section (50% Exempt)</td>
<td>169 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.5 Afters Exemption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Porch: (Not Exempt)</td>
<td>113 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Porch: (Not Exempt)</td>
<td>301 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Garage</td>
<td>426 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of existing Lot Coverage: 1,748 x 84.5 + 113 + 307 + 426 = 2,878.5 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,878.5 / 5,345 x 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Lot Coverage = 40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposed Setbacks

| Front: 19'-10" (27' Min. [Parking Prohibited]) |  |
| Infil Side 1: 0'-0" (15' Min. [Parking Prohibited]) | |
| Infil Side 2: 2'-11" (Existing) (5' Min.) | |
| Rear: 40'-6" (Existing) (30' Min.) | |
| Impervious Surface (Extd.) | 2,626.5 SF (50%) |
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CASE NO.: 09 ZMJV-0064

RE: An application by Donalee Floeter, on behalf of Tommy & Sophia Jenkins property owners, for major variances to allow the construction of a 2 story addition on the west side, a new 2 car attached garage on the north side, a new porch on the south and southwest side, and to raise the roof on the existing home to provide a full second story.
CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Good evening everyone. Thank you for waiting. This is a public hearing of the Zoning Board of Appeals of the City of Evanston. Present tonight are Board Members Mary Beth Berns, Beth McLennan, Matthew Rodgers and Laurie Summers. I'm Robert Creamer, the current Chair. We therefore have a quorum. Also present tonight from the City staff is Dominick Argumedo, the Zoning Planner.

We have a few rules that govern our proceedings, our most important rule is that only one person speaks at a time without interruption. It's more than good manners, it's necessary to permit the Court Reporter to accurately record our proceedings. Anybody who has anything to say with regard to any matter on our agenda will have an opportunity to do so at the appropriate time.

All testimony and evidence that we hear will be under oath. Although we do not apply the strict rules of evidence, we ask that you limit your testimony or statement to your own personal knowledge. When you make a statement or testify, please tell us your name and address, and print your name on the paper that's supposed to be on the podium for you to do so.

When all of the testimony and evidence
and statements have been received with regard to any matter, we then close our record and begin our deliberations. We have four members, or excuse me, four matters on the agenda tonight and I'd like to take roll to see who is here.

First we have 2415 Wade. Is the applicant here? Okay. Is there anyone else here who would like to speak to us with regard to 2415 Wade? I see none at this time. 3003 Park Place, is the applicant here? Okay, thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak to us with regard to 3003 Park Place? I see none at this time. 2650 Eastwood, is the applicant here? Okay, thank you. Anyone else here who wishes to speak to us with regard to 2650 Eastwood? I see none at this time. And lastly, 2837 Hartzell.

MR. ARGUMEDO: They're in the outer room right now talking.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: They're in the ante room at this moment. Okay.

MR. ARGUMEDO: On deck circle.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: All right. Well then with that, we'll ask Dominick to read us the background information with regard to 2415 Wade.

MR. ARGUMEDO: The first case for the evening.
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

2415 Wade Street

is Case No. 09ZMJV-0064, 2415 Wade Street. An application by Donalee Floeter, on behalf of Tommy and Sophia Jenkins property owners, for major variances to allow the construction of a two-story addition on the west side of the property, on the west side, a new two-car attached garage on the north side, a new porch on the south and southwest side, and to raise the roof of the existing home to provide a full second story. The project would require zoning relief from Section 6-4-1-9-B-1, front porch yard obstruction which may encroach ten percent into required front yard. The applicant proposes it encroach 22 percent for this application, a difference of 2.9 feet. And zoning relief from Section 6-8-3-7-8-3, a required five foot setback from the side property line, the applicant requests a three foot side yard set back from the east and west property lines.

The Zoning Board of Appeals is the determining body in this case.

In your case packets were a staff report, a contacts map of Wade Street, a survey of the property, project drawings, zoning analysis review sheet and the major variance application. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: All right. The people who plan to testify with regard to the Wade Street matter,
COMMISSIONER RODGERS: Mr. Chairman, before we begin, in the interest of disclosure, I am familiar with the applicant, but I do not believe that my acquaintanceship with them is going to influence my partiality in this matter.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Okay. Thank you for that disclosure. We're willing to take your statement at its face value, so we'll proceed with your participation. Thank you, sir.

Come on up and be sworn. If you have any doubt, be sworn and then we won't have to go back.

Whereupon,

DONALEE FLOETER, THOMAS JENKINS, SOPHIA JENKINS, called as witnesses herein, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

MS. FLOETER: Donalee Floeter, F-l-o-e-t-e-r.

MR. JENKINS: Thomas Jenkins, T-h-o-m-a-s, J-e-n-k-i-n-s.

MS. JENKINS: Sophia Jenkins, S-o-p-h-i-a.

MS. FLOETER: Good evening. Thank you for allowing us to make a presentation here. My name is Donalee Floeter, I'm an architect. I've been working
here in Evanston for close to 20 years. I have
presented many cases before the Zoning Board here and in
other communities, and I have to say that this
particular case has truly the most unique set of
hardships and practical difficulties, to use the
language of the Zoning Ordinance, that I've ever worked
with. And as I said, I've done dozens of zoning cases
here.

Tommy and Sophia are the owners of the
property. It's currently, if you've gone by to see it,
and by looking through the packet that's provided, it's
a little triangular lot, on the end of a very short cul-
de-sac. The building currently, it's approximately a
hundred years old, I'd say, and has been used as a two-
flat for probably most of its existence. Tommy and
Sophia have owned it for a while, they've been renting
the units till recently when they decided that they
would like to convert the home into a single family
home, make the additions that we're proposing to do to
make it suitable for their family, and move in. So, we
would be taking the property from a two-flat, as a
nonconforming use in the R2 District and making it a
single family use.

The other big hardships there besides the
shape of the lot, the fact that it's on the short cul-de-sac, is parking. There is no parking provided at all on the lot existing, and we went through quite a few different possibilities of where we could place a garage on the lot, came up with this rendition that you see before you.

There is no alley access to the back of the lot. There was an alley that was vacated by the City of Evanston in 1952, which we determined through the research that we were doing trying to figure out the best way of approaching this. There is an existing curb cut on the front of the lot, so it made itself evident that putting a driveway in from that spot would make sense. There is no way to put parking on this lot without coming to you for some sort of zoning relief.

Boy, can I answer any questions?

COMMISSIONER BERNS: Yeah, I have questions, because I looked at your plan and it took me quite a while to figure it out, what's going on there.

MS. FLOETER: I'm sorry that they're on such little pieces of paper.

COMMISSIONER BERNS: That's okay. It's just so unique that, you know, I read plans, so I understand what I'm looking at, but I just wanted to make sure that
you're really proposing to put the driveway along the property line, pull into this garage, and then you've got the other set of garage doors? Is that to be able to do some three point turning, to be able to get out and get back out?

MS. FLOETER: Yeah, and I brought a large scale drawing, and my little paper cars, what I could show you how we thought, how we --

COMMISSIONER BERNS: And as the owners, you guys are comfortable with this? I mean, it's not really my place to say whether this is right or wrong, but you guys are all comfortable with this?

MR. JENKINS: Right, you know, yeah, I mean, as comfortable as we can be. You know what I mean, without --

MS. FLOETER: We did look at other options.

COMMISSIONER BERNS: Okay, okay.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: I think the garage was one of my concerns too, so I wouldn't mind understanding how this thing works myself, actually, at some point. But if you have any other questions.

MS. FLOETER: We can show you how we came up with this idea. And if you look at the plats, seriously, there really aren't a lot of other options
for garages, other than smack up in the front, very
front, pushed way forward of the house in order to fit
-- and I don't have an easel, so I don't know how we're
going to do this to show you how this works, but let me
find. --

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: All right. First I must
warn you that whenever you show us something, it's ours,
and so we'll mark this when Dominick gets a change as
Applicant's Exhibit 1 and you're holding up for the
record a, I believe a drawing of the proposed addition
and the garage, is that correct?

MS. FLOETER: It's the, an enlarged version
of, sort of the back end of the house where the garage
is going to be. So, it's not a complete floor plan.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: All right.

MS. FLOETER: I've got to find my little cars.
Well, you want to ask a question about anything else
about it while I'm asking for a --

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: I kind of brought up, I
notice that in the Zoning Analysis, kind of a
complicated question to throw at you while you're trying
to do that, but I had brought up that, I notice in the
Zoning Analysis that it appears that the building lot
coverage is over, but --
MS. FLOETER: I understand, I think that might have been a typo on the part of the Zoning Officer, because in my form that I filled out to turn it in, I was less than 40 percent. I can give you the exact number that I gave to him, that I calculated. So, I know that we can fit it in the number that I have.

MR. ARGUMEDO: Yes, normally we, naturally double check anything the applicant turns in to, for our own calculation.

MS. FLOETER: Right.

MR. ARGUMEDO: I distinctly remember, I know Martin Travis, the Zoning Officer was at the hearing, Spark hearing, and as you pull out the drawing of the site plan for that, I definitely, I remember people immediately going well, I know we'll be doing one for lot coverage and Donalee and Martin correcting those there at the Spark hearing that actually it is compliant. Why we have that number right there that says not compliant, I am not sure, since I did not do the Zoning Analysis, but I do remember speaking to Martin Travis about that, whether we put a condition in here that we confirm that with the Zoning Officer that it is compliant or not, maybe something we could do.

MS. FLOETER: We can definitely check the
calculations. I'm going to guess because I believe I filed four separate Zoning Analyses for this particular project, each one noncompliant in different ways as we sort of worked our way through coming up with this last proposal, and that number could have been left over from one of the previous Zoning Analyses that he did, and didn't, somehow got transferred. I can, you know, I have a copy of the analysis form that I filled out that shows the proposed lot coverage at 2071, a percentage of 38.72, but would be compliant.

MR. ARGUMEDO: Right. Just as we, right now we're looking at a Zoning Analysis that has 43.6 percent and the requirement is 40 percent in this area.

MS. FLOETER: Right.

MR. ARGUMEDO: Where that discrepancy comes, I'm not sure. I'm a little unsure why it ways compliant next to that determination as well. That's a box that doesn't fill in automatically. That's one that the Zoning Officer, as we go through this paddle system, you click on yourself.

MS. FLOETER: And I apologize. I can't find my little make shift cars that we drove through the project.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Or you could just
briefly describe what the concept is, because it does
seem unusual and it's confusing as to why there's all
these driveways.

MR. ARGUMEDO: Dona, Donalee, if you could
just read copies into the microphone for our transcript.
I know they come off, so if that's easier for you take
it out of the --

MS. FLOETER: Could be behind here, how about
that. And I don't know if, this is just an enlargement
of the document that you have, the first floor plan.
This is the family room at the end of the house, and
this is the garage. And the driveway comes from Wade
Street, along the side of the house, on the west side.
Here back is the park area.

So, the proposal would be, or the ability
to do this would be, there is a garage door here and a
garage door on the, one on the west side of the garage
and one on the north side of the garage. So both would
have to be opened, this one is an overhead door. Since
we can't have two overhead doors, this would be a
swinging door. So you can see this is complicated
already.

The car would drive in, enter the garage,
this would be the first car in, enter the garage through
the west door, pull through the north door onto the
driveway on the north side. Then, that car would stay
there. The second car comes in and does the same thing,
and then they both back in this way. It works. I used
the, I don't know why I can't find them in my file, I
had these little paper, six by 15 rectangles that I
used, which is the size of my Honda Odyssey minivan, and
so Tommy and Sophia have smaller cars than that, so I
know their cars, their current cars would work, but it
does, you know, it is a tricky thing, but it's the best
we can do on this weird little lot.

COMMISSIONER BERNS: And then the only way out
is to actually back out.

MS. FLOETER: Yeah, it's one car --

COMMISSIONER BERNS: And you've got seven foot
nine from the corner of the house to a fence.

MS. FLOETER: Yup. That's why we put the
fence. That was a Zoning Department request of us so
that they wouldn't drive off their property onto the
park property.

COMMISSIONER BERNS: That is going to be some
challenging backing up.

MS. FLOETER: I know.

COMMISSIONER BERNS: I think my only other
question is related to the front porch, which I think looks very nice on your elevation, and I think it helps with character. My concern is the fact that you're asking for a variance for something that's really just to make it look pretty. And I know that you could have achieved the same thing by reducing the depth of the porch, and rather than being six feet, you could have asked for less and still gotten the net effect, which is this charming layer on the front of the house. So, can you speak to that?

MS. FLOETER: Oh, yes, I don't see that it's only an aesthetic portion of the plan. The property, their house is located next to the park, Metropolitan Sanitary District property, the City of Evanston, I believe, leases a portion of that as a playground. Tommy and Sophia have a young son now, he's two, two-and-a-half, and they've just discovered that they will be having another child next spring. The depth of that porch encourages it to be used as a place to sit. And Tommy and Sophia can sit out there because their yard is pretty small after this, even now, it looks big because of the park, the expanse of the park. It would enable them to sit out on the porch and view the playground from their front porch and watch their kids play,
safely.

COMMISSIONER BERNS: Which I absolutely appreciate, but they can do that from the side, as well, which doesn't require a variance. It's only that pesky front that requires the variance. So, you could have two different depths of front porch, and not have to ask for a variance. You could have a four in the front and a six on the side. It's a weird hip, I'll give you that, but, you know, weirder things have been done. And I don't think it would actually affect the way that it looks.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Anyone else have, as long as we're focusing on the porch, have a question or issue about that particular variance or request?

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: I just tend to agree with Mary's, you know, observations or whatever.

COMMISSIONER MCLENNAN: I actually don't agree with that, especially seeing as it is a south exposure. I would think that the six foot is going to be extremely helpful in the summertime, keeping the sun off of people as they're sitting on the porch. It's a very small cul-de-sac, I don't anticipate a lot of foot traffic and I actually just personally don't have a problem with front porches being extremely close to
sidewalks. I understand that that's not the way we do it here in Evanston, but I aesthetically and philosophically don't have a problem with it.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Any other questions? So, I need some help here. How many variations are we looking at. I have one thing where it looks like two and the other is three.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: It's technically three because it's a side yard for the west and a side yard for the east, so the two, number two is actually --

COMMISSIONER BERNS: Right, two for the garage, and one for the front porch.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: All right. Fair enough, all right. I think that's clarified then. Any other questions?

All right, thank you.

MS. FLOETER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Since we first called this case, is there anyone else present who has anything to say to us with regard to 2415 Wade Street? I see none, so we'll close the record. Thank you very much. We'll begin our deliberations.

MS. FLOETER: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CREAMER: And please leave that drawing for Dominick's tender care.

All right. It looks like we need to focus on the porch issue. I think I agree with Beth that although I normally am a minimum change hawk, I think this particular situation where this porch really isn't going to affect anybody, is it?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS: I think that one of the reasons for the porch is to keep uniformity in, like you're looking down a street. Since we're out of a cul-de-sac that is two houses deep, or one house deep, I don't know which address the other one faces on, that then goes into an open park area. I don't think that we're looking at it in the same say that we would look at it if it were in the middle of a normal city block, where it would be thrust forward from everything around it.

COMMISSIONER BERNS: Can I just clarify that in theory, I agree with you all as well. I like porches. I like all of that. It's just that the Evanston Zoning, the Zoning Code doesn't really allow for porches to encroach more. And so in theory, love the porches, they should encroach into a front yard. It's just that's not what happens to be in the Zoning
Code. And so, that's all I'm responding to, is I'm kind of viewing the Zoning Code versus my own personal preference towards porches.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Well, I think that one of the reasons we're here is to try to smooth those situations where this, and I think this is from the code itself, where the strict application of the code would work a hardship. And I do think given this project, requiring them to have an undersized porch, and I would think a four foot porch would be, at least in my view, undersized. Although --

COMMISSIONER BERNS: It's certainly large by City standards.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Yes, well that's one of my problems with the City. But anyway, I think part of the limited discretion that we have is to try to alleviate some of these hardship situations, and I think here it's an appropriate move on our part to permit them a little leeway here.

COMMISSIONER MCLENNAN: And I do want to add, I would probably feel much more inclined to support the Zoning Code if applicants had a backyard, but they kind of don't. It's the tiniest little lot, strangest lot size I've seen in a while. So, I mean, what they've got
to work with to make appropriate outdoor space in their home, is kind of the front and that size of a front porch, I think is going to make their outdoor space more livable and enjoyable for them. So, that's kind of why I can feel at ease with allowing a variance on it.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Any further discussion? Do we have a motion then? I don't think we have to march through each of the standards individually, unless someone insists on it.

COMMISSIONER BERNS: I'm only going to ask, just given they way that I think Laurie and I are probably leaning, do you want to split up the variances?

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Yeah, I think we'll need to. So, I lost my homework again. Been a hard night. I apologize to everybody. I woke up at 4:30 this morning in Syracuse and have been driving all day, and I did make it. It can be done, in spite road work in Ohio. Do not drive across Ohio in the summer, in road work.

But anyway, so, the first variance is for Section 6419B1, front porch yard obstruction. Is that correct?

MR. ARGUMEDO: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Okay. And do we have a
In the case of 2415 Wade Street, I move that the Board allow a front porch yard obstruction in the amount of 22 percent instead of the required ten percent into the front yard. Do we need to add any condition on that?

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Yes. Look on the second page, subject to construction uses.

COMMISSIONER MCLENNAN: With the condition that the approval is subject to construction and use of the development being in substantial compliance with the testimony and documents placed on file in connection with this case.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS: I'll second.

(Motion moved and seconded.)

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Okay, it's been moved and seconded to grant the variance requested with regard to the front porch yard obstruction setback. Any further discussion? All in favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Three ayes. All opposed.
COMMISSIONER BERNS: No.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Nay.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Okay, three ayes and two no's. On that one I will advise the applicant that under our rules and under the statute it takes four votes for the Board to act and in situations where there is an absence, and there are two absences tonight, the absent members will be asked to read the transcript and vote at the next regular meeting of which they are in attendance, which will be September 1. So hopefully we'll an answer on that on September 1.

So, that's the disposition for the time being with regard to the front porch yard obstruction request.

Now we have the two variances with regard to the side yard setbacks, is that correct? Does somebody want to make a motion on that, please?

COMMISSIONER RODGERS: I suppose I will.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER RODGERS: In regards to matter 09ZMJV-0064 at 2415 Wade Street, I move that the Board approve the variances for side yard setbacks, provided that the construction and development be in conformity with the testimony and documentation submitted herein.
CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Second.

(Motion moved and seconded.)

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: It's been moved and seconded. Any further discussion? All in favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Five ayes, no nays. That variance will be approved. And I think that concludes our proceedings with regard to this matter for this evening. Hopefully we'll have a final answer for you on September 1st with regard to the front porch.

MS. FLOETER: Thank you for separating those for us.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Thank you.
DESCRIPTIVE AND PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DAPR) MINUTES EXCERPT
August 22, 2018


Staff Present: J. Velan, D. Cueva

Others Present:

Presiding Member: J. Leonard

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

2415 Wade Street

Phillip Kupritz, applicant, applies for major zoning relief to construct a 1-car attached garage, a rear addition and deck to an existing single-family residence in the R2 Single-Family Residential District. The applicant requests building lot coverage of 50% where 40% is permitted, to reduce the minimum required front yard setback from 25.9’ to 19.8’, to reduce the required west interior side yard setback from 5’ to 0’ and to reduce the required east interior side yard setback from 5’ to 2.9’, to reduce the required off-street parking from 2 spaces to 1 space for a single-family residence.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Matt Kupritz, applicant, architect
Nicole Pinkard

DISCUSSION:

- S. Mangum asked what will be happening in the other areas on the first floor.
- Applicant said they will be putting kitchen in the rear and front of house will consist of bedroom space.
- S. Mangum asked about will there be any changes to the upstairs of the house.
- Applicant said no with the exception of the window facing the park.
- G. Gerdes asked why they can’t just connect garage to existing residential by eliminating the wrap around portion of the porch.
- Applicant said it needed due to not just having one primary entrance for purposes of being ADA accessible.
- S. Mangum said the east and west setbacks can be modified to help property better comply with current zoning in the R2 Single-Family Residential.
- S. Mangum asked applicant width of side porch.
- Applicant stated 5 feet.
- J. Nelson asked applicant how they plan on containing stormwater.
- Applicant said they have not really looked into it but are open to modifying for stormwater containment.
- J. Leonard explains that they would like to see more alternatives on how best to modify the property to accommodate the addition.

Committee recommended applicant come back to DAPR with alternative options of property modifications.
DESIGN AND PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DAPR) MINUTES EXCERPT
August 29, 2018


Staff Present: J. Velan, J. Nelson

Others Present:

Presiding Member: J. Leonard

A quorum being present, Ms. Leonard called the meeting to order at 2:33pm.

2415 Wade Street

Phillip Kupritz, applicant, applies for major zoning relief to construct a 1-car attached garage, a rear addition and deck to an existing single-family residence in the R2 Single-Family Residential District. The applicant requests building lot coverage of 50% where 40% is permitted, to reduce the minimum required front yard setback from 25.9’ to 19.8’, to reduce the required west interior side yard setback from 5’ to 0’ and to reduce the required east interior side yard setback from 5’ to 2.9’, to reduce the required off-street parking from 2 spaces to 1 space for a single-family residence.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Matt Kupritz, applicant, architect
Nicole Pinkard, property owner

DISCUSSION:
- M. Kupritz discussed an alternative plan that removes the side porch. He stated this plan eliminates the central entry location desired by the owner, requires removing a desirable window at the first floor and takes away from living space since a bedroom would need to be relocated.
- M. Kupritz stated the proposed plan has the main living areas at the back of the home with two bedrooms at the front away from the living area. He stated the 1st floor bedrooms are for one live-in parent and a guest room for a parent which visits. He stated the bedrooms need to be ADA accessible.
- M. Kupritz discussed a second alternative which provided an open parking pad in the west side yard instead of the attached garage. He stated this option has the entry on the west side, keeps the side porch and allows two bedrooms at the front of the home.
- N. Pinkard stated the goal is for two bedrooms on the 1st floor. She stated the parking pad works but a garage is preferred.
- M. Kupritz stated the open parking pad includes a wall to screen the parking and trash container.
- N. Pinkard stated they are working with the Park Dept. to provide a library or equipment storage at the back of the garage.
- S. Mangum asked if one of the bedrooms could be relocated away from the front.
- M. Kupritz stated the existing stairs is an obstacle, creates long narrow spaces. He stated a bedroom could be moved but it is not an ideal plan.
- S. Mangum questioned the setback at the proposed kitchen.
• M. Kupritz stated the existing garage foundation will be used, noting a variation had been granted for that setback. He stated the setback could be increased but they are trying to salvage the existing foundation.
• Discussion that locating both bedrooms next to the bathroom would help with resale.
• M. Kupritz stated that would not be practical since it would create long, narrow living space.
• S. Mangum noted the open parking pad would trigger additional variations, asked if that would reduce building lot coverage.
• M. Griffith stated even though it would still count towards building lot coverage, it may reduce it.
• M. Griffith noted the application requested building lot coverage of 50% but his review noted the plan is less than that, noting the applicant’s number includes a rear porch which is not part of the plan.
• N. Pinkard stated she is not willing to remove the side porch.
• J. Leonard stated this is a challenging case given the ADA needs. She stated she sees the benefit to the garage, stated having both bedrooms near the bathroom is a better design.
• S. Mangum asked if a chair lift would be feasible to access the 2nd floor.
• N. Pinkard stated it would be difficult to transition between a wheelchair and the lift.

L. Biggs made a motion to recommend approval to ZBA, seconded by J. Leonard.

The Committee voted, 5-4, to recommend approval to the ZBA.