Zoning Board of Appeals
Tuesday, September 25, 2018
7:00 P.M.
Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room G300

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES from September 4, 2018.

3. OLD BUSINESS

A. 413 Grove St.  18ZMJV-0068
   Jeffrey K. & Janet H. Clements, property owners, appeal the Zoning Administrator’s
decision to partially deny minor zoning relief (case number 18ZMV-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.

B. 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.

4. NEW BUSINESS

A. 2626 Reese Ave.  18ZMJV-0078

Order & Agenda Items are subject to change. Information about the ZBA is available at:
Questions can be directed to Melissa Klotz at mklotz@cityofevanston.org or 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 847-448-4311 or 847-448-8064 (TTY) at least 48 hours in advance of
the scheduled meeting so that accommodations can be made.

La ciudad de Evanston está obligada a hacer accesibles todas las reuniones públicas a las personas minusválidas o las
que no hablan inglés. Si usted necesita ayuda, favor de ponerse en contacto con la Oficina de Administración del
Centro a 847/866-2916 (voz) o 847/448-8052 (TDD).
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. 1919 Dempster St. 18ZMJV-0080
James E. Olguin, attorney, applies for a special use permit for a Type 2 Restaurant, McDonalds, and a special use permit for a Drive Through Facility, at 1919 Dempster Street in the C2 Commercial District (Zoning Code Section 6-10-4-3). The applicant proposes a 91 square foot building addition for a new Drive-Through window, and a second ordering lane for a dual Drive-Through Facility. The Zoning Board of Appeals makes a recommendation to City Council, the determining body for this case.

5. DISCUSSION

6. ADJOURNMENT
The next Zoning Board of Appeals meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 16, 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, September 4, 2018
7:00 PM
Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Council Chambers

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

Members Absent: Scott Gingold, Mary McAuley, Kiril Mirintchev

Staff Present: Scott Mangum

Presiding Member: Mary Beth Berns

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

Minutes
Ms. Cullen motioned to approve the meeting minutes of August 28, 2018, which were seconded by Ms. Dziekan, and approved 4-0.

New Business
514 Custer Ave. 18ZMJV-0062
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 two concrete walls (fences) that are 14’ and 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 6’ 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.

Mr. Mangum read the case into the record.

Carlo Cavallaro, applicant’s representative, explained the proposal:
- Third DC in a box project in Evanston (Church Street wall is 18’ tall, Green Bay wall is 20’ tall).
- Upgrades from 4kV to 12kV increasing capacity and reliability of equipment with more redundancy.
- Site is smaller than others, less separation from adjacent buildings requires higher two-hour firewall.
- Highest transformer is 9-feet tall.
- Thermographic study produced by engineers with wall height recommendation.
- Ward meeting discussion involved aesthetics, including landscaping. Limited area for landscaping reason for proposed prairie grasses.
- Coloring and stamping of wall can be customized.
- Outages to transfer equipment is limited.
- ComEd and industry-wide standard reason for 8” deep concrete firewalls.
- ComEd crews maintain grounds as needed.
- ComEd's responsibility to adapt site to future conditions as needed.
- Lighting not proposed but could be added if needed and pointed downward similar to facility on Green Bay Road.

Deliberation:
Ms. Cullen noted that the proposed project will be an improvement over existing conditions.

Ms. Arevalo inquired about the possibility of a mural. Mr. Mangum explained previous discussion regarding mural including ComEd's explanation that it could not be added to inside of wall and would have limited visibility from opposite side of wall.

Ms. Dziekan agreed that the proposal was an improvement, but suggested conditions for lighting and staff review of a thermographic study.

Chair Berns suggested two pours of concrete to break down scale of wall by adding variety.

The Special Use Standards were addressed:
1. Yes
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. NA
7. NA
8. NA
9. Yes

Ms. Cullen motioned to recommend approval of the special use, which was seconded by Ms. Dziekan and unanimously recommended for approval with conditions:
1. Thermographic study to be reviewed by staff.
2. Add Lighting as appropriate.
3. Reconsider perceived scale of wall.
4. Guarantee maintenance of project.
5. Substantial compliance with the documents and testimony on record.

The Major Variation Standards were addressed:
1. Yes
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. Yes
7. Yes

Ms. Dziekan motioned to recommend approval of the major variation, which was seconded by Ms. Cullen and unanimously recommended for approval with conditions:
1. Substantial compliance with the documents and testimony on record.

413 Grove St. 18ZMJV-0068

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.

Mr. Mangum read the case into the record and summarized the reasons for the partial denial.

Mr. Clements, owner, explained the appeal request:
- Described context of property and proposed addition.
- Several revisions to project over design process including a compliant side setback.
- The plans reviewed for minor variation were erroneously submitted by applicant showing a planter.
- Preservation Commission recommended approval.
- Neighbors in support.

Chair Berns noted that the dimensions of plans were not reduced when the 2-foot deep planter was removed from plans.

In response to Chair Berns, Mr. Clements confirmed that the planter was removed but the dimension didn't change, however, the use of a portion of the area changed to pantry and closet from dining area.

Chair Berns remarked about the large size of the 11’ by 12’ pantry and closet area with skylights and window. Ms. Clements noted that there is no other closet on 1st floor.

In response to Ms. Dziekan, Ms. Clements stated the that space is intended to be used as a kitchen, for dining, in addition to as a mud room, pantry, and closet.

Mr. Mangum clarified that staff believed other reductions were possible, not solely the removal of the planter area.

Ms. Clements stated that the area has been reduced in 3 different ways.

Chair Berns noted the difference in plans submitted and the ability of ZBA to make modifications to the Zoning Administrator’s decision.

Mr. Mangum summarized the preservation and minor variation process and clarified that the plans submitted by the applicant for the minor variation did include the planter.

Ms. Arevalo noted minimal difference in size of the addition approved versus requested.
Ms. Dziekan stated there was the ability for the ZBA to uphold initial decision based on information presented, but still approve what was requested based on the applicant following the spirit of reducing to limit impact.

Chair Berns stated that the minimum necessary is an important standard and the scale of pantry/closet is oversized.

Standards for Minor Variation:
1. Yes
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. No

Ms. Dziekan motioned to affirm decision of the Zoning Administrator to partially deny the minor variation for building lot coverage, which was seconded by Ms. Cullen and unanimously approved.

Ms. Dziekan motioned to approve a building lot coverage of 34.6% in compliance with testimony and plans as revised showing a pantry/mudroom/storage area, which was seconded by Ms. Arevalo.

With a vote of 3 in favor and one opposed, the case continues to September 25, 2018 meeting for concurring vote of 4 board members. Testimony is closed so no additional information may be provided.

2626 Reese Ave. (rescheduled and re-noticed to Sept. 25, 2018) 18ZMJV-0078
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.

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.

Mr. Mangum read the case into the record.

Matthew Kupritz, architect, explained the proposal:
- Clarified 44.3% actual relief requested based on staff calculations.
- Prior owners received approval in 2009 for garage, driveway built over property line.
- Garage built without permit, but inspected. Does not function as constructed.
- Accessibility needs of mother that lives in house and one that visits.
- Additionally, 2 nieces now living in house.
- Plan would add lift and stair and additional first floor bedroom.
- The taper of lot results in location and setback variations for garage.
- Lower height of garage adjacent to park.
- Berm west side of property to integrate with park and provide storage.
- Proposed east setback at location of existing garage.
- Believes full foundation present below existing garage based on discussion with building division staff.

Nichole Pinkard, property owner, testified that:
- Would not have purchased the property without a garage.
- There are 7 residents in the house.
- Need to seat up to 12 guests for University position.
- Desired to live in 5th Ward based on work.
- Interested in adding space on side of garage with cupboards for parks/library storage space.
- Have spoke to neighbors and two Alderman and have not had opposition.
- The lack of an alley and the lot shape are hardships.
- Currently own 2 cars which are stacked in driveway, but may reduce to 1 vehicle.
- Garage needed for covered accessible entrance and because of tree damage to vehicles currently parked in driveway.
- Was not aware driveway was located off property line at time of offer on house.

Deliberation:

Ms. Cullen, sympathizes about accessibility and parking concerns, not sure of other options.

Chair Berns stated there are ways to meet rules by reducing sizes or removing existing garage.

Ms. Arevalo noted current applicant shouldn’t be responsible for previous applicant’s actions.

Ms. Dziekan sees the applicant taking a problematic situation and improving it while also adding public benefit to wall of garage.
Chair Berns noted that the addition could be reduced to be closer to lot coverage requirement. As proposed it is not the minimum necessary and the hardship is based on the occupants and not property.

Ms. Arevalo believes proposed solution is best that applicant can do. Ms. Cullen and Ms. Dziekan agree.

The Major Variation Standards were addressed:

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. No (Berns); Yes (Dziekan, Cullen, Arevalo)
4. No (Berns); Yes (Arevalo, Cullen)
5. Yes
6. Yes
7. No (Berns); Yes (Dziekan)

Chair Berns suggested a condition that if the existing garage foundation is not adequate, and needs to be removed, the addition needs to comply with side setback and lot coverage requirements.

Ms. Dziekan motioned to reopen the record, which was seconded by Ms. Cullen, and unanimously approved.

Mr. Kupritz asked for confirmation on suggested condition regarding foundation removal.

The record was closed again for deliberation:

Chair Berns believes condition should state that if the existing foundation needs to be removed completely, with exception of portion already proposed to be removed, the new addition would need to meet current zoning requirements.

Ms. Arevalo clarified suggested condition regarding delineation of the west property line could be stated that fence is constructed where shown on plans.

Ms. Cullen moved to recommend approval of the variations requested, with the exception that the building lot coverage allowed is up to 44.3%, which was seconded by Ms. Arevalo, subject to conditions:

1. Consider fence or other delineation of west lot line in rear as shown on plan.
2. If existing foundation is inadequate per code and removed in its entirety, the building lot coverage shall be limited to 40% and the addition shall comply with the required setback.
3. Substantial compliance with the documents and testimony on record.

With a vote of 3 in favor and 1 opposed, the ZBA recommends approval to the City Council.

The meeting adjourned at 9:43 pm.
1943 Sherman Ave.
18ZMJV-0073

ZBA Recommending Body
MEMORANDUM

To: Members of the Zoning Board of Appeals

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

Subject: 1943 Sherman Ave. - ZBA 18ZMJV-0073
ZBA Recommending Body
City Council Determining Body

Date: September 18, 2018

Notice - Published in the August 2, 2018 Evanston Review
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.

Update
The case was represented by attorney C. Shawn Jones and was heard at the August 28, 2018 ZBA hearing. ZBA Members inquired about the specific interior and exterior improvements needed at the property to address Property Standards code violations as well as required building code improvements to convert the structure from a single family residence to a multiple family residence. ZBA Members requested the property owner be present at the September 25, 2018 ZBA hearing to address these questions and concerns, and provide an estimated timeline for completion of all work. Testimony remains open for the case.

Attachments
List of Exterior Improvements to be Made – submitted at August 28, 2018 ZBA Hearing
August 28, 2018 ZBA Meeting Minutes Excerpt
August 28, 2018 ZBA Packet
August 28, 2018 ZBA Video
I. LIST OF EXTERIOR IMPROVEMENTS TO BE MADE

- Tear off existing Roof and SUPPLY AND INSTALL NEW GAF TIMBERLINE HD ARCHITECTURAL SERIES SHINGLES or comparable.
- Install NEW CRESTLINE SELECT 500 Vinyl Clad Wood Windows and Patio Doors or comparable.
- TUCKPOINT AND RESTORE EXISTING EXTERIOR STONWORK, MASONRY, AND CHIMNEY
- Remove all existing Pine Trim Boards, Fascia, Soffit and Siding and **SUPPLY AND INSTALL NEW LP (Louisiana Pacific) ENGINEERED SMARTSIDE
- Remove existing porch decking and SUPPLY AND INSTALL NEW TIMBERTECH/AZEK COMPOSITE DECKING
- Remove existing Wood Columns on Porch and SUPPLY AND INSTALL ALL NEW **DIXIE- PACIFIC DURALITE 8” X 8’ TAPERED ROUND FIBERGLASS COLUMNS & CAP AND BASE
- Remove existing Porch Railings and Balustrades and SUPPLY AND INSTALL NEW **TREATED OR CEDAR PORCH RAILING AND BALUSTRADES.
- SUPPLY AND INSTALL NEW ALUMINUM GUTTERS AND DOWNSPOTS
- Remove existing Brick Pavers at Front and Side Walkway and SUPPLY AND INSTALL NEW BRICK PAVERS or CONCRETE.
- PROVIDE FOR NEW SOD AND LANDSCAPING in Rear of Home and Front where needed.

**ALL EXTERIOR WOOD and FIBERGLASS PRODUCTS TO BE PRIMED AND PAINTED WITH HIGH QUALITY EXTERIOR PRIMER AND PAINT (ie., BEHR, BENJAMIN MOORE, SHERWIN WILLIAMS, or comparable.)
MEETING MINUTES EXCERPT
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.

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 Masoncups 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.
2626 Reese Ave.
18ZMJV-0078

ZBA Recommending Body
MEMORANDUM

To: Members of the Zoning Board of Appeals

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

Subject: 2626 Reese Avenue - ZBA 18ZMJV-0078
ZBA Determining Body

Date: September 19, 2018

Notice - Published in the September 6, 2018 Evanston Review
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.

Recommendation
City staff and DAPR recommend approval of major zoning relief for building lot coverage, interior and street side yard setbacks, and open parking, to construct a new single family residence with a one-car detached garage and one open parking space in the R1 District. The applicant has complied with all other zoning requirements and meets all of the standards for major variations for this district.

Site Background
2626 Reese Ave. is located on the southwest corner of Hartzell St. and Reese Ave. in the R1 Single Family Residential District, and is surrounded by the following:

North: R1 Single Family Residential District
East: R1 Single Family Residential District
South: R1 Single Family Residential District
West: R1 Single Family Residential District

The property is a vacant corner lot that is substandard in lot width and lot size. The property is surrounded by moderately-sized single family residences in all directions.
Property Background
2626 Reese is a vacant lot that has existed since at least 1960, and has not been held in common ownership with adjacent properties since at least 1960. The property features a substandard 25’ lot width where 35’ is required, and 3,325 square foot lot size where 7,200 square feet is required. Since the lot was previously platted, it is considered a buildable lot. However, with setbacks taken into account, the buildable area on the lot is 5’ x 83.5’, so zoning relief is necessary to construct a usable single family residence.

The property was sold in 2016 and the new owner applied for zoning relief to construct a three bedroom, three bathroom, 35’ tall single family residence. The proposal was met with significant neighborhood opposition (as well as support) so the owner ultimately withdrew the request and sold the property prior to the ZBA hearing. Opposed neighbors felt the property should either feature a smaller house similar to the existing surrounding housing stock, or should not feature a house at all.

The property was purchased by the current applicant, William James, who applied for zoning relief in late 2017 to construct a smaller three bedroom, 2.5 bathroom, 29.6’ tall single family residence on the property. The applicant requested the following zoning relief, which was ultimately denied by the ZBA because the variations requested were not the minimum change necessary and could be minimized more if the house were made smaller, which would also make the house similar in size and bulk to the rest of the neighborhood:

### 2017 Submittal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Lot Coverage</td>
<td>30% maximum</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Street Side Yard (principal structure, garage, porch) | 15’ minimum  
13.5’ minimum (porch) | 4’ (principal structure)  
3’ (garage)  
1’ (porch) |
| Accessory Structure Location (garage) | Not closer to the street than the house | 1’ closer to the street than the house |

Proposal
The applicant now proposes to construct a smaller two bedroom, 2.5 bathroom, 23.7’ tall single family residence and one-car detached garage with one open parking space. The request includes the following zoning relief:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Lot Coverage</td>
<td>30% maximum</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Street Side Yard (principal structure, deck, garage, open parking) | 15’ minimum  
3.5’ (principal structure)  
8.5’ (deck)  
10’ (garage)  
1’ (open parking) | |
| Interior Side Yard Setback (principal structure) | 5’ | 3’ |
The proposed house complies with the averaged required front yard setback on Reese Ave. at 19.5’ as well as the required rear yard setback and all other zoning regulations.

The applicant designed the proposed house to be smaller in bulk and height to minimize impact on neighboring properties, and to fit contextually with the neighborhood’s existing housing stock. The requested building lot coverage is larger than the previous proposal because the applicant now proposes one open parking space to maintain adequate sight lines near the alley intersection for vehicles and pedestrians as specifically requested by neighbors. Required open parking counts as 200 square feet of building lot coverage. If the open parking space is excluded from the calculation, the portion of the property that is truly covered by structures amounts to 36.5% (which is less than the previous proposal).

The proposed house is located 3’ from the south interior side property line where 5’ is required, which allows for window and door openings that meet building codes. 3’ interior side yards for substandard lots in Evanston are typical. The proposed house is located 3.5’ from the street side yard (Hartzell St.) property line, which is approximately 1’ from the public sidewalk. The main entrance to the house is recessed so that the porch does not protrude closer to the Hartzell St. property line like the previous proposal.

The proposed deck, detached one-car garage, and open parking space are all within the street side yard setback (Hartzell St.) but are minimized to the extent possible while maintaining an appropriate and usable site layout. The open parking variation is needed because neighbors previously expressed concern about sight line visibility for vehicles and pedestrians navigating the alley intersection, who preferred an open parking space to a garage in that area.

The applicant worked extensively with staff to modify the house bulk to address neighbor concerns while also minimizing necessary variations. The current proposal eliminated one second floor bedroom, and combined the kitchen and formal dining room into an eat-in kitchen to reduce the building footprint. The gambrel roofline allows for minimal bulk for a second story while allowing adequate head-height for the second floor. The house features a peak height of 23.7’, which is comparable to other properties. Staff is aware of concerns from neighboring property owners that ranges from the size and bulk of the structure, reduced setbacks that may not be in character with the surrounding area, and potential flooding issues due to ponding on the currently vacant property after heavy rain storms.
Ordinances Identified for Requested Relief
6-8-2 R1 Single Family Residential District
6-8-2-7 The maximum building lot coverage in the R1 District is 30%.
6-8-2-8 The minimum yard requirements in the R1 District are as follows:
   6-8-2-8-A-2 Side yard abutting a street – 15’
   6-8-2-8-A-3 Interior side yard – 5’
   6-8-2-8-C-2 Side yard abutting a street – 15’ (accessory structure; open parking)

Design and Project Review Committee (DAPR) Discussion and Recommendation
August 29, 2018 – The DAPR Committee found the proposal addressed many of the concerns previously raised by neighbors and the ZBA. Comments were made regarding construction and shoring due to the proximity of the house to the interior and street side yard property lines.
Recommendation: Approval 8-1

Variation Standards
For a variation to be approved, 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: The property is a vacant lot to that is not serving the highest and best land use. The proposed house is similar in bulk to the surrounding neighborhood so it will complement the area while increasing the tax base.
2. Is in keeping with the intent of the zoning ordinance: Setbacks are required to ensure adequate open space and minimal impact on adjacent properties and uses. Proposed setbacks are similar to existing conditions on other properties in the area. The significantly reduced street side yard setback is adjacent to a larger than typical right-of-way green-space.
3. Has a hardship or practical difficulty that is peculiar to the property: The property is substandard in lot width and lot size, and requires increased setbacks since it is a corner lot. The remaining available building footprint is only 5’ wide.
4. Property owner would suffer a particular hardship or practical difficulty as distinguished from a mere inconvenience: With a 5’ wide building footprint, the property is essentially unbuildable without zoning relief.
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 intends sell the house for a profit. However, a public benefit will be provided by increasing the tax base and providing a housing unit for a family on an otherwise unbuildable lot.
6. Does not have a hardship or practical difficulty that was created by any person having an interest in the property: The property has existed at its platted size and width since before the current ownership.
7. Is limited to the minimum change necessary to alleviate the particular hardship or practical difficulty: The applicant has modified the proposal multiple times to design the house to complement the neighborhood and minimize the necessary zoning relief.

Attachments
Variation Application – submitted August 24, 2018
Zoning Analysis
Plat of Survey
Site Plan (revised July 27, 2018)
Floor Plans
Elevations
Letters of Opposition
Image of Property
Aerial View of Property
Zoning Map of Property
ZBA Packet for Previous Proposal – January 9, 2018
ZBA Minutes for Previous Proposal – January 9, 2018
ZBA Packet for Previous Proposal (continued from January 9, 2018) – January 16, 2018
ZBA Minutes for Previous Proposal (continued from January 9, 2018) – January 16, 2018
DAPR Meeting Minutes Excerpt – August 29, 2018
MAJOR VARIATION
APPLICATION
CASE #:__________________________________________

1. PROPERTY

Address
Permanent Identification Number(s):
PIN 1: 0 5 3 3 4 2 9 0 0 7 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 James
Organization: Oakton-Custer Partners, LLC
Address: 345 Sherman Avenue
City, State, Zip: Evanston, IL 60202
Phone: Work: 312.879.9518 Home: __________ Cell/Other: 312.399.4063
Fax: Work: 847.556.6410 Home: __________
E-mail: b.james@camiros.com

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

Please circle the primary means of contact.

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

Name(s) or Organization: __________________________________________
Address: __________________________________________________________
City, State, Zip: ____________________________________________________
Phone: Work: Home: Cell/Other: ______________________________________
Fax: Work: Home: __________________________________________________
E-mail: ____________________________________________________________

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

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

Date

4. SIGNATURE

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

Applicant Signature – REQUIRED

Date
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5. REQUIRED DOCUMENTS AND MATERIALS

The following are required to be submitted with this application:

- [x] (This) Completed and Signed Application Form
- [x] Plat of Survey Date of Survey: 1/11/2016
- [x] Project Site Plan Date of Drawings: 8/12/2018
- [x] Plan or Graphic Drawings of Proposal (If needed, see notes)
- [x] Non-Compliant Zoning Analysis
- [x] Proof of Ownership Document Submitted: Deed
- [x] Application Fee (see zoning fees) Amount $350.00 plus Deposit Fee $150

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

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

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

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

Proof of Ownership
Accepted documents for Proof of Ownership include: a deed, mortgage, contract to purchase, closing documents (price may be blacked out on submitted documents).

- Tax bill will not be accepted as Proof of Ownership.

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

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

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

A. Briefly describe the proposed project:
   Construction of a new single family residence on a vacant lot.

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>6-8-2-7</td>
<td>&quot;maximum lot coverage is 30%&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;lot coverage of 42.5%&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

2

6-8-2-8-A-2 | "minimum side yard for a residential structure abutting a street is 15 feet" | "side yard abutting a street of 3.5 feet"

3

6-8-2-8-C-2 | "minimum side yard for an accessory structure abutting a street is 15 feet" | "side yard abutting a street of 10 feet"

   The proposed one-car garage is setback 10 feet from the corner side lot line.
6. PROPOSED PROJECT

A. Briefly describe the proposed project:

see description above


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>6-8-2-8-C-2</td>
<td>“minimum side yard for an accessory structure abutting a street is 15 feet”</td>
<td>“side yard abutting a street of 8.5 feet”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The deck in the rear yard is setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.5 feet from the corner side lot line.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| 6-8-2-8-C-2  | “minimum side yard for an accessory structure abutting a street is 15 feet” | “side yard abutting a street of 1.0 feet”          |
|              |                                                        | The ground level parking pad in the rear yard      |
|              |                                                        | is setback 1.0 feet from the corner side lot line.  |

| 6-8-2-8-A-3  | “minimum interior side yard for a residential structure is 5’”                | “interior side yard of of 3’”                      |
|              |                                                        |                                                   |
B. A variation’s purpose is to provide relief from specified provisions of the zoning ordinance that may unduly impact property due to the property's particular peculiarity and special characteristics. What characteristics of your property prevent compliance with the Zoning Ordinance requirements?

The property is a lot of record that is legal nonconforming due to lot area and lot width. These characteristics preclude the use of the lot for a residential dwelling without relief from the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance specified in this application.

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

   The lot is a corner lot and only one property (2624 Reese) is adjoining along the common interior side yard to the south.

   The proposed residence has an interior side yard of 3', which is consistent with other houses in the area. The 2624 Reese property has an interior side yard of less than 3'. Thus an interior side yard of 3' will not create an impact.

   The building lot coverage of 42.5% is only slightly above that needed for a minor variance (40.5%). The corner side yard variations and the obstruction variation are on the opposite side of the lot and will not affect the adjoining property.

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.

   If the strict letter of the regulations were to be carried out the lot could not be built on and the property owner's investment in the purchase of the property and the investment in design plans for the new residence would be a total loss, which is a true hardship.

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.

   (a) The purpose of the variations is to allow the lot to be used for residential purposes, which is not possible without the variations. 6-3-8-12-(E)-5-(a) states that the variations should not be “based exclusively upon a desire to extract additional income” from the property. The variations will not lead to maximizing (additional) income, which would result from the largest house possible. Rather, the proposal is for the smallest house still practical, resulting in the minimum financial gain.

   The proposed house is the smallest house practical in terms of meeting the needs of families for a modern lifestyle.

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

   The hardship is the nonconforming lot area and lot width of the property. This condition was not self-created, but was created at the time of subdivision, which was approved by the City of Evanston. The hardship is also the result of the establishment of zoning regulations that do not reflect the lot size and lot width characteristics in the immediately surrounding area.
Much effort has been expended in formulating a design for the proposed house that minimizes the number of variances and the degree of variance in those variations requested. No house could be built on this lot without variations. The application of the corner side yard (15') and interior side yard (5') regulations would leave only 5 feet of lot width on which to build a house. The proposed house is only 18.5 feet wide, which is the smallest practical 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.

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.)
   Does not apply.

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.
   Same as applicant.
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.

Same as applicant.

If Applicant or Proposed Land User is a Corporation

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

a. Names and addresses of all officers and directors.

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

If Applicant or Proposed Land User is not a Corporation

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

Oakton-Custer Partners, LLC is a single-member limited liability company with William James as sole member.
Zoning Analysis

Summary

Case Number: 18ZONA-0137
Case Status/Determination: Non-Compliant

Proposal:
new single family residence with a one car detached garage and one open parking space

Site Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address:</th>
<th>2626 Reese</th>
<th>Zoning District:</th>
<th>R1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overlay District:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Preservation District:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicant: William James
Phone Number: 

Zoning Section | Comments
--- | ---
6-8-2-7 | Maximum allowed building lot coverage in R1 District is 30%

6-8-2-8-A-3 | Proposed 42.5% building lot coverage
5' south interior side yard setback required for principal structure

6-8-2-8-A-2 | Proposed 3' south interior side yard setback for principal structure
15' street side yard setback required for the principal structure

6-8-2-8-C-2 | Proposed 3.5' street side yard setback for the principal structure
15' street side yard setback required for accessory structures/uses (garage + open parking)

Proposed 10' street side yard setback for the detached garage
Proposed 1' street side yard setback for open parking
Proposed 8.5' street side yard setback for the deck
Case Number: 18ZONA-0137  
Case Status/Determination: Non-Compliant

Proposal:  
new single family residence with a one car detached garage and one open parking space

Site Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address:</th>
<th>Zoning District:</th>
<th>Overlay District:</th>
<th>Preservation District:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2626 Reese</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicant: William James

Recommendation(s): Click on the link(s) below to access online application(s)
## City of Evanston
### ZONING ANALYSIS REVIEW SHEET

**APPLICATION STATUS:** August 24, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z.A. Number:</th>
<th>18ZONA-0137</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address:</strong></td>
<td>2626 Reese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>William James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**District:** R1  **Overlay:** Preservation

**Reviewer:** Melissa Klotz

**RESULTS OF ANALYSIS:** Non-Compliant

### THIS APPLICATION PROPOSES (select all that apply):
- [X] New Principal Structure
- [X] 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

### Proposal Description:
new single family residence with a one car detached garage and one open parking space

### ZONING ANALYSIS

#### RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT CALCULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front Porch Exception (Subtract 50%)</th>
<th>Pavers/Pervious Paver Exception (Subtract 20%)</th>
<th>Open Parking Debit (Add 200sqft/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 Porch Regulatory Area</td>
<td>Paver Regulay Area</td>
<td>Addtn. to Bldg Lot Cov.</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>Dwelling - SF Detached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minimum Lot Width (LF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE:</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Width (LF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>35 FT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minimum Lot Area (SF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE:</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Area (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>7,200 sqft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dwelling Units:

| Comments: | 1 | 1 | Compliant |

### Rooming Units:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Lot Coverage</th>
<th>997.5</th>
<th>1413</th>
<th>42.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LF:** Linear Feet  **SF:** Square Feet  **FT:** Feet
**Impervious Surface Coverage (SF, %)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1496.25</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**Accessory Structure Rear Yard Coverage:**

<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>40% of rear yard</td>
<td>&lt;40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**Gross Floor Area (SF)**

<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Height (FT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Front Yard(1) (FT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.5 (average)</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Street:** Reese Ave

**Comments:**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Street:**

**Comments:**

**Street Side Yard (FT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Street:** Hartzell St

**Comments:**

**Interior Side Yard(1) (FT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direction:** S

**Comments:**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direction:**

**Comments:**

**Rear Yard (FT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACCESSORY USE AND STRUCTURE**

**Use (1)**

<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></td>
<td>Garage (Det), Coachhouse or Carport</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**Permitted Required Yard:**

**Comments:**

**Additional Standards:**

**Comments:**

**Height (FT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flat or mansard roof 14.5', ot</td>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

*LF: Linear Feet    SF: Square Feet    FT: Feet*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance from Principal Building:</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00'</td>
<td></td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Front Yard(1A) (FT)
- **Direction:** E
- **Street:** Reese Ave
- **Comments:**

### Front Yard(1B) (FT)
- **Comments:**

### Street Side Yard (FT)
- **Street:** Hartzell St
- **Direction:**
- **Comments:**

### Interior Side Yard(1A) (FT)
- **Direction:** S
- **Comments:**

### Interior Side Yard(1B) (FT)
- **Comments:**

### Rear Yard (FT)
- **Direction:**
- **Comments:**

### ACCESSORY USE AND STRUCTURE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use(2):</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Districts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open Off-street Parking</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Required Yard:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Standards:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Height (FT)
- **Flat or mansard roof 14.5', ot**
- **Comments:**

### Distance from Principal Building:
- **10.00'**
- **Comments:**

### Front Yard(2A) (FT)
- **Direction:** E
- **Street:** Reese Ave
- **Comments:**
### Front Yard (2B) (FT)
- **Street:**
- **Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Side Yard (FT)</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street:</strong> Hartzell St</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>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interior Side Yard (2A) (FT)
- **Direction:** S
- **Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interior Side Yard (2B) (FT)</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interior Side Yard (2B) (FT)
- **Direction:**
- **Comments:**

### Rear Yard (FT)
- **Direction:**
- **Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rear Yard (FT)</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PARKING REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use(1): Single-family Detached</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 per dwelling unit (Table 16-B)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL REQUIRED:
- **Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Handicap Parking Spaces:</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 6-16-2-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access: Sec. 6-16-2-2</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vertical Clearance (LF)</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7'</td>
<td></td>
<td>+7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surfacing: Sec. 6-16-2-8 (E)</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>paved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location: Sec. 6-4-6-2</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 open; 1 enclosed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LF:** Linear Feet  **SF:** Square Feet  **FT:** Feet
### Standard Existing Proposed Determination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Angle(1): 90 Degree</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Width(W) (FT)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth(D) (FT)</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aisle(A) (FT)</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module (FT)</td>
<td>SL 42.0, DL 60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Angle(2):</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Width(W) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth(D) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aisle(A) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module (FT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Garage Setback from Alley Access (FT)

Comments:

#### MISCELLANEOUS REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement (1): 15' street side yard setback</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REQUIREMENTS

#### Requirement (2):

Comments:

#### Requirement (3):

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: **Required**

See attached comments and/or notes.

SIGNATURE DATE

---

LF: Linear Feet SF: Square Feet FT: Feet
2624 REESE

1. Front yard Twenty-seven (27) feet; parking prohibited
2. Side yard abutting a street Fifteen (15) feet; parking prohibited
3. Side yard Five (5) feet
4. Rear yard Thirty (30) feet

TOTAL BUILDING COVERAGE: 1,413 SF; 42.5%
GROSS FLOOR AREA; FIRST FLOOR: 1,165 SF
TOTAL IMPERVIOUS COVERAGE: 1,496 SF; 45.0%

SITE & FIRST FLOOR PLAN

TWO BEDROOM/GAMBREL ROOF DESIGN
2626 REESE AVENUE
DEVELOPED BY: OAKTON-CUSTER PARTNERS, LLC
SECOND FLOOR PLAN

GROSS FLOOR AREA; SECOND FLOOR: 771.5 SF
GROSS FLOOR AREA; FIRST FLOOR: 1,165.0 SF
TOTAL FLOOR AREA: 1,936.5 SF

ALTERNATE DESIGN: GAMBERL ROOF
2626 REESE AVENUE
DEVELOPED BY: OAKTON-CUSTER PARTNERS, LLC
TWO BEDROOM/GAMBREL ROOF DESIGN

2626 REESE AVENUE
DEVELOPED BY: OAKTON-CUSTER PARTNERS, LLC

SOUTH ELEVATION

SCALE: 3/16" = 1'
JULY 12, 2018

WOOD DECK
HARDIBOARD SIDING
DECORATIVE SHINGLES

1'-0"  9'-0"
1'-3" 23'-8"
2'-0"
9'-8"
9'-6"  9'-6"
50'-0"  50'-0"
50'-0"  50'-0"
1'-6"  1'-6"
1'-6"  1'-6"
1'-9"
1'-9"  1'-9"  1'-9"
Richard Horsting <dhorsting711@aol.com>  
To: mklotz@cityofevanston.org  

-----Original Message-----
From: dhorsting711 <dhorsting711@gmail.com>  
To: dhorsting711 <dhorsting711@aol.com>  
Sent: Mon, Sep 17, 2018 7:00 pm  
Subject: 2626 Reese Ave., water/storm runoff issues

Melissa:

My name is Richard Horsting and I live at the house that is pictured with the standing water from a typical rain.  

Will the ZBA board please address this water issue for the residents at the meeting for the development of 2626 Reese Ave?  

I can assure you that all of the residents who surround the lot are still opposed. These pictures will demonstrate the massive issue of water runoff and where will the water go if a house is two feet from a sidewalk.

Sincerely,

Dick Horsting

Sent via my Samsung Galaxy, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone

2 attachments

20180521_153037.jpg  
3512K

20180220_152146.jpg  
2300K
April 29, 2016

Mark E. Muenzer
Director of Community Development
City of Evanston
2100 Ridge Avenue
Evanston, IL 60201

Re: Application for Major Variation at 2626 Reese Avenue

Dear Mr. Muenzer:

As a licensed structural engineer and an owner of a neighboring property, I am writing to express my concerns to the Design and Project Review Committee (DAPR) and Zoning Board of Appeals (Board) regarding the Application for Major Variation for the development of the lot located at 2626 Reese Avenue, Evanston, Illinois.

I have reviewed the following publicly available documents pertaining to the 2626 Reese Avenue Application for Major Variation:

- 3.30.16 DAPR packet.pdf
- 3-30-16 DAPR Minutes & Comments.pdf
- 4-13-16 DAPR Minutes & Comments.pdf

My primary concern regarding the application relates to the Applicants’ request for a variation to the required 5 ft. interior side yard setback. As a structural engineer I have investigated numerous incidents of structural damage resulting from new construction and excavation performed in close proximity to older, existing structures. These incidents are common in the City of Chicago, where in certain districts minimum interior side yard setbacks of 4 ft. or less are required. Fortunately this type of damage occurs less frequently in the City of Evanston, in large part due to the City’s greater minimum interior side yard setback requirements.

In the case of the proposed construction at 2626 Reese, the adjacent existing structure at 2624 Reese was reportedly constructed in 1925 and is a legal non-conforming structure. According to a January 6, 1988 Plat of Survey prepared by B.H. Suhr & Company, the north wall of the 2624 Reese residence is located 3 ft. south of the north property line, and the structure’s masonry chimney is located 2 ft. south of the line. The proposed interior side yard setback of the new construction is 3 ft., less than the 5 ft. minimum required by code. This provides a separation of only 6 ft. between the proposed structure and the north wall of the existing, nearly century-old structure. This separation would only be 5 ft. at the chimney. The proposed full basement foundation will require an excavation to a depth of 8 ft. or more. During construction, this
excavation would be very close to the existing structure, potentially extending to the property line, or to within approximately 2 ft. of the existing structure at its nearest point.

The Standards for Major Variations require that the Applicants demonstrate that “the requested variation will not have a substantial adverse impact on the use, enjoyment or property values of adjoining properties.” A reduced separation between structures would be permitted should the interior side yard setback variation be granted, and any structural damage to the existing residence related to the proximity of the new construction and excavation would clearly constitute “a substantial adverse impact” on the use and value of the adjoining property. Therefore, it is the Applicants’ burden to demonstrate that the requested interior side yard variation will not contribute to damage to the adjacent structure. Based on my review of the publicly available documents related to this application, the Applicants have not provided such proof.

The April 13, 2016 DAPR meeting minutes state that Mr. G. Gerdes “requested that a survey be provided including interior/exterior photos prior to start of construction to ensure no damage to neighboring property.” I agree that a detailed pre-construction survey of existing conditions at the 2624 Reese residence should be performed by a licensed structural engineer. However, it must be recognized that while such a survey will protect the interests of both property owners to some extent, it will do nothing to “ensure no damage” to the existing structure at 2624 Reese Avenue. The pre-construction survey will simply facilitate distinguishing between pre-existing conditions and any damage resulting from the new construction, after the fact.

In my opinion, in order to demonstrate that the adjacent structure at 2624 Reese Avenue will not be damaged as a result of the interior side yard setback variation being requested, at a minimum the following items should be addressed by the Applicants to the satisfaction of the DAPR and/or Board:

1. What consideration has been given to the age of the existing adjacent structure at 2624 Reese, and to the depth and nature of construction of the foundation system of said structure as it relates to the proximity of the proposed new construction and excavation?
2. What is the maximum proposed depth of excavation? This depth is not shown on the drawings. How does this depth compare to the depth of the foundation of the existing adjacent structure?
3. What is the design footing width? This width is not shown on the drawings. What is the proposed width of excavation and how close to the property line will the excavation extend in order to provide for the design footing width?
4. The March 30, 2016 DAPR meeting minutes contain the note: “Will use shoring on the property line to prevent soil erosion.” Presumably this comment refers to a proposed excavation bracing/shoring system. Has the proposed excavation bracing system been designed by a licensed structural engineer experienced in the design of such systems? Does it take into account the proximity of the existing structure and the relevant characteristics of its foundation?
5. Have sealed drawings of the excavation bracing system been presented to the DAPR for their review?
6. Of what materials will the excavation bracing system be constructed?
7. To what depth will the excavation bracing extend and how does this depth compare to the depth of the foundation of the existing adjacent structure?
8. At what specific location relative to the property line will the excavation bracing system be installed? What are the plan dimensions of the excavation bracing system?
9. Will the bracing designer perform a site inspection following installation to verify construction in accordance with the design?

10. What equipment will be used to install the bracing system? For example, if sheet piles are to be used will they be installed with a vibratory hammer or a hydraulic press?

11. Considering the bracing system and installation methods to be used, what steps will be taken to protect the adjacent property from damage during installation of the excavation bracing?

12. What equipment will be used during backfilling following completion of the foundation construction?

13. What steps will be taken to protect the adjacent property from damage during backfilling?

14. What provisions will be made to provide for adequate drainage in the area between the new and existing structures?

Based on my review of the publicly available documents pertaining to this application, none of the foregoing considerations has been adequately addressed by the Applicants. As a structural engineer, I find it alarming that the DAPR Committee would consider recommending approval of the requested interior side yard setback variation without these issues being satisfactorily addressed. If the Board grants the interior side yard setback variation, particularly without adequate demonstration by the Applicants that the adjacent property will not be harmed, it seems that the Board and the City of Evanston would be taking on a degree of responsibility for any damage that may result from the proximity of the proposed new construction to the existing adjacent structure. Clearly, the Applicants and their contractor would also bear responsibility for any related damage. I suggest that the Board request the City’s legal department to carefully review this situation before a decision is made on this variation.

While I am unable to attend the Public Hearing scheduled for Tuesday, May 3rd due to a health-related commitment, I would be pleased to meet with you at a mutually convenient time to discuss these issues further and address any questions you may have. In addition, my father, Wade P. Clarke, will attend the hearing on my behalf, will request permission to speak briefly, to read portions of this letter at the hearing, and hand out copies of the letter. He will also be available to pass along to me any questions or comments from the DAPR, the Board, or the Applicants.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Wade M. Clarke, P.E., S.E.
Licensed Structural Engineer
Illinois No. 6360

cc: Mr. Dick Horsting, owner, 2624 Reese Avenue
Mr. Gary Gerdes, Manager, Building and Inspection Services, City of Evanston
Ms. Melissa Klotz, Zoning Planner, City of Evanston
Statement of Joseph Paradi, 2907 Hartzell St., before the Evanston Zoning Board of Appeals, September 4, 2018.

My name is Joseph Paradi and I reside at 2907 Hartzell Street.

We are once again considering a proposal for 2626 Reese Ave. While the date of the hearing has changed, and the proposal has changed slightly, the circumstances have not changed at all. The applicant continues to ignore the zoning rules of the City of Evanston, and continues to misinterpret the section 6-3-8 standards for a major variance.

The interest of the applicant continues to be very clear, to maximize the profit on the development of this parcel of property. Since the last hearing, the applicant has made no effort to address the concerns raised by neighbors in the last hearing, but continues to insist that the City of Evanston, and the taxpayers of the City of Evanston, owe him a handsome profit.

May I remind the board that the applicant was not forced to buy this property. He is a speculator, but more importantly, a speculator that wants the City, and its citizens, to ignore the law so that he can profit. This approach is in direct conflict with rule 6-3-8-12(E).

The proof that this applicant’s motive is purely profit is that a property directly across the street from this plot, on Hartzell Street, was sold in the last 6 months, quite quickly. That house is significantly smaller than the proposed structure, proving that the market for such housing exists in Evanston. The developer, by proposing a structure that requires so many major variances, has demonstrated that his motive is only profit. A smaller house, with less profit, is not only theoretically viable, it is a fact.

The fact that there is a recent sale of a much smaller house, directly across the street, also demonstrates that the applicant has not satisfied the requirement that the requested variations are “limited to the minimum change necessary”. A much smaller house would clearly be possible to build on this lot, and economically viable.

Per the Zoning Hearing guidelines, “the applicant bears the burden to demonstrate that the proposal meets EACH of the standards applicable”. In this case, as I have detailed, the applicant has not demonstrated that the request meets the standards of zoning code 6-3-8-12 and I thus respectfully request that the Zoning Board of Appeals rejects this application.
2626 Reese Ave.
This map is not a plat of survey. This map is provided "as is" without warranties of any kind. See www.cityofevanston.org/mapdisclaimers.html for more information.
2626 Reese Ave.

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

3.  2626 Reese Avenue

Bill James, property owner, submits for major zoning relief to construct a single family residence with a one-car detached garage and one open parking space, with 42.5% building lot coverage where 30% is allowed, a 3’ south interior side yard setback for the principal structure where 5’ is required, a 3.5’ street side yard (Reese) setback for the principal structure where 15’ is required, and a 10’ street side yard setback for a detached garage, 1’ street side yard setback for open parking, and an 8.5’ street side yard setback for a deck where 15’ is required for accessory structures, in the R1 Single Family Residential District.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY:  Bill James, property owner

DISCUSSION:
• B. James stated this plan incorporates comments from the ZBA, smaller house, 1-car garage.
• D. Cueva noted the 1st, 2nd and basement labels need to be corrected on the plans.
• B. James stated the basement is 90% below grade. He stated the gambrel roof pulls the mass away from the property.
• G. Gerdes asked about building height and if building lot coverage increased.
• B. James stated the proposed roof minimizes the building bulk, and confirmed building lot coverage increased.
• S. Mangum stated the open parking pad counts toward building lot coverage per the zoning code.
• G. Gerdes cautioned that a soil study should be done to verify if a basement is feasible related to the water table.
• G. Gerdes asked about shoring between the existing residence and proposed construction.
• B. James stated steel will be used, that required shoring will be done.
• I. Eckersberg stated shoring will also be required along the street right-of-way due to the proximity.
G. Gerdes stated it is preferred to locate the window well to the rear.
B. James stated the proposed rear deck may conflict.
D. Cueva asked where downspouts will be directed.
B. James stated he will work with the City, but could consider directing downspouts to the area under the deck and establish a splash pad.
S. Mangum asked if he had spoken with neighbors.
B. James stated no.
S. Mangum stated variations are needed to build on this property due to the lot size, plan is responsive to many concerns expressed at previous ZBA meeting.

S. Mangum made a motion to recommend approval to the ZBA, seconded by L. Biggs.

The Committee voted, 8-1, to recommend approval to the ZBA.

Adjournment

L. Biggs made a motion to adjourn, seconded by S. Mangum. The Committee voted, 9-0, to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 3.47pm.

The next DAPR meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 5, 2018, at 2:30 pm in Room 2404 of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Griffith
1919 Dempster St.
18ZMJV-0080

ZBA Recommending Body
Re: 1919 Dempster St special uses
1 message

Jim Olguin <jim@buikemalaw.com>
To: Melissa Klotz <mklotz@cityofevanston.org>  
Fri, Sep 21, 2018 at 10:45 AM

Mellissa,

We would like to have the public hearing continued to the October 16th date. I am working to get certain changes to the site plan approved internally and that will take a bit of time past Tuesday. Please let me know if this email is sufficient for this request.

Thank you,

James E. Olguin

On Sep 19, 2018, at 8:57 AM, Melissa Klotz <mklotz@cityofevanston.org> wrote:

Jim,

The ZBA packet posts on the City website this Friday. If you email me any changes thru the end of the day this Thursday, I will add it into the packet. After that, feel free to bring changes in hard copy (at least 9 copies) directly to the meeting. It is best to get it into the packet so ZBA Members can review it ahead of time, but not absolutely required. Alternatively, if you would like to reschedule then the next ZBA hearing is October 16th, so I would need revisions no later than October 11th...if you want to go that route and the changes are significant enough you think DAPR might have a different position, you can return to DAPR to see about obtaining a different recommendation (though I have to confirm that with our team since they already voted on one plan). Please let me know which route you prefer.

Thanks,

Melissa Klotz
Zoning Planner
Planning & Zoning Division
Community Development Department
Morton Civic Center
City of Evanston

2100 Ridge Ave. | Evanston, IL 60201 | 847-448-8230
mklotz@cityofevanston.org | cityofevanston.org
Call 311 to make an appointment, or walk-in to the Building Permit Desk on Tuesdays

On Tue, Sep 18, 2018 at 4:37 PM, Jim Olguin <jim@buikemalaw.com> wrote:
Melissa,

I am working thorough some possible revisions with the McDonald’s. Can you let me know 1. What the deadline for submitting for the September 25th ZBA meeting would be; and 2. If we ask to go to the next ZBA meeting, what the date of that meeting would be.
Thank you,

James E. Olguin

On Sep 18, 2018, at 4:33 PM, Melissa Klotz <mklotz@cityofevanston.org> wrote:

Jim,

Just checking in - I understand DAPR did not go favorably for your requested special uses. This means your case is proceeding to the ZBA with a recommendation for denial by the DAPR Committee and City staff. You are scheduled to attend ZBA on Tuesday, September 25th at 7pm in room G300 (ground floor/basement) of the Civic Center.

If you have any other documentation you would like included in the ZBA packet, alternate plans, etc., please send them to me asap. The ZBA packet will post on the City website this Friday. If you don't have anything else, please confirm you are still moving forward given the recommendation for denial.

The ZBA is the recommending body for this case, so however the ZBA hearing unfolds, you will then move forward to City Council for a final determination.

Thanks,

Melissa Klotz
Zoning Planner
Planning & Zoning Division
Community Development Department
Morton Civic Center
City of Evanston

2100 Ridge Ave. | Evanston, IL 60201 | 847-448-8230
mklotz@cityofevanston.org | cityofevanston.org
Call 311 to make an appointment, or walk-in to the Building Permit Desk on Tuesdays