DESIGN AND PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DAPR)

Wednesday, October 2, 2019
2:30 p.m..
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 2404

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER/DECLARATION OF QUORUM, JOHANNA LEONARD, CHAIR

II. MINUTES: September 18, 2019, DAPR Committee meeting minutes

III. NEW BUSINESS

1. 820 Davis Street Preliminary and Final Review
   Patrick Buck, applicant, submits for building permit for exterior renovation to include new entry canopy, storefronts, roof trellis, and new paint, in the D3 Downtown Core Development District.

2. 1560 Sherman Avenue Preliminary and Final Review
   Laura Young, applicant, submits for building permit to install an 8’ tall metal picket fence at the 4th floor, Rotary Building, in the D3 Downtown Core Development District.

3. 1224 Oak Street Recommendation to ZBA
   DonnaLee Floeter, architect, submits for Major Variation relief to construct an attached garage, deck, and attic addition, in the R3 Two-Family Residential District and Ridge Historic District. The applicant requests a 3’ rear yard setback where 30’ is required, a 3.2’ north interior side yard setback where 5’ is required, a 1’ south interior side yard setback for an accessory structure (deck) where 5’ is required, and building lot coverage of 51% where 45% is the maximum amount permitted. The Zoning Board of Appeals is the determining body for this case.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The next DAPR meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 9, 2019, at 2:30 p.m. in Room 2404 of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.
DRAFT-NOT APPROVED

DESIGN AND PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DAPR) MINUTES
September 18, 2019


Staff Present: M. Rivera

Others Present:

Presiding Member: J. Leonard

A quorum being present, J. Leonard called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

1. September 4, 2019, DAPR Committee meeting minutes.

L. Biggs made a motion to approve the September 4, 2019, meeting minutes, seconded by S. Mangum.

The Committee voted, 6-0, 1 abstention, to approve the September 4, 2019, meeting minutes.

2. September 11, 2019, DAPR Committee meeting minutes.

L. Biggs made a motion to approve the September 11, 2019, meeting minutes, seconded by S. Mangum.

The Committee voted, 6-0, 1 abstention, to approve the September 11, 2019, meeting minutes.

New Business

1. 1605-1631 Chicago Avenue

   Subdivision and Major Adjustment to a Planned Development

   The applicant, Horizon Realty Group, submits for a subdivision and Major Adjustment to a Planned Development in the D4 Downtown Transition District. The requested adjustment will increase FAR from 3.15 to 4.2, increase parking spaces from 32 (23 on-site, 9 leased) to 38 (all leased off-site), and a decrease in total number of units from 205 to 186 (includes 65 dwelling units). No new site development allowance will be needed.

2. 1621 Chicago Avenue

   Planned Development

   The applicant, Horizon Realty Group, submits a planned development application to construct a 19-story apartment building with 240 units, 85 subterranean parking spaces, and approximately 3,540 sq. ft. of ground floor retail space in the D4 Downtown Transition District. Site development allowances are being requested for: 1) a building height of 211 ft. 8 in. where 105 ft. is allowed), 2) an FAR of 11.62 where a maximum of 5.4 is allowed, 3) 240 dwelling units
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where 54 is maximum is allowed, 4) 85 parking spaces where a minimum 185 is required, and
5) 1 short loading berth where 2 short loading berths are required.

APPLICATIONS PRESENTED BY:  Jeff Michael, applicant
Tim Kent, architect

DISCUSSION:

- Proposed development is designed to create a senior campus between The Merion and
  the proposed Marion Legacy. Both buildings will share services and amenities, including
  staff, counselors, caretakers, health care services, and social activities; there will be an
  internal connection between both buildings.
- Applicant reviewed their list of public benefits:
  ○ Contribution of 0.5% of construction budget to public projects.
  ○ Promote local artists to curate art to display in the building.
  ○ Environmental site clean-up.
  ○ One electric vehicle charging station available for public use, additional spaces
    for building resident use.
  ○ Provide composting and recycling for building residents.
- Applicant stated the site development allowances requested are in line with other
devotions.
- J. Leonard asked about where the art will be displayed.
- Applicant stated art would be displayed in common areas of the building.
- J. Leonard clarified the proposed public benefit is promoting local artists and not
  providing a public art display.
- L. Biggs stated the alley needs to be reconstructed; the estimated cost is $430,000. She
  asked if recycling is already required by City Code.
- It was noted by the Committee that recycling is required by the City’s refuse franchise
  agreement.
- S. Mangum stated site clean-up is required in order to develop the site.
- Applicant stated they are proposing a curb cut and loading off Chicago Avenue because
  it is safer than alternatives, such as loading on the street. Applicant provided a City of
  Evanston Bike Infrastructure map showing bike routes. Applicant noted existing curb
cuts and pedestrian crossings. Applicant reviewed their policy paper in support of a curb
cut off Chicago Avenue. Applicant stated the alley is in poor condition, used for
commercial activities, and is congested. If there is not a curb cut off Chicago Avenue,
the conflict points are not eliminated, just shifted to be on-street or at the street
intersection and the street and alley intersection.
- Applicant presented a video of the bike lane along Chicago Avenue and Sheridan
  Avenue through Northwestern University's campus, video taken around noon on August
21, 2019. Applicant stated the video shows several existing curb cuts, lack of signage at
curb cuts, cars in the bike lane, and other various activities in the bike lane.
- Applicant proposes to install proper signage to identify the proposed curb cut.
- L. Biggs stated concerns with the proposed curb cut have not changed. She noted that
  standards change over time. She stated it would be difficult to install a bike lane without
curb cuts, not all curb cuts should be denied, but the preference is not to have a curb cut
cross a bike lane. She stated plan being considered is a new curb cut. She stated the
public way is not benefited by the proposed development. She stated the City works to
minimize conflicts, the proposed curb cut is located mid-block, traffic should be directed
towards existing infrastructure. She noted seniors would have to navigate through
several conflict points with a curb cut off Chicago Avenue.
J. Leonard stated it is likely vehicles could be stacked onto the sidewalk with the three spaces in the proposed loading zone. She stated if on-street loading is proposed as an alternative, the plan can be revised and reviewed by staff.

Applicant stated the anticipated traffic volume is low given the number of garage parking spaces.

M. Rivera stated that an on-street loading zone for the proposed development is not acceptable, the City prefers to locate on-street loading zones at the end of a block for general use.

M. Rivera asked if valet parking will be provided and if parking is available to the retail space.

Applicant stated valet parking will be provided, parking garage provides parking to the retail space, and they will lease off-site parking spaces to meet the parking requirement.

S. Mangum stated pedestrian friendly store fronts at street level are preferred over vehicle areas. He stated the site development allowances requested are a big ask, agrees with other staff regarding the curb cut.

Applicant stated they will comply with Pilot 55 LEED Silver bird friendly measures.

M. Jones stated windows overhang into the public street right-of-way, an easement will be required.

S. Mangum asked if a construction value has been determined.

Applicant stated no, not at this time.

S. Mangum asked if the high water table has been addressed related to the proposed underground parking.

Applicant stated they do not have additional details to provide at this time.

Public Comment:

Dennis Harden concerned with the condition of the alley and the cost to repair it, project lacks public benefits, the ask is more than the benefits. He stated he has design concerns, traffic backs up on Chicago Avenue.

Ken Green stated 8-stories is the appropriate height for a transitional area, he stated building heights should step down from downtown, 19-stories is not consistent. He asked if the developer could buy on-street parking spaces for use as their loading.

Sarah Vanderwick noted the City’s affordable housing goal, stated on-site affordable dwellings should be provided.

Leslie Shad stated the City is located along the Mississippi bird fly-way, noted glass balconies are a concern, building height up to 36’ should have 90% bird friendly treatment and height above that should have 60% treatment. She stated lights should be lowered and directed down, a threat calculation should be provided.

Kiera Kelly stated the proposed building height is double what is allowed, if the development is allowed it would undermine trust with residents. She noted several towers have been approved recently. She stated the senior housing development on Oak should be allowed to finish first before other senior housing projects are approved. She stated concern with traffic, the development should meet the current affordable housing regulations, and concerned with loss of storefronts.

Bernard Reilly stated the development degrades the quality of the streetscape, concerned with building shadow, and increases obstacles along Chicago Avenue. He stated public benefits are lacking.

Monique Petan stated construction to occupancy could take 6-7 years given the approaching election, stated the City is turning into Lakeview.

Suzanne Carlson asked who will occupy the building, seniors only? She stated the proposed building height is out of proportion. She stated bird friendly details are needed, concerned with affordable housing.
• Zafiro Papastratakis stated building height limits should be maintained, impacts quality of life.
• Lori Keenan stated proposed development lowers quality of life, concerned with wind tunnel effects. Demolishing the building adds to landfills. Businesses close with new construction. The historic district should be kept intact, we’re losing the downtown.
• S. Mangum stated the developer is proposing to pay the fee-in-lieu of providing on-site affordable dwellings to comply with the IHO.
• S. Mangum stated both agenda items are related.
• J. Leonard encouraged the applicant to work on addressing issues as the project moves forward.
• S. Mangum stated underground parking is a plus but there are several concerns with the project.

S. Mangum made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed subdivision and major adjustment to the Planned Development at 1605-1631 Chicago Avenue, seconded by J. Leonard.

The Committee voted, 8-0, to recommend approval to Plan Commission of the proposed subdivision and major adjustment to the Planned Development at 1605-1631 Chicago Avenue.

S. Mangum made a motion to recommend denial of the proposed 1621 Chicago Avenue Planned Development, seconded by L. Biggs.

The Committee voted, 8-0, to recommend denial to Plan Commission of the proposed 1621 Chicago Avenue Planned Development.

---

Adjournment
L. Biggs made a motion to adjourn, seconded by S. Mangum. The Committee voted, 8-0, to adjourn. The Committee adjourned at 3:48 p.m.

The next DAPR meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 25, 2019, at 2:30 p.m. in Room 2404 of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Griffith
Design and Project Review (DAPR)
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1560 Sherman Avenue

Preliminary and Final Review
View from Sherman Ave.  
(fence beyond line of sight)
BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION

Please type or print in ink. ALL APPLICABLE LINES MUST BE COMPLETED.
YOU WILL NEED ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS IF CONSTRUCTION COST EXCEEDS $10,000

Address of Property: 1560 Sherman Ave., 4th Floor Roof, Evanston, IL 60201
(Include floor/unit #’s where work is to be done - Must include a house number and street name. We do not accept intersections or building names).

Name of Business: Rotary International
Type of Business: Office
☐ Check if change from previous business type

Use of Building/ Type of Project: (Check all that apply)
☐ Single Family ☒ Commercial
☐ Multi-Family-Rental: # of units
☐ Condo Conversion / New Condo: # of units
☐ Dwelling Conversion
☐ Addition
☐ Garage ☐ Detached ☐ Attached
☐ Exterior Renovation ☐ Interior Renovation
☐ Restaurant ☐ Office
☐ Health Care ☐ Retail
☐ Educational ☒ Other: Fence

Scope of Work: Install metal picket fence on part of 4th floor roof

Work Valuation (required for permit issuance) $ 62,093

APPLICANT/CONTACT NAME: Laura Young & Dana Gilberti (for comments)
PHONE NUMBER: 312-645-0011
E-MAIL ADDRESS: Laura_Young@GYHarch.com & Dana_Gilberti@GYHarch.com

OWNER OF PROPERTY: Rotary International

ARCHITECTURE FIRM: Griskelis Young Harrell
PHONE #: 312-645-0011
E-MAIL ADDRESS: Laura_Young@GYHarch.com & Dana_Gilberti@GYHarch.com

Contractor Information
(Please enter the contractors necessary for this job. If the contracts are out to bid, this portion can be completed prior to permit issuance)

General Contractor: 
Phone #: 
Address: 
Email: 
 Evanston Registration #: Expiration Date

Plumber/Sewer: 
Phone #: 
Address: 
Email: 
 Evanston Registration #: Expiration Date

Electrical Contractor: 
Phone #: 
Address: 
Email: 
 Evanston Registration #: Expiration Date

24 HOUR EMERGENCY CONTACT-DURING CONSTRUCTION:
Name: Sandra Gutierrez
Phone Number: 

Address (if different): Cushman & Wakefield of III = acting agent 
E-MAIL ADDRESS: S Gutierrez@onercratorycenter.com

Landmark / Historic District:
☐ Yes Applicant MUST complete back of application & Pres. worksheet
☐ No
Owner Occupied: ☐ Yes ☐ No
Mechanical Contractor: _____________________________

Phone #: _____________________________

Address: _____________________________ Email: _____________________________

Evanston Registration #: _____________________________ Expiration Date _____________________________

**Additional Permit Information**
(Please complete the sections below that apply)

Sign/Roofing/Other Contractor: _____________________________

Address: _____________________________________________

Phone #: _____________________________ Email: _____________________________

Evanston Registration #: _____________________________ Expiration Date _____________________________

**LANDMARK / HISTORIC DISTRICT**

Is the property where the work is to be done a Landmark or in a Historic District?

☐ If YES, please answer the following questions: ☒ NO

Are there exterior modifications to the property?

☐ If YES, you must apply for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

☐ NO, I will not be modifying the exterior in any way: X _____________________________

Sign and Print Your Name

**MULTI-UNIT APARTMENTS / CONDOMINIUMS**

Are you constructing a new multi-unit residential building, upgrading an existing apartment building, or converting an existing building into apartments?

☐ If Yes, please answer the following questions ☐ No

Are these residential units going to be condominiums?

☐ If YES, how many units? _____________________________

You must contact the Plan Review/Project Supervisor at (847) 448-4311 to begin the Condominium paperwork.
(Required for Permit Issuance).

☐ NO, These units will not be sold as condominiums: X _____________________________

Sign and Print Your Name

**WATER/SEWER: NEW, REPAIR, OR REPLACEMENT, AND/OR WORK ON THE PUBLIC WAY**

Does this project require street, sidewalk/parkway openings and/or obstruction of a public right of way (driveway, street, sidewalk, or driveway)? ☐ Yes ☒ No

*If YES, a Right of Way Permit must be obtained from the City Engineer prior to issuance of a building permit, and in addition to a building permit for work performed.*

I have completed the application honestly and to the best of my knowledge. I understand that all work performed pursuant to this application shall be in strict compliance with all provisions of the City of Evanston statutes, laws, rules, regulations and ordinances.

Applicant Signature _____________________________ (Griskelis Young Harrell) Date: 8/23/19

Ms. Laura Young
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FENCE WORKSHEET

Submittal Documents:
- Building Permit Application
- Fence Worksheet
- Copy of Signed Contract showing total cost
- 3 copies of plat of survey reflecting current conditions to include property dimensions, location of existing buildings and proposed fence/gate locations marked on survey with series of X's. If plat of survey is not available, Zoning Division will provide an aerial view of property with approximate property lines.

Approvals:
- Zoning Division
- Historic Preservation (if applicable)

Fees:
- $20 for first 100', $6 for each additional 100' or fraction thereof = $ 20
- $45 inspection; additional inspections at $45 per inspection

Inspection:
- Final – call 847 448-4311 to schedule – supply address and permit number

Date: 8-23-19

Address of Property: 1560 Sherman Ave, Evanston, IL 60201

Fence Material: Chain Link □  Wood □  Iron [X]  PVC □  Other:  

Fence Height: (in feet and inches): 8'-0"

Fence Length (in feet and inches): 200'-0"

Are You Replacing an Existing Fence?  □ Yes  [X] No

Note: The finished side of the fence must face out towards residential properties or the street except when adjacent to an alley. The applicant and owner are solely responsible for locating property lines. The property may be subject to the provisions of the historic preservation ordinance. A Right of Way (ROW) permit may be required if use of ROW (sidewalk, parkway) is needed during installation.

All the information on this application and on any accompanying documents is true and correct.

Signature:  [Signature]

Date: 8-23-19

Daytime Phone #: 312-645-0011
Design and Project Review (DAPR)

1224 Oak Street

Recommendation to ZBA
Aerial Map - 1224 Oak Street

September 26, 2019

- User drawn points
- TOD Area Parcels
- Tax Parcels

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

Copyright 2018 City of Evanston
1904.4044 BOUNDARY SURVEY
COOK COUNTY

THAT PART OF LOT 5 IN THE RESUBDIVISION OF PART OF BLOCK 2 IN CRAIN'S
SUBDIVISION OF THE NORTH 1/2 OF THE NORTHWEST 1/4 OF THE NORTHWEST 1/4
OF SECTION 15, T36S R122E, 16TH PARRISH 41 NORTHEAST 1/4, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL
MERIDIAN, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: COMMENCING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF
SAID LOT THEN NORTH 260.00' ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT TO THE NORTH
LINE OF SAID LOT; THENCE SOUTH 400.00' ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT TO THE
NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT; THENCE EAST 260.00' ALONG THE NORTH LINE
OF SAID LOT TO THE PLACE OF BEGINNING IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

TOTAL AREA OF PROPERTY SURVEYED 4972 SQ.FT.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
COUNTY OF DUPage

[Signature]

I, W. D. JONES, PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR, WHEATON, ILLINOIS, DO SWORE: THE ABOVE SURVEY IS A PROFESSIONAL SERVICE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE MINIMUM STANDARDS OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS. NO IMPROVEMENTS SHOULD BE MADE ON THE BASIS OF THIS PLAT ALONE. PLEASE REFER ALSO TO YOUR DEED, TITLE POLICY AND LOCAL ORDINANCES. COPYRIGHT BY EXACTA ILLINOIS SURVEYORS. THIS DOCUMENT MAY ONLY BE USED BY THE PARTIES TO WHICH IT IS CERTIFIED. PLEASE DIRECT QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS TO EXACTA ILLINOIS SURVEYORS, INC. AT THE NUMBER IN THE BOTTOM RIGHT CORNER.

CLIENT NUMBER: 19GSA207009/1 LP
DATE: 04/03/19
BUYER: MARK METZ AND NOREEN EDWARDS
SELLER: JEREMY BLOOMFIELD AND CHRISTINE BLOOMFIELD, HUSBAND AND WIFE, AS TENANTS IN COMMON

The Cara Program
transforming lives...

www.thecaraprogram.org

Exacta Proudly Supports

Since 2004, The Cara Program has served more than 1,500 students through our Career Education, Work Experience and Housing Assistance Program to help end the cycle of poverty using the power of education and employment.
Section C. Application for Advisory Review of Zoning Variations...

A. Is necessary or appropriate in the interest of historic conservation and does not adversely affect the historical architecture or aesthetic integrity of the landmark or character of local historic districts.

Our proposed addition and alterations are appropriate for our building and fit into the character of the local historic district. We are happy to have purchased a lovely brick building in a great old neighborhood in central Evanston and seek to minimize the impact of our changes.

Zoning Variances:

These variances have been removed:

- ACs have been moved to compliant locations.
- Impervious surface has been reduced and is compliant.
- Building height is now compliant. The previously proposed side dormers did not meet the definition of a dormer and needed more windows to be called dormers. With the addition of 3 windows on north and south sides, building height is now compliant.
- Minimum Lot Area for a 2-flat was removed (per staff comment) as it is legally non-conforming. It was and will remain a 2-flat.

Three of the zoning variations we are requesting result from adding a 3-car attached garage, which is required by the city zoning ordinance.

- Building lot coverage (45%-51%). The size of the garage is dictated by the zoning requirement of 3 parking spaces.
- North side interior yard (3'2" instead of 5'): The principal structure is currently at 3'2" and the new addition would line up with the non-conforming existing structure. This is necessary in order to provide enough space for the required 3-car garage.
- Rear yard setback (requirement is 30'; we currently have about a 24' rear yard. 3' is requested). The existing non-conforming rear yard will be replaced with the required 3 car garage.

The remaining Zoning variance is the Interior Side Yard variance (The proposed deck is 1' from the lot line where 5' is required). The Code regarding side yards and accessory structures are to ensure privacy and peacefulness to protect neighboring residences from noise from neighbors in side yards. The small, low deck in the south side yard is adjacent to the basketball court in the city park, not a residence or a street. It is set way back (70 feet) from the front walk, 25' from the alley and only 18" high, hidden in front by the chimney and in the rear by the garage, and should not be visible from front or rear. The City Zoning Code does not mention city parks in reference to side yards or accessory structures. The deck is adjacent to the park and the heavily used full-court basketball court, which is only about 15' from the lot line and 26' from the bedroom windows. The deck is at least 100' from neighboring residences.
For your consideration, here are changes in appearance that ARE code-compliant, but that might be of importance to the Preservation Commission:

- The new roof height of 35’. It is code-compliant and lower than neighboring roofs. The relatively small change in height (+3’2”) will likely not even be noticeable to the average observer. The neighbor’s property to the north is 38’. The neighboring home to the west at 1225 Ridge is 45’ plus there’s a 10’ rise in elevation, which would make their roof 20’ higher than the proposed height of subject. There are other homes on Ridge behind us that are over 35’. There are many multi-unit buildings nearby which are 3+ stories high, including one on our block. Single family homes across the street are 2+ stories high and some are over 35’ high.
- Dormers: There are many roof and dormer styles in the neighborhood on various style buildings. The neighbor on the north has many. There currently are side shed dormers on our building that we plan to make larger. In an effort to minimize change, the proposed side dormers are smaller than allowed by code and set further back than required from the front of the home. The new gable roof on the rear is necessary in order to be able to access the attic; it makes the attic accessible from the rear interior stairs. The rear gable of the main structure also matches and integrates the screen porch gable roof. The gable is like many roofs in the neighborhood and will be an attractive addition to the rear. The dormers and gable roof allow some attic space to be utilized, thereby increasing the use and enjoyment of the property.
- The screen porch is in keeping with many screen porches in the area and indeed simulates the sleeping porch which was originally on the rear of the building but which was enclosed at least 70 years ago.
- The proposed 2nd floor deck on top of the garage will have horizontal rails similar to the ones that are currently on the existing 2nd floor deck. (In fact, we hope to re-use the actual materials.)
- Proportions of facades and openings, rhythms, relationships of materials and texture, roof shape, walls, scale, directional expression—all stay the same for most of the building and are appropriately sized otherwise and sensitive to surroundings.

What is NOT changing?

- Use: We are happy to maintain this building as a two-flat in keeping with the zoning ordinance, the need for housing near trains and shopping areas and with our desire to live in and age-in-place in the same building with our children and grandchildren.
- The architectural details on the front of the building will NOT change- 6 decorative corbels, columns, and Italianate capitals- will all be restored. The graceful, open front porch will be repaired and maintained. The concrete front steps repaired. The leaded windows will be restored. There is a distinctive brick pattern of the building and masonry dentils over the windows and doors that demonstrate good craftsmanship. The masonry will be repaired where necessary, using matching mortar and pointing. We will maintain the existing exposed rafter tails which have decorative profiles.

What else is improving?

- Green algae growing on the sides of building will be gently removed.
• The existing fence is encroaching approximately 2’ into the alley. It will be removed, and the proposed garage is set back 3-6’ from the lot line, thereby “giving back” more than 150sf to public right of way.

**Do our changes adversely affect the character of the local historic district? To give you context, here is Other information pertaining to Building lot coverage, Rear Yards, Side Yards and Accessory Structures for neighboring structures:**

The lots on our (west) side of Oak and on Dempster on the other end of the block are shallow and many have non-conforming parking and little or no rear yards; our lot does not have enough room for the required rear yard and the required number of parking spaces or garage. Currently there is only one gravel parking space for our lot. Three are required for this size building. In order to come into compliance with regard to providing parking, we propose an attached 3-car garage, but that means there will be no rear yard and no outdoor living area for either unit. We would like each unit to have an outside living space, so, we are planning a rooftop deck and screen porch on the garage for the 2nd floor unit and a small deck on the south side for 1st floor use. Having an interior side deck seems to work since the lot to the south has no residence; only city park with basketball court adjacent to our building.

**Other lots on the alley behind us and on this block:**

Many of the lots on the west side of Oak and on Dempster are substantially over the building lot coverage and out of compliance on parking and on rear yard setbacks. Though we haven’t done a complete analysis of building lot coverage for every building, it is easy to see that many are way over the limit.

1228 Oak: Has 4+ units (non-compliant), is 3 stories (non-compliant), has gravel parking across the rear of the building, from the building to the alley, with no rear yard (non-compliant).

1234 and 1236 Oak are single family homes which are not as long as our building, so they have small (non-compliant) rear yards and detached garages. 1234 has a 20’ tall garage.

1238 Oak is a large apt building. The building has no rear yard, little parking and little/no setback on the alley.

1030 Dempster has 2 units and has a detached garage on the alley with no rear yard and over the impervious surface limit.

1028 Dempster has 2 units and a garage with a partial rear yard.

1024 Dempster is single family with a deck and parking spaces that cover much of the rear yard.

1020 Dempster has 2 units with 2 open parking spaces and a deck that covers the rear yard.

1016 Dempster is single family with open parking spaces, over impervious surface, and no rear yard.

1100 Dempster has an attached garage, asphalt parking area, is over impervious surface and has no rear yard.
1104 Dempster is over lot coverage, has little/no rear yard setbacks, is over impervious surface and is landlocked with no parking.

1106 Dempster is single family and has non-conforming spot in the front off the alley and a 1 car detached garage and almost no rear yard and over impervious surface limit.

*All the houses on Ridge* have large lots; many with curb cuts and driveways.

The home at 1241 Ridge is quite set back from the street and has an attached garage on the alley and asphalt parking/driveway, and no rear yard.

1235 Ridge has a 2 story coach house directly on the alley with little/no alley setback.

1229 Ridge has a long asphalt driveway from alley to a basement garage. 1229 also has an interior side yard deck on the 2nd story. It is very close to the neighboring residence.

1225 Ridge, directly behind us, has a large back yard and garage on this long, wide lot. Their rear stone fence has little/no alley setback and so makes navigating even our parking space difficult. The house is 45’ high (non-compliant).

1217 Ridge is developing the lot at 1211 which currently has a 2 story coach house on the alley. Plans are in permit process.

1205 Ridge has a large yard and detached garage.

1201 Ridge is at the corner with Crain and has a detached garage with non-conforming rear yard.

**Conclusion to the question of whether our changes “adversely affect the character of our local historic district?” regarding zoning requests:**

So, as you can see from the above list, our variances are few and relatively minor. We will comply with Use, Building Height, Impervious Surface, and Required parking. Many homes on the block are out of compliance with the rear yard setback and/or don’t meet parking requirements. The 6% overage we are requesting on Building Lot Coverage is small compared to many on the block. Many homes on the block have no rear yards. The 1.8’ side yard setback variance on north is minimal, lines up with the building and is less than others on the block. And the deck on the south is small, low, almost non-visible from the public way and is not adjacent to a residence or street as indicated in code.

B. Is necessary to provide the owner a recoverable rate of return on the real property where the denial thereof would amount to a taking of the property without just compensation. The proposed addition and alterations provide the owners with reasonable and appropriate use and enjoyment of their real property. Denial would thereby be a taking of their reasonable and appropriate use and their enjoyment of real property.

C. Will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare or injurious to property in the district. The addition and alterations will NOT be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare or injurious to property in the district or vicinity. They will enhance the appearance of the neighborhood and increase the value of property in the district.
COA App Section C Conclusion: Given the need and the city requirement to provide 3 parking spaces in this historic R3 neighborhood, we have designed an addition that provides the parking in a sensitive manner. The addition and other alterations retain the original structure, do not destroy significant historic material and are compatible with the features, size, scale, proportion, massing, color, material and character of the property, neighborhood and environment. We have proposed a solution that complies with impervious surface requirements, provides the required parking (relieving some parking stress for the neighborhood), retains the unique architectural elements on the front of the home and the beautiful masonry work of the building, replaces energy-inefficient or unsightly windows, gives outdoor living space to both units, complies with height limits, and is fitting and appropriate for this historic area and R3 neighborhood. We have taken care to minimize changes and to make proposed changes in keeping with the architecture of the building and lending value to the character of this historic neighborhood.
MAJOR VARIATION
APPLICATION

Address: 1224 OAK AVENUE

Permanent Identification Number(s):
PIN 1: 119-10-0000 PIN 2: [Redacted]
(Note: An accurate plat of survey for all properties that are subject to this application must be submitted with the application.

2. APPLICANT

Name: DONNA LEE FLOETER

Organization:

Address: 3306 HAYES ST.

City, State, Zip: EVANSTON, IL 60201

Phone: Work: 847-322-7481 Home: [Redacted] Cell/Other: [Redacted]

Fax: [Redacted] Home: [Redacted]

E-mail: DONNA LEE FLOETER@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 lessee
- [ ] 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: NOREEN EDWARDS and MARK METZ

Address: 2125 SHERMAN AVE.

City, State, Zip: EVANSTON, IL 60201


Fax: [Redacted] Home: [Redacted]

E-mail: NEDWARDS@GMAIL.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."

Property Owner(s) Signature(s) – REQUIRED

Property Owner(s) Signature(s):

Date: Sep 10, 2019

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: 9/10/2019
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: 4-30-2019
☑ Project Site Plan  Date of Drawings: July 29, 2019. Revised Sep 5, 2019
☑ Plan or Graphic Drawings of Proposal (If needed, see notes)
☑ Non-Compliant Zoning Analysis
☑ Proof of Ownership  Document Submitted: 
☑ Application Fee (see zoning fees)  Amount $_______ 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: Build new attached garage on rear of building with rooftop deck and screen porch on roof. Add small (273 sf), low deck to south side yard. Raise attic height to 35’ and add dormers to sides and rear to add bedrooms and bath to attic.

B. Have you applied for a Building Permit for this project? NO

What specific variations are you requesting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Section</th>
<th>B. Requirement to be Varied</th>
<th>C. Requested Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-8-4-6</td>
<td>R3 Building lot coverage maximum is 45%</td>
<td>Bldg lot coverage of 51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-4-7</td>
<td>5' side yard</td>
<td>North side of home is currently 3.2' from lot line. The garage would continue along same line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-4-7</td>
<td>Rear yard requirement is 30'</td>
<td>Current setback is approx. 24'. 3' setback requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessory structure not to be located in a side yard abutting a street or interior side yard</td>
<td>AC in 1st drawing. Removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-4-6-3</td>
<td>&quot;Accessory structure&quot; not to be located in a side yard abutting a street or interior side yard.</td>
<td>Locate small deck in south side yard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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 lot dimensions prevent adherence to the zoning code regarding parking and rear yard setback. The existing lot does not comply with the city parking requirement which is 1.5 spaces per unit in R3. We can not provide the required parking without eliminating the rear yard. Providing the required parking also eliminates outdoor living space for the 1st floor unit so that will be provided with the side yard deck.

1. The requested variation will not have a substantial adverse impact on the use, enjoyment, or property values of adjoining properties: The current building is non-compliant in regard to parking. In addition, the gravel parking space, existing rear fence and rear yard encroach upon the public alley. The use, mass and bulk of the proposed addition is appropriate and will have a minimal or positive impact on adjacent properties. The proposed addition will provide off-street parking, which benefits the neighbors, and restore approximately 100 square feet of property to the public alley; this will enhance the use, enjoyment and property values of adjoining properties. The small deck in the side yard is only a couple steps off the ground; it is not “interior” in that it is not adjacent to another residence, nor is it adjacent to a street. It is adjacent to the city park with the 11’ chain link fence and the full-court basketball court about 15’ from the property line.

2. Property owner would suffer a particular hardship or practical difficulty as distinguished from a mere inconvenience: Currently in their 60s, owners hope to “age-in-place” in this property. They are “downsizing” from a larger home in Evanston. Often there is no parking on this block, and therefore it would be both a hardship and difficulty for an “age-in-place” owner to park on neighboring blocks.

3. Is not based exclusively upon a desire to extract additional income from the property or public benefit to the whole will be derived: No additional income will be derived from these variations as the building will be occupied by the owners and other family members. Public benefit to the whole is derived from adding off-street parking and restoring alleyway to the public space.

4. The alleged difficulty or hardship has not been self-created: The property was platted at its current size and location prior to the current ownership. Zoning guidelines for required parking and rear yard setback were created by the city.

5. Have other alternatives been considered, and if so, why would they not work? There is no alternative that meets both the parking requirement and the rear yard setback. Providing for the parking requirement also means increasing building lot coverage. The proposed garage eliminates outdoor space for the first floor so the side deck gives back outdoor space to the first floor unit. The size of proposed garage and increase in building lot coverage is determined by the city parking requirement.

Other Zoning Variation Standards:

2. The proposed variation is in keeping with the interest of the zoning ordinance: The proposed addition promotes the objectives of the comprehensive general plan as well as enhances the taxable value of the property. The proposed garage provides required parking and the deck in the side yard provides some outdoor living space for the first floor unit. The deck in the side yard does not abut a residence or a street; it abuts a city park basketball court. The side yard requirements or accessory structure requirements are to ensure privacy and peacefulness to neighboring residences. There is no neighboring residence on the south side, only basketball players. Embracing the purpose of the R3 Zoning District, this two unit building will continue to “Provide for...two-family residences in moderate density neighborhoods and to preserve the character of such neighborhoods.”
5. Have other alternatives been considered, and if so, why would they not work?  
See prior inserted sheet.

City of Evanston  
DISCLOSURE STATEMENT FOR ZONING HEARINGS  

(Evanston  
(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.  
   NAREEN EDWARDS + MARK METZ  
   2125 SHERMAN AVE.  
   EVANSTON IL 60201  
   312-862-0580  
   DesignGreenLandscapes @ gmail.com

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 1 above, or indicated below. (An example of this situation is if the land user is a division or subsidiary of another person or organization.)  
   NA

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 1 above, or indicated below.  
   NA
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.

    NA

---

**If Applicant or Proposed Land User is a Corporation**  NA

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**  NA

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.
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THE GRANTOR(S), Jeremy Bloomfield and Christine Bloomfield, husband and wife, of Lasalle in
Common of 1226 Oak Avenue, Evanston, Ill. 60202, for and in consideration of the sum of $150,000.00
paid, CONVEYS, to Norren D. Edwards, as Trustee of the Norren D. Edwards Declaration of
Trust dated September 25, 1975, all interest in the following described Real Estate situated in Evanston in
the County of Cook, in the State of Illinois, to wit:

THAT PART OF LOT 6 IN THE RESUBDIVISION OF PART OF BLOCK 2 IN GRAIN'S SUBDIVISION
OF THE NORTH 1/2 OF THE NORTH-WEST 1/4 OF THE NORTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 16, TOWNSHIP 43 NORTHEAST 1/4, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS,
COMMENCEING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG
THE WEST LINE OF OAK AVENUE 40 FEET THENCE WEST PARALLEL TO THE NORTH LINE OF
SAID LOT TO THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT THENCE NORTHWESTERLY ALONG THE WEST
LINE OF SAID LOT 40 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT THENCE EAST ALONG
THE NORTHEAST LINE OF SAID LOT TO THE PLACE OF BEGINNING IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

SUBJECT TO:
Covenants, conditions and restrictions of record and building lines and easements, if any, provided they do
not interfere with the current use and enjoyment of the Real Estate and general real estate terms are not
and payable at the time of closing.

Permanent Real Estate Index Number(s): 11-19-101-016-6600
Address(es) of Real Estate: 1226 Oak Avenue, Evanston, Ill. 60202

DATED this day of

Jeremy Bloomfield

Christine Bloomfield
STATE OF ILLINOIS, COUNTY OF Cook

I, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for said County, in the State aforesaid, CERTIFY THAT Jeremy and Christine Bloomfield, personally known to me to be the same person(s) whose name(s) subscribed to the foregoing instrument, appeared before me this day in person, and acknowledged that they signed, sealed and delivered the said instrument as their free and voluntary act for the uses and purposes therein set forth, including the release and waiver of the right of homestead.

Given under my hand and official seal, this 8th day of MAY

[Signature]
(Notary Public)

Prepared By: Michael F Bonaguro
Attorney at Law
708 Church St. Suite 235
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Mail To:
Katherine Hart
9349 Foresview Road
Evanston, Illinois 60202

Name & Address of Taxpayers:
Noreen Edwards and Mark Metz
1224 Oak Avenue
Evanston, IL 60202

CITY OF EVANSTON
032325
P A S T E State Transfer Tax
AMOUNT $3,275.00
Agent [Signature]
**Zoning Analysis**

**Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number:</th>
<th>Case Status/Determination:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19ZONA-0133 – 1224 OAK AVENUE RIDGE HISTORIC DISTRICT</td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal:**

Raise roof and add dormers to existing 2-flat; construct 3-car garage, screen porch and open deck at second floor; side porch and deck; interior remodel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Section:</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-8-4-6. - BUILDING LOT COVERAGE.</td>
<td>The proposed building lot coverage is 51.5% where 45% is the maximum permitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-4-7. - YARD REQUIREMENTS. (A) Residential Structures 3. Side Yard</td>
<td>The proposed north interior side yard for the principle structure is 3.2’ where 5’ is required. Although the nonconforming condition is not increased, the addition needs to meet the required setback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-4-7. - YARD REQUIREMENTS. (A) Residential Structures 4. Rear Yard</td>
<td>The proposed rear yard is 3’ where 30’ is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-4-7. - YARD REQUIREMENTS. (C) Residential Structures 3. Side Yard</td>
<td>The proposed deck is 1’ from the south interior side yard where 5’ is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments:**

1. Major work Certificate of Appropriateness application and review by the Preservation Commission is required.
City of Evanston
ZONING ANALYSIS REVIEW SHEET

APPLICATION STATUS: August 05, 2019
RESULTS OF ANALYSIS: Non-Compliant

Z.A. Number: 19ZONA-0133
Address: 1224 OAK AVE
Applicant: Donnalee M Floeter
Phone:

Purpose: Zoning Analysis without Bld Permit App
Dist.: R3
Overlay: None
Preservation
Reviewer: Cade Sterling

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: July 19, 2019
Prepared By: Donnalee M. Floeter
Survey Dated: April 30, 2019
Existing Improvements: 2-STORY BRICK 2-FLAT

Proposal Description:
RAISE ROOF AND ADD DORMER S TO EXISTING 2-FLAT. CONSTRUCT 3-CAR GARAGE. SCREEN PORCH AND OPEN DECK AT 2ND FLOOR. SIDE PORCH AND DECK. 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 60%)</th>
<th>Pavers/Pervious Paver Exception (Subtract)</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</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>R3 Two-Family Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling - 2F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Minimum Lot Width (LF)
USE: Two Family

| Minimum Lot Width (LF) | 35 | 40.00 | 40.00 | No Change |

Comments:
Minimum Lot Area (SF)
USE: Two Family

| Minimum Lot Area (SF) | 7,000 sq. ft. (3500/DU) | 4972 | 4972 | No Change |

Comments: 6-8-4.4. - ENLARGEMENT OF STRUCTURE

| Dwelling Units: SFR, 2F | 2 | 2 | No Change |

Comments: 6-8-4.4. - ENLARGEMENT OF STRUCTURE

| Building Lot Coverage (SF) (defined, including subtractions & additions): | 2237.4 | 1787 | 2559 | Non-Compliant |
| Comments: | 36% | 51.5% |

<p>| Impervious Surface Coverage (SF, %) | 2983.2 | 2903.25 | 2985 | Compliant |
| Comments: | 59.25% | 60.0% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessory Structure</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Coverage:</td>
<td>40% of rear yard</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (FT)</td>
<td>&lt; OF 35' OR 2.5 STORIES</td>
<td>31.83 / 2 stories</td>
<td>35' / 3 stories</td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>DOES NOT MEET DEFINITION OF DORMER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard(1) (FT)</td>
<td>27' or block average</td>
<td>33.88 / 26.5 to front porch</td>
<td>33.88 / 26.5 to front porch</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street:</td>
<td>Oak Avenue</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(1) (FT)</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Addition in vertical or horizontal direction req. adherence to setback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard(2) (FT)</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard (FT)</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACCESSORY USE AND STRUCTURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use (1)</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Districts:</td>
<td>RSD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Air-conditioning Unit</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Required Yard:</td>
<td>RY or ISY</td>
<td>Interior Side Yard</td>
<td>Interior Side Yard</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Standards:</td>
<td>6' or 6' w/screening setback</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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>RSD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deck or Patio (raised)</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Required Yard:</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>Additional Standards:</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(2A) (FT)</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1'</td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
</table>

LF: Linear Feet  SF: Square Feet  FT: Feet
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use(1): Two-family</th>
<th>Standard 1.5 per dwelling unit</th>
<th>Existing 0</th>
<th>Proposed 3</th>
<th>Determination Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REQUIRED:</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vertical Clearance (LF):</strong></td>
<td>7'</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8.5'</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surfacing:</strong></td>
<td>Sec. 8-18-2-8 (E)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Concrete Apron</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Sec. 8-4-6-2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Attached Garage</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Angle(1): Garage (Attchd)**

**Angle(2):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MISCELLANEOUS REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement (1): YARD OBSTRUCTIONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS AND/OR NOTES**

**RESULTS OF ANALYSIS**

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

Site Plan & Appearance Review Committee approval is: **Not Required**

See attached comments and/or notes.

[Signature] 9/25/19