ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
Tuesday, August 4, 2020
7:00 P.M.
Via Virtual Meeting

AGENDA

As the result of an executive order issued by Governor J.B. Pritzker suspending in-person attendance requirements for public meetings, Zoning Board members and City staff will be participating in this meeting remotely.

Due to public health concerns, residents will not be able to provide public comment in-person at the meeting. Those wishing to make public comments at the Zoning Board meeting may submit written comments in advance or sign up to provide public comment by phone or video during the meeting by calling/texting 847-448-4311 or completing the Zoning Board online comment form available by clicking here or visiting the Zoning Board webpage: https://www.cityofevanston.org/government/agendas-minutes/zoning-board-of-appeals and clicking on Public Comment Form.

Community members may watch the Zoning Board meeting online through the Zoom platform:

Join Zoom Meeting
https://zoom.us/j/99321504841?pwd=aytRR3lITVZDODlFR1pPZDdHc3p2Zz09

Meeting ID: 993 2150 4841
Passcode: 910459

Dial by your location
+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

2. SUSPENSION OF THE RULES: Members participating electronically or by telephone

3. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: July 21, 2020

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 (TYY) 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 quines 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).
4. NEW BUSINESS

A. 1800 Central Street

Matthew Kerouac, architect, applies for major zoning relief to construct an upper story dwelling unit atop an existing one-part commercial building in the B1a Business District and oCSC Central Street Corridor Overlay District. The applicant requests a 13 foot rear-yard setback where 15 feet is required (Zoning Code Section 6-9-5-7 (H)), a 0 foot stepback between the first and second floors where 10 percent of the lot depth from the required pedestrian area (7.25 feet) is required (Zoning Code Section 6-15-14-8), and no off-street parking space where one is required (Zoning Code Section 6-16, Table 16-B). The Zoning Board of Appeals makes a recommendation to City Council, the determining body for this case.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the Zoning Board is scheduled for September 15, 2020.
MEETING MINUTES
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
Tuesday, July 21, 2020
7:00 PM
Via Virtual Meeting

Members Present:  Violetta Cullen, Myrna Arevalo, Kiril Mirintchev, Jill Zordan, Lisa Dziekan, Max Puchtel

Members Absent:  Mary McAuley

Staff Present:  S. Mangum, M. Klotz, C.W. Sterling

Presiding Member:  Violetta Cullen

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

Suspension of Rules for digital meeting
Ms. Zordan motioned to suspend the rules to permit members to convene via virtual meeting. Second by Ms. Arevalo and approved 6-0.

Minutes
Ms. Dziekan motioned to approve the meeting minutes of June 16, 2020. Second by Mr. Mirintchev and approved 6-0.

1701 Howard Street

Adam Zats, applicant, submits for a special use for Cannabis Transporter, MJA Chicago LLC, in the C1 Commercial District (Zoning Code Section 6-10-2-3). The Zoning Board of Appeals makes a recommendation to City Council, the determining body for this case.

Ms. Klotz read the case into the record.

Adam Zats explained the proposal:
- Proposes to upgrade the look of the property
- BZ has been in the family for 40 years
- Point to point delivery system from distributor (ie. one is in Aurora) to 3-4 dispensaries
- No cannabis on site or at the transport facility ever in any way
- Submitted updated site plan that closes off the two Howard St. curb cuts and adds landscaping parallel to the sidewalk as suggested by DAPR
- Space for 6-9 vehicles inside but will start with 2 vehicles
- All vehicles are stored indoors overnight
- Motion sensors, cameras, retina scanners for safety and security
- Plan to give back 5% of proceeds to Evanston and have murals painted on the back of the building where there is graffiti
- Pending approval of the state license
- Normal 8am-5pm operations for drivers. Office will be staffed with four dispatchers and a security guard from 7:30am-6pm, M-F
- Back of property is a brick wall so the alley will remain unused

Ms. Zordan asked why the high level of security is needed if there is no cannabis onsite, and the applicant responded that the security is based on what is required by the State. Applicant states that in his professional opinion the degree of security is unnecessary, but they will meet state requirements.

Mr. Mirintchev asked where the employees will park their own vehicles when they arrive at work, and the applicant responded there is ample space in the parking lot although it isn’t striped to delineate individual spaces.

Mr. Mirintchev asked if the entire area from the landscape bed to the sidewalk can all be landscaped and the applicant responded yes that can be done. Also the front facade will be improved by removing two vehicle doors and adding at least one window and stucco.

Mr. Puchtel asked how the State license works with timing and what will happen if the State license is not granted, and the applicant responded that the State requires the special use approval prior to license awarding. The date for license awarding is unknown. If not granted a State license, the building will still be fixed up as described.

Gloria Clunie, 1620 Dobson - explained BZ does sometimes have too many vehicles around and is somewhat blighted. There are also good things about BZ. The concern is that vehicles will now exit only onto Dewey and into the neighborhood. Will the kids who graffiti the building think there is cannabis inside anyway? Will the business model change within the first 5 years if successful? What signage will there be?

The applicant responded the plan is to grow to 6-9 employees and if more successful than that would move to a larger location. The end goal not for this location, but for his business, is for an Uber Cannabis delivery business. Vehicles that exit onto Dewey will exit south and get to Howard. Signage will not state anything about cannabis so as not to attract attention to the property.

Ms. Zordan asked Ms. Bond Clunie if she received the post card notice and she replied yes but is surprised more neighbors are not at the meeting and asked if there will be additional meetings. Ms. Klotz responded that she spoke to roughly 10 neighbors who originally had concerns about the proposal but no longer did after learning there would never be cannabis on site. If the special use is recommended tonight, the case will move on to meetings at the Planning & Development Committee and City Council.

Ms. Bond Clunie asked if there is a more appropriate use for the property since the property is within a neighborhood.

Resident at 1710 Dobson stated she received notification twice, and appreciates BZ painting over the graffiti continuously. The proposal will be an improvement to the property and there will be fewer cars in the parking lot. Cameras facing the alley will help and reduce dumping.
Carlis Sutton, 1821 Darrow, stated the business shouldn’t be in a neighborhood and will become a nuisance property as people break in when seeing cannabis signs (no cannabis signs are proposed).

Deliberation:
Ms. Dziekan stated the proposal improves multiple things on the property and traffic flow.

Mr. Mirintchev stated the use is less impactful than the current business but landscaping and parking lot striping are needed.

Ms. Zordan wished there was more information from DAPR regarding landscaping and parking striping improvements.

Ms. Zordan and Mr. Puchtel agreed that the perception of the use may not be compatible to the nearby residential. Beautifying the property with things like a mural will help change the perception.

Ms. Arevalo stated the use is appropriate but the parking and beautification details for the property are needed. Chair Cullen agreed.

Standards:
1. Yes
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes (JZ, No)
5. Yes
6. Yes
7. NA
8. NA
9. Yes

Motion to recommend approval by Ms. Dziekan, seconded by Ms. Arevalo

Conditions Include:
1. Applicant shall submit an updated site plan that shows a larger landscape bed that goes to the front sidewalk and stripe parking for employees, and beautification details for the property prior to City Council.
2. Special use is not transferable to any other owner or user.
3. Mural required and preferred on the front-facing facade
4. Maximum hours of operation shall not exceed 8am - 8pm 7 days a week
5. Proposal be implemented in substantial compliance with the documents and testimony on record

Ms. Zordan noted Standard 4 is not met because the property is blighted due to the current owner letting it get that way so any improvement is because it previously lacked maintenance.
Recommended for approval 5-1

Discussion -

Mr. Sterling asked if the Board receives the information they need within the staff memos and packet or would like anything changed.

Chair Cullen asked if we can get the packet earlier. Ms. Zordan stated it is difficult to get to all of the properties over a weekend. Ms. Klotz suggested staff send a copy of the legal notice to ZBA Members so that gives them 3-4 weeks to visit the sites.

Mr. Putchtel requested the staff memos explain why the regulation in question is a regulation - what the intent of that regulation is. The Board discussed the Standards and explanations of them in the memos.

Ms. Klotz explained a few recent text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance that shift some Major Variations to Minor Variations and change the determining body for parking variations for 1-2 family residential. She noted the ZBA caseload will likely decrease a bit from the changes but there may be more appeals as more Minor Variations are processed.

Adjourned 8:42pm
1800 Central Street
20ZMJV-0045

ZBA Recommending Body
MEMORANDUM

To: Members of the Zoning Board of Appeals

From: Johanna Nyden, Director of Community Development  
Scott Mangum, Planning & Zoning Manager  
Melissa Klotz, Zoning Administrator  
Cade W. Sterling, Planner

Subject: 1800 Central Street - ZBA CASE 20ZMJV-0045 
ZBA Recommending Body

Date: July 28, 2020

Notice - Published in the July 16, 2020 Evanston Review
Matthew Kerouac, architect, applies for major zoning relief to construct an upper story dwelling unit atop an existing one-part commercial building in the B1a Business District and oCSC Central Street Corridor Overlay District. The applicant requests a 13 foot rear-yard setback where 15 feet is required (Zoning Code Section 6-9-5-7 (H)), a 0 foot stepback between the first and second floors where 10 percent of the lot depth from the required pedestrian area (7.25 feet) is required (Zoning Code Section 6-15-14-8), and no off-street parking space where one is required (Zoning Code Section 6-16, Table 16-B). The Zoning Board of Appeals makes a recommendation to City Council, the determining body for this case.

Recommendation
Planning and Zoning staff and DAPR recommend approval for major zoning relief to construct an upper story dwelling unit atop an existing one-part commercial building in the B1a Business District and oCSC Central Street Corridor Overlay District.

Staff believes that the proposal is in keeping with the intent of the Zoning Ordinance, and the goals of the Comprehensive General Plan. Specifically, the proposal enhances the taxable value of the subject property, constitutes a sensitive upper-story addition to the first floor commercial structure and adjacent architecturally significant mixed-use structure at the southeast corner of Central Street and Poplar Avenue, and promotes the public health and general welfare by affording a moderately sized live-work space in close proximity to transit.

The proposal complies with all additional Zoning Code requirements and satisfies all the needs to move forward in the variation process.

Site Background
1800 Central Street is currently improved with a small footprint one-part commercial structure in good condition and exhibiting good integrity. The subject property is located on
the south side of Central Street between Poplar Avenue to the west and Eastwood Avenue to the east. The property is significantly smaller than most parcels and structures along the eastern portion of the Central Street Merchant District, representing ideal “smallness” and human scale development which contribute to the District’s sense of cohesion, place, and identity. The property is served by a public alley along the south lot line, and is just east of the Central Street Metra Station, and approximately one-half mile west of the Central Street CTA station.

The surrounding development to the north and west of the block is more intact, smaller, and older, with two to three-story mixed use at the corners with adjacent traditional one-part retail. The block moving east has seen significant erosion of a cohesive pedestrian-oriented built environment including several surface parking lots, mid-century interventions, and a large footprint mixed-use development at the southwest corner of Central Street and Eastwood Avenue which occupies over half of the block’s southern frontage. The mixed-use structure on the northwest corner of Central and Eastwood retains significant integrity.

Several single-family residences can be found immediately south of the subject property, although they are separated by a small alley-facing surface parking lot which does not directly serve the subject property.

Zoning: B1a – Business District & oCSC Central Street Corridor Overlay District

Surrounding zoning:

North: B1a – Business District & oCSC Central Street Corridor Overlay District
East: B1a – Business District & oCSC Central Street Corridor Overlay District
South: B1a – Business District & oCSC Central Street Corridor Overlay District
West: B1a – Business District & oCSC Central Street Corridor Overlay District

Property size: ~1,800 square feet
~24’ wide

Proposal
The property owner proposes a modest second floor residential addition to the extant first floor commercial structure. The architect proposes use of contextually appropriate brick and stone materials, as well as fenestration closely aligning with the adjacent structure. The proposal has high levels of detailing and appropriate massing and façade articulation with well balanced components emphasizing human scale. The two-story proposal embraces the established amenity zone and pedestrian area along Central Street and contributes to the existing street wall more effectively than a single-story structure, or a second-story addition set back from the first floor.

The applicant plans to continue his business in the first floor retail/office space and rent the above unit temporarily. The applicant has long-term plans to downsize and inhabit the second floor residence where he and his partner can age in place without need for a car.

To construct the upper-story residential addition, the applicant requests a reduced rear yard setback (13’ where 15’ is required), a reduced front stepback above the first story (0’ where 7.25’ is required) and reduced off-street parking (0 where 1 is required).
Other alternatives were considered, including meeting the required stepback on the front-facing upper-story façade with an open deck. However, the applicant and City staff believed this condition would erode the established street wall and be contextually inappropriate to the established development pattern on the west half of the block. Long-term lease of a parking space within 1500 feet of the development was considered. However, under direction from City staff, and due to close proximity to the Metra and CTA stations, a parking variation was preferred. Notably, if developed as a live-work space as the applicant intends to pursue in the future, the single parking space would not be required. The applicant currently has a parking permit for the surface parking lot on the corner of Central Street and Stewart Avenue, west of Green Bay Road.

City staff has not received correspondence from neighboring property owners.

**Ordinances Identified for Requested Relief**

**6-9-5-7 (H) - Yard Requirements**

The minimum rear-yard requirement when abutting a non-residential district is fifteen (15) feet. Rear-yard setbacks provide adequate separation between adjacent buildings, allowing air and light infiltration, as well as promoting adequate utility service, and a location for screened, open off-street parking, providing proper access management, and eliminating conflict points between pedestrians and vehicles. It is the opinion of staff that a 13’ setback compared to a 15’ setback is not detrimental to the health, safety or well-being of adjacent users and uses. Notably, the subject property does not abut the alley and is bordered by a separate parcel containing a small surface parking lot. Although they haven’t done so, it would be reasonable for the applicant to propose a rear-yard setback aligning with the existing building footprint.

**6-15-14-8 - Building Height**

A required stepback of 10% of the lot depth (7.25’) between the first and second floors as measured from the required pedestrian area is required per the Central Street Corridor Overlay. The purpose of a zoning overlay is to provide additional area-specific management which responds to unique existing conditions and/or intends to implement a new pattern of land-use. The Central Street Corridor Overlay is a reaction to inappropriate, large, and unattractive interventions which occurred in the early 2000s. Examples include 2951 Central Street and 2935 Central Street. Both these developments lack appropriate modulation fenestration, and articulation of materials. Additionally, they have a limited pedestrian area and limited storefront transparency, which deadens the streetscape and creates an uncomfortable and inactive pedestrian environment. The overlay stepback requirement in part attempts to address the need for modulation in large expanses of building massing to break-up the front-facing façade, create visual interest, permit additional light permeation, enhance pedestrian comfort, and activate the streetscape. An example of a building which meets this requirement is 1720 Central Street. The stepbacks seen in this development help reduce bulk and modulate the building into three parts rather than one mass. It is the opinion of staff that the stepback regulations are more applicable to large interventions with a high degree of bulk and mass, and that enforcing the stepback requirement for a building of such small footprint would erode the established streetwall and be less sensitive to the adjacent mixed-use structure. It should be noted that the proposal has a high degree of material articulation, an established and comfortable pedestrian area, and would have less height than the adjacent building, preserving the visual separation between structures.
Chapter 16, Table 16-B - Schedule of minimum off-street parking requirements

One parking space is required for a two-bedroom unit located in a Transit Oriented Development (TOD) area. Required parking spaces are controversial, and theoretically intended to reduce traffic congestion. Although there is a reduced requirement since the subject property is located in a TOD area, a single parking space is still required. Best planning practices and research suggest that this number is high for a location with this level of density and transit availability. As such, staff believes a parking variation is appropriate for this location due to its proximity to the Metra Station, Pace and CTA bus service, and CTA train service. The Center for Neighborhood Technology’s All-Transit performance score for this location is 8.7 out of 10, suggesting an excellent combination of trips per week and number of jobs accessible within a half mile. This condition enables numerous people to take transit to work.

It should be noted again that if the space is used as a live-work space as intended, no parking space would be required.

Comprehensive Plan

Objectives from the Evanston Comprehensive General Plan that apply to this application include:

- **Value:** Evanston’s housing stock should continue to offer buyers and renters a desirable range of choice in terms of style and price

- **Objective:** Maintain and enhance property values and positive perceptions of housing in Evanston.

- **Policy:** Encourage both new housing construction and the conversion of underutilized non-residential buildings to housing in order to increase housing variety and to enhance the property tax base.

- **Policy:** Encourage creative adaptive use of properties available for redevelopment using zoning standards and the DAPR Review process to protect historic character.

- **Policy:** Support efforts aimed at improving Evanston’s housing stock.

- **Policy:** Monitor Central Street… in the appropriate locations, residential and residential/commercial mixed-use developments in order to enhance the existing character of the neighborhood.

- **Policy:** Protect and enhance the traditional character of neighborhood business districts; carefully examine proposed design changes using the Zoning and Sign Ordinances and design review.

Design and Project Review Committee (DAPR) Discussion and Recommendation

On July 22, DAPR members heard testimony from the property owner and the project architect. DAPR members found the proposal to be appropriate and sympathetic to the existing urban fabric, established street wall, and adjacent structures of architectural significance. A DAPR member acknowledged the work the project architect had put into
significantly improving the proposed materials, and façade articulation to be more contextually appropriate. DAPR members did have some concern that it was possible to meet the stepback requirement by reversing the location of the deck, making the rear-deck, a front-facing deck on the Central Street frontage. The property owner and project architect showed a willingness to explore this option. However, a DAPR member noted that this solution, although it would reduce the degree of the variation request, had potential to erode the existing fabric by unnecessarily modulating the mass of an already small-scale structure. Members debated the appropriateness of the stepback requirement ultimately determining that the project as proposed was the best design intervention for a second floor addition to an existing one-story building on an established and well preserved portion of the merchant district.

Recommendation: DAPR members voted 11-0 to recommend approval of the proposal as presented to the Zoning Board.

Variance Standards
Although staff recommends approval, the responses to the standards below constitute the professional opinion of Planning & Zoning staff. Determination whether the standards for Major Variation have been met shall be exclusively afforded to members of the Board.

For the ZBA to recommend approval of a variance, the ZBA must find that the proposed variance:

a) Will not have a substantial adverse impact on the use, enjoyment or property values of adjoining properties; Staff believes this standard has been met: Staff has not received any objections from neighboring property owners. Moreover, the proposed addition will provide additional density to the business districts catchment area, is modest in size and is contextual in design adding to the vibrancy of the neighborhood.

b) Is in keeping with the intent of the zoning ordinance; Staff believes this standard has been met: The proposed addition promotes the public health, morals, general welfare, and objectives of the comprehensive general plan, as well as enhance the taxable value of the property.

c) Has a hardship or practical difficulty that is peculiar to the property; Staff believes this standard has been met: A practical difficulty exists as there is no location where an additional parking space could be provided, nor are there long-term lease alternatives within 1500 feet of the subject property. Additionally, the small size of the lot combined with the strict stepback and setback regulations, severely limit the buildable area of the lot creating difficulty to construct a contextually appropriate addition.

d) Property owner would suffer a particular hardship or practical difficulty as distinguished from a mere inconvenience; Staff believes this standard has been met: The property owner could suffer a particular hardship as strict adherence to the zoning ordinance has significant potential to deprive the property owner of the property's economically reasonable use and value.
e) **Is not based exclusively upon a desire to extract additional income from the property or public benefit to the whole will be derived;** Staff believes this standard can be met with conditions added: It is the owner's intent to create a traditional live-work space and occupy the residential addition in order to age in place without use of a vehicle. In order to meet this standard, staff recommends that members of the Board stipulate a condition that until owner occupied, the unit be rented as an affordable unit to derive a public benefit.

f) **Does not have a hardship or practical difficulty that was created by any person having an interest in the property;** Staff believes this standard has been met: The unique size of the parcel was platted prior to current ownership.

g) **Is limited to the minimum change necessary to alleviate the particular hardship or practical difficulty.** Staff believes this standard has been met: The proposed addition is modest in size and limited to the square footage required for a viable two-bedroom unit under current market conditions.

Attachments
Variance Application
Zoning Analysis
Plat of Survey
Site Plan and Elevations
Image of Property
Aerial View of Property
Zoning Map of Property
DAPR Meeting Minutes Excerpt – July 22
MAJOR VARIATION APPLICATION
CASE #:__________________________

1. PROPERTY

Address: 1800 CENTRAL AVE., EVANSTON, IL 60201
Permanent Identification Number(s):
PIN 1: 1011220100200000 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: JOHN W. ROMAN
Organization: ROMAN HOLDINGS, INC.
Address: 1800 CENTRAL ST.
City, State, Zip: EVANSTON, IL 60201
Phone: Work: 847.869.0677 Home: ____________________________ Cell/Other: 847.894.8005
Fax: Work: ____________________________ Home: ____________________________
E-mail: JOHN@ILOVEINSURANCE.COM

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

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 06.24.2020

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 06.24.2020
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5. REQUIRED DOCUMENTS AND MATERIALS

The following are required to be submitted with this application:

- (This) Completed and Signed Application Form
- Plat of Survey Date of Survey: 09.22.2006
- Project Site Plan Date of Drawings: 09.30.2020
- Plan or Graphic Drawings of Proposal (If needed, see notes)
- Non-Compliant Zoning Analysis
- Proof of Ownership Document Submitted: MORTGAGE STATEMENT
- 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:
   The project consists of a second floor addition above an existing 1 story brick commercial building. The addition will contain a 2-bedroom dwelling unit.

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 (ex. &quot;6-8-3-4&quot;)</th>
<th>(B) Requirement to be Varied (ex. &quot;requires a minimum front yard setback of 27 feet&quot;)</th>
<th>(C) Requested Variation (ex. &quot;a front yard setback of 25.25 feet&quot;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-9-5-7</td>
<td>requires a 15.0' rear-yard setback when abutting a non-residential district.</td>
<td>a rear-yard setback of 13.0'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Parking requirement: There are no existing/available parking spots within 1,000 feet of the proposed project. The property owner has secured a parking spot located in City Lot 4, 2100 Central Street, which is located 1,400 feet from the property.

Rear-yard setback: The rear of the project abuts a parking lot. A majority of existing buildings encroach into the required setback.

Building height: All new and existing buildings along the street have a 0 foot stepback between the first and second floors.

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 use, mass, and bulk of the proposed addition is appropriate and will have a minimal or positive impact on adjacent properties. The proposed 0' stepback elevation of the second floor addition will maintain the integrity of the adjoining properties by creating a continuous streetscape. The proposed 13' rear setback will minimally impeded on the adjoining buildings light and vent. The surrounding properties are a mix business and residential with similar bulk and mass.

The addition of a second floor apartment with no additional parking will not impact residential parking in the area since all such 24 hour 7 day a week parking requires a residential sticker and is not available to the general public (or the owner or tenant of the proposed apartment).

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 project would not be allowed since there are no existing/available parking spots within 1,000 feet. Additionally, the required rear-yard 15' setback and the 7' front elevation setback would not provide enough available square footage for a typical 2-bedroom dwelling unit.

3. Either...

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

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

The proposed project is located within a 1/4 block of the Metro Station and bus line, and above an existing business space. The addition of the 2-bedroom dwelling unit will add a future live/work space to the Central Street business district, contributing to the desired "Missing Middle Housing" goals of Evanston.

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

The property was platted at its current size and location prior to the current ownership. Zoning guidelines for required parking, required rear-yard setback, and 10% stepback where created by the city. The project is designed to accommodate the typical requirements of similar 2-bedroom dwelling units in the area.
5. Have other alternatives been considered, and if so, why would they not work?

There are no alternatives that meet the parking requirements. The required 15' setback and 10% street front stepback would not provide enough allowable square footage for a viable 2-bedroom dwelling unit in the local marketplace.

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.)

Roman Holdings, Inc. owns the building and land @ 1800 Central St.

John and Susan Roman own 100% of Romans Holding, Inc.
0N730 Waterbury Drive, Wheaton, IL 60187  847.894.8005

3. List the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of person or entity holding title to the subject property. Same as number _____ above, or indicated below.
4. List the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of person or entity having constructive control of the subject property. Same as number 2 above, or indicated below.

If Applicant or Proposed Land User is a Corporation

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

a. Names and addresses of all officers and directors.
   
   John and Susan Roman own 100% of Romans Holding, Inc.
   0N730 Waterbury Drive, Wheaton, IL 60187  847.894.8005
   
   Roman Holdings, Inc.
   John Roman - 51% - 0N730 Waterbury Drive, Wheaton, IL 60187
   Susan Roman - 49% - 0N730 Waterbury Drive, Wheaton, IL 60187

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.

   Same as above

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.
STATE FARM BANK
CUSTOMER SERVICE 1-877-734-2265
PO BOX 3298
MILWAUKEE WI 53201-3298

ROMAN HOLDINGS INC
1800 CENTRAL STREET
EVANSTON IL 60201-1510

Account/Note Number 09520070202-00200
Statement Date 06/24/20
Officer TYLER ROSS
Branch Number 700
Current Balance $278,005.07
Payment Due Date 07/10/20
Amount Due $2,027.52

SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note(Category)</th>
<th>Current Balance</th>
<th>Interest Rate</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00200/C</td>
<td>278,005.07</td>
<td>4.750000</td>
<td>02/10/24</td>
<td>Principal Payment</td>
<td>926.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interest To 07/10/20</td>
<td>1,100.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Due On 07/10/20</td>
<td>$2,027.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEAR-TO-DATE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest Paid</td>
<td>6,791.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unapplied Funds</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes Disbursed</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escrow Interest Paid</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escrow Balance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOAN HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note Number</th>
<th>Posting Date</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Transaction Description</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Late Fees/Others</th>
<th>Escrow</th>
<th>Insurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00200</td>
<td>06/03/20</td>
<td>05/05/20</td>
<td>Reversal</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00200</td>
<td>06/03/20</td>
<td>06/02/20</td>
<td>Payment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00200</td>
<td>06/03/20</td>
<td>06/02/20</td>
<td>Payment</td>
<td>887.61</td>
<td>769.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00200</td>
<td>06/03/20</td>
<td>06/02/20</td>
<td>Special Payment</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please return the bottom portion of the statement with your loan payment.

008520952007020200020000020275200002128902

ROMAN HOLDINGS INC
1800 CENTRAL STREET
EVANSTON IL 60201-1510

A late fee of $101.38 will be imposed if payment is not received by 07/27/20.

852

Please remit and make check payable to:

STATE FARM BANK
PO BOX 3298
MILWAUKEE WI 53201-3298

Check here for change of address or phone number and indicate changes.
**Zoning Analysis Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number:</th>
<th>Case Status/Determination:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19ZONA-0192 – 1800 Central Street B1a – Business District / oCSC – Central Street Corridor Overlay District</td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal:**

First floor facade alterations; second floor addition

**Zoning Section:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Section:</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-9-5-7. - YARD REQUIREMENTS. (H).</td>
<td>Non-Compliant: A 13' rear-yard setback is proposed where 15' is required when abutting a non-residential district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15-14-15. - BUILDING FACADE ARTICATION. (B).</td>
<td>Undetermined/Subject to DAPR Approval: The proposed fenestration on the second floor lacks articulation. I recommend resubmitting plans which show the proposed fenestration in context with the two-story building to the west to verify continuity between existing and proposed second floor window placement. Additionally, I recommend introducing window lintels and sills which extend beyond the width of the proposed windows to increase articulation. The proposed materials will be subject to review by the Design and Project Review Committee. I recommend bringing samples of the proposed materials with you. The materials are not contextual and the proposed second-floor addition cheapens the architectural integrity of the existing one-part commercial building. My recommendation is to use more contextual materials capable of creating a semblance of cohesion between the first and second floors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15-14-8. - BUILDING HEIGHT. Table 3.</td>
<td>Non-Compliant: A 0’ stepback between the first and second floors is proposed where 10% of the lot depth from the required pedestrian area is required (7’-3”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE 16-B — SCHEDULE OF MINIMUM OFF STREET PARKING REQUIREMENTS</td>
<td>Non-Compliant: 0 parking spaces are proposed where 1 (rounded down from 1.1) are required for a two-bedroom dwelling unit in a TOD area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments:**

- Please provide additional detail and information on the proposed storefront level alterations and material selection. Include information on the transparency of the new entry door.
• This proposal necessitates major zoning relief with advisory review of variations by the Zoning Board of Appeals and Design and Project Review Committee. City Council is the determining body for this proposal.
  o The fee for major variations is $385 per requested variation.
  o Variations may or may not be granted. More information can be found in Zoning Code Section 6-3-8 or on the City webpage.
    https://www.cityofevanston.org/government/departments/community-development/planning-zoning/zoning

• I recommend reviewing in detail, the standards for Major Variation. This proposal will face significant difficulty proving that a hardship or practical difficulty exists, that the difficulty or hardship has not been self-created, and the proposal is not based exclusively upon the desire to extract income from the property.
  o I recommend committing to making the proposed unit affordable. Contact the Housing and Grants Division to determine the specifics of this. Typically, it is a 10 year commitment with rent at 80% of the area median income (AMI).

Cade W. Sterling, Planner
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DESIGN AND PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DAPR) MINUTES
July 22, 2020


Staff Present: M. Griffith

Others Present:

Presiding Member: J. Nyden

A quorum being present, J. Leonard called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m.

Suspension of the Rules

1. Members participate electronically or by telephone.

L. Biggs made a motion to suspend the rules to allow members to participate electronically or by telephone, seconded by S. Mangum.

The Committee voted by roll call, 11-0, to suspend the rules allowing members to participate electronically or by telephone.


Nays:

Minutes

1. July 15, 2020, meeting minutes.

S. Mangum made a motion to approve the July 15, 2020, meeting minutes, seconded by G. Gerdes.

The Committee voted by roll call vote, 7-0, to approve the July 15, 2020, meeting minutes, 4 abstentions.


Nays:

Abstentions: E. Cano, L. Biggs, I. Eckersberg, J. Hyink

New Business
1. **1800 Central Street**

John Roman, applicant, submits for a major variation to reduce the required rear yard setback from 15’ to 13’, to eliminate the required stepback between 1st and 2nd floors of 10% of lot depth from the required pedestrian area, and to eliminate the required 1 off-street parking space for a 2nd story addition for a 2-bedroom dwelling unit, in the B1a Business District and Central Street Overlay District.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY:  
John Roman, applicant  
Matthew Kerouac, architect

DISCUSSION:

- Applicant stated the plan is to construct an addition for a live/work space that includes two bedrooms and two bathrooms.
- S. Mangum stated the plan shows a rear deck and asked if the applicant considered flipping the plan so that the deck is at the front and the 2nd floor stepback is provided.
- M. Kerouac stated there are no 2nd floor stepbacks on the block. He stated the stepback would alter the building wall along the street.
- S. Mangum pointed out the Central Station building as an example of a building on the block with the stepback.
- Applicant stated he would be willing to revise the plan if that would make the difference.
- C. Sterling stated the proposed addition fits within the context of the existing adjacent building. He asked about the exterior brick proposed.
- M. Kerouac stated the brick at the addition will match the brick on the 1st floor of the building.

L. Biggs made a motion to recommend approval to the ZBA, seconded by G. Gerdes.

The Committee voted by roll call vote, 11-0, to recommend approval to the ZBA.

**Ayes:**  
J. Nyden, S. Mangum, G. Gerdes, E. Cano, L. Biggs, M. Tristan, D. Cueva,  
I. Eckersberg, J. Hyink, M. Jones, C. Sterling

**Nays:**