

The City of Lake Forest
Zoning Board of Appeals
Proceedings of the January 27, 2020 Meeting

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Zoning Board of Appeals was held on Monday, January 27, 2020 at 6:30 p.m., in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 220 E. Deerpath, Lake Forest, Illinois.

Zoning Board of Appeals members present: Acting Chairman Michael Sieman and Board members James Moorhead, Nancy Novit, Kevin Lewis, Laurie Rose and Lisa Nehring

Zoning Board of Appeals members absent: Mark Pasquesi

Staff present: Michelle Friedrich, Planning Technician and Catherine Czerniak, Director of Community Development

1. Introduction of Board members and staff, overview of meeting procedures.

Acting Chairman Sieman reviewed the role of the Zoning Board of Appeals and asked members of the Board and staff to introduce themselves.

2. Consideration of the minutes from the December 3, 2019 meeting.

The minutes of the December 3, 2019 meeting were approved as submitted.

3. Consideration of a request for a variance from the corner side yard setback to allow construction of an infill second story addition to the existing residence located at 374 Wisconsin Avenue.

Owners and Representatives: Kristin Ryan

Representative: Sue Auerbach, architect

Acting Chairman Sieman introduced the agenda item and asked the Board for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, he invited a presentation from the petitioner and swore in all those intending to speak.

Ms. Auerbach introduced the petition. She noted the house was built prior to the adoption of the Zoning Code. She noted the current setbacks and their relationship to the house and property. She noted that a dormer addition is proposed on the front elevation. She stated that the dormer does not encroach further into the setback than the extent of the front of the house and sits lower than the roof peak. She explained that the addition is intended to provide storage space for the family. She noted that a bathroom is currently under construction in the attic space, within the

existing roofline and is not part of the project that is before the Board. She noted that other homes in the neighborhood encroach into the front yard setback because of their construction prior to the current setback. She noted that one home, on Scott Street, complies with the front yard setback and was built in 1994. She noted that other homes on Wisconsin have front facing dormers.

Ms. Friedrich noted that this petition will be presented to the Building Review Board at the next meeting for review of the architectural details of the project. She noted that the house was built prior to current setback requirements and the existing house encroaches into the front yard setback. She noted that the proposed dormer does not encroach further into the setback than the existing house. She stated that the staff report recommends approval of the variance for the dormer as requested, no closer to the front property line than 33 feet at the southeast corner and 37 feet at the northeast corner.

Acting Chairman Sieman invited questions from the Board.

In response to questions from Board member Moorhead, Ms. Auerbach confirmed that the construction of the bathroom was permitted and work is currently underway.

Acting Chairman Sieman, hearing no further questions from the Board, invited public testimony. Hearing none, he returned the discussion to the Board.

Board member Nehring stated support for the variance to allow the addition of a dormer to the front elevation.

Board member Novit agreed with Board member Nehring.

Board member Moorhead stated that the petition for the variance appears to meet the variance criteria. He stated support for the variance as requested.

Hearing no further comments from the Board, Acting Chairman Sieman invited a motion.

Board member Lewis made a motion to recommend approval to the City Council of a front yard setback variance to allow the addition of a dormer to the roof on the front elevation of the residence. He noted that the recommendation supports construction of a dormer no closer than 33 feet at the southeast corner and 37 feet at the northeast corner to the front property line consistent with the site plan submitted to the Board. He stated the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report and noted that the Board's discussion is incorporated into the motion as additional the findings.

The motion was seconded by Board member Nehring and was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

4. Consideration of a request for approval of variances from the front yard setbacks to allow an open front portico addition to the existing residence located at 401 E. Westminster.

Owners: Jeff and Laura Torosian

Acting Chairman Sieman introduced the agenda item and asked the Board for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, he invited a presentation from the petitioner and swore in all those intending to speak.

Ms. Friedrich noted that the property owners intended on making the presentation themselves but due to a family medical emergency today, they are unable to do so. She stated that with the Board's approval, staff is prepared to present the project.

The Board asked staff to proceed with the presentation given the circumstances.

Ms. Friedrich noted that this project was before the Historic Preservation Commission last week for review of the design elements and was granted approval. She stated that the house was constructed prior to subdivision of the area. She noted that the plat of subdivision established an 80 foot front yard setback likely to recognize the setback of the house as constructed. She noted that the petitioners wish to add a front facing, open portico at the front door, which will require a setback variance. She noted that the front portico, as proposed, encroaches 3 feet 1 inch into the front yard, 80 foot setback. She noted the petitioners plan other work on the house however, the other aspects of the project do not require a setback variance and therefore, do not require consideration by the Board. She noted there are findings of fact, included in the staff report in support of the open portico located no closer than 76'11" to the front property line.

Acting Chairman Sieman invited questions from the Board.

Hearing no questions from the Board, Acting Chairman Sieman invited public testimony. Hearing none, he returned the discussion to the Board.

Board member Nehring stated support for the project.

Board member Novit complimented the design and stated support for the variance as requested.

Board member Rose stated support for the variance to allow the addition of the portico noting the need for a proper overhang at the front door for protection from the weather.

Board member Moorhead stated that the request appears to satisfy the criteria for a variance.

Hearing no further comments from the Board, Acting Chairman Sieman invited a motion.

Board member Nehring made a motion to recommend approval to the City Council of a variance from the front yard setback to allow an open portico to be constructed no closer than 76'11" to the front property line, consistent with the site plan submitted to the Board. She stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report and noted that the Board's discussion is incorporated as additional the findings.

The motion was seconded by Board member Novit and was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

**5. Consideration of a request for approval of variances from the side and rear yard setbacks to allow an addition to the existing residence located at 685 Burton Drive
Owners: Patrick and Julia Barry
Representative: Michael Breseman, architect**

Acting Chairman Sieman introduced the agenda item and asked the Board for any Ex Parte contacts or conflicts of interest. Hearing none, he invited a presentation from the petitioner and swore in all those intending to speak.

Mr. Breseman introduced the petition. He noted that the owners desire to make upgrades to the home to allow them to stay in the home and to make the house more marketable. He described the existing house, built in 1928 and the neighborhood. He noted that the addition is intended to create a larger and usable two car garage, allow updates to the kitchen and add a second floor master suite. He described the architecture and the use of simple forms that are in keeping with the existing architecture of the home. He noted that the variance is requested to allow a wider driveway than permitted by the Code within the setback. He noted that the existing driveway exceeds the permitted width. He described the reduction in pavement that is proposed, along with enhanced landscape screening. He described the auto turn study that was completed for the purpose of designing a functional driveway for the new garage. He acknowledged that the driveway is tight, but workable. He noted that with the improved, larger garage space, there will be less need to park vehicles outside, on the driveway. He stated that the proposed driveway will improve upon existing problems with maneuverability on the driveway.

Ms. Friedrich noted that the project includes an addition to the home and a relocated garage which requires adjustments to the existing driveway. She described the variance request; to allow a wider driveway within the front yard setback than

permitted by Code. She noted that the Building Review Board will review the design elements of the project at an upcoming meeting. She noted that the existing driveway is non-conforming with respect to the width within the front yard setback. She noted that in response to staff comments early on about the amount of impervious surface proposed, the petitioners reduced the amount of pavement by 23 square feet. She noted the unique diagonal siting of the house, on the site, near the setback line, which limits the options for driveway access to the garage. She noted, that as Mr. Breseman described, the proposed, expanded garage will allow the property owners to park in the garage, rather than on the driveway, in the setback area. She described the enhanced landscape screening proposed near the east property line. She noted that an auto turn study is included in the Board's packet and was provided to verify that the driveway, as proposed, is functional. She noted that there is a letter in the Board's packet in support of the project and noted that two letters additional letters were received raising questions about the project and are provided at the Board members places. She noted that findings of fact are provided in the staff report supporting the variance request to allow the driveway to be up to 30'1" in width within the front yard setback, consistent with the site plan submitted to the Board.

Acting Chairman Sieman invited questions from the Board.

In response to questions from Board member Nehring, Mr. Bresemen noted that there is no intent to change the drainage pattern on the property, but rather, to regrade the property consistent with the current pattern. He noted that as reflected on the engineering plan, there is an inlet at the patio and the driveway is sloped to direct water partially to the west and partially to the east. He noted that the petitioners are willing to do further work to address any drainage concerns. He noted the curb proposed along the eastern edge of the driveway to direct drainage away from the neighboring property.

In response to questions from the Board member Lewis, Mr. Breseman further described the stormwater management plan for the site.

In response to questions from Board member Rose, Mr. Breseman noted that a permeable driveway surface was not explored and instead, a curb is proposed to direct water across and off of the site. He noted that a gravel drive is a maintenance issue and is not desired by the property owners.

In response to questions from Board member Lewis, Ms. Friedrich noted that the curb is proposed in response to the drainage concerns raised. She stated that the curb will require review and approval by the City Engineer as part of the plan review process and prior to the issuance of any permits.

In response to questions from Board member Lewis, Mr. Breseman explained the proposed curb in more detail and noted his discussion with the project engineer about other ideas to address the any drainage issues.

Acting Chairman Sieman, hearing no further questions from the Board, invited public testimony.

Mitch Warren, 905 Castlegate Court, noted that he submitted a letter to the Board detailing his concerns. He stated that many of his concerns were addressed by the architect's presentation and responses to questions from the Board. He pointed out that his property is lower than the Barry's property and expressed concern that more asphalt is proposed along the eastern side of the Barry's property than currently exists. He stated that the water problem needs to be mitigated. He noted that moving the water to the south could create a problem in his backyard.

In response to a question from Board member Lewis, Mr. Warren explained that there is a problem along the whole west side of his property and at the front of his property, along Castlegate.

In response to the Board's questions, Ms. Friedrich suggested that a condition can be included in a recommendation for approval directing the City Engineer to review drainage and grading plans with input from the neighboring property owner.

Hearing no further public testimony, Acting Chairman Sieman asked for Board comments.

Board member Nehring stated that it appears that the plan was developed after careful study. She stated that the drainage issue needs attention by City staff and careful review.

Board member Lewis agreed with Board member Nehring's comments and requested inclusion of a condition pertaining to drainage.

Board member Rose stated support for the variance subject to further consideration of the drainage.

Board members Moorhead, Novit and Acting Chairman Sieman stated agreement with comments of the other Board members.

Acting Chairman Sieman noted that corner lots can be difficult due to the geometry and how setbacks are applied. Hearing no further comments from the Board, Acting Chairman Sieman invited a motion.

Board member Nehring made a motion to recommend approval to the City Council of a variance to allow a driveway of up to 30' 1" in width within the front yard setback, consistent with the site plan submitted to the Board. She stated that the motion is based on the findings detailed in the staff report and noted that the Board's discussion is incorporated as additional the findings. She noted the motion includes a condition directing the City Engineer to review a detailed drainage and grading plan in the context of the concerns raised by the neighbor.

The motion was seconded by Board member Novit and was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

6. Public testimony on non-agenda items.

No public testimony was presented to the Board on non-agenda items.

7. Additional information from staff.

Ms. Friedrich noted that the next meeting is scheduled for Monday, February 24, 2020.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle E. Friedrich
Planning Technician