

The City of Lake Forest
Zoning Board of Appeals
Proceedings of the March 29, 2021 Meeting

A regular meeting of the Lake Forest Zoning Board of Appeals was held on Monday, March 29, 2021 at 6:30 p.m., in Lake Forest, Illinois.

Zoning Board of Appeals members present: Chairman Mark Pasquesi and Board members Michael Sieman, Pete Clemens, James Moorhead, Nancy Novit, Laurie Rose and Lisa Nehring

Zoning Board of Appeals members absent: None

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

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

Chairman Pasquesi stated he made a determination that the meeting should be conducted remotely due to the Covid-19 pandemic. He 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 February 22, 2021 meeting.

The minutes of the February 22, 2021 meeting were approved with one correction as requested by Board member Rose.

3. Consideration of a request for variances from front yard and side yard setback requirements to allow construction of a replacement front porch and a rear addition to the residence at 674 Oakwood Avenue.

Property Owners: Michael and Ashley Yakes

Representative: Troy Mock, architect

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

Mr. Mock introduced the petition and noted that the property has been in the Yakes family for three generations and is over 100 years old. He noted that the Yakes desire to remove and improve upon some additions to the house that have occurred over time to update the home and to better meet the needs of their family. He noted that the existing front porch is enclosed and is nonconforming to current setback requirements and is likely not original to the house. He stated that

the proposed replacement front porch will be centered on the front elevation and will be open rather than enclosed. He noted that the new front porch will encroach into the front yard setback to the same extent as the existing front porch. He described the rear addition that was added to the house in the 1950s and explained the plan to remove the prior rear addition and construct a replacement addition. He stated that as proposed, the eave of the replacement addition will encroach into the side yard setback, toward the south property line, for a length of just over 7 feet. He clarified that the wall of the addition will comply with the required setback. He noted that the main mass of the rear addition will step in to fully comply with the setback, including the eaves. He explained that the encroachment of a portion of the addition is necessary to properly integrate with the existing roof form.

Ms. Friedrich noted that this request is for front yard and side yard setback variances. She explained that the front yard variance is for a replacement front porch and the side yard variance, from the south property line, is to allow a portion of the eave of the addition to encroach into the setback for a length of just over 7 feet. She noted that the project will be considered by the Building Review Board for the design aspects of the project and building scale and height variances. She noted that the house is over 100 years old. She explained that the replacement front porch will be centered on the house and will be open rather than enclosed like the existing front porch. She said that the porch will encroach into the front yard setback to the same extent as the existing porch, 15 feet 9 inches. She noted that in the side yard, the eave will encroach 24 inches into the setback to match the existing eave on the house. She noted that there is an existing air conditioning unit in the side yard setback along the south property line for which a variance is also requested to acknowledge the existing condition. She noted that a condition is recommended requiring the front porch to remain open.

Chairman Pasquesi invited questions from the Board.

In response to questions from Board member Sieman, Mr. Mock confirmed that the variance request provides for some slight shifting as the final design is developed. He stated confidence that the variance as requested is sufficient to accommodate any refinement of the design.

In response to questions from Board member Novit, Ms. Friedrich confirmed that the driveway located immediately to the south of the 674 Oakwood property provides rear access to property on Ridge Lane.

In response to questions from Board member Nehring, Mr. Mock acknowledged that renovations to the garage may come forward in the future as the owners'

budget allows. He stated that the intent is that any future work will comply with the Code.

Hearing no requests for public comment, Chairman Pasquesi returned the discussion to the Board.

Board member Nehring commended the project adding that it integrates well with the new homes on the block and with updates that have been made to other homes in the area.

Board member Moorhead stated that although this is a big project, from a zoning perspective, it is a minor request. He noted that the project appears to satisfy the applicable Code criteria. He noted this property is distinguished from the June Terrace petition recently considered by the Board because on either side of the property in this request, there is a driveway that provides space for adequate light and air to the neighboring home and an adequate buffer.

Board member Novit agreed with Board member Moorhead's comments and noted that was part of the reason for her question about the ownership of the driveway on the south side of the house.

Board member Rose agreed with the comments of the other Board members.

In response to a question from Board member Rose, Ms. Friedrich confirmed that prior to the issuance of a building permit, City staff will require documentation on the existing foundation to verify that it is adequate to support the planned improvements.

Chairman Pasquesi agreed with the comments of the other Board members and with Board member Moorhead's comments which differentiate this petition from the June Terrace petition.

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

Board member Sieman made a motion to recommend approval to the City Council of a replacement front porch 15'9" from the front property line, a variance to allow a portion of the eave on the rear addition to extend no closer than 4 feet to the side (south) property line and to allow the replacement of the existing air conditioner unit in the current location within the side yard setback; all consistent with the site plan presented to the Board. He stated that the motion includes a condition that the front porch remain open as reflected on the plans presented in support of the variance request.

The motion was seconded by Board member Nehring and was approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

4. Consideration of a request for a variance from the side yard setback requirement to allow construction of a rear addition to the residence at 1191 W. Deerpath.

Property Owners: Sam and Megan O'Malley

Representative: Scott Streightiff, architect

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

Mr. Streightiff introduced the petition and the request for a side yard setback variance for a rear addition. He noted the addition is single story and that enhanced landscaping is planned along the east property line. He noted that the addition will encroach 4.5 feet into the 15 foot side yard setback. He noted that the proposed addition steps in slightly from the existing structure, to the extent possible. He described the existing house and surrounding neighborhood. He noted that the property owners' have lived in the house for a several years and desire to enhance the home in a way that meets their needs while being sensitive to the surrounding neighbors. He noted that the existing house encroaches into the side yard setback.

Ms. Friedrich noted that this request is for a side yard setback variance to allow a rear addition, on the east side of the property, to be constructed 10 feet 2 inches from the east property line. She noted that the setback requirement is 15 feet for this property in the R-3 District adding that the existing house is non-conforming to the side yard setback. She noted that the lot does not meet the current minimum lot size or lot width requirements. She noted that the residence was constructed in 1955, prior to the zoning requirements that are in place today. She noted that the petitioners explored shifting the addition further to the west, but to accommodate access to the rear yard from the main mass of the house, shifting it far enough to meet the setback requirement was not desirable. She noted that there is an existing hedge row on the east property line and the property owner's intend on enhancing the property line with additional plantings.

Chairman Pasquesi invited questions from the Board.

In response to questions from Board member Nehring, Mr. Streightiff noted that the property drains to the west and the south. He stated that a drainage and grading plan will be prepared for review by the City to assure that there are not negative off site drainage impacts.

Ms. O'Malley noted that the house is a split level and that the eastern part of the yard is drier than the rest of the property.

In response to questions from Board member Rose, Mr. Streightiff noted that the patio shown on the plan is conceptual at this point. He stated that the only additional plantings proposed are along the east side of the addition.

Hearing no requests for public testimony, Chairman Pasquesi returned the discussion to the Board.

Board member Novit commended the plan and stated appreciation for the one story configuration of the addition. She noted that the additional landscape screening is important to minimize the impact on the neighbor to the east.

Chairman Pasquesi agreed with Board member Novit's comments.

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

Board member Novit made a motion to recommend approval to the City Council of the side yard setback variance to allow an addition to be constructed no closer than 10'2" to the east property line, consistent with the site plan submitted to the Board.

The motion was seconded by Board member Sieman and was approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

5. Consideration of a request for variances from the corner side yard and rear yard setback requirements to allow construction of additions and alterations to the residence at 365 Chiltern Drive.

Property Owner: Adam Milewski

Representative: Wojtek Bialy, designer

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

Mr. Bialy introduced the petition and noted that the existing ranch home is nonconforming to the corner side and rear yard setback requirements. He noted that a second story addition is proposed over the existing single story structure and pointed out that the addition will follow the nonconforming footprint of the existing house although the eave overhangs on the addition will slightly reduce the extent of the encroachment. He noted that a complete demolition of the home was considered however, due to the limited buildable area, one or more variances would likely still be required. He described the design aspects of the project. He noted that the proposed rear porch will be in compliance with the setbacks.

Ms. Friedrich noted that this is a request for a second story addition over an existing single story structure that does not currently conform to the setback requirements.

She noted that the existing rear porch which encroaches into the rear yard setback will be removed. She noted that there is a semi-enclosed area in front of the existing garage within the corner side yard setback and noted that this area is proposed to be more fully enclosed. She noted that the existing property does not meet the current lot width and lot size requirements. She noted that in addition to the existing landscape screening on the site, additional plantings area planned around the foundation. She noted that the setback variance request is to allow the second story addition to generally follow the form of the existing house, no closer than 30 feet to the west property line and no closer than 36 feet to the north property line.

Chairman Pasquesi invited questions from the Board.

In response to questions from Board member Moorhead, Ms. Friedrich confirmed that the design aspects of the project are under review by the Building Review Board. She confirmed that the project conformed to the height limitation in the Code.

In response to questions from Board member Novit, Ms. Friedrich confirmed that the project conforms to the building scale limitations in the Code.

In response to questions from Board member Rose, Ms. Friedrich noted that some further refinements will be made to the plans including the addition of landscaping.

Chairman Pasquesi invited public testimony, hearing none, he returned the discussion to the Board.

Board member Novit expressed concern about the height of the proposed residence, especially in comparison to the nearby ranch homes. She acknowledged however that the project conforms to height and square footage requirements.

Board member Nehring noted that she initially had the same concern as Board member Novit and noted that the existing landscaping will be helpful in screening the height of the new mass.

Board member Moorhead agreed with Board member Novit's comments but acknowledged that height is not a consideration for the Zoning Board of Appeals. He noted that the proposed addition will not encroach any further into the setback than the existing house. He stated support for the petition.

Chairman Pasquesi agreed with the comments of the other Board members. He noted that the Building Review Board will study the massing and height. Hearing no further comments from the Board, he invited a motion.

Board member Moorhead made a motion to recommend approval to the City Council of corner side and rear yard variances to allow a second story addition and exterior modifications to be constructed no closer than 30 feet to the corner side (west) property line and no closer than 36 feet to the rear (south) property line, consistent with the site plan submitted to the Board.

The motion was seconded by Board member Novit and was approved by a vote of 7 to 0.

4. Public testimony on non-agenda items.

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

5. Additional information from staff.

Ms. Friedrich noted that the next meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 26, 2021.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle E. Friedrich
Planning Technician