

VILLAGE OF HOMEWOOD



MEMORANDUM

DATE OF MEETING: April 9, 2026

To: Planning and Zoning Commission

From: Noah Schumerth, Assistant Director of Economic and Community Development

Through: Angela Mesaros, Director of Economic and Community Development

Topic: Case 26-02: Variance for Bulk and Dimensional Standards at 17863 Golfview Avenue

APPLICATION INFORMATION

APPLICANT	Steven Scott
ACTION REQUESTED	Variance
ADDRESS	17863 Golfview Avenue, Homewood, IL 60430
PIN	29-31-121-008

ZONING & LAND USE

SUBJECT PROPERTY	ZONING	LAND USE
CURRENT	R-1 Single-Family Residence	Vacant (formerly single-family residence, demolished 2011)
SURROUNDING	N: R-1 Single-Family Residence	Single-family residence
	E: R-1 Single-Family Residence	Single-family residence
	S: PL-2 Public Land and Open Space	Golf course (Ravisloe CC)
	W: PL-2 Public Land and Open Space	Golf course (Ravisloe CC)

LEGAL NOTICE

Legal notice was initially published in *Daily Southtown* on February 11, 2026. Letters were sent to property owners and residents within 250’.

Legal notice was published in the *Daily Southtown* on March 25, 2026 after the applicant changed the extent of the variance request. Letters were sent to property owners and residents within 250’.

DOCUMENTS FOR REVIEW

Title	Pages	Prepared by	Date
Application	3	Steven Scott, Applicant	01/26/2026
Narrative	6	Steven Scott, Applicant	04/01/2026
Variance Standards Worksheets	4	Steven Scott, Applicant	03/31/2026
Site Plan	1	Linden Group Inc., Architect	03/30/2026
Staff Exhibits	4	Noah Schumerth, A.D. ECD	04/03/2026

BACKGROUND

The applicant and property owner, Steven Scott, has requested a variance from bulk and dimensional standards in the R-1 Single-Family Residence zoning district. The variance would allow for the construction of a single-family residence on the property, located at 17863 Golfview Avenue in the R-1 Single-Family Residence zoning district.

The applicant has requested variances from maximum building coverage and maximum impervious surface coverage requirements, which apply to all lots in the R-1 zoning district. The applicant initially requested a variance from the rear setback requirement for the lot. The applicant has modified plans and removed this request from the application.

HISTORY

This property was initially constructed as a single-family residence in 1953. The residence was a one-story home with a front-facing garage. The home deteriorated in the 2000s, with numerous citations issued against the property owner due to the declining condition of the property. The home was demolished in 2011 by the former owner of the property. The property has remained as a vacant lot since the demolition of the original home on the property.

The property has been zoned R-1 since the initial platting of the lot in the 1930s. The lot became legal non-conforming with the adoption of subsequent zoning ordinances and remains legal non-conforming under the current Village Zoning Ordinance in 2023.

DISCUSSION

The applicant has proposed a 1,553 square-foot residence on the property. The residence is proposed to have a width of 36 feet and a depth of 62.5 feet. The residence will have an internal accessory dwelling unit, which is permitted by-right in the R-1 Single-Family Residence zoning district. The residence meets setback and height requirements of the R-1 zoning district:

- 30' front setback (30' required)
- 16' and 8' interior side setbacks (8' required each side)
- 40' rear setback (40' required)
- 25' 10" height (30' maximum)

The applicant has proposed to construct a detached garage and shed on the property. These two accessory structures are permitted structures and are located on the lot in conformance with current zoning requirements.

The lot is 8,130 square feet in area, which is smaller than the minimum lot size for the R-1 zoning district (minimum 10,400 square feet). The lot is 25% narrower and 22% smaller than a zoning lot platted to meet the current standards of the R-1 zoning district. This lot size minimum was established with the adoption of the current Village Zoning Ordinance in 2023. The lot is legal non-conforming.

The applicant has requested a variance from the building coverage and maximum impervious surface coverage standards of the R-1 zoning district. The applicant has requested the following variances:

- Maximum building coverage (max. 30% in R-1 zoning district) – **32.6% requested**
- Maximum impervious surface coverage (max. 40% in R-1 zoning district) – **52.3% requested**

The lot has additional development constraints due to the application of local building and engineering codes. These constraints include:

- **Driveway Location/Design:** The applicant must provide a minimum 10' wide driveway. The driveway may not require the relocation of the fire hydrant located at the southwest corner of the subject property, and the driveway must job to avoid impacting the hydrant. The driveway requires a "hammerhead" or similar design to allow for vehicles to turn around in the driveway.
- **Water Line:** A 6" water line runs near the southwest corner of the property and limits any improvements which may be constructed on this corner of the property.
- **Berm Required:** An existing berm in the rear (east) of the property drains water in the rear of the property to the south toward the golf course and must remain. No improvements may be constructed in a manner which interrupts this drainage (generally, improvements must remain outside of 10' from the rear property line unless otherwise approved by the Village engineer).
- **Drainage:** Drainage must be routed toward the front of the property and stormwater shall be directly to the existing sewer connection at an inlet on the southeastern end of Golfview Avenue.
- **Mature Vegetation:** The property has mature and healthy trees on both sides of the property, including large trees screening the golf course to the south of the subject property. Removal of trees of this size and quality is strongly discouraged under current Village tree preservation ordinances. These trees create additional development challenges for the property owner.

VARIANCE STANDARDS

(1) The Planning and Zoning Commission shall use the following standards when considering this variance request, as set forth in Section 44-07-12 of the Village Zoning Ordinance. No variance shall be granted unless findings of fact for each specific application demonstrate a suitable degree of hardship outside of the control of the property owner, and the minimal deviation from this chapter necessary, as provided in the applicant's response to each of the following standards:

- Can the property in question yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations governing the district in which it is located?*

The minimum lot size in the R-1 zoning district is 10,400 square feet with a minimum width of 80' (requires minimum lot depth of 130'). With minimum setbacks applied to the smallest permitted lot under current R-1 setbacks, the building envelope would be 3,480 square feet (64' width x 60' depth).

Under the current regulations of the lot, the building envelope on this lot would be reduced to 2,860 square feet. The applicant has proposed a home which meets these setbacks. The smaller size of the lot (25% smaller than a minimum permitted lot in the R-1 lot) causes a home meeting the standard setbacks of the lot to contribute significantly more to the building coverage of the lot than a similar home on a lot which fully conforms to all of the requirements of the R-1 zoning district. The footprint of the home proposed (1,554 square feet) is smaller than the footprint of homes on other properties in the same zoning district and in the immediate vicinity of the subject property.

The applicant has proposed a two-car garage and a shed, which are both accessory structures which are permitted under current zoning requirements. These accessory structures are found on most properties located in the immediate vicinity of the property and within the R-1 zoning district more broadly. The area of these structures will also contribute significantly more toward the building and impervious surface coverage of the lot than similar structures proposed on a lot which fully conforms to all of the requirements of the R-1 zoning district. The size of these structures is similar to those found on other properties in the immediate vicinity.

The current requirements of the zoning district in which the subject property is located create restrictions on the property owner's ability to construct a residential structure which conforms with the setbacks and development standards for structures in the R-1 zoning district and has similar characteristics to other structures in the immediate vicinity.

b. Is the plight of the owner due to unique circumstances?

The property was platted in the 1920s at a size that is significant smaller than the current lot size requirement for the R-1 zone. This neighborhood was platted prior to the adoption of Homewood's first zoning ordinance in 1928. The developer has not modified the lot in any manner since purchasing the lot in 2020. **The current conditions of the lot, including the lot size and shape, are similar to those found in the immediate vicinity of the property, but are unique to the R-1 zoning district broadly across the Village which is generally comprised of larger-lot residential properties.**

The property has additional development constraints which further constrain development, including the requirement to maintain a berm on the rear of the property and to maintain clearance for utilities in the southwest corner of the property. **The property has additional unique development constraints due to existing utilities and drainage concerns.**

The plight of the owner is deemed to be due to circumstances which are unique to either the subject property itself or the broader neighborhood when compared to similarly-zoned property.

c. If granted, will the variance alter the essential character of the locality?

The proposed development meets the setbacks of the R-1 zoning district. The proposed home will match setbacks with the next three adjacent homes to the north of the subject property (30'). The proposed home will also have setbacks of 8' and 16' on each side of the property, which are similar to those found on other properties in the immediate vicinity which have setbacks between 5' and 10'. The location of the home on the property will not alter the essential character of the area surrounding the subject property.

The proposed home will have two stories and be within the maximum height of the zoning district (30'). Two of the three homes immediately adjacent to the subject property are also two-story homes, and numerous other homes in the immediate vicinity are two-story homes. The height and massing of the home will not alter the essential character of the area surrounding the subject property.

The applicant has designed the lot to minimize disruption to mature trees which line both sides of the property, including trees which screen the neighborhood from Ravisloe Country Club to the south. The landscaping planned for this home will maintain the existing character of the neighborhood, which includes mature foliage and large trees throughout the neighborhood.

The proposed development has been designed to minimize impact on the surrounding neighborhood, and is unlikely to alter the essential character of the locality.

(2) Supplemental to the above standards, the decision-making authority shall also consider findings on the character of the alleged hardship and the potential impacts to neighboring properties of granting the variance, as provided in the applicant's response to each of the following standards. Not one of the standards is controlling.

d. Do the particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the subject property pose a particular hardship upon the owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, under the strict application of these regulations?

The lot is significantly smaller than the minimum lot size required for lots in the R-1 zoning district. The lot is 25% narrower and 22% smaller than the minimum size of lots permitted in the R-1 zoning district. The lot meets the minimum depth requirement of the R-1 zoning district, creating a uniquely narrow and deep lot compared to "standard" lots in the R-1 zoning district.

The subject property has additional site engineering requirements which apply to this particular property. Any development is required to maintain a berm which currently exists in the rear of the property, which drains water toward the southern property boundary. The Village Engineer has required that this berm be maintained to ensure proper drainage from the rear of the property. The Village Engineer has reviewed the proposed plans for the home and recommended that a flow diagram or similar exhibit be provided to demonstrate that the location of the proposed detached garage will not inhibit the flow of water from this berm to the southern property line.

Current engineering requirements for the driveway require additional turning radius to turn a vehicle around near the rear garages, including the one-car attached garage and the two-car detached garage. The applicant has requested both garage areas to provide covered parking for the attached accessory dwelling unit on the second floor of the proposed home. The Village Engineer has reviewed and approved the proposed driveway configuration, which adds significant amounts of paved area to the lot which increase the impervious surface coverage of the lot.

The lot also has dense vegetation growth to screen the property from the golf course. While the applicant proposes the removal of some of the undergrowth on this side of the property, the applicant has planned to retain all of the existing mature trees in this area. These trees provide an additional constraint on development of the property.

The shape, topographical and general physical condition of the property create additional development restrictions on the property under strict application of current zoning and engineering requirements of the Village.

e. Would the conditions upon which the petition for variance is based be generally applicable to other properties within the same zoning classification?

The subject property is located in the R-1 zoning district. The subject property currently has a width (60') and an overall lot area (8,130 s.f.) which are not in conformance with zoning requirements. The lot is

25% narrower and 22% smaller than a lot built to the current standards of the R-1 zoning district. The lot is determined to be legal non-conforming.

Staff completed an analysis of 26 properties within 500' of the subject property (see Staff Exhibits). This analysis found that 18 nearby properties have identical dimensions to the subject property (60' width x 135' depth, ~8,100 s.f. total area), which are not conforming with the current requirements of the R-1 zone (80' minimum width, 10,400 s.f. minimum area). These lots were platted prior to the current lot size requirements found in the Village Zoning Ordinance.

Of the 26 nearby properties analyzed, 8 properties (31%) exceed maximum allowable building coverage and 17 of 26 properties (65%) exceed maximum impervious surface coverage. Many of these lots are at or below the minimum allowable lot area for the R-1 zoning district.

The conditions of the subject property are similar to those found on other nearby properties located in the same zoning district. Should the variance be approved, the characteristics of the proposed development will be similar to the characteristics of existing development on nearby properties.

f. Has the alleged practical difficulty or particular hardship been created by any person presently having an interest in the property?

The owner purchased the property in 2020. **The lot has not been modified in any manner by the applicant or any other person having a current interest in the property.**

g. If granted, will the variance be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other neighboring property?

The proposed home meets the setback requirements of the R-1 zoning district and minimally impacts the mature vegetation on the property. The proposed development satisfies the engineering requirements placed on the property to mitigate any potential impact of drainage or utility access on surrounding properties. The property is unlikely to impact surrounding property and will not be detrimental to the welfare of the surrounding neighborhood or the general public.

The variance is unlikely to be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other neighboring property.

e. If granted, will the variance: impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property; or substantially increase the danger of fire or otherwise endanger the public safety; or substantially diminish or impair values of neighboring property?

The proposed single-family residence is permitted and is in alignment with the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed development is similar to those constructed on surrounding properties and is unlikely to impact the value of neighboring property. The proposed development is subject to all applicable residential building and fire codes to ensure the safety of occupants and the general public.

The variance to increase building coverage and impervious surface coverage are also unlikely to impact the surrounding property or the general public. **The variance is unlikely to impair the adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, substantially increase the danger of fire, endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair the value of neighboring property.**

FINDINGS OF FACT

Staff has prepared the draft findings of fact in accordance with the standards set forth in Section 44-07-12 of the Village Zoning Ordinance for special use permit applications. The findings of fact, as proposed or as amended, may be entered into the record:

1. The subject property is a 0.18-acre parcel, identified as Cook County PIN #29-31-121-008;
2. The subject property is owned by Steven Scott, the applicant for the proposed variance;
3. The subject property is located within the R-1 Single-Family Residence zoning district;
4. The subject property is proposed to be developed as a single-family residence;
5. The proposed development will include a two-story home with an internal accessory dwelling unit as permitted by-right in the R-1 Single-Family Residence zoning district;
6. The proposed development will include a detached garage and accessory shed, two accessory structures which are permitted by-right in the R-1 Single-Family Residence zoning district;
7. The bulk and dimensional standards of the R-1 Single-Family Residence zoning district, set forth in Table 44-03-01 of the Village Zoning Ordinance, restrict properties to a maximum building coverage of 30% of any lot and maximum impervious surface coverage of 40% of any lot;
8. The applicant has requested a variance from Table 44-03-01 of the Village Zoning Ordinance to permit the construction of a single-family residence which exceeds the maximum building coverage for the lot by 2.6% (211 square feet) and the maximum impervious surface coverage for the lot by 12.3% (1,000 square feet).
9. The proposed development meets the setback requirements and other applicable zoning and engineering requirements applied to the subject property;
10. The proposed variance for building coverage and impervious surface coverage standards meets the Standards of Variance required to be met prior to approval of any variation from the Village Zoning Ordinance.

RECOMMENDED PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION ACTION

The Planning and Zoning Commission may wish to consider the following motion:

Approve Case 26-02: Variance for Bulk and Dimensional Standards at 17863 Golfview Avenue, to permit the construction of a single-family dwelling residence which exceeds the maximum building coverage and impervious surface coverage requirements which apply to the property, subject to the following condition:

1. The applicant shall provide a copy of flow diagrams or other grading and drainage plans as requested by the Village Engineer to demonstrate drainage from the rear 15’ of the property. The drawings shall be reviewed and approved by the Village Engineer prior to issuance of building permits.

AND

Incorporate the Findings of Fact into the record.