

**WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES
OCTOBER 14, 2024**

Zoning Board Members Present: Matt Bradley, Chairman
Mark Haller
Lynn Hanley
Kathryn Leister
Kate Casale MacNally
Mike Nielsen
Todd Vender

Zoning Board Members Absent: None

Village Staff: David Schoon, Director of Community Development
Ann Klaassen, Assistant Director of Community Development
Christopher Marx, Assistant Planner

Village Attorney: Peter Friedman

Call to Order & Roll Call:

Chairman Bradley called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Roll call was taken of the Board Members present.

Approval of Meeting Minutes.

Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to approve the September 9, 2024, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the September 9, 2024, meeting minutes was made by Ms. Casale MacNally and seconded by Ms. Hanley. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 7 to 0:

AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Leister, Casale MacNally, Nielsen, Vender

NAYS: None

Community Development Report.

Mr. Schoon stated there is no Community Development Report.

Chairman Bradley stated the agenda would be taken out of order and called Case No. 24-20-V2.

New Cases:

a. **Case No. 24-20-V2: 595 Elm Street:** An application seeking approval of a variation to allow construction of a second floor addition to the existing residence at 595 Elm Street. The requested variation would permit the proposed addition to provide less than the minimum required side yard setback from the west property line. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.

Mr. Marx identified the property's location and zoning classification and described how the lot is legally nonconforming and the request encroached into the required side yard setback by 6.02 feet. He also identified the south façade and described the proposed second story addition location and provided a summary of the variation being requested. Mr. Marx then identified the proposed floor plan and south and west elevation renderings. He stated the Board may consider the options on page 405 in the agenda packet and asked if there were any questions.

1 Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time. He then
2 swore in those speaking to this matter.

3
4 Healy Rice introduced herself as the project architect representing the homeowners. She stated they were
5 granted the HAIS historic bonus in August 2024 and planned to construct the proposed addition over the
6 existing garage. Ms. Rice referred to the 2002 garage expansion which would be extended upward and
7 asked if there were any questions. She added the proposed location represented the most logical location.
8

9 Ms. Hanley asked if any addition would have triggered a variation. Mr. Marx responded although the
10 property was granted a historical maximum building size bonus, they could have possibly located the
11 proposed addition to take advantage of the extra GFA in another location which did not require a side
12 yard variation. Mr. Haller asked if any comments were received from the neighbors. Mr. Marx noted no
13 public comments were received. Mr. Haller referred to the space over the side door and asked if it was
14 done to continue the roofline. Ms. Rice explained the reasoning for that space which is necessary for the
15 hallway. No additional questions were raised at this time.
16

17 Chairman Bradley asked if there was any public comment. No comments were made at this time. He then
18 called the matter in for discussion.
19

20 Chairman Bradley stated the home currently contained an existing nonconformity and since no other
21 zoning relief is being sought, the project did not present an issue and referred to the reasonable return
22 standard with the remaining standards being met. He stated he would be in favor of the request. Mr.
23 Vender agreed with Chairman Bradley's comments. Mr. Haller referred to standard no. 4 and stated since
24 there has been no objection, he would also be in favor of the request. Ms. Casale MacNally stated since
25 the project would be extended straight up, it would maintain the home's look and feel and allow the
26 Village to keep the older historic home. She stated she would also be in favor of the request. Ms. Hanley
27 and Ms. Leister agreed with the comments made. Mr. Nielsen also referred to the reasonable return
28 standard which the home could achieve without the project but since the project would not create a larger
29 setback encroachment, he would be in favor of the request.
30

31 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to recommend approval of the variation as noted on page nos. 405
32 and 406. A motion as stated by Chairman Bradley was made by Ms. Casale MacNally and seconded by Mr.
33 Nielsen. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 7 to 0:

34 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Leister, Casale MacNally, Nielsen, Vender

35 NAYS: None
36

37 **b. Case No. 24-08-SU: 225 Sheridan Road - Centennial Park & Beach: An application seeking**
38 **approval of (i) a Special Use Permit to allow construction of improvements to the existing park and**
39 **beach; (ii) a zoning variation to allow fences and walls to exceed the maximum permitted wall and fence**
40 **heights allowed in a front yard setback; and (iii) steep slope exceptions to allow walkways, retaining**
41 **walls, steps, and seating areas within the steep slope zone. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on**
42 **this request.**

43 Chairman Bradley first explained how the presentation would take place. Mr. Schoon provided
44 background information related to the request including the Winnetka Park District's role and the zoning
45 relief application in detail, as well as the review and approval process, the steep slope regulations recently
46 adopted and the public trust doctrine. Ms. Klaassen outlined the specific details related to the zoning
47 request relief and identified the property's location, zoning classification and stated that public parks and
48 recreation facilities are allowed as a special use in the R-2 district. She also stated that the lakefront

1 preservation overlay district regulations do not apply but would if a portion of the public park became
2 privately owned. She then referred to images of the park from varying viewpoints. Ms. Klaassen provided
3 an overview of the proposed uses and improvements. She also identified the proposed bluff
4 improvements in detail as well as the proposed landscape plans and improvements along the beach and
5 access points.

6
7 Ms. Klaassen then explained the requested zoning relief in detail which is identified in the table. She stated
8 the Plan Commission and Design Review Board would also consider the proposed plan following the
9 Board's review. Ms. Klaassen referred to the Police Department's recommendation for security cameras,
10 and the Village Engineer's comments regarding the installation of a more robust permanent method to
11 notify the public for when the pier is closed due to high wave action. She referred to the variation and
12 special use standards the Board is to consider which are included in the packet. Ms. Klaassen then stated
13 following the applicant's presentation and public comment, the Board may either continue the public
14 hearing to a specific date to allow the applicant and Village staff time to provide additional information
15 or consider a motion to recommend approval or denial to the Village Council with draft language included
16 beginning on page 28 of the packet.

17
18 Chairman Bradley then asked for the applicant's presentation and swore in all those present at the
19 meeting that would like to speak on this matter.

20
21 Christina Codo, President of the Winnetka Park District Board of Commissioners, introduced herself to the
22 Board and stated they plan to discuss the proposed plans for repairs, protections, and ADA access
23 elements for Centennial Park and beach with the goal being to ensure that this project not only aligns with
24 the Park District's mission statement and the Village's 2040 Plan as well as the new zoning regulations,
25 but also incorporates the changes recommended by Winnetka residents over the past two years while
26 preserving the natural beauty of the lake environment. She noted tonight Park District staff and
27 consultants will present the Centennial improvements, reviewing the project from its starting point - the
28 Winnetka Waterfront 2030 Plan to the plan we are presenting tonight, the result of hundreds of hours of
29 engagement and review. Ms. Codo stated that tonight's plan has been revised from their original plan
30 proposed in April 2022 that was withdrawn from consideration by the Park Board in June 2022. She
31 explained that the current plan was amended to prioritize improved and expanded views and reduce the
32 impact of large breakwater's as requested by Winnetka residents Ms. Codo stated that Centennial is the
33 District's fourth beach project; following Maple, Tower, and Lloyd. She referred to over 220 pages of public
34 comments and questions received and the extensive presentation planned which represented the first of
35 four meetings for the special use permit process. Ms. Codo then introduced Shannon Nazzal, Winnetka
36 Park District Executive Director, Costa Kutulus, Parks and Maintenance Director, Scott Freres of The Lakota
37 Group, Bill Loftus of Spaceco Engineering and Adam Simon of Ancel Glink, the Park District's attorney.

38
39 Costa Kutulus first identified the items that would be discussed during the presentation. Scott Freres
40 explained to the Board how the process evolved over the past 10 years, specifically relating to access in
41 terms of visual and accessibility for all community members. He explained how the process started with
42 an investigation at the state level with the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. He stated the Park
43 District wrote a grant for funding to study the lakefront in terms of studying their Master Plan which was
44 approved in 2016 and followed up with a Bluff Restoration Master Plan approved in 2019.

45
46 Mr. Kutulus explained how lake levels have changed and its evolution which took place over the course of
47 the last 10 years and contained dramatic events. Mr. Freres then referred to the 2030 Master Plan and
48 explained the amount of dialog that took place which was built around sustainable strategies for

1 operational excellence by the Park District as well as the shoreline's protection, preservation and
2 restoration. He stated a steering committee was established which helped develop the strategy for the
3 Master Plan and identified the seven pillars it contained. Mr. Freres stated the overwhelming takeaway
4 was that it needed to be for residents of all ages. He then explained in detail how the plan would
5 reestablish bluff habitats and revegetate it as well as provide for the removal of invasive species. Mr.
6 Freres also explained how the Comprehensive Plan and specific items were considered in terms of the
7 planning process.

8
9 Mr. Kutulus referred the Board to the implementation plan outline which he explained in detail as well as
10 the timeline for the application's planned presentation to the DRB, Plan Commission and the Village
11 Council and subsequent approval bodies. He identified the prior bluff restoration and beach
12 improvements in illustrations at other beaches and referred to before and after images for the proposed
13 project as well as their mission for long-term reinvestment in open space. He noted they have been
14 responding to all of the public input received and considered their concerns in the proposed plan. Mr.
15 Kutulus referred to the area's images during high lake levels and repairs which are part of the project. He
16 stated in terms of the regulatory process, he outlined the process in terms of the timeline for the permit
17 process and the departmental reviews required.

18
19 Shannon Nazzal explained the need for the special use permit since the property is zoned R-2 residential
20 including the variances to permit development in the front yard setback and exceptions to items in the
21 steep slope zone. Mr. Freres stated the standards would be addressed in the presentation. Mr. Kutulus
22 then outlined the site programming elements and mission alignment in detail which include an all access
23 swimming beach, a fenced dog beach and ADA park and beach access from Sheridan Road down to the
24 beach, as well as engaged viewing and access. He then referred to several illustrations and explained the
25 design elements for the project in detail.

26
27 Bill Loftus provided additional detail with regard to Element 1 which is the ADA accessibility route from
28 Sheridan Road to the end of the beach pier as well as the grade level change and the need for the retaining
29 walls. Mr. Kutulus also provided detail and boardwalk cross section images of the ADA accessibility route
30 which he indicated would have a subtle appearance. He outlined their responses to the standards and
31 their reasoning behind the variance requests. Mr. Kutulus then referred to the development in the steep
32 slope zone and Section 17.82.040 and identified the three elements for which they are requesting
33 exceptions and explained the reasoning behind those requests. He then referred to the six site renderings
34 which showed the plans as submitted to date. Mr. Kutulus then described the various elements and
35 several changes made to the proposal in illustrations in detail for the Board. He asked if there were any
36 questions.

37
38 Chairman Bradley asked for the Board's comments and questions prior to questions being taken from the
39 audience. Ms. Hanley asked the Village staff why the boardwalk is not considered an improvement in the
40 front yard setback and why it is not considered a deck. Mr. Haller also asked questions relating to the
41 walkway and why it would be allowed in the front yard setback. Mr. Schoon explained the reasoning to
42 the Board in that it is elevated and is being held up by the wall being constructed which would require
43 relief in either case. Ms. Hanley also questioned the type of maintenance equipment that would be used
44 for the ADA walkway. Mr. Kutulus described the proposed equipment to be used for maintenance and
45 noted stamped concrete would be used to provide the wooden effect on the boardwalk. Ms. Hanley then
46 asked how much of the slope would be excavated to accommodate the walkway. Mr. Kutulus referred to
47 a cross section image and identified the area to be cut out with the retaining wall installed.

48

1 Chairman Bradley asked for an additional explanation for Slide F in terms of users of the swimming beach
2 and users of the dog beach navigating the same area to enter each of the beaches. Mr. Kutulus identified
3 it as the main intersection and also identified an access gate and secondary gate leading to the dog beach.
4 He noted maintenance would be done after hours. Mr. Kutulus added a secondary access is also being
5 provided and explained the reasoning for the way the access points were set up and the alternative design
6 features which were considered. Chairman Bradley then referred to Slides J and K in the steep slope
7 exception and asked if they were not ADA accessible. Mr. Kutulus confirmed the stone steps are not ADA
8 accessible and identified areas of ADA accessibility.
9

10 Ms. Casale MacNally referred to page 169 and asked Village staff with regard to the subject property being
11 separate from Elder Park is that the request is being brought first. She also asked if a single plan could
12 have been brought before the Board for consideration for Centennial and Elder Park at one time. Mr.
13 Schoon responded the applicant could have submitted applications for both projects at the same time.
14 Ms. Casale MacNally asked the applicant if there was anywhere a guard station, bathrooms, water bottle
15 filling stations or shade were considered as part of the plan. Mr. Kutulus responded one lifeguard chair
16 would be provided and identified an area for the guard staff to be situated. He also identified two drinking
17 fountains in Centennial Park and a foot wash station next to the dog shower. Mr. Kutulus noted a
18 bathroom was not proposed for the site and the nearby Elder Lane beach house has a bathroom. Mr.
19 Nielsen questioned the need for 10-foot fencing and wall height. Mr. Kutulus responded the variation for
20 a 10 foot fence height is adjacent to the pier structure and noted the elevation of the area near the steel
21 wall is lower and described the varying elevation foot heights.
22

23 Mr. Haller asked if ADA ramp alternatives were considered that were less intrusive into the slope such as
24 a lift. Mr. Kutulus responded they discussed alternative elements to gain beach access but due to the size,
25 scale, cost, maintenance, etc., it made more sense to use the proposed walkway which would be the least
26 impactful and provide the most direct access. Mr. Haller asked for additional information relating to the
27 longer term plan to join both beaches. Mr. Kutulus explained their upcoming plan on the process to
28 connect both parcels and their reasoning not to include a bathroom at the Centennial site. Ms. Leister
29 questioned safety at the pier and asked what other regulatory bodies are evaluating it. Mr. Schoon
30 informed the Board that the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers and IDNR would have to review the pier design
31 and the Village Engineer and the coastal engineer would undertake a complete review of the pier. Mr.
32 Kutulus also provided additional information relating to safety which would also prohibit diving off the
33 pier. He added the proposed design would also serve to reduce rip currents. Mr. Haller asked for additional
34 information relating to the length of the dog beach compared to the swimming beach which Mr. Kutulus
35 provided to the Board. Mr. Haller asked how many dog beach passes there are. Ms. Nazzal informed the
36 Board there are over 350 dog beach passes with 175 active users.
37

38 Chairman Bradley then asked for public comment and provided an overview as to procedure.
39

40 Mark Mitchell, 224 Sheridan Road, read his concerns into the record relating to the proposed
41 development and referred to specific sections in the steep slope ordinance. He noted the proposed plans
42 would be very detrimental to his property and lack sufficient parking.
43

44 David Seaman, a former Park Board commissioner, referred to the amount of work that went into the
45 project's development over the years and described the proposed plan as much better. He stated they
46 need to invest in the lakefront to protect it and improve its access.
47

1 Dawn Livingston, 117 DeWindt Road, agreed with Mr. Seaman's comments and stated the Park Board was
2 elected to solve this problem. She asked for the Board to not comment on the items included in the plan
3 other than zoning issues.
4

5 Patty Mitchell stated she lives directly across the street from Centennial Park and that they purchased
6 their home 20 years ago. She described her views of the park as not overcrowded. She questioned the
7 need for the outlandish and unwanted change to the property and the project would turn the natural lake
8 into a dangerous rock pile. Ms. Mitchell stated the proposed plan would also increase traffic and asked
9 for the special use and zoning changes to not be allowed.
10

11 Joanna, resident of Winnetka, referred to the dog beach containment and the fact that it is not fully fenced
12 in. She commented they do not need a hermetically sealed dog beach and that the amount of proposed
13 fencing is not necessary.
14

15 Ted Wynnynchenko commented that this is not a pier, it's a breakwater and although the ordinary high
16 water mark is an item of concern relating to property line demarcation, it is not possible to determine the
17 boundary line between public and private ownership. He described the proposed fence installation as
18 improper. Mr. Wynnynchenko also stated the IDNR and U.S. Army Corp of Engineers do not comment on
19 safety issues and he made comments relating to sand height.
20

21 Steve Juliusson, 1436 Asbury, provided everyone with an overview of the two beaches at Centennial and
22 Elder which he read into the record. He urged the Board to reject the application.
23

24 John Root referred to an illustration and identified the Park District's plan to use the pier to separate the
25 human beach from the dog beach and serve as an amenity to view the lake. He stated the request would
26 result in two piers which violated lakefront construction ordinances with unnecessary building in the lake
27 as well as provided comments on sand and bluff retention. Mr. Root also referred to the claim that the
28 pier is being considered a wall.
29

30 Laurie Morse, a non-Winnetka resident, described the existing Centennial beach as the best beach in the
31 area. She stated water levels and accretions have occurred over the years and there is no urgency to
32 resolve the issue as had been claimed. Ms. Morse stated the answers to the safety questions were not
33 adequate and reiterated the IDNR and U.S. Army Corp of Engineers do not review safety concerns. She
34 referred to the insurance agency which did consider safety concerns and asked the Board to consider the
35 actual safety concerns. Ms. Morse added half of the beach should not be dedicated to dogs and a fence
36 should not be approved and additional sand is not needed.
37

38 Chuck Dowding described his background as a professor of civil and environmental engineering at
39 Northwestern and disagreed that the plan increased access. He described in detail how the proposed plan
40 restricted access in areas he identified and also discussed how the side yard setback should not be violated
41 by the proposed development.
42

43 Katie Stevens referred to the statement made that the public is not allowed to walk on the water line and
44 referred to the 2019 Elder Lane approval. She made several other comments relating to the water level
45 and the dangerous conditions relating to their kayaking experience and the rocks. Ms. Stevens stated the
46 large, proposed rocks are not what are minimally necessary as well as unsanitary beach conditions. She
47 concluded by asking that the project not be approved.
48

1 Mary Garrison referred to the approved steep slope ordinance and compliance with ADA requirements
2 being vital in all Village projects. She stated the proposed ADA pathway variation presented a significant
3 threat to the bluff and is full of significant safety risks and suggested the use of a less invasive alternative
4 such as an ADA lift. Ms. Garrison then asked for the variation to be denied.
5

6 Melissa Mizel referred to the neighborhood character standard and commented on the obstructed view
7 the proposal would cause with which the Park District's plan is greatly at odds. She asked for 3D modeling
8 of the project to assist in decision making prior to any approvals.
9

10 Kimberly Marsh, 360 Forest, urged the Board to table or vote against the special use permit and
11 commented on the view obstruction the proposal would cause and create detrimental safety issues. She
12 described the recent safety incidents and stated the proposed break wall would impede safety views.
13

14 John Edwardson, 301 Sheridan Road, described improvements recently made on his property and the
15 amount of approvals necessary. He stated he is concerned with beach erosion and referred to the amount
16 of money lakefront owners have spent on protections. Mr. Edwardson asked for the bluff to be protected
17 at the lake level to prevent further erosion of the bluff.
18

19 Linda Welch stated the proposed improvements would harm general welfare and safety by covering the
20 lake and beach with steel, stone, concrete, block site lines and create a major safety hazard. She also
21 stated it violated lake front ordinances since it is significantly more than is necessary for its intended
22 purpose. Ms. Welch described simpler alternatives used to separate the dog beach from the human beach
23 and asked for the application to be rejected.
24

25 Peggy Martay stated she has been following plans concerning the Centennial and Elder beaches over the
26 years and that the photos do not accurately depict the proposal. She asked the Board Members to visit
27 the beach prior to voting.
28

29 Susie Schreiber, a former Park District Board member, described her background and responded to the
30 comments made relating to the Centennial bathroom. She stated the Great Lakes are federal waters and
31 read related statements into the record. Ms. Schreiber stated offshore improvements can be used to
32 provide protections which would not directly impact the bluffs and asked the Board to not yet vote on
33 this matter.
34

35 Teresa Claybrook, a former Park District Board Member, stated she was part of the lakefront Master Plan
36 team for which an extensive amount of community input was contained. She stated she is in full support
37 of the plan as presented which addressed key issues discussed years ago in addressing items in the
38 lakefront Master Plan with regard to access and ADA compliance. Ms. Claybrook stated the Lloyd beach
39 break water installation has been successful and the proposed pier would serve the same function at
40 Centennial Beach. She concluded the Park District has performed its due diligence and encouraged the
41 Board to approve the plan.
42

43 Kris Schriesheim commented on whether the proposed plan is reasonably necessary for a dog beach and
44 stated the plan threatened public health with a lack of a bathroom. She also commented on there not
45 being enough lifeguards. Ms. Schriesheim stated piers and break walls create riptides, drowning risks, etc.
46 and referred to the lack of safety measures. She stated the non-professional lifeguards' safety would be
47 threatened by the break walls and currents and read a statement from the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers

1 relating to safety. Ms. Schriesheim then referred to an illustration comparing Navy Pier to the proposal
2 which she stated would draw increased activity.

3
4 David Stevens commented the Park District's hard work did not guarantee a good result and identified
5 several issues including the residents' opinions. He stated the second factor is that the plan did not take
6 into account elders and did not represent a comprehensive plan. Mr. Stevens also referred to previously
7 raised safety concerns and asked the Board to table the matter until a more comprehensive proposal is
8 submitted.

9
10 Wendy Dury, 339 Sheridan Road, agreed with Mr. Stevens' comments and described the difficulties she
11 experienced swimming including water clarity as a result of the lakefront improvements being constructed
12 south of Centennial Park. She also asked for the proposal to be tabled.

13
14 A neighbor spoke on behalf of Irene Smith and read Ms. Smith's letter into the record which included a
15 request to table the application.

16
17 Carol Rasmus agreed with Mr. Edwardson's comments relating to beach erosion. She stated the pier is
18 unsightly, unneeded and unwanted and should have been put to a referendum. No additional public
19 comments were made at this time.

20
21 Chairman Bradley closed public comment and thanked the public for their comments. He offered the
22 applicant the opportunity to respond to concerns raised at this time or at a later date. Chairman Bradley
23 suggested the matter be continued to a date certain. Ms. Nazzal stated they are willing to answer
24 questions tonight but if the Board wished to continue the matter, they are willing to make an
25 accommodation. Chairman Bradley then asked the Board if they had any questions or would like to
26 continue the matter to a date certain. Several Board Members agreed to continue the matter. Mr. Simon
27 asked for the Board to provide their questions to the Village staff.

28
29 Chairman Bradley stated his questions relate to the steep slope ordinance and the access ramp framed as
30 being ADA accessible and asked what specifically drove the 10 foot width and if mitigation efforts were
31 considered to minimize it. He then referred to the outcropping stones and pavement and asked for
32 clarification as to why the 6 foot width is being proposed as opposed to the 5 foot width allowed by right
33 as well as for the mid bluff paver walkway relating to the variation. Chairman Bradley stated special use
34 standard nos. 1, 2 and 3 have not been adequately addressed and also asked for additional clarity relating
35 to parking and the increased use.

36
37 Ms. Hanley asked for additional information relating to public safety and beach access and asked for
38 additional engineering or justification for the pier as designed in terms of it being a want or need. She also
39 questioned how to minimize safety risks and for additional information relating to beach access in
40 connection with the walkway around the dog beach which cut off access along the water. Ms. Hanley also
41 questioned how the fence would be positioned along the water.

42
43 Mr. Vender referred to the comments raised relating to the fence's appearance as well as the parking
44 concerns. Mr. Haller asked for additional information relating to coastal engineering reviews being done
45 as well as the essential character of the locality which would result in a different characteristic as a beach
46 and a park. Chairman Bradley referred to the Elder beach curiosity and suggested a lot of concerns would
47 be allayed if what is planned on that parcel would create a bootstrapping approval on subsequent
48 requests. He confirmed the Board considered projects as being separate.

1 Ms. Nazzal stated the Elder beach special use permit is not ready yet although the application has been
2 submitted to the Village. She stated that information may be contained in the application for which they
3 have not yet received comments back. Mr. Haller added it appeared funding is coming from another
4 individual which is conditioned on approvals as submitted. He asked if that created a problem for the
5 applicant if the planned changed. Mr. Simon stated they are aware they have to go through all of the
6 regulatory steps and confirmed that the project's funding is independent of the Board's review.

7
8 Ms. Leister asked about the 50 year restrictive covenant and the maintenance obligations embedded in
9 that and how that might interact with work that would need to be done in the future and what we're
10 signing off on now if it's just on what's being done now or if they would have to come back in the future
11 for any improvements related to maintenance and what's the prioritization is legally in terms of who
12 would have sign off rights. Mr. Simon stated the Park District with its experts, its consultants, community
13 input, put together the Park District's plan. He explained that what the Board sees tonight is the Park
14 District's plan. Mr. Simon stated they have a donor who likes the Park District's plan and they have offered
15 to support the District. He stated they have said that they want the District to support this plan for 50
16 years as the District has shown it. Mr. Simon stated they have to maintain what they are showing.

17
18 Chairman Bradley then asked for a motion to continue the request to the next regular ZBA meeting on
19 November 11, 2024. The Board Members discussed their availability. Mr. Nielsen moved to continue the
20 application to November 11, 2024, and reserved the right to open public comment. Mr. Haller seconded
21 the motion. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 7 to 0:

22 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Leister, Casale MacNally, Nielsen, Vender

23 NAYS: None

24
25 **New Business:**

26 a. **November 11, 2024, Meeting - Quorum Check.**

27 The Board Members previously discussed their availability.

28
29 **Public Comment:**

30 No comments were made at this time.

31
32 **Adjournment:**

33 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Casale MacNally
34 and seconded by Mr. Nielsen. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 7 to 0:

35 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Leister, Casale MacNally, Nielsen, Vender

36 NAYS: None

37 The meeting adjourned at 11:03 p.m.

38
39 Respectfully submitted,

40
41 Antionette Johnson

42 Recording Secretary