

**WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 9, 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
Christopher Marx, Associate Planner

Village Attorney: Peter Friedman

Call to Order & Roll Call:

Chairman Bradley called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. Roll call was taken of the Board Members present.

Approval of Meeting Minutes.

Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to approve the November 11, 2024, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the November 11, 2024, meeting minutes was made by Ms. Casale MacNally and seconded by Mr. Nielsen. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 7 to 0:

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

NAYS: None

Community Development Report.

Mr. Schoon stated there is no Community Development Report.

Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to call the agenda out of order. A motion to present Case No. 24-27-V, 780 Prospect Avenue, was made by Mr. Nielsen and seconded by Ms. Casale MacNally. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 7 to 0:

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

NAYS: None

New Cases:

a. Case No. 24-27-V: 780 Prospect Avenue: An application seeking approval of a zoning variation to allow construction of a one-story addition to the existing residence at 780 Prospect Avenue. The requested variation would permit the addition to exceed the maximum permitted gross floor area. The Zoning Board of Appeals has final jurisdiction on this request.

Mr. Marx identified the variation being requested and property's owner, location, size and zoning classification in addition to where the home is legally nonconforming. He referred to the pictures of the home from various vantage points and identified the proposed addition's location. Mr. Marx explained the need for the GFA variation and referred to illustrations of the proposed addition including a

1 mudroom and rear entrance extension as well as the proposed elevation renderings. He stated following
2 the applicant's presentation, public comment and Board discussion, a Board Member may make a
3 motion to approve or deny the request. Mr. Marx noted one public correspondence was received and
4 included in the agenda packet as Attachment E and asked if there were any questions. No questions
5 were raised at this time.

6
7 Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Ellen Whitehead, the project architect, stated
8 that the historic home was purchased by Sarah and Chris Martinez in 2019 and identified the home's
9 nonconforming aspects in the corner yard setback and minimum lot area. She stated the lot is
10 undersized for the zoning district, was built in the early 1900's and has had several additions by various
11 owners. Ms. Whitehead stated the 159 square-foot mudroom would be added at the rear of the home
12 and stated the home has minimal storage on the first floor. She explained how the rear entrance serves
13 as a main access point of the home and goes right into the main living area, while adding that a
14 mudroom addition would allow that area to not be interrupted while adding valuable storage space. She
15 also explained that the addition would use some of the home's existing footprint without compromising
16 the connection of the existing living space. Ms. Whitehead then asked if there were any questions. No
17 questions were raised at this time.

18
19 Chairman Bradley asked for public comment. No comments were made at this time. Chairman Bradley
20 then called the matter in for discussion.

21
22 Ms. Casale MacNally stated she is in favor of the request and commented on how the proposed addition
23 would maintain the home's look and feel and add value to the home with a much-needed amenity in the
24 older home. She added she appreciated the applicants' attempts to keep an older home and the
25 neighbors' comments in support. Mr. Haller agreed with Ms. Casale MacNally's comments and noted
26 there were no objections from the neighbors. He also described the request as a reasonable ask. Ms.
27 Leister agreed with the comments made. Mr. Vender stated he had no issues with the request. Ms.
28 Hanley stated the request is for a large home on a small lot and that the request did not meet the first
29 standard in particular. Mr. Nielsen agreed with Ms. Hanley's comments although he felt it was not a
30 huge request. Chairman Bradley described the difficulty of projects such in meeting standards, while the
31 home's nonconformities and the lot's uniqueness should be taken into consideration. He also stated
32 with regard to reasonable return, while mudrooms are nice to have, they are not essential and referred
33 to the amount of additions by previous owners. Chairman Bradley referred back to the uniqueness of
34 the lot size in regard to its zoning district and that he would be in support of the request, given that it's a
35 minimal request.

36
37 Chairman Bradley then asked for a motion to approve the request. A motion to approve the request was
38 made by Mr. Haller and seconded by Ms. Casale MacNally. A vote was taken and the motion passed, 6 to
39 1:

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

41 NAYS: Hanley

42
43 **Continued Cases:**

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

1 **request. This item was continued from the October 14, 2024 and November 11, 2024 Zoning Board of**
2 **Appeals meetings.**

3 Chairman Bradley explained how the meeting would proceed and swore in those speaking to this
4 matter. Mr. Schoon provided a summary of the November 11, 2024, meeting. He stated following the
5 applicant's presentation and public comment, he explained the Board's options in detail and then asked
6 if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time.

7
8 Chairman Bradley asked for the applicant's presentation. Christina Codo, Winnetka Park District Board of
9 Commissioners' President, stated their presentation would focus on key project components which
10 were identified as areas of concern including: (i) the pier's design and to ensure it met engineering and
11 safety standards, (ii) to ensure the pier's safety particularly with regard to access and usage, (iii) address
12 parking and usage concerns and how they would be effectively managed, (iv) updates to restroom
13 facilities to ensure they are functional and accessible, (v) the pedestrian bypass and (vi) beach closure
14 and signage to ensure clear and concise communication with the public. She stated they appreciated the
15 Board's input and the opportunity to address community concerns noting they are dedicated to
16 delivering a project which would serve the community for generations to come. Ms. Codo then
17 introduced Shannon Nazzal, the Winnetka Park District Executive Director, Costa Kutulus, Parks and
18 Maintenance Director, Morgan Chapman, The Lakota Group, Bill Loftus, Spaceco Engineering, Peter
19 Lemmon, Kimley Horn, and Adam Simon, the Park District Attorney.

20
21 Costa Kutulus stated they would review the agenda items previously discussed and would elaborate on
22 the pier's design, pier safety, parking and traffic, public restrooms and pedestrian bypass which were the
23 concerns raised at the last meeting. He noted any changes and findings determined at this meeting
24 would have to be reviewed by the Park District Board via their review and approval process. Mr. Kutulus
25 referred to the plan design's renderings and identified several of its elements which have remained as
26 proposed. He stated the pier design's focus was based on coastal engineering and comments from the
27 public while identifying lakebed down cutting and littoral drift which he described in detail as being the
28 reasons for the pier and armor stone surround. Mr. Kutulus identified illustrations of littoral barrier
29 examples at several other beaches over the course of several years as well as images of the pier's cross
30 sections. He then provided additional details in terms of the need for the structure's size and scale with
31 regard to its appearance relating to the lake levels.

32
33 Shannon Nazzal read a design statement they received from Red Barn, the project's coastal engineer,
34 into the record. Mr. Kutulus identified the statement as a key piece with regard to the project's design
35 intent and which is minimally necessary to achieve their goal.

36
37 Mr. Kutulus then referred to beach safety and stated he would discuss the elements which fell under the
38 design parameters and safety expectations. He referred to illustrations of pier structures in several other
39 locations as well a comparison of the proposed pier and the Maple Street Beach pier, both of which he
40 described in detail. He stated with regard to swim zones, he referred to images of the proposed swim
41 zones with barriers and are monitored by lifeguards. Ms. Nazzal explained to the Board in detail the
42 lifeguard certification process through the American Red Cross as well as their scheduling and the audit
43 review process. She also provided information related to their newly launched beach water safety
44 campaign.

45
46 Mr. Kutulus stated with regard to the parking and traffic concerns, their traffic consultant would speak
47 in that regard and informed the Board while they would be willing to build additional parking, previously
48 made comments from the community indicated a preference for the balance of greenspace. He stated

1 they are confident in their ability to manage the site with the existing conditions versus taking away
2 greenspace for additional parking. Mr. Kutulus then stated they would discuss ways in which they
3 planned to address the initial surge as a result of the new project and once it normalized after time. He
4 also described the existing parking spaces at Centennial, Elder, Tower and Lloyd beaches.

5
6 Peter Lemmon, traffic engineer, stated with regard to traffic generation, he described the considerations
7 in detail in connection with new uses. He also described the initial uptick with the new beach
8 improvements which would normalize after the first couple of seasons. Mr. Lemmon stated they
9 determined there would not be a lot of traffic drawn to the site over what they are able to
10 accommodate. He then described existing parking and traffic conditions at several beach locations. Mr.
11 Lemmon also referred to comparable North Shore swimming beaches and parking conditions. He then
12 stated with regard to parking measures if there are determined to be issues, he described restrictions
13 that could be imposed such as signage, management and overflow parking at nearby schools. Mr.
14 Lemmon then referred to the special use standards and explained how there would be no significant
15 issues in terms of the amount of parking, vehicular and pedestrian access. Mr. Kutulus then described
16 optional available parking in the area which can be considered if needed.

17
18 Mr. Kutulus then stated with regard to the restroom concerns, they would be able to provide a
19 seasonable ADA accessible portable restroom. He also referred to the option to combine both sites in
20 the future. Mr. Kutulus then stated with regard to the pedestrian bypass concerns, they can consider an
21 easement agreement with the neighbor which he described for the Board. He then summarized their
22 responses to the concerns raised and reiterated the proposed changes would have to be approved by
23 the Park District Board. Mr. Kutulus then asked if there were any questions.

24
25 Chairman Bradley first asked if there were any questions from the Board. Ms. Hanley referred to the
26 swim zone illustration and questioned how swimmers would be able to determine where to swim. Mr.
27 Kutulus described and explained the swim zone limitation elements as well as the amount of lifeguards
28 monitoring the beach. Ms. Hanley stated with regard to parking, she asked if the beach lots have
29 residents only parking restrictions. Mr. Kutulus explained how restrictions are currently set up. Ms.
30 Hanley then asked with regard to the pier design and length, if it had to be that big and long to match
31 other piers. Mr. Kutulus explained how the proposed pier design was done to reduce erosion and
32 referred to an illustration.

33
34 Chairman Bradley asked if there would be three new pier designs coming up in the future to the north
35 and south of Elder of this size, complexity and scale. Mr. Kutulus responded there would be no piers at
36 Elder Beach since the existing pier would be removed.

37
38 Ms. Casale MacNally questioned the beach user capacity load for Centennial Beach without creating
39 undue health or safety hazards. Mr. Kutulus stated he did not have that specific figure available. Ms.
40 Casale MacNally stated that amount would affect parking, bathroom facilities, etc. and questioned how
41 many people are expected to be able to safely use the facility. Mr. Kutulus described the Tower Beach
42 amenities and stated the beach is never fully packed. He also stated there have never been parking or
43 congestion complaints at those facilities and stated there would now be four beaches over the current
44 two beaches with people being spread out over those beaches. Ms. Casale MacNally stated is it
45 disingenuous for the Board being asked to consider both beaches separately for some portions of the
46 project and together for others. Ms. Nazzal explained their ability to consider other locations as parking
47 options as being available for this facility.

1 Mr. Simon stated the applicant hired a traffic engineer to perform an analysis of the traffic and parking
2 system and referred to the findings. The Board Members and applicant further discussed parking
3 concerns. Mr. Kutulus stated the parking study was provided to the Board as soon as it was available in
4 terms of the timing of its presentation.

5
6 Mr. Haller asked Mr. Lemmon to respond with regard to unavailable data due to the seasonal nature of
7 the beach. Mr. Lemmon confirmed they considered available data and provided a further explanation to
8 the Board in terms of validating parking options. Mr. Haller then asked Mr. Lemmon if he felt 11 parking
9 spaces at Centennial Beach is adequate and referred to a comparison of the amount of shoreline related
10 to the number of parking spaces provided. Mr. Lemmon provided an explanation to the Board and
11 referred to the similarities of Glencoe Beach to Centennial Beach noting Winnetka users have other
12 swimming beach options, unlike Glencoe. Mr. Kutulus and Ms. Nazzal provided additional information
13 relating to the parking options to the Board along with land banking options.

14
15 Mr. Haller asked why the pier is being built in the middle of the property in terms of attempts to solve
16 accretion problems. Mr. Kutulus provided a detailed explanation for the pier's location which was
17 designed to provide the greatest amounts of erosion protection. Mr. Haller then referred to the portable
18 restroom location and asked why they did not consider a permanent structure. Mr. Kutulus explained
19 the reasoning a planned permanent restroom was not installed at the beach many years ago was do the
20 request of the community.

21
22 Ms. Leister asked for the stone rubble width of the pier element during different lake-level cycle heights.
23 Mr. Kutulus responded he did not have exact figures and estimated the width is 10-15 feet as noted
24 earlier.

25
26 Chairman Bradley referred to the illustration containing the fence and the second special use standard.
27 He questioned why the dog fence is being set where it is requiring a lot of maneuverability in terms of
28 navigation. Chairman Bradley referred to the slight modification to avoid the need for an easement on
29 the adjacent property and asked for evidence for the large dog beach's size with a decreasing number of
30 dog beach permits being issued. Mr. Kutulus referred to Table 3 on page 5 relating to dog beach season
31 passes remaining flat. He stated the size was based on utilizing the existing infrastructure and to not
32 adding additional costs to the project as well as being based on information received by the community
33 as opposed to requesting an easement. Mr. Simon explained the status of an easement discussion with
34 the 205 Sheridan Road owner. Ms. Nazzal provided a summary of the 5 years' worth of discussions
35 relating to the dog beach and its location. The applicant reiterated their position that they have to take
36 the Board's feedback to the Park District Board for approval.

37
38 Chairman Bradley asked why the proposal only contained one shared path to access the beach. Mr.
39 Simon explained they are presenting the option which would have the least amount of impact with
40 regard to the steep slope ordinance and there cannot be several stair options to the beach. He stated
41 the experienced professional team put together the best possible option. No additional questions were
42 raised at this time from the Board.

43
44 Chairman Bradley asked for public comment and explained how public comment would take place.

45
46 Mary Garrison, 350 Ridge Avenue, asked questions relating to the original special use permit's location.
47 She stated if it is determined that sharing the dog beach with people is unsafe, the request should be
48 denied. Ms. Garrison also stated if it is determined that the massive breakwater endangered the public,

1 the request should be denied. She stated that while ADA access is necessary, it should be done in a safe
2 manner. Ms. Garrison stated if Elder Beach, which has been closed for four years, should be part of the
3 proposed Centennial Beach plan, the current request for Centennial Beach should be denied.
4

5 Kim Marsh read a letter from Willie Franzen, 232 Sheridan Road, into the record.
6

7 An unidentified audience member stated she has been opposed to the request which has been
8 considered for four years and referred to affected views. She then referred to the amount of rocks that
9 are used as a pier at Elder Beach. She also referred to the lack of available parking, the 50-year
10 restrictive covenant, and the limited size of Elder Beach compared to Centennial Beach.
11

12 Rahila Anwar, 1195 Tower Road, stated she is opposed to the significant amount of data being
13 presented this late to the Board and audience for consideration. She described the parking study results
14 as inaccurate with the increased usage being proposed. Ms. Anwar then stated asking a previously
15 challenging neighbor for access with an easement is untenable. She described her initial concerns as lack
16 of fiscal discipline and prudence, no plan for ongoing maintenance, lack of beach accessibility and safety
17 issues. Ms. Anwar suggested using Gilsen to the south as a comparison which has a significant footprint
18 and horrible parking issues. She then referred to an article in the packet relating to the Nielsons' and
19 Stepan's unrestricted gifts.
20

21 Maggie Hayes, an Orchard Lane resident, stated her concerns related to safety and aesthetics. She
22 referred to the Park District's comments relating to the well-trained lifeguards and her experience with
23 the lifeguards at Centennial Beach. Ms. Hayes stated she would not count on lifeguards for safety. She
24 also referred to the unsafe conditions in terms of sailing, swimming with rocks in the water, etc.
25

26 Susie Schreiber, former Winnetka Park District Commissioner, informed the Commission she was on the
27 Commission when the initial bathroom installation was discussed. She then stated her concerns related
28 to ADA accessibility and summarized her discussions with others who would be affected in terms of their
29 difficulties. Ms. Schreiber stated they would prefer a passive beach and commented on the in-lake
30 hazards and asked for the beach to be made safer for its users.
31

32 Ted Wynnichenko described the lakefront's history and described the entire plan as a farce. He stated
33 there are other locations for dog parks and suggested alternatives be used to protect the beaches as
34 opposed to the proposal. He described the proposed dog fence as illegal and also stated comparisons
35 were made with regard to the more restrictive beaches.
36

37 John Root described the pier's primary purpose which would serve no other function. He referred to
38 Matthew Right, a civil engineer, and summarized his conclusions that the breakwaters would not
39 preserve the bluff, retain sand and have no practical engineering purpose.
40

41 Chuck Dowding, 968 Elm Street, described the two ordinances that the proposed pier violated which he
42 read into the record. He also referred to several illustrations to further outline his position.
43

44 Irene Smith, a 38-year Winnetka resident, read a statement from a neighbor into the record.
45

46 Peggy Marte read Angie Dahl, a former Park Board member, comments into the record.
47

1 Vicki Apatoff stated she has been a 20-year lakefront advocate and commented on the amount of time it
2 has taken the Village to undertake bluff and lakefront protections. She stated it is her hope that the
3 plethora of information provided with regard to the serious design flaws would allow the Board to
4 confidently deny the request. Ms. Apatoff stated Board members repeatedly stated they could not
5 consider the entirety of the plan without the Elder Beach plans finalized. She then identified before and
6 after photographs of an approved project. Ms. Apatoff then elaborated on how the proposed plans are
7 not appropriate and read additional comments into the record.
8

9 Mickey Archambault, a 40-year Winnetka resident, stated he has not heard seen concerns related to
10 parking at any of the beaches. He was on the dog beach committee on the dog park and the only other
11 potential dog beach alternative location is at Tower Road, and there would be the same concerns. In
12 terms of safety between people and dogs, just look at the community parades and all the dogs.
13

14 No additional comments were made at this time. Chairman Bradley closed public comment and asked
15 the applicant if they would like to respond to public comment.
16

17 Ms. Codo referred to previously held study sessions and specific information from those meetings
18 relating to the need for shoreline protection. She concluded that the elements are in good repair, have
19 good design and are in the open air and open pathways are safer.
20

21 Chairman Bradley thanked everyone for their comments and called the matter in for discussion. He
22 summarized the Board's role in terms of the application's consideration.
23

24 Mr. Haller stated with regard to the special use permit and standards, he referred to the public health,
25 safety, comfort, morals and welfare and did not find the young lifeguards have the ability to ameliorate
26 problems or the danger from those on the pier walking on the rocks. Mr. Haller stated the applicant has
27 not shown that the rock piers would be safe and any restrictions from the area, which would reduce the
28 number of people who can enjoy the beach. He then stated the downward walk to the beach is an
29 accident waiting to happen and is not a safe environment. Mr. Haller also referred to the lack of parking
30 and congestion concerns. He stated safety has not been adequately addressed and ADA advancements
31 without adequate bathroom facilities. He did not think through the entire plan. Mr. Haller then stated
32 the option of kicking the can down the road to see what happens without doing hardcore analysis and
33 added the traffic safety analysis to not be adequate. He then stated the dog beach next to the swimming
34 beach is not appropriate in terms of a sanitary option and year-round fencing would result in an unsafe
35 environment. Mr. Haller stated surrounding property impacts were not taken into consideration from a
36 traffic perspective and the problem referencing the 1985-bathroom plan as the reasoning for not having
37 adequate facilities in the current plan. He concluded he would recommend denial and provided his
38 opinion with regard to the fence being considered a wall and the steep slope ordinance.
39

40 Mr. Nielsen stated he would recommend approval with regard to the fence and wall height variations
41 and the steep slope exception and against the special use permit. He referred to the use of stone for the
42 groin and safety of similar situations in comparison to Lloyd Beach and commented on the good use of
43 lifeguards at Maple Beach and their signage. Mr. Nielsen stated there would be issues with regard to
44 parking for the beach, which is double the size of Maple Beach, as well as parking and drop-off concerns
45 in connection with ADA drop-off. He described the proposed bathroom situation as a last-minute
46 solution and the south wall access and easement suggestion did not click for him. Mr. Nielsen concluded
47 he would be against recommending in favor of the special use permit.
48

1 Ms. Casale MacNally agreed with Mr. Haller's comments and stated she did not have as much of a
2 problem with the fence and wall height and that it has not been thoroughly explained why it needed to
3 be as high as proposed. She stated with regard to the steep slope exceptions, the outcropping stone
4 steps exceeding 5 feet is not necessary. Ms. Casale MacNally then stated the midbluff paver walkway
5 and seating area would not be a problem exceeding 5 feet. She stated she would not vote in favor of the
6 request.

7
8 Ms. Hanley stated she had no problem with the three variations and the steep slope exceptions, except
9 for the stone steps since they do not have to be 6 feet. She stated with regard to the special use, she
10 appreciated that the applicant came prepared with a better explanation and justifications which
11 addressed her concerns relating to parking. Ms. Hanley then stated if approval is recommended for this
12 project and then the Elder Beach project, she asked if they provide stipulations for Elder Park to provide
13 additional parking at Centennial Beach. Mr. Friedman responded it would depend on the approvals by
14 the Village Council and that the Village Council can stipulate what would happen in that situation. Ms.
15 Hanley then stated she had no problem with the wait and see approach in terms of parking and did not
16 agree with the applicant's contention that there would not be an increase in use. She also stated with
17 regard to safety and the pier, she appreciated the applicant's presentation, the coastal engineer's
18 explanation as to why it is needed and that she relied on that information since they are experts. Ms.
19 Hanley stated if the breakwater is necessary with regard to coastal erosion, she did not understand how
20 it is considered to be the best place to put a swimming beach. She stated not enough was done to
21 ensure swimmers would be kept away from the rocks and suggested alternatives be provided to keep
22 swimmers away from the rocks. Ms. Hanley stated she did not like the idea of an easement in
23 connection with the dog beach and suggested the fence be moved significantly. She also stated the
24 breakwater could be injurious in terms of the lake and erosion issues for other properties.

25
26 Mr. Vender agreed with the comments made relating to standard nos. 2 and 3 and that while he did not
27 have an issue with people and dogs mixing, he is comfortable with regard to parking. He commented he
28 liked the land banking suggestion as a solution regarding future use. Mr. Vender commented on the
29 easement, fence and dog beach size and agreed with the seasonal bathroom at the top. He referred to
30 items 1(a) and (e) with regard to the special use standards and referred to the extensive amount of work
31 and studies done, feedback and public opinion and stated improvements need to be done at multiple
32 beaches with not everyone being satisfied. Mr. Vender then stated the pier design and scale appeared
33 to stand out as out of place. He concluded he is questionable with regard to standard 1(a).

34
35 Ms. Leister stated she would recommend against the special use permit in connection with standards (a)
36 and (e) and she would not be in favor of adding more parking unless Elder Beach was never reopened.
37 She stated she had no issue with the wall height and with regard to the steep slope exceptions, she had
38 no problem with the outcropping exceeding 5 feet and reconfigured mid-bluff paver walkway. Ms.
39 Leister reiterated she is not in favor of the 10-foot-wide concrete ramp and prefers for a lift to be
40 provided for ADA purposes.

41
42 Chairman Bradley stated he had no issue with the steep slope exceptions or the fence and wall height
43 variations. He described the biggest challenges as the pier and safety concerns, the dog beach and its
44 placement and stated alternatives exist which would mitigate the concerns raised. Chairman Bradley
45 stated sufficient evidence had been provided with regard to parking although there would be parking
46 issues with the increased amount of use. He described the parking situation as unique when compared
47 to schools and referred to the other beach options which are available. Chairman Bradley then referred

1 to special use standards (a) and (b) and the description of the pier design in terms of its utility to prevent
2 erosion.

3
4 Chairman Bradley then stated that based upon the comments he has heard, the Board's
5 recommendations would be separated and that the Board would be recommending against the special
6 use approval with possible sufficient votes to recommend approval of the variations and exceptions. Mr.
7 Friedman stated with regard to the findings and recommendations for the variations and exceptions, the
8 recommendation does not stand alone and would be subject only to the ultimate approval of the special
9 use. He stated the applicant would not be allowed to have a height on the property but only in the
10 context of a special use if granted. Mr. Friedman stated the Board is to make a motion to adopt the
11 findings and recommendations of the Board as included in the packet regarding the variations and
12 exceptions.

13
14 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion as indicated on page 20. Ms. Hanley moved to accept the findings
15 and recommendations as indicated on page 20. Mr. Nielsen seconded the motion. A vote was taken and
16 the motion passed, 4 to 3:

17 AYES: Bradley, Handley, Nielsen, Vender

18 NAYS: Casale MacNally, Haller, Leister

19
20 Ms. Hanley noted for the record she did not approve of the recommendation in connection with the
21 steep slope exception for the outcropping stone steps.

22
23 Mr. Friedman provided a document to the Board for its review in connection with the special use permit
24 denial and suggested the language be amended with regard to paragraph 8.

25
26 Ms. Hanley moved to adopt the findings and recommendations as provided to the Board by the Village
27 Attorney and to recommend denial of the special use with the addition of the language in paragraph 8
28 to delete "in advance of the meeting" to be replaced with "until immediately before the meeting." Ms.
29 Casale MacNally seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 7 to 0:

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

31 NAYS: None

32
33 **New Business:**

34 a. January 13, 2025, Meeting - Quorum Check.

35 The Board Members discussed their availability.

36
37 **Public Comment:**

38 No comments were made at this time.

39
40 **Adjournment:**

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

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

44 NAYS: None

45 The meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

46 Respectfully submitted,

47 Antionette Johnson

48 Recording Secretary