WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 10, 2025

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

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 December 9, 2024, meeting minutes. A motion was made by Ms. Casale MacNally and seconded by Mr. Nielsen to approve the December 9, 2024, meeting minutes. 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 provided the Board with updates on Village Council approvals for 402 Hawthorn and 630 Walden, and the Applicant ultimately withdrawing 270 Birch. He also provided an update on the Centennial Beach application.

New Cases:

a. **Case No. 25-01-V2: 314 Walnut Street: An application seeking approval of zoning variations to allow construction of a new detached garage and a two-story addition to the existing residence at 314 Walnut Street. The requested variations would permit the proposed improvements to (i) exceed the maximum permitted front yard lot coverage along Wilson Street; (ii) exceed the maximum permitted gross floor area, (iii) provide less than the minimum required front yard setback from the west property line along Wilson Street to the proposed detached garage; and (iv) provide less than the minimum required corner yard setback from the north property line along Orchard Lane to the proposed addition to the existing residence. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**

Ms. Klaassen identified the property's location, size and zoning classification noting it is a legally nonconforming lot due to its average lot width. She also described the lot's configuration, site photos and existing garage to be removed to accommodate the proposed garage. She then explained the need for the four variations being requested in detail as well as the previous variation approved for the property. Ms. Klaassen referred to illustrations identifying the proposed first and second floor additions along with various elevations and the proposed garage and residence.

Ms. Klaassen stated following the applicant's presentation, the Board may either continue the application to a date certain to allow the applicant or Village staff time to respond to any questions raised or move to recommend approval or denial of the request. She then asked if there were any questions.

Ms. Hanley asked if the 39-foot setback along Wilson is the average of the block. Ms. Klaassen identified the setback along Wilson as being the average front yard setback of the other residences on the block, not the other detached garages. Ms. Hanley asked if the proposed attic is included in GFA. Ms. Klaassen confirmed that is correct and also provided additional information with regard to measurements for the garage, mudroom expansion and second floor addition. Chairman Bradley asked if there were any accessory dwelling issues regarding the office space above the garage. Mr. Schoon explained the request would have to meet building code requirements for an occupied space and that it cannot be a dwelling unit from a zoning perspective. No additional questions were raised at this time.

Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Healy Rice, the project architect, introduced herself to the Board along with the property owners. Ms. Rice explained how the property's uniqueness drove the variations being requested including the fact that there are three front yards and the lot's unique shape. She also explained how they planned to replace the garage in a different position and the reason they are not eligible for the 400 square foot garage gross floor area bonus. Ms. Rice stated alternative locations are not feasible options and that the driveway access would not change. She then explained the reasons for the front yard lot coverage request and asked if there were any questions.

Ms. Hanley asked if the property is unique in that the driveway did not exit on Wilson. Ms. Rice explained how the garage's location would be repositioned closer to Wilson Street to maximize the amount of usable backyard space and to benefit the neighbors. Ms. Hanley asked why there is a need for a three-car garage. Ms. Rice explained the applicants' need for that amount of space. She reiterated the lot's uniqueness is having three front yards and its irregular shape as well as the ineligibility of the garage bonus since there is no rear yard.

Ms. Casale MacNally questioned the stairway configuration and whether the stairs would be fixed or a pull-down system leading to the second floor. Ms. Rice confirmed they would be fixed stairs. Ms. Casale MacNally asked if it were changed to ladder type stairs, would that negate that aspect and allow for the space to have a two-car garage. Ms. Rice explained how the applicant's vehicle size and storage space needs drove the garage's measurements. Chairman Bradley referred to the setback in terms of the way the home was built and the current garage's location. Ms. Rice stated they were less inclined to receive additional approvals due to the fact that the home was new construction. Mr. Haller questioned the amount of impervious surface relating to the driveway configuration. Ms. Rice informed the Board there are two parkway trees which cannot be removed to allow driveway relocation. Chairman Bradley asked if the neighbors were consulted. Ms. Rice responded notice was sent to the neighbors.

Chairman Bradley confirmed there are no members of the public to comment and called the matter in for discussion.

Ms. Casale MacNally stated she did not have any issues with the front yard and corner yard setbacks given the unusual way the property is considered in terms of the zoning standards, the porch enclosure or second floor proposed addition. She also stated she had no issue with moving the garage closer to Wilson to provide more usable yard space. Ms. Casale MacNally described a three car garage as an over-improvement on the site but would be in favor of the other aspects of the request.

Ms. Hanley stated her issue related to the garage and the need to go over GFA for a three-car garage. She also stated she is struggling with the hardship contention and that there are a fair number of three front yard properties in the Village. Chairman Bradley noted the home and garage both contributed to the GFA overage. Ms. Hanley concluded she had no issue with the mudroom and second floor addition portions of the project with regard to GFA. The Board Members discussed how the GFA issue can be considered in connection with the home having three front yards. Chairman Bradley also commented on how the standards can be applied in that regard and the fact that it would set a precedent. The Board Members and applicant discussed their positions in detail.

Mr. Haller stated his concerns are similar to Ms. Hanley's and referred to Wilson being considered an alley as opposed to a typical street in the Village. He agreed the three-car garage is overreaching which related to accommodating the stairs and upstairs office as opposed to requesting accommodations to simply move the garage closer to Wilson to allow for a bigger backyard. Mr. Haller stated they would then have three garage doors facing neighboring properties and an additional amount of asphalt. He also referred to the option of having the garage face Wilson and concluded he is more concerned with the amount of access and less concerned with the Wilson setback.

Ms. Leister stated she has no issues with the mudroom, the addition to the home or moving the garage towards Wilson, which is more of an alley as opposed to a typical street. She questioned the appropriateness of a three-car garage on a small lot and confirmed she had no issues with a two car garage.

Mr. Nielsen identified his concerns with regard to the standards in connection with the three-car garage request, the property's hardship claim and street congestion. He stated he had no issues with the mudroom and second story addition.

Mr. Vender referred to the issues raised relating to the garage size as well as letters from neighbors against the request. He also stated he had no issues with regard to the mudroom and second floor additions.

Chairman Bradley stated it appeared that the Board is in agreement that the three-car garage request with regard to GFA is not compatible with the standards. He then asked the applicant if they would consider a two-car garage in an effort to reduce the GFA amount requested. Ms. Rice responded they would and noted one of the criteria for the garage is to match the home's style which drove the volume. She then stated they would like the opportunity to review their request and reduce the garage size. Ms. Rice stated it would be compatible with the neighborhood for the garage to be moved back toward Wilson.

Chairman Bradley stated the applicant's options include voting on the request at this meeting with a negative recommendation or to continue the matter to a date certain to allow the applicant to explore modifications. Ms. Klaassen confirmed the next meeting date is March 10, 2025. A question was raised with regard to a further exterior staircase encroachment on the Wilson side with a two-car garage. Ms. Rice confirmed they would like to continue the matter to March 10, 2025. The Board Members discussed their availability. Ms. Rice asked if the Board would be amenable to a two car or 2.5 car garage. The Board Members summarized their positions.

Chairman Bradley then asked for a motion to continue the application to the March 10, 2025, meeting; such a motion 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, Haller, Hanley, Leister, Casale MacNally, Nielsen, Vender
NAYS: None

New Business:

a. March 10, 2025, Regular Meeting - Quorum Check.
The Board Members previously discussed their availability.

Public Comment:
No comments were made at this time.

Adjournment:
Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn 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, Haller, Hanley, Leister, Casale MacNally, Nielsen, Vender
NAYS: None
The meeting adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Antionette Johnson
Recording Secretary