

**WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 14, 2025**

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

Zoning Board Members Absent: Todd Vender

Village Staff: Scott Mangum, Director of Community Development
Ann Klaassen, Assistant Director of Community Development

Call to Order & Roll Call:

Chairman Bradley called the meeting to order at 7:01 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 18, 2024, special meeting and February 10, 2025, regular meeting minutes. A motion to approve the November 18, 2024, special meeting and February 10, 2025, regular meeting minutes was made by Ms. Casale MacNally and seconded by Mr. Nielsen. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

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

NAYS: None

Community Development Report.

Ms. Klaassen confirmed there is no Community Development Report.

Continued 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. This item was continued from the February 10, 2025, Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. The Applicant is requesting this item be continued to the May 12, 2025, Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

Chairman Bradley identified the previous application continuations requested by the applicant and the current request to continue the matter to the May 12, 2025, meeting. He then asked for a motion to continue the application to the May 12, 2025, meeting. A motion as stated by Chairman Bradley was made by Ms. Casale MacNally and seconded by Mr. Nielsen. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

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

1 NAYS: None

2
3 **New Cases:**

4 a. **Case No. 24-14-SU: Grace Presbyterian Church of the North Shore (440 Ridge Avenue and 760**
5 **Cherry Street): Applications seeking approval of (i) an amendment to an existing Special Use Permit to**
6 **allow construction of additions to the existing church and site improvements on the proposed**
7 **consolidated lot; and (ii) zoning variations to (a) exceed the maximum permitted roofed lot coverage;**
8 **(b) exceed the maximum permitted gross floor area; (c) provide less than the minimum required front**
9 **yard setback from the east property line along Ridge Avenue; and (d) provide less than the minimum**
10 **required corner yard setback from the north property line along Cherry Street. The Village Council has**
11 **final jurisdiction on this request.**

12 Ms. Klaassen identified the property's location and the recently purchased adjacent lot where the existing
13 improvements would be demolished and both lots consolidated to accommodate the proposed church
14 improvements. She also identified the zoning classification and permitted special uses in the district as
15 well as property photos and various elevations of the existing church. Ms. Klaassen explained the
16 reasoning for the proposed south and north additions noting no additional church programming is
17 proposed. She also explained the reconfigured parking lot and the parking lot eliminated on the west side
18 of the church. Ms. Klaassen informed the Board the parking and traffic study was reviewed by the Village
19 Engineer with the conclusion that there is sufficient parking and there would not be an adverse impact on
20 the neighborhood.

21
22 Ms. Klaassen then described the proposed interior spaces of the south and north additions in detail as
23 well as the proposed landscape screening. She also stated with regard to storm water, preliminary
24 engineering plans have been reviewed by the Village Engineer and due to the impermeable surface
25 reduction, onsite stormwater detention is not required. Ms. Klaassen stated the Village Engineer
26 concluded that all permitting requirements can be met when final engineering plans are submitted with
27 a building permit application and noted the Village's stormwater standards must be adhered to. She then
28 identified the proposed east and north elevations of the church as well as aerial views of the proposed
29 improvements.

30
31 Ms. Klaassen summarized the four variations being requested as well as the existing nonconformities. She
32 also summarized the Historic Preservation Commission's, DRB's and the Plan Commission's review of the
33 proposed plan. Ms. Klaassen then stated following the applicant's presentation, public comment and
34 Board discussion, the Board may either continue the matter to a date certain or recommend approval or
35 denial of the request with draft language included on page nos. 31 and 32. She noted additional public
36 correspondence was received and provided to the Board, she then asked if there were any questions.

37
38 Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. Ms. Casale MacNally referred to the one story
39 portion of the south addition and asked for clarification of its measurements and whether it would impact
40 roofed lot coverage and GFA. Ms. Klaassen confirmed that is correct and provided additional information
41 for the Board. No additional questions were raised at this time.

42
43 Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Matt Dower, Grace Presbyterian Church's
44 Building Committee Chairman, introduced the applicant's team, Marshall Brown, Grace Presbyterian
45 Church Senior Pastor, attorney Karl Camillucci, Joe Buehler, the architect and several advisors from
46 Ericksson Engineering. He referred to an additional signed letter of support they received.

47

1 Marshall Brown outlined the church's mission and the goal behind the project to increase accessibility and
2 provide better security and functionality. He referred to illustrations and described the difficulty of
3 navigating the amount of stairs in the multi-level building and the lack of ADA accessibility. Mr. Brown
4 also described the difficulties in terms of how the existing multipurpose space is being used as well as
5 security challenges. He referred to the neighborhood engagement in the process and how the project was
6 improved with their input. Mr. Brown referred to the security issues, accessibility, safety, experience and
7 functionality which are difficult to accomplish in the 100 year old building. He concluded by stating they
8 are attempting to update a beautiful, old building and to care for people's needs in a way that fits and
9 honors their neighbors, the community and the Village.

10
11 Mr. Dower summarized the building's history and stated the neighboring property was purchased in
12 connection with the project and renovation. He referred to an aerial view of both properties, irregular
13 property shape and easements they had to consider with regard to the renovation project. Mr. Dower
14 provided an illustration of the project timeline and summarized the project's design evolution as well as
15 the concessions and compromises reached.

16
17 Joe Buehler of Present Future Architects referred to the west hall of the existing building in an illustration
18 which he described as a solution in terms of how they arrived at the current proposal. He then described
19 how the area was modified and how the interior spaces would function. Mr. Buehler referred to various
20 elevations and the proposed one and two story addition volumes as well as the proposed landscape plan
21 and screening on the site.

22
23 Laura Rosenbauer of Erickson Engineering referred to illustrations of existing drainage patterns in the
24 area which she explained to the Board. She described how the proposed design included re-grading the
25 site and how the plan would direct existing drainage offsite and explained how the asphalt parking lot
26 would be reconstructed with permeable pavers to improve onsite drainage. Ms. Rosenbauer stated the
27 improvements would result in a reduction in the amount of impervious surface.

28
29 Mr. Dower referred to the findings reached in the parking and traffic analysis in that there would not be
30 an adverse impact on the neighborhood and that there is sufficient parking to accommodate church
31 demand. He then stated with regard to the requested variations, he referred to the neighborhood use
32 plan map from the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and stated the church is in line with several surrounding
33 legal nonconforming neighbors. Mr. Dower noted the amount of impervious surface would be reduced
34 which eliminated the nonconformity. He then described the minimum setback variation to the north
35 which was driven by neighbor comments. Mr. Dower concluded that the unique hardship related to all of
36 the changes included in the restoration of the historic building.

37
38 Karl Camillucci, Taft Stettinius & Hollister, explained in detail how the variation standards were addressed
39 by the applicant. He also summarized the applicant's response to the special use standards. Mr. Camillucci
40 then asked the Board recommend approval of the special use and the variations requested.

41
42 Chairman Bradley asked for public comment.

43
44 Joe Schelly, 720 Pine Street, stated he is a church member and that the North Shore church is growing and
45 described two issues which are insufficient including programming space and accessibility issues. He
46 referred to the various concerns and issues and concluded the final version is much better than the
47 previous submission.

1 Terry Dason, 134 Green Bay Road, a church member and Director of the Winnetka Northfield Glencoe
2 Chamber of Commerce, stated she supported the expansion and renovation. She stated the church made
3 a concerted effort to address the neighbors' concerns and took significant steps in response. Ms. Dason
4 stated the proposed improvements would enhance safety and accessibility concerns and urged the Board
5 to move toward recommending approval and allowing the much needed project to proceed.

6
7 Tom Shannon, a church member, stated they realized when the church purchased the existing church
8 building it would need some work. He described the proposed plan as great and referred to the
9 compromises and concessions made with many neighbors being in support of the plan. Mr. Shannon asked
10 for the Board to recommend approval of the request without any additional continuances.

11
12 Missy Shinall, 510 Elder Lane, a church member, Sunday school teacher and children's director, described
13 the close knit community. She also commented on the safety issues she discussed with the police
14 department along with the challenges the building posed. Ms. Shinall, asked the Board to consider the
15 ADA, safety and security challenges to allow the church to be a safe place for many families.

16
17 Alek Glenman, a historic and landmarks volunteer, commented while he is glad to see the continuing
18 viable use of an historic structure, he had concerns with regard to the proposal. He identified parking and
19 traffic as a slight issue due the amount of overflow parking required. Mr. Glenman stated while the
20 applicant stated there would not be growth in the church, the larger space is being built for the future use
21 and asked for the traffic issue to be tested. He stated with regard to public comment, the neighbors to
22 the north are also affected and suggested vertical use on the site, lower the parking elevation and to
23 recover the space without bumping out to the north which would eliminate the need for a variation and
24 minimize the effect on properties to the north.

25
26 Chris Crooks, 422 Ridge, spoke on behalf of several neighbors and stated he has provided comment at all
27 of the meetings with the biggest issue on several specifically identified issues including scale and massing
28 although they did not object to ADA accessibility and security issues. He stated the GFA would be
29 increasing to 125% nonconforming and commented on the excessive proposed single story structure
30 height which would have an undue impact on the neighbors. Mr. Crooks stated they want to be able to
31 enjoy their homes and the request would create undue harm to the neighbors. He concluded while he
32 appreciated how far the proposal has come, it would still be unduly burdensome to the neighbors.

33
34 Connie Wright Sanders, 429 Linden, read comments from Steve Sanders into the record.

35
36 Judy Murphy, 426 Linden, agreed with Mrs. Sanders' and Mr. Crooks' comments. She stated while she
37 appreciated the changes made, her concern related to other items that would not be shared with the
38 neighbors down the road. She questioned additional items which have not yet been presented and asked
39 for the request to be denied.

40
41 Alexa Day, 751 Cherry Street, stated she had serious concerns with the current proposal and its effect on
42 the neighbors and asked for a continuance until plans are presented which limit the additions' impact to
43 the neighbors. She stated the north addition measured the same size as her home which would
44 compromise those on the north side of the property. Ms. Day also raised traffic concerns and her skeptical
45 belief of the traffic study conclusion that there would be no impact. She then stated while she agreed with
46 the safety and ADA concerns, she urged the church to consider options within the church's existing
47 footprint without the use of the proposed additions. No additional comments were made at this time.

48

1 Chairman Bradley closed public comment and asked the applicant to respond.

2
3 Mr. Dower stated with regard to the traffic study concerns, they are confident there is sufficient parking
4 and referred to the loss of sanctuary seats. He stated they would be improving the use for the
5 constituents, staff, community and volunteers with dedicated spaces. Mr. Dower clarified the height and
6 square footage of the south addition.

7
8 Chairman Bradley asked if there were any questions from the Board. Ms. Hanley asked for additional
9 information on the church's history and the number of Sunday services and the hours which Mr. Brown
10 provided to the Board. He then provided information on church activities during the week. Ms. Hanley
11 asked for additional information related to the south side addition rendering which was provided to the
12 Board. Mr. Brown also identified the trash enclosure/screening element.

13
14 Chairman Bradley referred to the gradient issues raised. Mr. Buehler explained the grade differential on
15 several areas on the site. Mr. Haller asked for information for any planned change in programming. Mr.
16 Brown stated they are constrained by the Sunday seating capacity and added there are no plans for a
17 daycare in the future. He confirmed they have no plans to sublet the space. Mr. Haller questioned if the
18 special use called for the applicant to come back for unapproved uses. Mr. Brown responded they do not
19 have any such plans and that the traffic study confirmed parking would serve the existing programming.

20
21 Mr. Camillucci stated the existing programming is the impetus for the proposal and that the church
22 doesn't have plans for new programming. He also referred to the traffic study being based on peak traffic
23 created during Sunday service. Mr. Brown described their parking agreement with the library and the
24 number of people who attend Sunday mass and on Easter.

25
26 Chairman Bradley asked for clarification with regard to the number of existing multiple purpose rooms
27 and their uses. Mr. Brown explained how the space is used, which included dedicated office space which
28 he identified in an illustration. Mr. Brown identified the number of staff members and further explained
29 the office, boardroom and classroom space.

30
31 Ms. Casale MacNally referred to the amount of space in the first floor addition and the contention that
32 there would be no further expansion of programming. She stated she is concerned with how the space is
33 used. Mr. Brown explained how the space is currently used and how it could be used going forward. Mr.
34 Buehler explained how the space is not logistically likely to be used for wedding space.

35
36 Chairman Bradley referred to the easements and the parking lot being turned into green space. Mr.
37 Buehler stated it was done in response to community conversations. Mr. Dower provided further
38 explanation for moving the congregation hall and creating that amount of green space. Mr. Brown
39 informed the Commission of the small number of weddings and funerals held at the church.

40
41 Ms. Casale MacNally asked how much the north neighbors were engaged in terms of the impact of the
42 addition on that side. Mr. Dower responded they spoke with the north neighbors and sent letters and
43 described the work they have done with those neighbors. Mr. Buehler referred to an illustration and
44 provided additional information in terms of the setback which would place the proposed addition further
45 back than the existing conditions. No additional questions were raised at this time.

46
47 Chairman Bradley then called the matter in for discussion and referred to the standards the Board is to
48 consider and their options. Ms. Hanley commented she was initially stunned by the mass and after

1 performing her own calculations in terms of the zoning requirements, she reiterated institutional uses
2 should be in a planned development where they are considered special uses in residential areas. She
3 stated the special use has been there for a long time and the Board has to consider whether the expansion
4 is legitimate. Ms. Hanley stated due to the fact that the current programming space is inadequate and
5 there are security issues, the special use is appropriate to provide for those needs. She commented the
6 new classroom sizes are not large for instance and for the multipurpose room, the church needed a
7 community gathering space. Ms. Hanley described the applicant's response to reduce the size as a good
8 effort in response to community comments and concluded she is in favor of the special use.
9

10 Ms. Hanley stated with regard to the variations, she started while the GFA figure is large, the request is
11 not unreasonable in the residential zoning district which was reduced by the applicant in response to the
12 neighbors' comments. She stated she had no problem with the parking lot, which is needed and for the
13 corner yard setback, it is significantly west of Ridge and pulled back from that of the former home. Ms.
14 Hanley concluded by stating she is fine with the variations with the caveat of the applicant limit the
15 intensity of use to their current programming.
16

17 Mr. Haller agreed with Ms. Hanley's comments and referred to the north bump out which he described
18 as invading but is in line with other homes to the west with a reduction in mass. He commented the
19 amount of office space is somewhat generous and while the church needed gathering space outside of
20 the sanctuary, it may not need to be 35 feet wide which impacted the south neighbor. Mr. Haller stated
21 his biggest issue related to intensity of use and referred to the parking study. He stated if programming is
22 expanded, it would affect the intensity of use as it related to the special use permit and agreed with
23 conditions upon expansion with regard to the special use permit to ensure that the church would not
24 become a very different institution that further impinged on the neighborhood to an excessive degree.
25 He concluded he would be in favor of the special use with conditions relating to expansion of programming
26 and intensity of use.
27

28 Mr. Nielsen agreed with the comments made and referred to the comments from the neighbors who are
29 not in favor of the request and after the applicant made concessions including removing the parking lot,
30 he referred to the Fire and Police Departments across the street not being the best neighbors to have. He
31 commented he liked how the project evolved and agreed with Ms. Hanley that the special use is
32 warranted. Mr. Nielsen concluded he would lean toward approval with conditions.
33

34 Ms. Leister stated she is leaning towards recommending approval for the special use, which is a unique
35 situation. She also commented she is glad the applicant is updating and preserving the historic building
36 while incorporating neighbor feedback and identified the compromises made. Ms. Leister stated the
37 neighbors' issues have been largely addressed and that the application was thorough including the parking
38 study and stormwater mitigation. She stated with regard to the variations, adding 1,800 square feet of
39 roofed lot coverage and 2,000 GFA increase is not that large and described the request as not excessive.
40 Ms. Leister also stated she is in favor of the setback to the north.
41

42 Ms. Casale MacNally stated she has no issue with the special use expansion which is warranted for safety
43 and ADA accessibility concerns but she had a problem with the zoning relief. She also stated she is less
44 concerned with regard to the corner yard setback and front yard setback compared to roofed lot coverage
45 and GFA. Ms. Casale MacNally stated she is more moved toward the neighbors' plight in that there is the
46 assumption that the church would exist in the same format it has for the last 100 years and referred to
47 the multipurpose room addition that would alter the character of the locality. She also stated there may
48 be additional fire safety concerns with the increased amount of square footage although other areas

1 would be brought up to code. Ms. Casale MacNally then stated there may be an effect on the taxable
2 value of surrounding properties with the church's increased square footage. She stated she is also
3 concerned with street congestion which would impair the safety, comfort, morals and welfare of the
4 Village. Ms. Casale MacNally then stated she did not put much stock in the parking study's conclusions
5 and noted alternatives for lower level expansion were not explored. She concluded while she did not have
6 a problem with the requested setback variations or special use permit, she had concerns relating to roofed
7 lot coverage and GFA.

8
9 Mr. Haller referred to Ms. Casale MacNally's concerns relating to changing the character of the locality
10 and the increased use potential that would impinge on the neighborhood and he also stated he was not
11 impressed with the traffic study conclusion which was based on the current use on one day.

12
13 Chairman Bradley stated the church has been in existence for years and the special use existed by right to
14 allow for schools and churches to exist in residential neighborhoods. He stated there has not been
15 testimony by the applicant that the use would change or increase. Chairman Bradley stated with regard
16 to the zoning variations, while he understood the neighbors' concerns, it is admirable that the applicant
17 worked to mitigate the size, density and the project overall. He encouraged the applicant to continue
18 conversations with the final decision with the Village Council. Chairman Bradley referred to GFA, roofed
19 lot coverage and the north addition corner yard setback, and stated the structure did not need to be 1,800
20 square feet which created a zoning issue. He referred to the original plan which included a parking lot
21 instead of green space and the parking agreement with the library. Chairman Bradley suggested the size
22 of the north addition be reduced noting its height is not an issue for the Board to consider. He concluded
23 he would be in favor of recommending approval without conditions.

24
25 Chairman Bradley then asked for a motion to recommend approval as included on page no. 18. A motion
26 as stated by Chairman Bradley was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Mr. Nielsen. A vote was taken
27 and the motion passed, 5 to 1:

28 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Leister, Nielsen

29 NAYS: Casale MacNally

30
31 **New Business:**

32 a. May 12, 2025, Meeting - Quorum Check.

33 The Board Members discussed their availability.

34
35 **Public Comment:**

36 No comments were made at this time.

37
38 **Adjournment:**

39 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Hanley and
40 seconded by Ms. Casale MacNally. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

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

42 NAYS: None

43 The meeting adjourned at 9:37 p.m.

44
45 Respectfully submitted,

46
47 Antionette Johnson

48 Recording Secretary