WINNETKA PLAN COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 10, 2025

Members Present:	Layla Danley, Chairperson Matthew Bradley Chris Enck Liz Kunkle Cyrus Subawalla
Members Absent:	Jonathan Alt Mamie Case
Non-Voting Members Present:	Rob Apatoff
Village Staff:	Scott Mangum, Director of Community Development Ann Klaassen, Assistant Director of Community Development

Call to Order & Roll Call:
The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Danley at 7:13 p.m. Ms. Klaassen took roll call of the Commission Members present.

Approval of March 13, 2025, Special Meeting Minutes:
Chairperson Danley asked for a motion to approve the March 13, 2025, special meeting minutes. A motion to approve the March 13, 2025, special meeting minutes was made by Mr. Bradley and seconded by Ms. Kunkle. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

AYES: Bradley, Danley, Enck, Kunkle, Subawalla
NAYS: None
NON-VOTING: Apatoff

Public Comment:
No comments were made at this time.

Community Development Report:
Ms. Klaassen provided an update on the Grace Presbyterian Church project which is to be presented to the ZBA on April 14, 2025, and the design changes to be presented to the DRB on April 17, 2025.

New Applications:

a. **Case No. 25-02-SD: 473 Sheridan Road and 499 Sheridan Road: Applications seeking approval of (i) a Final Plat of Subdivision to consolidate the two existing lots known as 473 Sheridan Road and 499 Sheridan Road into a single Lot of Record, which requires (a) a variation to allow a side lot line abutting a rear lot line; and (b) a finding of "No Material Increased Adverse Impact" for the existing wood deck at 499 Sheridan Road, which observes less than the minimum required side yard setback of 12 feet and less than the minimum required front yard setback of 50 feet from the ordinary high water mark of Lake Michigan; and (ii) a Special Use Permit to allow the consolidation that is greater than two times the minimum required lot size and more than two times the minimum required average lot width for a corner lot in the R-2 Single-Family Residential Zoning District. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**

Ms. Klaassen stated the application is for the lot consolidation of two existing lots to accommodate the construction of a new home with the Commission to consider a recommendation on the final plat of subdivision and a special use request. She identified the property's location, zoning classification and size, both of which she described to the Commission in detail. Ms. Klaassen then referred to the Comprehensive Plan designation with regard to the two lots and noted the property is also subject to the steep slope regulations. She referred to current property photos and noted demolition permit applications for both lots were approved without delay by the Historic Preservation Commission. Ms. Klaassen described the proposed consolidated lot which she identified for the Commission in an illustration as well as the existing utility easements. She noted a special use permit is required due to the proposed lot's size and noted the two existing lots are nonconforming in terms of minimum required lot area and lot width for 473 Sheridan parcel and lot depth for the 499 Sheridan Road parcel. Ms. Klaassen then described the existing nonconforming deck and gazebo that would remain and referred to residential standards used to evaluate the proposed consolidation with the ability of the Village Council to impose conditions.

Ms. Klaassen stated plans were provided by the applicant and the Commission can determine if the proposed plans are consistent with the special use standards and may consider any appropriate conditions. She also referred to 40 lots east of Sheridan Road which measure more than double the minimum lot area. Mr. Bradley asked for clarification relating to the standards for the minimum lot size for two lots. Ms. Klaassen explained that the ordinance was adopted in 2023 in order to address these types of issues. She also referred to subdivision standards with which the proposed consolidation must comply and she explained how it applied to the application that the Commission is to consider. Ms. Klaassen then identified the standard which encouraged typical lot configurations and identified the existing remaining nonconformities and those which would be eliminated.

Ms. Klaassen described the proposed improvements and stated the Village Engineer and Coastal Engineer assisting the Village with the review of lakefront developments confirmed the application would comply with the steep slope zone regulations. She noted the proposed boathouse is allowed in the steep slope zone and the front yard setback, and is within the size limitations allowed in the steep slope regulations. Ms. Klaassen noted that the Village Engineering Department would require additional engineering with regard to the entire proposal to ensure it would not impact the stability of the steep slope zone or adjacent properties. She also noted storm water detention would not be required and explained how storm water would be discharged from the site with the Village Engineering staff verifying storm water regulations are adhered to in terms of onsite storm water management. Ms. Klaassen then referred to the various proposed elevations.

Ms. Klaassen stated the Commission is to consider whether the special use to allow the lot consolidation is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the six special use standards as well as whether the subdivision code variation to allow the side lot line to abut the rear lot line complied with the exception she previously referred to. She stated the Commission is also to consider whether the remaining nonconforming wood deck would result in a material increased adverse impact on the public health, comfort and welfare. Ms. Klaassen stated following the applicant's presentation and public comment, the Commission may either continue the hearing to a date certain to allow the applicant or staff to address questions or consider a motion recommending approval or denial of the special use and plat of subdivision with draft language included on page nos. 24 and 25. She then asked if there were any questions.

Chairperson Danley asked if there were any questions. Mr. Subawalla asked if the gazebo would be grandfathered in. Ms. Klaassen confirmed that is correct and referred to the fact that it is not uncommon for existing lakefront improvements to be legally nonconforming. She also explained it is not uncommon in this area for side lot lines to abut rear lot lines, etc. Ms. Klaassen also explained the conditions under which flag lots are allowed to be created and that they are not strictly prohibited. Ms. Klaassen added the Village Engineering Department preferred for storm water to be discharged to the lake.

Chairperson Danley swore in those speaking to this matter. Bill Murphy, the architect, introduced himself to the Commission and referred to an illustration and explained the existing homes' positions. He also explained how storm water would be discharged to the lake and noted there is currently no detention system in place on either property. Mr. Murphy stated storm water discharge toward the lake would benefit the storm water management system and the neighborhood.

Chairperson Danley asked if there were any questions. Mr. Enck asked if the project would involve bluff reinforcement. Mr. Murphy responded there is an existing sound concrete reinforcement with additional reinforcement to be constructed around the boathouse. Chairperson Danley asked for an explanation for keeping the existing wood deck and gazebo. Mr. Murphy explained their reasoning including that they are in good condition. Mr. Subawalla asked if the pool is beyond the steep slope zone. Ms. Klaassen responded it is allowed in the slope transition area with certain engineering standards to be met. No additional questions were raised at this time.

Chairperson Danley asked for public comment. No comments were made at this time. She then called the matter in for discussion.

Mr. Bradley stated he is generally in support of the application, due to the uniqueness of the properties, although it is precedent setting. He referred to the amount of the square foot overage which is a result of joining two lots which would create a side lot abutting a rear lot. Mr. Bradley stated the new home would comply with the standards and steep slope issues. Trustee Apatoff commented the proposal represented a good plan and would not have a significant impact on the slope while eliminating worse problems. Mr. Enck informed the Commission the Historic Preservation Commission reviewed the home to the north for landmark status and referred to the irregularly shaped lots in the neighborhood. Ms. Kunkle agreed with the comments made and the odd lot shapes. She stated the request would not be overdone and the gazebo and deck to remain would be similar in style to the new home. Ms. Kunkle also noted no other potential relief is requested and agreed it is a unique situation which would not be precedent setting. Mr. Subawalla asked for accommodations to be made in terms of the 1950's or 1960's gazebo style. Mr. Enck referred to the fact that the new home would be smaller than the buildable amount of FAR allowed. Ms. Kunkle referred to the unanimous support from other advisory bodies and the fact that there was no public objection. Chairperson Danley agreed with Ms. Kunkle's comments and referred to the deck remaining and that she would be in support.

Mr. Bradley questioned the demolition plans and property access. Mr. Murphy explained how staging would occur during the demolition and construction process.

Chairperson Danley then asked for a motion to recommend approval. Mr. Bradley moved to recommend approval of the request as indicated on page nos. 24 and 25 of the agenda packet without conditions. Ms. Kunkle seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

AYES: Bradley, Danley, Enck, Kunkle, Subawalla
NAYS: None
NON-VOTING: Apatoff

New Business.

a. <u>April 23, 2025, Regular Meeting – Quorum Check</u>.

The Commission Members discussed their availability. Ms. Klaassen advised the Commission Members of the alternatives if there is not a quorum.

<u>Adjournment:</u>

Chairperson Danley asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Bradley and seconded by Mr. Enck. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

AYES: Bradley, Danley, Enck, Kunkle, Subawalla
NAYS: None
NON-VOTING: Apatoff

The meeting was adjourned at 8:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Antionette Johnson
Recording Secretary