

**WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES
MAY 12, 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: Steve 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 April 14, 2025, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the April 14, 2025, 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:

Mr. Mangum provided an update on the Grace Presbyterian Church application with the Village Council scheduled to consider the item at its June 3, 2025, meeting.

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; (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; (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 The Applicant has withdrawn this application. The Zoning Board of Appeals will not be taking action on this application.

Chairman Bradley advised the Board that the application has been withdrawn by the applicant and no further action is required.

New Cases:

a. **Case No. 25-03-SU: Hubbard Woods Metra Train Station (1065 Gage Street):** An application seeking approval of a Special Use Permit to allow renovation of the existing train depot and train

1 **platform and construction of a new pedestrian bridge, new accessible ramps, new stairs and elevators**
2 **to the train platform, and new warming shelters. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this**
3 **request.**

4 Ms. Klaassen described the proposed exterior improvements which include a new pedestrian bridge, new
5 ADA accessible ramps, new stairs and elevators to the train platform. She stated the proposal also includes
6 new warming shelters and renovations to the existing train depot, and windbreak shelters, which required
7 special use approval. She then identified the property's location and zoning classification. Ms. Klaassen
8 then referred to photos of the site and identified the items to be repaired and replaced. She noted an
9 important component of the project included ADA accessibility. Ms. Klaassen noted due to the UP's
10 ongoing review, Metra and its design team have identified options for the pedestrian bridge railing. She
11 then explained the options for the pedestrian bridge railing. Ms. Klaassen noted that the applicant has
12 submitted a landscape plan that has been reviewed by the Village Forester who noted that the shade and
13 ornamental trees listed on the plan are acceptable to the Village. She then explained that all trees
14 installed on Village property, which includes the plantings on the west end of Hubbard Place, must meet
15 certain standards and be inspected by the Village Forester at planting.

16
17 Ms. Klaassen summarized the Design Review Board's review of the proposal with the Plan Commission to
18 consider the special use permit at their May 22, 2025, meeting. She referred to the standards the Board
19 is to consider and stated following the applicant's presentation, public comment and Board discussion,
20 the Board may either continue the application to a date certain or move to recommend approval or denial
21 with draft language for a motion provided on page nos. 24 and 25 of the agenda packet. Ms. Klaassen
22 noted additional public correspondence was provided to the Board and then asked if there were any
23 questions.

24
25 Ms. Casale MacNally asked with regard to the height of option nos. 1, 2 and 3, if the Elm Street station
26 height would continue to be grandfathered in. Ms. Klaassen responded that the railing height is a UP
27 standard; when the railing needs replaced the UP will need to review and approve the railing. No
28 additional questions were raised at this time.

29
30 Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Patricia Davidson, Ty Lin International Project
31 Manager, referred the Board to illustrations and summarized their responses to the special use standards.
32 She then asked if there were any questions.

33
34 Chairman Bradley asked which elements of the project are ADA focused. Ms. Davidson identified the step
35 and grade modifications for access to the depot, the area leading from the pedestrian bridge over the UP
36 railroad and the ADA accessible platforms from the bike trail. She further explained how the proposed
37 design structure was determined compared to what is required in order to become ADA compliant.

38
39 Mr. Haller commented the design is great and stated he is only concerned with the east side. He described
40 egress points at other Metra stations being in commercial areas, not residential like this instance, and
41 suggested additional landscaping be installed to benefit the residential neighbors, which might require
42 pushing the east ramp to the west. Mr. Haller questioned the rationale of Metra leaving the stations open
43 in terms of its profile. Ms. Davidson responded it is due to the ramp and stairs' location which is currently
44 outside the UP right-of-way but pushing the east ramp to the west would put those improvements inside
45 the UP right-of-way. She also stated 50% of the entrances are required to be ADA accessible and explained
46 the other entrances at the train station. Mr. Haller questioned the effect on property values on that side
47 of the street.

48

1 Ms. Hanley asked what is it built on now if it is not currently on the UP right-of-way on the west side. Ms.
2 Davidson responded there is an existing roadway right-of-way between the UP right-of-way and Hubbard
3 Place. It was confirmed the Village owned the vacated easement. Ms. Hanley asked what is the amount
4 of ridership at that station. Ms. Davidson stated she did not have that information and confirmed there
5 would be no ticket agent. Ms. Davidson noted they would not be upgrading the lower level of the depot.
6 Ms. Hanley asked if there would continue to be heaters in the windbreaks. Ms. Davidson responded she
7 would have to review the plans with regard to that detail. Ms. Hanley questioned how likely it would be
8 for the applicant to obtain approval for the pedestrian bridge railings. Ms. Davidson stated a variation
9 would have to be submitted to UP and described the safety issues relating to the fence height. She also
10 provided information relating to maintenance and snow clearance issues. The Board Members discussed
11 safety issues relating to the gap with regard to potential safety hazards. No additional questions were
12 raised at this time.

13
14 Chairman Bradley asked for public comment and swore in those speaking to this matter.

15
16 Crispin Hales, 1000 Sheridan Road, provided information which he documented over the years with regard
17 to safety issues relating to the bridge and the response he received from Metra. He stated he is pleased
18 that the bridge would be replaced.

19
20 Charles Billington, a Glencoe resident, described the freight shaft and dumbwaiter elevator usage and
21 suggested it be used as an ADA accessible elevator. He also identified an area which could be used as a
22 warming shelter.

23
24 Craig Lan, referred to the previous comments with regard to making the east ramp area less intrusive and
25 stated he is in favor of the proposed ADA accessibility improvements and the ramp. No additional public
26 comments were made at this time.

27
28 Chairman Bradley questioned the project's timeline. Ms. Davidson responded the plans are at 90% and
29 summarized their permit process as well as their presentation to the other Boards. She stated they
30 planned to begin construction in the early spring with no plans to close the station during construction.
31 Ms. Davidson also provided information relating to work to be done on the Green Bay Trail and estimated
32 construction to take 18-24 months.

33
34 Chairman Bradley called the matter in for discussion. Mr. Haller stated his only concern related to the
35 second standard in that the size and scale of the east ramp and the building's exposure in a commercial
36 sense would be a burden on the homeowners on Hubbard Place. He suggested consideration be given to
37 push the entire ramp system back to the west and reduce the scale of the opening of the center section.
38 Mr. Haller also referred to the amount of screening and concluded he is fine with other aspects of the
39 project. Ms. Hanley indicated that may not be practical or an option due to the easement. The Board
40 Members discussed possible alternatives and the second standard being addressed.

41
42 Mr. Nielsen stated he would lean toward approval and referred to Ms. Hanley's and Ms. Casale MacNally's
43 questions relating to the design. He stated reconsideration is definitely in line and the project has not
44 been rushed. Mr. Nielsen concluded by stating the Board's comments would be clear and referred to the
45 fact that there was not more public comment against the request.

46
47 Ms. Casale MacNally stated she is in favor of the request and referred to the amount of support for the
48 project. She stated addressing the ADA accessibility concerns is well past due. Ms. Hanley also stated she

1 is in favor of the request and commented she is disappointed that there is not a warming station on both
2 sides. She then stated in terms of the design, she commented it is lovely and agreed the bridge has been
3 over salted for years. Ms. Hanley commented she is glad to see the station being renovated and agreed
4 with Ms. Casale MacNally's comments relating to ADA compliance. Ms. Leister stated she is also in favor
5 of the request and asked for the Plan Commission to closely consider the east side which appeared more
6 commercial looking with an attempt to make it fit in more with the neighborhood.

7
8 Chairman Bradley stated he also is in favor of recommending approval and agreed the project is long
9 overdue and would improve safety concerns and increase ADA accessibility. He referred to one neighbor's
10 comment to request the signage size be reduced and to increase landscaping on the residential side.
11 Chairman Bradley stated with regard to option no. 2 for the railing design, he would be in favor of aligning
12 with UP's approach so as to not delay the project.

13
14 Chairman Bradley then asked for a motion to recommend approval of the request as indicated on page
15 no. 24 of the agenda packet. A motion to recommend approval was made by Ms. Casale MacNally. Mr.
16 Nielsen seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

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

18 NAYS: None

19
20 **b. Case No. 25-04-SD: 557 Orchard Lane and 561 Orchard Lane: Applications seeking approval of a**
21 **Final Plat of Subdivision to consolidate the two existing lots into a single lot of record. As part of the**
22 **Final Plat approval, the application includes a request of approval of a zoning variation to permit the**
23 **existing residence at 561 Orchard Lane to observe less than the minimum required side yard setback**
24 **from the west property line, which is due to an increase in the minimum required side yard setback as**
25 **a result of the proposed increase in total lot area and increase in average lot width. The Village Council**
26 **has final jurisdiction on this request.**

27 Ms. Klaassen identified the property's location, size and zoning classification and the existing
28 improvements on each parcel. She also referred to photos of the site and provided a summary of the
29 Historic Preservation Commission's consideration of the demolition permit for 557 Orchard. Ms. Klaassen
30 then provided information relating to the proposed consolidated lot and the proposed addition on 561
31 Orchard with the proposed improvements confirmed to comply with zoning regulations. She stated the
32 consolidation would eliminate two nonconforming lots and create one conforming. Ms. Klaassen
33 informed the Board the Village Engineer reviewed the proposed plans and noted additional storm water
34 detention would be required. She stated the Plan Commission is to consider the proposed consolidation
35 at their May 22, 2025, meeting with one public comment having been received and provided to the Board.
36 Ms. Klaassen then stated following the applicant's presentation, public comment and Board discussion, a
37 Board Member may make a motion to continue the matter to a date certain or recommend approval or
38 denial as indicated on page no. 91 of the agenda packet. She asked if there were any questions.

39
40 Chairman Bradley referred to situations when lot consolidations create a zoning issue without full project
41 plans. Ms. Klaassen stated if the proposed addition required zoning relief, it would be included in the
42 application. She explained that plans were submitted by the applicant as part of this application, so a
43 zoning review was completed to verify the plans presented to the Board comply with all the zoning
44 regulations.

45
46 Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Katherine Kirkpatrick, the applicant and
47 property owner, and Edward Deegan, the architect, introduced themselves to the Board. Ms. Kirkpatrick
48 provided the Board with the intent behind the project to change the two car detached garage to a three

1 car attached garage with the space above it to be used as an in-law suite. She then summarized their
2 responses to the standards and asked if there were any questions.

3
4 Chairman Bradley referred to the curb cut change and asked if the tree on 557 Orchard would remain.
5 Ms. Kirkpatrick confirmed that the tree will remain. Ms. Leister asked for the 565 Orchard neighbor's
6 comments with regard to the setback. Ms. Kirkpatrick responded the neighbor is fully supportive of the
7 request. She also stated they initially considered building a carriage house on 557 Orchard which would
8 create a less preferable aesthetic and result in a less usable driveway. No additional questions were raised
9 at this time.

10
11 Chairman Bradley noted there is no one in the audience to comment and called the matter in for
12 discussion.

13
14 Ms. Casale MacNally referred to a previous consolidation at Elder Lane and Myrtle with this request being
15 similar to that situation. She also stated while curing numerous nonconformities and creating one, she
16 described the request as a no-brainer in that regard and concluded she would be in favor of the request.
17 Mr. Nielsen also stated he is in favor of the request and noted the current home would not be moving but
18 the side yard setback would increase. Ms. Leister stated she is concerned with the bigger picture if too
19 many of these consolidations start happening and referred to the number of similar situations when
20 dilapidated homes are purchased by adjacent property owners with additions being constructed and how
21 that impacted the feel of the neighborhood. Ms. Hanley stated while she agreed with the comments
22 made, she referred to prior discussions relating to accessible dwelling units and carriage homes. She then
23 stated the variation is only being created as a result of the consolidation and would not change the
24 neighborhood's overall look. Chairman Bradley stated while he agreed with the comments made, due to
25 the condition of 561 Orchard, it did not solve the reasonable return standard. He stated the request would
26 result in holding the line on the existing setback in order to create a home which did not belong in the R-
27 5 zoning district. Chairman Bradley concluded he would be in favor of the request.

28
29 Chairman Bradley then asked for a motion to recommend approval as indicated on page 92 of the agenda
30 packet. A motion to recommend approval was made by Ms. Casale MacNally and seconded by Mr. Nielsen.
31 A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

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

33 NAYS: None

34
35 **New Business:**

36 a. June 9, 2025 Meeting - Quorum Check

37 The Board Members discussed their availability.

38
39 **Public Comment:**

40 No comments were made at this time.

41
42 **Adjournment:**

43 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Casale MacNally
44 and seconded by Mr. Nielsen. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

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

46 NAYS: None

47 The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

48

1 Respectfully submitted,
2
3 Antionette Johnson
4 Recording Secretary
5