

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

**Zoning Board Members Present:** Matt Bradley, Chairman  
Mark Haller  
Lynn Hanley  
Kathryn Leister  
Mike Nielsen  
Michael Ritter

**Zoning Board Members Absent:** Todd Vender

**Village Attorney:** Courtney Trefil

**Village Staff:** Scott Mangum, Director of Community Development  
Ann Klaassen, Assistant Director of Community  
Development  
Christopher Marx, Associate Planner

**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 June 9, 2025, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the June 9, 2025, meeting minutes was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Mr. Nielsen. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

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

NAYS: None

**Community Development Report.**

Ms. Klaassen stated there is no Community Development Report.

**Recommendations and Determinations:**

a. **Case No. 25-09-APL: 314 Walnut Street: Consideration of approval of written findings and determination to affirm the Zoning Administrator's determination that 314 Walnut Street has a front yard along Wilson Street.**

Ms. Trefil provided a summary of the status of the matter and the recommendation that the item be continued to the next meeting date. Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to continue the consideration of the written findings and determinations to the August 11, 2025, ZBA meeting. A motion as stated by Chairman Bradley was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Mr. Haller. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

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

NAYS: None

**New Cases:**

a. **Case No. 25-10-V2: 270 Birch Street: An application seeking approval of zoning variations to allow construction of an addition to the existing residence and a new detached garage at 270 Birch**

1 **Street. The requested variations would permit the proposed improvements to (i) provide less than the**  
2 **minimum required front yard setback from the east property line along Birch Street; (ii) provide less**  
3 **than the minimum required total side yard setback; and (iii) exceed the maximum permitted width for**  
4 **front-facing garage doors. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**

5 Ms. Klaassen identified the property's location, zoning classification, photos and location of the proposed  
6 detached garage. She summarized the Board's consideration of the previous variation application at a  
7 prior ZBA meeting, as well as the Village Council's consideration of the previous proposal. The Board  
8 Members discussed the tree in question which caused access issues. Ms. Klaassen summarized the  
9 proposed variations related to constructing an addition to the existing attached front facing garage and a  
10 new detached garage she identified for the Board. She noted the total garage space on the site would  
11 accommodate three vehicles and explained the rear quarter setback requirements. Ms. Klaassen  
12 described the proposed and existing garages' position and dimensions and explained the zoning relief  
13 required. She informed the Board two emails were received from neighbors and stated following hearing  
14 from the applicant and the public, and Board deliberation, a Board Member may make a motion to  
15 recommend approval or denial with draft language provided on page 78. Ms. Klaassen asked if there were  
16 any questions. No questions were raised at this time.

17  
18 Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Scott Rosett, the general contractor, explained  
19 the two year process undertaken in considering the proposed plan to help maintain the integrity of the  
20 older home. He stated a two car normal sized garage would not function well for the owners and described  
21 the process the applicants underwent to solve the issues. Mr. Rosett stated although there may be a way  
22 in which to conform to the restrictions, the owners are aesthetically driven and the architect created a  
23 plan to allow for modern day living. He noted the existing two car garage would not conform to a typical  
24 two car garage in terms of its width which drove the need for how an additional garage came into play.  
25 Mr. Rosett also provided an explanation in response to the two letters submitted in opposition.

26  
27 Chairman Bradley summarized the application's prior consideration and questioned the issues involved  
28 relating to the tree and the vehicle turning radius. Mr. Rosett described the limitations of the existing two  
29 car size in detail which explained the need for the additional south garage.

30  
31 Ms. Hanley questioned the interior and exterior garage measurements as well as the floorplan with two  
32 garage doors. Mr. Rosett explained the reasoning for the different elevations as well as the size needed  
33 for the applicants' vehicles and storage. He added that the north side would be a very wide one car garage  
34 and explained the need for the garage addition. The Board Members and applicant further discussed the  
35 amount of interior space. Mr. Haller asked for the amount that it could be brought forward which did not  
36 trigger a front yard variation. Ms. Klaassen responded it could come towards Birch Street approximately  
37 3.5 feet and identified the existing front yard setback. The Board Members and applicant discussed  
38 possible garage sizes to eliminate one of the variances.

39  
40 Ms. Leister asked about the south neighbor's position regarding the detached garage placement in the  
41 front compared to the rear of the lot. Mr. Rosett responded the neighbor supported their initial  
42 submission and stated the proposed location would affect them less. Chairman Bradley noted the  
43 neighbor to the south presented a letter in opposition to the free standing structure. He then asked why  
44 the design was changed. Mr. Rosett stated the applicant's preferred a single detached garage in the front  
45 of the property but that would not have been acceptable, which resulted in the three car garage noting  
46 the tree presented a problem. He explained the applicants' preference for a detached garage on the south  
47 which would result in an estate type setting which mimicked the home's original architectural style. The

1 Board Members and applicant further discussed alternatives. No additional questions from the Board  
2 were raised at this time.

3  
4 Chairman Bradley asked for public comment and swore in those speaking to this matter. Alexandra Nichols  
5 identified herself as the rear neighbor and described how the existing garage is not used. She stated the  
6 applicants are asking for special consideration to allow them to have additional space and referred to  
7 several neighbors who are strongly opposed to the request. No additional comments were made at this  
8 time.

9  
10 Chairman Bradley called the matter in for discussion and summarized the items the Board is to consider.  
11 Ms. Hanley stated she voted in opposition to the initial request and stated the property did not have any  
12 unique aspects which created a hardship. She stated she would not vote in favor of the requested setbacks  
13 and identified alternatives for the garage location. Ms. Hanley applauded the applicants on maintaining  
14 the older home and stated she would not be in opposition to one garage door for the existing garage.

15  
16 Mr. Nielsen agreed with Ms. Hanley's comments and referred to the standards. He stated the applicants  
17 still have the ability to yield a reasonable return. Mr. Nielsen stated he would not vote in favor of the  
18 request and would agree to the existing garage's modification. Mr. Haller agreed with the comments  
19 made and stated bringing the garage forward would provide additional depth and allow for more storage.  
20 He also stated he would not have an issue with a wider garage door on the existing garage.

21  
22 Ms. Leister stated she would vote against the three variations requested and referred to the standards  
23 which were not met. She also referred to the neighbors' concerns. Ms. Leister then stated they can  
24 maximize the existing options which would not trigger the setback as well as the alternatives suggested  
25 with regard to storage space. Mr. Ritter commented the project has been beautifully done and stated the  
26 criteria for granting the variations have not been met. He stated he would be in favor of the garage door  
27 width change and extending the front of the existing garage. Chairman Bradley stated he supported the  
28 initial plans and there has been no justification for the detached garage on the south side. He identified  
29 the prior concerns raised with regard to placing a detached garage on the south side. Chairman Bradley  
30 stated he would otherwise support the application and described the effect on the neighbors. He then  
31 stated the first three standards are not satisfied with the architect having identified other options.

32  
33 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to recommend denial of the request as noted on page 78. A motion  
34 as stated by Chairman Bradley was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Mr. Nielsen. A vote was taken  
35 and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

36 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Leister, Nielsen, Ritter

37 NAYS: None

38  
39 **b. Case No. 25-13-V2: 826 Humboldt Avenue: An application seeking approval of zoning variations**  
40 **to allow construction of an addition and work beyond ordinary repair and maintenance of the existing**  
41 **residence at 826 Humboldt Avenue. The requested variations would permit the proposed**  
42 **improvements to (i) provide less than the minimum required front yard setback from the northerly**  
43 **property line along Humboldt Avenue; (ii) allow structural changes necessary to provide a new window**  
44 **opening in the legally nonconforming east side building wall; and (iii) provide an unarticulated east side**  
45 **building wall. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**

46 Mr. Marx identified the applicant and summarized the variations being requested. He then identified the  
47 property's location, size and zoning classification as well as exterior photos of the home. Mr. Marx stated  
48 the home was built in approximately 1921 with a subsequent addition. He referred to the plat of survey

1 and noted the home was built closer to the street than would be permitted according to the current zoning  
2 code. Mr. Marx then described the proposed renovations, improvements and requested variations in  
3 detail. He also referred to illustrations of both current photos and plans for the basement floor deepening  
4 and footing improvements as well the proposed first floor plan and window well addition. Mr. Marx then  
5 referred to the proposed second floor improvements and proposed elevations of the front of the home  
6 as well as the proposed east elevation. He summarized the requested zoning relief and stated the  
7 applicant is present to answer any questions.  
8

9 Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. Ms. Leister questioned the amount of the  
10 requested items the Zoning Administrator would handle as opposed to presenting them to the Board. Mr.  
11 Marx responded enlarging, relocating or requesting a window opening would require Zoning  
12 Administrator approval with building articulation requiring final Board approval.  
13

14 Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Samuel Pavlovcik introduced himself as the  
15 architect and identified the nonconforming nature of the existing residence driving the variations being  
16 requested.  
17

18 Ms. Leister asked if they considered articulation. Mr. Pavlovcik referred to the floor plan and explained  
19 the existing nonconforming articulation and the limited alternatives. Mr. Ritter asked if they considered  
20 adding windows in the unarticulated wall. Mr. Pavlovcik responded part of the request included adding a  
21 window in the wall in the front section and referred to second floor window additions which did not  
22 require relief. No additional questions were raised at this time.  
23

24 Chairman Bradley asked for public comment and swore in those speaking to this matter. Stephanie Wilson  
25 stated the home had been vacant for four years and described the problems with the property being a  
26 cause of concern for many neighbors. She stated they assumed the home would be torn down which is  
27 located closer to the street and referred to neighboring homes being set back from the street. Ms. Wilson  
28 stated there is concern about the house being so close to the street and would prefer it met the standard  
29 for front yard setback to be consistent with neighboring homes.  
30

31 Chairman Bradley called the matter in for discussion. Ms. Leister stated she appreciated the neighbor's  
32 comments and would be in favor of the request with the variations due to the existing nonconformity.  
33 Mr. Ritter agreed with Ms. Leister's comments and commented the unarticulated wall is unfortunate. He  
34 stated the front of the home would be made more attractive and concluded he would be in favor of the  
35 request. Ms. Hanley also stated she is in favor of the request and referred to the nonconformities not  
36 being expanded. Mr. Nielsen commented the architect did a great job and added it is good that they are  
37 keeping the home with all of the standards being met. He concluded he is in favor of the request. Mr.  
38 Haller agreed with the comments made and referred to the difficulty in terms of rebuilding the home. He  
39 stated he would be in favor of the request. Chairman Bradley agreed with the neighbor's comments and  
40 commented he is glad the home is being improved. He added they cannot mandate what is done with the  
41 property and it would have to comply in terms of engineering standards.  
42

43 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to recommend approval as indicated on page 101. A motion as  
44 stated by Chairman Bradley was made by Mr. Nielsen and seconded by Mr. Haller. A vote was taken and  
45 the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

46 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Leister, Nielsen, Ritter

47 NAYS: None  
48

1 **New Business:**

2 a. August 11, 2025, Meeting - Quorum Check.

3 The Board Members discussed their availability.

4

5 **Public Comment:**

6 No comments were made at this time.

7

8 **Adjournment:**

9 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Hanley and  
10 seconded by Mr. Nielsen. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

11 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Leister, Nielsen, Ritter

12 NAYS: None

13 The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

14

15 Respectfully submitted,

16

17 Antionette Johnson

18 Recording Secretary