

**WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES
OCTOBER 13, 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 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 7:02 p.m. Roll call was taken of the Board Members present.

Public Comment:

No comments were made at this time.

Approval of Meeting Minutes.

Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to approve the September 8, 2025, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the September 8, 2025, meeting minutes was made by Mr. Nielsen and seconded by Ms. Hanley. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

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

NAYS: None

Community Development Report.

Mr. Mangum provided an update on the 314 Walnut appeal with the appellant having filed a case in Circuit Court.

Continued Cases:

a. **Case No. 25-14-V2: 175 DeWindt Road: An application seeking approval of zoning variations to allow construction of a second-floor addition to the existing residence at 175 DeWindt Road. The requested variations would permit the proposed improvements to (i) exceed the maximum permitted gross floor area; and (ii) provide less than the minimum required front yard setback from the west property line. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request. At the August 11, 2025, Zoning Board of Appeals meeting, at the request of the Applicant, the Zoning Board of Appeals continued this item to the October 13, 2025, meeting.**

Ms. Klaassen noted although the request had been continued, discussion has not been opened until this meeting. She identified the property location, zoning classification and size along with site photos containing the proposed addition. Ms. Klaassen summarized the two variations for front yard setback and GFA requested by the applicant in connection with the proposed addition. She then identified the proposed building elevations and noted public correspondence was received regarding the request and provided to the ZBA. Ms. Klaassen stated following the applicant's presentation, public comment and

1 Board discussion, a Board Member may make a motion to either continue the matter to a date specific to
2 address any questions or concerns or consider a motion recommending approval or denial with a draft
3 motion included on page 13 of the agenda packet. She then asked if there were any questions.
4

5 Ms. Hanley stated the packet of materials indicate for the 1997 addition, the applicant was denied the
6 front yard setback and asked if the proposed addition would be in the same location. Ms. Klaassen
7 responded it must have been and identified the 50-foot front yard setback. No additional questions were
8 raised at this time.
9

10 Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Christopher Canning, 1000 Skokie Blvd.,
11 Wilmette, introduced himself along with the property owners, Emily and John Thomas, Scott Walker, the
12 builder, and Healy Rice, the architect. He stated the GFA and front yard setback variations are being
13 requested for the flag lot which originally contained a ranch home and described the subsequent additions
14 which conformed to GFA requirements in 1997. Mr. Canning stated the applicants purchased the home in
15 2021 and noticed the garage was being used for storage and a gym. He stated the home had inadequate
16 storage and described the alternatives they discussed with Mr. Walker and Ms. Rice to obtain more
17 storage and which would require variations. Mr. Canning stated the proposed plan represented the best
18 alternative and would not increase impervious coverage. He referred to the concerns raised by the
19 neighbors and explained that the proposed addition would not be built into the front yard. Mr. Canning
20 then stated with regard to GFA, there was no GFA request made for the 1997 addition with the home now
21 being out of compliance by no action of the applicants. He stated the flag lot penalized them in terms of
22 the amount of GFA available for use and a GFA variation would not have otherwise been necessary.
23

24 Mr. Canning stated in response to the standards, he referred to reasonable return and several price
25 reductions in the price of the home due to the lack of a basement. He then summarized their responses
26 to the remaining standards and asked for the Board to make a positive recommendation to the Village
27 Council. Mr. Canning then asked if there were any questions.
28

29 Chairman Bradley asked if the existing nonconformity with regard to lot size and questioned the math
30 calculations. Mr. Canning referred to the worksheets prepared and explained the method for the lot area
31 calculations. Chairman Bradley then questioned the difference between the existing and proposed GFA
32 when the flagpole area is taken out. The Board Members discussed how the figures were calculated. Ms.
33 Klaassen provided further information with regard to the GFA calculation. Chairman Bradley questioned
34 the amount of storage the applicants need to allow reasonable return.
35

36 Scott Walker, general contractor, explained how the size of the proposed addition was balanced by
37 loading the second floor on the perimeter walls with the second-floor addition to blend in with the
38 remaining home's architecture. He stated to make it 100 square feet less would make it less architecturally
39 appealing and would be more difficult to build. Chairman Bradley asked if the applicants are justifying the
40 need for the zoning variation as being due to the fact that the property is located in the flood plain which
41 did not allow them to have a basement which would have been used for storage. Mr. Walker responded
42 yes.
43

44 Mr. Haller referred to the plat of survey which referenced a basement. Mr. Walker confirmed there is no
45 basement and there is an error on the plat of survey. Mr. Haller referred to the area to be built over the
46 garage. Mr. Walker responded it would remain as a garage for use by the applicants. No additional
47 questions were raised at this time.
48

1 Chairman Bradley asked for public comment. He then swore in those speaking to this matter. Amy Burke,
2 181 DeWindt, introduced herself as president of the DeWindt Homeowners Association representing the
3 neighbors. She stated after receiving the public notice, she met with the applicants with regard to their
4 plans. Ms. Burke stated they are still concerned with regard to the wording vagueness and future
5 implications for those requesting similar projects with similar setbacks and GFA.

6
7 David Nelson, 130 Evergreen Lane, provided information with regard to the property's history and stated
8 with regard to the hardship claim, the applicants purchased the home knowing what they were getting.
9 He also referred to the number of price reductions due to the prior owners' contentious situation and the
10 fact that it is a flag lot. Mr. Nelson stated those reasons are not justifiable to claim hardship and the price
11 of the older, deteriorated home reflected its market value. He also stated the area is in the 100-year flood
12 plain and referred to the applicants' plan to build a pool in connection with their claim regarding hardship.
13 Mr. Nelson also informed the Board of the landscaping permit approval process they went through as well
14 as a lack of privacy concern relating to his house and pool. He added the home has a third floor and an
15 area above the garage which is currently used for storage. No additional comments were made at this
16 time.

17
18 Mr. Haller asked if consideration was given to creating a basement area underneath the home. Mr.
19 Canning confirmed they considered it but it would have been cost prohibitive due to engineering
20 concerns. He noted the pool installation is not a part of this application. Mr. Walker also stated there
21 would not have been access to the basement other than through the garage which would have made it a
22 1.5 garage.

23
24 Chairman Bradley asked if there was any other public comment. No additional comments were made at
25 this time. He then called the matter in for discussion and summarized the relief being requested by the
26 applicants and the items the Board is to consider. Ms. Klaassen also provided additional information with
27 regard to a GFA text amendment.

28
29 Ms. Hanley stated she had trouble with the first three standards and is leaning toward voting against the
30 request and explained her reasoning in detail. Ms. Leister agreed with Ms. Hanley's comments noting a
31 lack of a basement in this area as typical. She agreed that a flag lot is not an unusual condition and referred
32 to the denial of the second-floor addition in 1997 as well as the neighbors' comments. Ms. Leister
33 concluded she would vote against the request. Mr. Ritter stated while he appreciated the attempt to not
34 change the nonconforming setback and the potential height addition, he agreed with the comments made
35 that the first three standards were not met. He stated he would vote against the request. Mr. Nielsen
36 agreed with the comments made and referred to the reduced purchase price comments. He also agreed
37 with the statements relating to flag lots and how that is addressed with zoning. Mr. Nielsen concluded he
38 would vote against the request. Mr. Haller agreed with the comments made and stated he would lean
39 toward voting against the request and the garage would become two stories which would potentially
40 impinge on the neighborhood character. Chairman Bradley stated the front yard setback is not an issue
41 for him and referred to the sensitivities of homeowners in the flood plain where he stated homes have
42 been adequately priced. He referred to the discussion of properties having pools and creating a basement
43 in the flood plain. Chairman Bradley also referred to the flag lot and the smaller lot size. He then stated
44 he was leaning toward recommending approval and the fact that the situations can be mitigated.

45
46 Chairman Bradley offered the applicant the opportunity to either move forward with the Village Council
47 or modify their plans to evaluate the Board's comments. The applicants' team discussed their options and
48 decided to request that the item be continued to the January 12, 2026, meeting.

1 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to continue the application to the January 12, 2026, meeting. A
2 motion as stated by Chairman Bradley was made by Mr. Haller and seconded by Ms. Hanley. A vote was
3 taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

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

5 NAYS: None

6
7 **New Cases:**

8 a. **Case No. 25-12-SD: 881 Private Road and 883 Private Road: Applications seeking approval of a**
9 **Final Plat of Subdivision to relocate the lot line dividing the two properties, which requires variations**
10 **to allow: (i) Proposed Lot 1 (883 Private Road) to provide less than the minimum required front street**
11 **line for an interior lot; (ii) Proposed Lot 2 (881 Private Road) to provide less than the minimum required**
12 **lot depth; and (iii) the existing residence at 881 Private Road to observe less than the minimum required**
13 **total side yard setback, which is due to an increase in the minimum required total side yard setback as**
14 **a result of the proposed increase in total lot area and increase in average lot width. The Village Council**
15 **has final jurisdiction on this request.**

16 Ms. Klaassen summarized the proposed lot line relocation dividing the two properties and noted the
17 request is limited to the proposed subdivision and zoning variations required with no proposed
18 improvements being presented at this time. She then identified the property's location, zoning
19 classification, size and improvements and noted both lots are flag lots. Ms. Klaassen stated both lots are
20 legally nonconforming which she identified for the Board. She stated there is a contingent sales contract
21 entered into between the property owners and identified the triangular area to be subdivided which
22 represented approximately 5% of existing lot area for 883 Private Road. Ms. Klaassen also summarized
23 the two variations required by the proposed subdivision. She then informed the Board of the Plan
24 Commission's findings after their consideration of the application at its September 24, 2025, meeting as
25 well as the ZBA's standards they are to consider. Ms. Klaassen stated no public comment was received
26 and following the applicant's presentation, Board discussion and public comment, a Board Member may
27 follow the two options identified in the packet of materials and asked if there were any questions.

28
29 Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. Ms. Hanley asked if moving the lot line would
30 do nothing for the variations created when the lot was originally subdivided. Ms. Klaassen confirmed that
31 is correct and provided additional information with regard to the increase in average lot width creating
32 the nonconforming total side yard setback. Mr. Haller asked if the length of the flagpole nonconformity is
33 being extended in connection with the triangular area. Ms. Klaassen confirmed that is correct and
34 provided further clarification. No additional questions were raised at this time.

35
36 Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Christopher Canning, 1000 Skokie Blvd.,
37 introduced himself as representing the owner, Jesse Van Dyke, along with Dan Creaney, the project
38 engineer. He explained the detachment of a triangular portion from 883 Private Road and confirmed
39 nothing would change with regard to two existing variations with the third variation representing an
40 unintended consequence. Mr. Canning identified the existing noncompliant aspects of the lot and noted
41 those would not change. He noted the two lots were conforming at the time they were created and
42 became nonconforming when the code changed. Mr. Canning also identified five other homes on Private
43 Road which have similar conditions in terms of the front lot line, and he submitted FOIA requests for
44 information relating to the surveys of those homes and related easements.

45
46 Mr. Canning described the unintended consequences by the addition of the triangular portion to 881
47 Private Road noting the purchase and sale is contingent upon zoning approval. He also summarized their
48 responses to the standards including reasonable return. Mr. Canning informed the Board that the

1 applicants realized after the property purchase that the north garage bay was being used for storage due
2 to the inability to access it. He referred to a photo which was shown to the Plan Commission on page nos.
3 73 and 74 which showed the property conveyance. Mr. Canning concluded by asking for a positive
4 recommendation to the Village Council and if there were any questions.

5
6 Chairman Bradley asked if there were any public comments. No comments were made at this time.
7

8 Chairman Bradley called the matter in for discussion. Mr. Haller stated he had no problem with the request
9 and described the request as a modest ask which would improve the property's utility. He also stated he
10 had no problems with regard to the standards and would recommend approval of the request. Mr. Nielsen
11 stated he would also recommend approval with all of the standards being met. He stated a new
12 nonconformity would not be created over the existing nonconformities. Ms. Hanley stated she would also
13 be in favor of the request and that it would not be so much a resubdivision but would return the lot line
14 to a better design which would reduce the lot's irregular shape. She also stated it would be a small
15 adjustment and that the variations would not be altered or increased. Ms. Hanley concluded she would
16 be in favor of the request.
17

18 Ms. Leister stated she is also in favor of the request and granting the 10-inch exception would be de
19 minimus with regard to the value being added. She concluded she would be in favor of the request. Mr.
20 Ritter agreed the standards have been met and he would also be in favor of the request with there being
21 no change to the front street line, lot depth, and side yard setback. He concluded he would also be in
22 favor of the request. Chairman Bradley agreed with the comments made and stated the standards have
23 been met, particularly with regard to reasonable return which is being applied to the zoning relief of an
24 existing nonconforming street line, lot depth and a total side yard setback resulting in less than 1 foot. He
25 concluded the standards have been met and would perfect the lot's design and allow for the 881 parcel
26 to have a wider turn to gain access to the garage's second parking bay. He also noted there have been no
27 comments from the public.
28

29 Chairman Bradley then asked for a motion to recommend approval as indicated on page 10 of the memo.
30 A motion as stated by Chairman Bradley was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Mr. Haller. A vote was
31 taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

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

33 NAYS: None
34

35 **b. Case No. 25-16-SD: 936 Sunset Road: Applications seeking approval of a Final Plat of Subdivision**
36 **to allow a two-lot subdivision of 936 Sunset Road, which requires variations to allow Proposed Lot 2 to**
37 **(i) provide less than the minimum required lot area for an interior lot; and (ii) provide less than the**
38 **minimum required rectangular buildable area. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**

39 Ms. Klaassen noted the request being presented is limited to the proposed subdivision and existing site
40 improvements with no proposed improvements being presented by the applicant. She then identified the
41 property's location, existing improvements, zoning classification and size. Ms. Klaassen described the two
42 buildable lots created by the proposed subdivision and how the original lot was platted as well as provided
43 an explanation of the areas of compliance and noncompliance with the lot area and rectangular area
44 requirements in detail. She also summarized the MWRD and Village requirements with regard to flood
45 plain regulations, storm water detention, compensatory storage and requirements in detail. Ms. Klaassen
46 then described the future improvements to the Skokie Ditch and reiterated any future development
47 would be required to comply with flood plain and storm water regulations upon submittal of permits in
48 connection with any site improvements.

1 Ms. Klaassen informed the Board the Plan Commission considered the final plat, zoning variations and
2 subdivision code variation to allow a rear lot line to abut a side lot as well as a finding of no material
3 increased adverse impact for the existing nonconforming front yard and corner yard setbacks as well as
4 the front-facing attached garage door width. She advised the Board of the Plan Commission's
5 consideration of the request and vote to recommend approval with the condition that the existing
6 nonconforming playhouse be relocated to comply with zoning regulations or be removed. Ms. Klaassen
7 stated the Board is to consider whether the two variations are in harmony with the general purpose and
8 intent of the Zoning Ordinance and whether the eight standards for granting the variations have been
9 met. She noted all public correspondence was provided to the Board and asked if there were any
10 questions.

11
12 Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time. He then
13 swore in those speaking to this matter.

14
15 Christopher Canning, 1000 Skokie Blvd., Wilmette, introduced himself, the property owners, Bob and
16 Susan Marren, and Dan Creaney, the project engineer and author of the Exhibit presented to the Board
17 and who is available to answer questions. He provided a summary of the Plan Commission's discussion
18 including the history of the property and subdivision noting the existing conditions were not created by
19 the applicants and they are attempting to undo the lot consolidation. Mr. Canning stated the request is
20 similar to 860 Lamson that was approved by the Village Council.

21
22 Mr. Canning stated the Plan Commission made a positive recommendation with conditions to be
23 addressed including variations for minimum lot area and referred to the discussion regarding moving the
24 lot lines which would result in two conforming lots but would still require variations. Ms. Klaassen
25 provided additional clarification for the Board following questions from the Board regarding a lot depth
26 variation that would be required for proposed Lot 1 if the lot line between the two lots were to be shifted
27 north. Mr. Canning agreed Lot 2 could be made conforming but they decided it was better to return the
28 lot to its original condition. He referred to eight other lots of similar sizes in the area. Mr. Canning then
29 referred to the Exhibit, which addressed the spirit of meeting the minimum rectangular area requirement
30 and reiterated no new home is being proposed with the Exhibit being done in response to the Village
31 Engineer's concerns.

32
33 Mr. Canning then stated with regard to the flood plain and storm water concerns raised by the neighbors,
34 he summarized the Plan Commission's discussion relating to their prior application submitted in 2014
35 which addressed the compensatory story and storm water detention issues. He confirmed any future
36 potential construction would have to meet the Village's engineering and storm water requirements. Mr.
37 Canning then summarized their response to the eight standards and first referred to John Satter's
38 appraisal and response in that the parcels were more valuable separately as opposed to the combined
39 parcel in connection with the reasonable return standard. He stated they are available to answer any
40 questions relating to storm water or zoning.

41
42 Chairman Bradley asked if there were any questions. Mr. Ritter asked if subdivision approval was granted,
43 would the tennis court be removed. Mr. Canning confirmed that is correct and referred to the condition
44 of removing the playhouse. Ms. Leister asked what the cost of engineering the potential home would be
45 and its impact to the value of selling this parcel of land. Mr. Canning responded they did not consider that
46 and stated their focus was on the land subdivision. Mr. Haller asked if there would be overall height
47 restrictions for any new potential building due to it being raised to be out of the flood plain. Mr. Canning
48 responded this engineering technique has been used on other homes in the neighborhood.

1 Dan Creaney, the civil engineer, stated with regard to the flood plain, he explained the standard flow
2 through crawl space construction which is used and how roof angles could be modified to comply with
3 potential height. Mr. Canning confirmed the height limit is 33 feet. No additional questions were raised at
4 this time.

5
6 Chairman Bradley asked for public comment and swore in those speaking to this matter. James Langer,
7 956 Sunset, stated his concerns relate to the view of proposed Lot 2. He stated the request did not meet
8 the standards and failed to specifically comply with Section 16.12.010 since a side lot abutting a rear lot
9 line would be created. He noted they never received notification with regard to the neighborhood meeting
10 held by the Marrens and described the water issues they experience on their property. Mr. Langer stated
11 the proposal would definitely lower their property value with regard to reasonable return with flooding
12 concerns representing their main issue. He then stated with regard to the 2014 findings; the exact same
13 case was presented and rejected as not meeting the standards.

14
15 Githesh Ramamurphy, 916 Higginson, identified his home for the Board and stated he has lived in his home
16 since 2006 and described the substantial flooding issues they experienced. He stated in his line of
17 business; he is very familiar with flooding issues and any potential new home would exacerbate the
18 flooding issues even more and referred to the amount of water they currently experience. Mr.
19 Ramamurphy stated the second issue is that the compliance standards are not being met as well as the
20 amount of water in the Skokie Ditch which is located next to his home. He stated two neighboring homes
21 would also be affected by them having severe property damage. Mr. Ramamurphy stated the only way
22 the applicants would be able to realize reasonable return would be if a home is built on the subdivided
23 lot. No additional comments were made at this time.

24
25 Chairman Bradley asked the applicants if they would like to respond. Mr. Canning identified the square
26 footage of several surrounding lots which he outlined in his letter that are smaller or similarly sized to
27 proposed Lot 2. He confirmed no decision was made on the 2014 application and the matter was
28 continued and ultimately withdrawn. Mr. Canning then stated with regard to the neighbors' comments,
29 the home's views are raised since they are located in the flood plain. He stated the Langers' home
30 immediately to the west submitted photos which included compensatory storage which is being proposed
31 for Lot 2. Mr. Creaney then described the Skokie Ditch improvements in detail and referred to the MWRD
32 and Village engineering requirements. He also stated they have built several homes in the Village which
33 he identified for the Board and which comply with MWRD and Village engineering standards. Chairman
34 Bradley confirmed the Board is not voting on any potential new build for the proposed lot.

35
36 Chairman Bradley closed public comment and called the matter in for discussion. He reminded the Board
37 of the items the Board is to consider. Ms. Klaassen confirmed the zoning variations the Board is to
38 consider.

39
40 Mr. Ritter stated the standards for granting the variance have arguably been met and described the lot
41 area variance as de minimus as well as the fact that the rectangular area variance did not seem significant
42 either. He stated while he understood the neighbors' concerns with regard to flooding, if there is a
43 residence built on the lot, there are lot of stringent requirements which would need to be met. Mr. Ritter
44 then stated the tennis court removal would result in a significant impervious surface area being removed
45 which would help both lots and concluded by stating he would be in favor of the request. Ms. Leister
46 stated with regard to 1(a), she is fine with regard to where the lot line would be drawn with there being
47 precedent for it. She also stated it would trigger the least amount of variances but she struggled with (b)

1 and that there would be constraints in terms of building a home. Ms. Leister stated she would prefer for
2 it to meet the rectangular requirements.
3

4 Ms. Hanley agreed with Ms. Leister's comments in that she is not sure it would be an ideal buildable lot
5 as well as standard nos. 2 and 3 which would make Lot 2 more unique. She stated with regard to the
6 essential character of the locality; there would be a ditch that ran through a significant portion of the lot
7 and into the buildable area. Ms. Hanley stated it would ultimately require a variation for a home to be
8 built on Lot 2. Chairman Bradley stated he would be in favor of the request and although he sympathized
9 with the neighbors' concerns and if this request was not located in the flood plain, it would not have been
10 an issue. He stated there are storm water regulations in place for new development to adhere to and the
11 lots would be returned to their original condition. Chairman Bradley then stated if the applicants' home
12 is sold, the home could be torn down with a new home conforming to the requirements of the
13 consolidated lot. He stated the Board should not consider what is possible for the lot and also commented
14 in detail the consideration of any new potential construction on the proposed irregularly shaped and
15 undersized lot with new construction being considered a clean slate which would be extremely difficult in
16 terms of obtaining zoning relief.
17

18 Ms. Hanley clarified her comment in that the issue before the Board is that the code stated if a lot is
19 subdivided, it had to result in two, clean lots without variances. She stated they have to apply the current
20 zoning code in that the ditch created a unique circumstance which would alter the essential character of
21 the locality and would create a unique circumstance which should prohibit the subdivision. Mr. Nielsen
22 summarized Chairman Bradley's and Ms. Hanley's comments and referred to the 2014 previous review of
23 the Board. He stated with the tennis court removal, the applicants could consider installing compensatory
24 storage where the courts are currently to help mitigate everyone's concerns. He then stated he would
25 recommend approval.
26

27 Mr. Haller shared Ms. Hanley's and Ms. Leister's concerns and stated he is less persuaded by what the lot
28 would have been had it stayed the way it was. He stated they are being asked to create an irregular lot
29 and he had difficulty with the idea of giving the applicants a pass on some elements of the lot. Mr. Nielsen
30 stated he could be persuaded and reiterated he had difficulty with standard nos. 2 and 3 being
31 troublesome to him. The Board Members discussed their positions at length.
32

33 Ms. Hanley suggested the matter be continued to allow the applicants time to resubmit the application
34 with a conforming, buildable Lot 2 being perfected to be a buildable lot with the variation to be requested
35 on Lot 1. Ms. Klaassen informed the Board that Lot 1 measured 165 feet in width and referred to an
36 illustration. The Board Members discussed alternatives with regard to various lot line measurements.
37

38 Chairman Bradley stated in order to sway the undecided Board Members, he offered the applicants the
39 opportunity to continue the matter to a date certain to come back before the Board with a nonconforming
40 Lot 1 or proceed with a vote at this time. Ms. Leister and Mr. Haller stated they would like to see the
41 alternative presented to the Board or the applicants can proceed at this time.
42

43 Chairman Bradley then presented the options to the applicants to either continue the request to a future
44 meeting to consider the variances or proceed with a vote on the request with a negative recommendation
45 to the Village Council. Mr. Canning stated it would be up to the Village staff and stated it may be a
46 worthwhile exercise with the December 8, 2025, meeting date being a possibility. While the Board was
47 discussing their availability for December 8, Mr. Mangum noted there is one Board Member absent from
48 this meeting.

1 Mr. Canning asked for the request to be continued to the December 8, 2025, meeting. A motion was made
2 by Ms. Hanley to continue the request to December 8, 2025, and seconded by Mr. Ritter. A vote was taken
3 and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

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

5 NAYS: None

6

7 **New Business:**

8 a. November 10, 2025, Meeting - Quorum Check.

9 The Board Members discussed their availability.

10

11 **Public Comment:**

12 No comments were made at this time.

13

14 **Adjournment:**

15 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Hanley and
16 seconded by Ms. Leister. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

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

18 NAYS: None

19 The meeting adjourned at 9:51 p.m.

20

21 Respectfully submitted,

22

23 Antionette Johnson

24 Recording Secretary