

**WINNETKA PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
SEPTEMBER 24, 2025**

**Members Present:**

Layla Danley, Chairperson  
Jonathan Alt  
Christopher Blum  
Matthew Bradley  
Chris Enck  
Liz Kunkle  
Cyrus Subawalla  
Kate Van Vlack

**Members Absent:**

Mamie Case

**Non-Voting Members Present:**

Bridget Orsic

**Village Staff:**

Scott Mangum, Community Development Director  
Ann Klaassen, Assistant Director of Community  
Development  
Christopher Marx, Associate Planner

**Call to Order & Roll Call:**

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Danley at 7:00 p.m. Ms. Klaassen took roll call of the Commission Members present.

**Approval of July 23, 2025, Regular Meeting Minutes:**

Chairperson Danley asked for a motion to approve the July 23, 2025, regular meeting minutes. A motion to approve the July 23, 2025, meeting minutes was made by Mr. Bradley and seconded by Mr. Blum. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 8 to 0:

AYES: Alt, Blum, Bradley, Danley, Enck, Kunkle, Subawalla, Van Vlack

NAYS: None

NON-VOTING: Orsic

**Public Comment:**

No comments were made at this time.

**Community Development Report:**

Mr. Mangum provided an update on the affordable housing plan approved by the Village Council and submitted for review by the state. He also provided an update on the special use permit application by Charles Schwab in the One Winnetka development which was approved by the Village Council.

**New Applications:**

a. **Case No. 25-12-SD: 881 Private Road and 883 Private Road:** Applications seeking approval of a Final Plat of Subdivision to relocate the lot line dividing the two properties, which requires (i) variations to allow: (a) proposed Lot 1 (883 Private Road) to provide less than the minimum required front street line for an interior lot; (b) proposed Lot 2 (881 Private Road) to provide less than the minimum required lot depth; (c) the existing residence at 881 Private Road to observe less than the minimum required total side yard setback, which is due to an increase in the minimum required total side yard setback as

1 **a result of the proposed increase in total lot area and increase in average lot width; and (ii) a finding of**  
2 **"No Material Increased Adverse Impact" for the existing residence at 881 Private Road, which exceeds**  
3 **the maximum permitted width for a front-facing attached garage. The Village Council has final**  
4 **jurisdiction on this request.**

5 Chairperson Danley summarized the application and asked the Commission Members if they had any  
6 preliminary comments. No comments were made at this time. Ms. Klaassen referred to the variations  
7 being requested as well as the finding of no material increased adverse impact from an existing  
8 nonconformity for the Commission to make a recommendation to the Village Council. She identified the  
9 properties' location, zoning classification, size and the existing structures and noted both are flag lots and  
10 legally nonconforming. She noted the applicants have entered into a sales contract to convey a triangular  
11 portion of the 883 Private parcel and consolidate with the 881 Private parcel. Ms. Klaassen also  
12 summarized the application review by the ZBA and noted no easements are required by the Village's  
13 Engineering and Water and Electric Departments. She then identified the factors the Commission is to  
14 consider and stated following the applicant's presentation and public comment, a draft motion is included  
15 on page 19 of the agenda packet for the Commission to consider. Ms. Klaassen noted no public comment  
16 was received on the application and asked if there were any questions.

17  
18 Chairperson Danley also asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time.

19  
20 Chairperson Danley swore in those speaking to this matter. Christopher Canning, 1000 Skokie Blvd.,  
21 introduced himself and Jesse Van Dyke, the property owner of 881 Private Road, to the Commission and  
22 stated the engineer, Dan Creaney, is also present to answer any technical plat questions. Mr. Canning  
23 stated the parcel in question is a triangular parcel measuring 1,387 square feet with a sales contract being  
24 conditioned upon zoning approval. He also stated the request would be presented to the ZBA and  
25 described the two flag lot configurations. Mr. Canning summarized the existing conditions as well as the  
26 front lot line and minimum lot depth. He then outlined the FOIA request he submitted to the Community  
27 Development Department with regard to minimum front lot line and referred to lots which are similarly  
28 situated in terms of driveway width. Mr. Canning stated there is an unintended consequence of moving  
29 the triangle which resulted in the home encroaching into the side yard and confirmed the home would  
30 not become larger. He also referred to the no material increased adverse impact standard and the 1993  
31 garage expansion following the Commission's approval which was not an issue at that time. Mr. Canning  
32 asked the Commission to agree with that finding in that the garage is of a greater width than is permitted.  
33 He stated the requested variations are for existing conditions and are a result of the attempt to square  
34 off the lot. Mr. Canning referred to a slide in the presentation which depicted the area they are attempting  
35 to rectify by the purchase of the triangular portion of the 883 parcel so that the 881 parcel can make full  
36 use of the garage bay. He concluded by asking for a positive recommendation and asked if there were any  
37 questions.

38  
39 Chairperson Danley asked if there has never been garage access since the applicants purchased the home.  
40 Mr. Canning responded the prior owner used the north bay for storage and described the many  
41 movements required to get a vehicle into the north bay.

42  
43 Mr. Blum asked if there was ever access on the northwest corner via Ravine Drive to the 883 parcel. Mr.  
44 Canning responded he did not know and referred to the number of flag lots in the area and also described  
45 the dimension as not being unusual. Mr. Enck asked if there are any immediate plans to build on the 883  
46 parcel. Mr. Canning responded it is not considered as part of the application. Mr. Enck asked if there is  
47 future building on the lot later, would be problematic in terms of access. Mr. Canning described proposed  
48 siting for any future building on the site. Ms. Van Vlack asked about eliminating access and how that could

1 be an issue. Mr. Canning stated the purchase and sale agreement is related to the triangle and the  
2 authorization provided to the 881 parcel by the 883 parcel.

3  
4 Mr. Alt asked if the driveway on the 881 parcel would be modified. Mr. Van Dyke informed the  
5 Commission that approximately 8 feet of asphalt would be added to access the northernmost garage bay  
6 as well as landscaping. No additional questions were raised at this time.

7  
8 Chairperson Danley asked for public comment. No comments were made at this time. She then called the  
9 matter in for discussion. Chairperson Danley described the request as a neighbor to neighbor exchange  
10 and noted there is no public comment.

11  
12 Trustee Orsic stated due to the fact no neighbors are involved, this isn't facing a street, it isn't impacting  
13 neighbors or the character other than a future home being built, she is not a voting member but had no  
14 issue with the request. Mr. Blum stated it made sense for it to be done with regard to the small triangular  
15 area and he had no problem with the request. Mr. Enck agreed with the comments made. Mr. Subawalla  
16 also stated he had no issue with regard to the request. Mr. Alt agreed with the comments made and stated  
17 there would be no material increased adverse impact and he would be in favor of the request. Mr. Bradley  
18 stated he would reserve his comments until the matter is presented to the ZBA but agreed the garage  
19 width did not rise to the level to meet the standard that there would be an increased material adverse  
20 impact. Ms. Kunkle agreed with the comments made and noted the property is located on a private road  
21 and would have a minimal impact on neighbors. Chairperson Danley agreed with the comments and  
22 referred to the existing nonconformities and the existing front facing garage. She concluded she is in favor  
23 of the request.

24  
25 Chairperson Danley then asked for a motion as indicated on page 19 of the agenda packet. A motion to  
26 recommend approval as indicated on page 19 for the proposed AJV Subdivision Final Plat relocating the  
27 lot line dividing 881 Private Road and 883 Private Road as the final plat of subdivision was made by Ms.  
28 Van Vlack and seconded by Ms. Kunkle. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 7 to 0:

29 AYES: Alt, Blum, Danley, Enck, Kunkle, Subawalla, Van Vlack

30 NAYS: None

31 NON-VOTING: Bradley, Orsic

32  
33 **b. Case No. 25-16-SD: 936 Sunset Road: Applications seeking approval of a Final Plat of Subdivision**  
34 **to allow a two-lot subdivision of 936 Sunset Road, which requires (i) variations to allow: (a) proposed**  
35 **Lot 2 to provide less than the minimum required lot area and less than the minimum required**  
36 **rectangular buildable area; (b) a side lot line abutting a rear lot line; and (ii) a finding of "No Material**  
37 **Increased Adverse Impact" for existing improvements on proposed Lot 1 (936 Sunset Road) which (a)**  
38 **observe less than the minimum required front yard setback from Sunset Road; (b) observe less than the**  
39 **minimum required corner yard setback from Higginson Lane; and (c) exceeds the maximum permitted**  
40 **width for a front-facing garage door. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**

41 Chairperson Danley asked the Commission Members for any preliminary comments with regard to the  
42 application. No comments were made at this time. Ms. Klaassen described the proposed subdivision of  
43 the existing lot into two buildable lots. She noted the request is limited to the subdivision itself and the  
44 existing improvements with no proposed improvements included as part of the request. Ms. Klaassen  
45 identified the property's location, zoning classification, existing improvements and measurements. She  
46 stated the Comprehensive Plan designated the subject property and surrounding properties as  
47 appropriate for single family residential uses and the applicant's use of the site is consistent with the  
48 Comprehensive Plan and zoning.

1 Ms. Klaassen described Lots 1 and 2 and the existing improvements on Lot 1. She noted the site was  
2 originally platted as two lots similar to the current proposal and described the 1976 parcel created to  
3 allow construction of the tennis court which would be removed as part of the proposal. Ms. Klaassen  
4 noted Lot 1 complied with the zoning standards and summarized Lot 2's noncompliance and the current  
5 requirements in detail. She then identified the subdivision standards that proposed subdivisions are to  
6 comply with which she described in detail. Ms. Klaassen referred to irregularly shaped lots in the  
7 neighborhood and identified the three existing nonconformities.

8  
9 Ms. Klaassen informed the Commission the site is located entirely in the 100 year flood plain with  
10 development on either lot being subject to the Village's flood hazard protection ordinance as well as  
11 MWRD requirements. She stated development on Lot 2 would require storm water detention and flood  
12 plain compensatory storage. Ms. Klaassen referred the Commission to an image of a conceptual possible  
13 home on the proposed vacant lot in response to the Village's engineering comments on the proposed  
14 subdivision which she described in detail along with compensatory storage and storm water detention.  
15 Ms. Klaassen stated the Village's Engineering Department confirmed with MWRD that surface  
16 compensatory storage is acceptable provided it did not impact the storm water conveyance easement  
17 and noted there are planned improvements to the Skokie Ditch resulting in increased capacity. She  
18 reiterated the applicant is not proposing any new improvements on either lot at this time.

19  
20 Ms. Klaassen stated the Water and Electric Department requested a 5-foot utility easement on proposed  
21 Lot 2. She stated the ZBA would consider the request at its October 13, 2025, meeting and since the  
22 agenda packet was posted, two letters were received from neighbors and provided to the Commission.  
23 Ms. Klaassen stated following the applicant's presentation, public comment and Commission deliberation,  
24 a draft motion is provided on page 56 for the Commission. She then asked if there were any questions.

25  
26 Mr. Blum stated as his initial preliminary comment, he disclosed that he was on a different zoning board  
27 for which an application for this property was presented 11 years ago and the application was withdrawn.  
28 Mr. Bradley asked for clarification with regard to the lots appearing to be mirror properties and the forced  
29 consolidation by the Village at the time. He asked if the application is a request to put the property back  
30 to its original condition. Ms. Kunkle stated after the property was divided, it appeared that the Village  
31 increased lot sizes with the neighborhood character now being called small estates. Mr. Alt asked if this is  
32 the first stop for this application. Ms. Klaassen confirmed that is correct and outlined the application's  
33 presentation before the various boards. She stated there has been no record of a home being on the lot.  
34 Ms. Klaassen also stated by shifting the dividing line between the two lots, it would require zoning relief  
35 from the minimum lot depth requirement for Lot 1. Ms. Van Vlack expressed concern in the neighborhood  
36 with regard to water displacement. She then referred to 901 and 905 Higginson which represented similar  
37 situations of lots being subdivided into a nonconforming size in the R-2 district as well as the lot area  
38 requirements at the time. Ms. Klaassen informed the Commission the lot area requirement was increased  
39 in 1999 and that it is likely a nonconforming lot with respect to at least the lot area requirements. She  
40 added she is not sure when those lots were subdivided.

41  
42 Mr. Subawalla asked if the southwest corner represented the lowest point in the neighborhood for the  
43 adjacent lots and would result in a water catch point from the surrounding lots. He also asked if the  
44 surrounding homes have their own storm water detention systems and where did the storm water  
45 detention from this lot get released. Ms. Klaassen responded the proposed lot if developed would drain  
46 to the Skokie Ditch and stated she could not speak to the elevation of this lot compared to others. She  
47 confirmed the newer home to the west had compensatory storage and noted storm water detention  
48 compliance is required with water runoff not being allowed to run to other lots. Mr. Blum questioned the

1 forced consolidation which Ms. Klaassen explained to the Commission. No additional questions were  
2 raised at this time.

3  
4 Chairperson Danley swore in those speaking to this matter. Christopher Canning, 1000 Skokie Blvd.,  
5 introduced himself, Bob and Susan Marren, the property owners, and the project engineer, Dan Creaney  
6 who prepared the exhibit the Commission Members discussed at the request of the Village Engineer  
7 following the comments they made. He confirmed the matter did not relate to a hypothetical home but  
8 only the lot. Mr. Canning stated to address Mr. Blum's question, he explained the reason for their first  
9 request to the ZBA. He then referred to 860 Lamson which added a tennis court on their property which  
10 had to be consolidated which happened to this property in 1976 in connection with the 936 Sunset, and  
11 further explained how 860 Lamson went through the same process to subdivide the lot back to its original  
12 configuration.

13  
14 Mr. Canning stated the current owners purchased the property in 2006 and are asking for the two lots to  
15 be restored to the pre-1976 condition. He stated he discussed with Ms. Klaassen moving the lot line  
16 between the lots, and the applicants are willing to amend their application. Mr. Canning stated if the  
17 property line is moved north, they would be able to achieve the 3% needed to comply with lot area but it  
18 would result in a minimum lot depth variation for Lot 1. Mr. Canning stated they decided to go with the  
19 pre-1976 condition and are willing to revisit the alternative if required by the ZBA. He stated it would not  
20 change the rectangular variation issue, any storm water calculations or detention areas. Mr. Canning also  
21 referred to other smaller homes in the area identified in the application materials and with regard to the  
22 minimum rectangular area, he referred to the previous discussion which he cited for the Commission. Mr.  
23 Canning referred to the standard addressing the minimum rectangular area which has not been met  
24 resulting in the variation being sought in which the spirit of requirement existed has been met.

25  
26 Mr. Canning also addressed the comment relating to rear lot lines not abutting side lot lines which  
27 currently existed as well as in other areas on Higginson. He then addressed the no material increased  
28 adverse impact comment and the letter received from the neighbor which only related to the existing  
29 home and not the proposed Lot 2. Mr. Canning addressed the north setback issue which did not represent  
30 a material adverse impact as well as the garage door measuring 16 feet which has existed for a long time.  
31 He reiterated there is no request pertaining to the proposed Lot 2.

32  
33 Mr. Canning then stated with regard to the concerns raised with regard to the flood plain and storm water  
34 section of Ms. Klaassen's memo, the neighbors' concerns relating to storm water need to be addressed.  
35 He stated Mr. Creaney was brought in to address the concerns relating to storm water management  
36 regulations and which was a concern to only one neighbor who raised no further concerns. Mr. Canning  
37 summarized their response in the materials to the Village Engineer's request addressing the easements,  
38 rights-of-way, setback, maximum building footprint and available space for detention. He emphasized  
39 that Exhibit 10 represented a demonstrative example of what could be done and cited language requiring  
40 compliance with Village Engineering requirements. Mr. Canning identified surrounding homes built which  
41 complied with the engineering requirements and identified 956 Sunset as an example. He then asked if  
42 there were any questions.

43  
44 Chairperson Danley asked if the applicants have a buyer for the adjacent lot. Mr. Canning responded there  
45 is not. Chairperson Danley asked if thought was given to the lot being kept together which would create  
46 a situation for the existing home being torn down and replaced and questioned the cost of building  
47 detention on the lot. Mr. Canning responded it has not been priced out and an appraisal was submitted  
48 estimating the value of the 936 parcel as consolidated and the two separate lots with there being a higher

1 return on two separate lots.

2  
3 Mr. Blum asked for an explanation in terms of raising the home in the flood plain which Mr. Creaney  
4 explained to the Commission in detail. Mr. Subawalla stated his concern related to if and when the lot  
5 went into potential construction, if it would result in it being a contributory catch area for the other lots.  
6 Mr. Creaney confirmed they are aware of it. Mr. Canning also referred to the engineering comments with  
7 regard to the flood plain elevation. Mr. Blum asked if the lot line is moved north, what is the process in  
8 that regard. Ms. Klaassen indicated it is possible to come back to the Commission at the next meeting.  
9 The Commission Members discussed the possible outcomes if the lot line is moved and a new, larger home  
10 is built and Ms. Klaassen referred to Table 4 on page 9 of the staff memo. Mr. Canning referred to homes  
11 built on Meadow which are similar to this property with regard to the flood plain concerns raised. Mr.  
12 Blum asked if the only factors the Commission are to consider is whether the nonconformity resulted in a  
13 material increased adverse impact with regard to the front yard setback as well as the play structure. Mr.  
14 Canning confirmed the play structure can be removed if necessary.

15  
16 Ms. Van Vlack referred to flood water being a reality in the area and asked if any analysis was done of the  
17 projected impact in terms of what has already been accomplished in connection with the Village's flood  
18 water project. Mr. Creaney described the project in detail that the Village has been working on it for years.

19  
20 Chairperson Danley asked if there were any other questions or comments from the Commission or the  
21 public. No additional questions were raised at this time. She then called the matter in for discussion.

22  
23 Mr. Blum stated this area has been particularly affected by flooding and described the proposal as well  
24 presented the concerns being addressed. He referred to the Commission's narrow scope in terms of their  
25 review and stated the requested variations are minimal and there will be no increased adverse impact  
26 along with the property's history. Mr. Blum indicated he would be inclined to recommend approval not  
27 knowing what may happen in the future in terms of development. Mr. Enck agreed with the comments  
28 made and stated the lot line moving discussion would create another issue with regard to the variation.  
29 He also referred to the fact the property would be reverting back to its original condition as well as there  
30 being no precedent for it in this particular location. Mr. Enck stated future engineering issues would be  
31 addressed at that point. Mr. Subawalla stated as long as the Village Council is cognizant of what is coming  
32 down the pike, legally, it would be fine. Mr. Alt stated he had concerns with regard to the precedent it  
33 would set and if the Commission decided a subdivision is fine knowing going forward what is possible  
34 which did not adhere to conformity requirements, he would vote against the request. Ms. Van Vlack  
35 commented the opinions expressed are valid and with regard to the scope of the Commission's review,  
36 she described it as straightforward. She then stated the concerns expressed with regard to it not  
37 conforming to be a 24,000 square foot lot, that would warrant revisiting maintaining those standards  
38 although that did not address water concerns and there being an effort to mitigate those issues by the  
39 Village.

40  
41 Ms. Van Vlack concluded she would be in support of the request with consideration of revisions to comply  
42 with lot standards. Mr. Bradley stated he appreciated the flood plain and storm water comments and with  
43 regard to the Comprehensive Plan, the request would result in the creation of two legally complying R-2  
44 lots with the exception of the 3% minimum lot area and rectangular shape. He stated it would be difficult  
45 to say these two lots would not conform to the Comprehensive Plan and referred to the problems in  
46 connection with building in the flood plain which would be addressed by engineering and compliance  
47 requirements. Mr. Bradley stated it would be difficult for this proposal to fail if it were not in the flood  
48 plain and he would reserve the rest of his comments for the ZBA meeting.

1 Ms. Kunkle agreed with the comments made and stated she did not see a basis to refuse the request  
2 based on what is possible down the road noting her concerns were addressed. She agreed the lot would  
3 be brought back to its original configuration and she would be in favor of the request. Chairperson Danley  
4 stated she also had concerns and referred to the standards changed in neighborhoods to keep homes in  
5 a certain configuration. She also referred to the concerns raised with regard to setting precedent which is  
6 a concern to her as well as the flooding issues. Chairperson Danley stated if this configuration was not the  
7 original lot configuration, she would not consider agreeing to the request but is persuaded by the fact that  
8 it would be reverted back to its original configuration. She then asked for the applicant to maintain the  
9 lot as is and referred to the significant amount of comments from the neighbors. Chairperson Danley  
10 stated based on the Commission's narrow scope, she is still concerned but that is not a reason to reject  
11 the proposal. Trustee Orsic suggested asking the applicant to seek unsolicited offers for the property and  
12 although she is not voting, she had concerns which were raised with good reason. Mr. Alt noted the  
13 concern of neighborhood in opposition, particularly from five specific neighbors.

14  
15 Mr. Bradley stated since the standards the Commission are asked to consider are different than those of  
16 the ZBA, he suggested the Commission consider the applicant's testimony with regard to the possible  
17 concession and the play structure removal be included as an approval condition. Mr. Blum agreed with  
18 Mr. Bradley's suggestion and that they do not know what will happen the future.

19  
20 Chairperson Danley took a straw poll in terms of making an approval recommendation with a condition  
21 related to the play structure removal. Ms. Klaassen agreed the play structure located within the corner  
22 yard setback being brought into compliance can be a condition of the motion.

23  
24 Chairperson Danley then asked for a motion. Mr. Blum moved to recommend approval of the proposed  
25 resubdivision final plat as referenced in the materials with the condition that the existing play structure  
26 be either removed or moved to a conforming location. Ms. Kunkle seconded. A vote was taken and the  
27 motion passed, 7 to 1:

28 AYES: Blum, Bradley, Danley, Enck, Kunkle, Subawalla, Van Vlack

29 NAYS: Alt

30 NON-VOTING: Orsic

31  
32 The Commission Members took a break at this time.

33  
34 **c. Case No. 25-18-SU: 986 Green Bay Road - Sit Still Kids Salon: An application seeking approval of**  
35 **a Special Use Permit submitted by Sit Still Kids Salon, as the prospective lessee of the commercial space**  
36 **located at 986 Green Bay Road to allow a hair salon in the C-2 General Retail Commercial Overlay**  
37 **District. The property is currently owned by 986 Green Bay Road, LLC. The Village Council has final**  
38 **jurisdiction on this request.**

39 Chairperson Danley called the meeting back to order. Mr. Marx identified the applicant, the property's  
40 location, the prior and current tenants, its size and zoning classification and referred to an illustration. He  
41 also identified the surrounding businesses. Mr. Marx then referred to Attachment A as a summary of the  
42 proposed plan for the space and business operation plans which he described in detail. He noted there  
43 would be no exterior front façade changes other than a sign to be reviewed by the DRB at their October  
44 2025 meeting. Mr. Marx summarized the hours of operation and the number of employees and proposed  
45 customers during regular hours and special events. He stated in terms of parking available; he described  
46 the plan to use on-street parking and in the Hubbard Woods parking deck during peak and non-peak hours  
47 as well as the number of proposed special events and length of time customers would be in the location.  
48 Mr. Marx asked if there were any questions.

1 Ms. Van Vlack asked what is the maximum defined space occupancy. Ms. Klaassen stated it would have  
2 to comply with building code ordinances and regulations which included occupancy limits. Mr. Bradley  
3 asked in situations where a special use has certain events which occur outside of its normal use such as is  
4 done by a church, if they have ever conditioned how the space is used. Ms. Klaassen responded she is not  
5 aware of such a condition noting special event permits are required by churches.  
6

7 Chairperson Danley asked if employees would be required to park in the employee lot. Ms. Klaassen  
8 responded they would have to park in employee designated areas which she identified for the  
9 Commission. Mr. Subawalla referred to the fluctuation in terms of potential occupancy during special  
10 events and asked what are the Village restrictions in terms of occupancy counts. Mr. Marx stated the  
11 applicant can respond. Ms. Klaassen stated the permit approval would have to comply with occupancy  
12 limits which would be based on the space.  
13

14 Mr. Blum asked how many of the buildings are special uses in terms of the overlay district. Ms. Klaassen  
15 identified two special uses with others down the block. Mr. Blum asked how can they limit the number of  
16 special uses in order to not lose the retail overlay district. The Commission Members discussed the  
17 location of several other special uses in the area and the type of clientele the special use would occupy.  
18 No additional questions were raised at this time.  
19

20 Chairperson Danley swore in those speaking to this matter. Brett and Chris Jordan introduced themselves  
21 to the Commission. Mr. Jordan described the unique offerings proposed by the salon which would bring  
22 positive foot traffic to the local businesses and asked if there were any questions.  
23

24 Chairperson Danley asked if it would be a franchise. Mr. Jordan confirmed that is correct. Mrs. Jordan  
25 described in detail the services in the small space they planned to offer and noted parties would not be a  
26 common occurrence. Mr. Jordan described the components in terms of occupancy for the small types of  
27 parties they planned to offer and noted there were no concerns raised by the Fire Marshall. He described  
28 the proposal as a very unique and different offering for their clientele. Mr. Bradley commented on the  
29 types of private parties which are done in other locations which would generate a lot of traffic. Mrs. Jordan  
30 provided clarity in terms of their offerings for the Commission.  
31

32 Ms. Van Vlack referred to a neighbor's concern relating to noise and asked where the courtyard is located  
33 and if children would have access to that space. Mrs. Jordan responded it is not and identified the door  
34 opened to an alleyway which would not be accessed by children and would be used as a fire exit only. She  
35 also identified their primary door. Mr. Enck referred to the small space being planned as a party space  
36 and asked if the main space would also be used for parties. Mrs. Jordan responded in a buyout situation,  
37 they would have to match the profitability of turning 15-20 chairs which would not be a common  
38 occurrence in the other locations and would not be common for them. She confirmed they would ensure  
39 that sound would not be an issue in response to the neighbor's concern.  
40

41 Ms. Van Vlack asked Mrs. Jordan if other salons are trending to stay open later and suggested the  
42 Commission request a condition relating to the late hours of operation. Mrs. Jordan informed the  
43 Commission they are not intending to change their hours of operation and noted they served a wide range  
44 of customers. No additional comments were made at this time.  
45

46 Chairperson Danley swore in those speaking to this matter. Marlene Calders, from the Winnetka Manor  
47 Condominium Association stated they would be most impacted by the commercial space use. She  
48 identified their concerns relating to traffic and the number of accidents. She also stated the proposed use

1 would cause detrimental harm to the building in terms of drainage, sewer and pipe issues. Ms. Calders  
2 described the proposed concept as a great use but not for this building and asked the Commission to  
3 consider how the use would affect the condominium owners.  
4

5 Cav Smith, 1095 Merrill, commented the proposed use would not be a good fit for the residential building  
6 and referred to the difficulty finding parking with the proposed use making it worse. Mr. Smith questioned  
7 the precedent for a commercial party venue in a 1919 building and described the narrow alley condition.  
8 He also stated the use being open on Sunday would impact available parking.  
9

10 Kathleen Geary, 1095 Merrill, stated her bedroom would be located immediately above the party room  
11 and described the issues with regard to noise carrying in the condo building. She informed the Commission  
12 she questioned sound barrier requirements in mixed use buildings years ago and was told there was no  
13 higher standard for noise reduction barriers between commercial and residential units. Ms. Gary stated  
14 the building code enforcement manager at the time informed her the issue would be brought up at the  
15 next building and code enforcement meeting. She stated there would be a negative effect on the residents  
16 and described how she was able to hear people speaking in connection with the prior tenant. Ms. Gary  
17 described how loud the occupants and patrons utilizing the space would be as well as the potential  
18 dangerous traffic issues. She concluded by stating children's beauty parties are non-essential to the  
19 Village.  
20

21 Sarah Lyon, a 35-year Winnetka resident, commented Winnetka is about supporting children and  
22 described the applicants as hardworking who have done their due diligence. She referred to other uses  
23 which support families and while she understood the concerns raised, it would be unfair to single out this  
24 use as being detrimental. Ms. Lyon described the proposal as a great opportunity.  
25

26 Chairperson Danley swore in Beata Krzynska, a 25-year Winnetka Manor resident and owner, who stated  
27 the most important issue related to client parking and referred to a number of accidents that happened  
28 over the last several years. She questioned the amount of haircuts required to be profitable and stated  
29 the amount of customers would be problematic. No additional comments were made at this time.  
30

31 Chairperson Danley closed public comment and asked the applicants if they would like to respond to  
32 public comment. No comments were made at this time. She then called the matter in for discussion.  
33 Chairperson Danley referred to the crosswalk concerns and asked if those issues had been looked into.  
34 Ms. Klaassen responded it has been discussed as part of the Village's streetscape project and noted it is  
35 located in an IDOT right-of-way with the Village being aware of the concerns raised.  
36

37 Mr. Subawalla asked if the Teska streetscape plan was subject to the Village's jurisdiction in terms of the  
38 bump outs. Ms. Klaassen responded some are under IDOT jurisdiction. Ms. Van Vlack referred to the  
39 dentist's office and stated while she did not object to this type of business, the building having clay pipes  
40 represented a significant issue due to its deterioration over 100 years along with the building housing 29  
41 residents. She suggested any future business should consider whether they would add to this issue and  
42 any the potential use contributing to the issue and asked where the responsibility lied in addressing these  
43 issues. Ms. Van Vlack also stated the Commission is tasked to consider maintaining reasonably priced  
44 home options on which a use of this type could negatively affect.  
45

46 Chairperson Danley responded those are landlord issues to mitigate and noted a retail space could go into  
47 the space without a special use. The Commission Members discussed alternative businesses which could  
48 occupy the space and the parking issues which would result from the space being occupied. Mr. Blum

1 agreed with the comments made. Mr. Bradley described the use of the Hubbard Woods parking lot and  
2 stated the proposed business use would be viable in this commercial district. He stated his concern related  
3 the number of special uses which have been allowed in the area with the lack of parking and he would  
4 generally be in favor of recommending approval which would result in storefronts being filled. He added  
5 the residents' issues need to be dealt with by Hoffman.  
6

7 Chairperson Danley referred to the lack of a parking study and stated the dangerous crosswalk issues are  
8 valid but are out of the Village's control. She stated she understood the residents' concerns for any  
9 business which would occupy the space and encouraged them to discuss the issues with the landlord.  
10 Chairperson Danley stated she would be in favor of the application and the standards relate to issues  
11 which arose no matter what occupied the space. Mr. Enck stated his initial thought on the application was  
12 that it would be good for business although parking is an issue. He agreed some of the issues are worth  
13 exploring and are outside of the Commission's purview. Mr. Enck also agreed with the suggestion that the  
14 residents discuss their issues with the landlord.  
15

16 Mr. Alt stated with regard to the residents' concerns, the applicant's biggest concerns relate to the clients  
17 who are children and suggested the applicant listen to the neighbors and that having a conversation would  
18 help. Ms. Van Vlack stated it is imperative for Hoffman to perform their due diligence and address the  
19 potential clay pipe issue as well as address the concerns raised. She suggested the applicant address the  
20 residents' concerns before their presentation to other boards. Ms. Van Vlack also commented on whether  
21 the business would be profitable and the amount of traffic generated which she commented is unrealistic.  
22 Ms. Kunkle agreed with the comments made and stated she is familiar with the parking difficulty in  
23 Hubbard Woods. She stated although hearing the residents' concerns is impactful, it is more of a landlord  
24 issue and stated any business would be substantially injurious to the residents. Ms. Kunkle added they do  
25 not want to jeopardize the Village's housing stock and she would lean toward supporting the request. No  
26 additional comments were made at this time.  
27

28 Chairperson Danley then asked for a motion. A motion was made by Mr. Bradley to recommend approval  
29 as indicated on page 7 to allow the applicant to operate within the C-2 commercial overlay district based  
30 on the findings of fact nos. 1-12 which have been met. Mr. Blum seconded the motion. A vote was taken  
31 and the motion unanimously, 7 to 1:

32 AYES: Alt, Blum, Bradley, Danley, Enck, Kunkle, Subawalla

33 NAYS: Van Vlack

34 NON-VOTING: Orsic  
35

### 36 **New Business.**

#### 37 a. October 22, 2025 Meeting – Quorum Check.

38 The Commission Members discussed their availability. Ms. Kunkle informed the Commission she would  
39 be stepping down from the Commission as the EFSC liaison.  
40

### 41 **Adjournment:**

42 Chairperson Danley asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Alt and the  
43 motion was seconded. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 8 to 0:

44 AYES: Alt, Blum, Bradley, Danley, Enck, Kunkle, Subawalla, Van Vlack

45 NAYS: None

46 NON-VOTING: Orsic

47 The meeting was adjourned at 10:14 p.m.  
48

1 Respectfully submitted,  
2  
3 Antionette Johnson  
4 Recording Secretary