

**WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 10, 2025**

Zoning Board Members Present: Matt Bradley, Chairman
Mark Haller
Lynn Hanley
Kathryn Leister

Zoning Board Members Absent: Mike Nielsen
Michael Ritter
Todd Vender

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 7:03 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 October 13, 2025, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the October 13, 2025, meeting minutes was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Ms. Leister. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Leister

NAYS: None

Community Development Report.

Ms. Klaassen confirmed there is no Community Development Report.

New Cases:

a. Case No. 25-22-V2: 20 Fox Lane: An application seeking approval of a zoning variation to allow construction of an addition to the existing detached garage at 20 Fox Lane. The requested variation would permit the proposed improvement to provide less than the minimum required side yard setback from the east property line. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.

Mr. Marx summarized the side yard setback variation request and identified the property's location, improvements and zoning classification. He referred to photos of the home and identified the detached garage as well as the existing storage shed. Mr. Marx stated the proposal included removing the shed and building a one story addition in its place on the south side of the garage. He stated the highlighted area represented the area of the proposed addition which would cause the addition to have a setback of 5.96 feet at the closest point to the east property line representing a variation of 6.04 feet or 50.33%. Mr. Marx stated the garage currently encroached into the side yard setback.

1 Mr. Marx summarized the proposed addition's measurements which would be built over the existing
2 shed's footprint and would be aesthetically contiguous with the existing garage's design. He also identified
3 the proposed front building elevation and noted the request was reviewed by the Historic Preservation
4 Commission (HPC), since the property is a locally designated landmark. Mr. Marx stated the HPC found
5 the proposed alterations were appropriate to the property's preservation. He then summarized the
6 Board's purview in reviewing the application and stated following the applicant's presentation, public
7 comment and Board discussion, the Board may either continue the matter to a date certain to allow the
8 applicant and Village staff time to address any additional questions or consider a motion recommending
9 approval or denial of the variation with draft language included on page nos. 7 and 8. He asked if there
10 were any questions. No questions were raised at this time.

11
12 Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Jeff Letzter of Aspect Design, Inc. stated he
13 represented the applicants, Brendan and Colleen Carroll, who are also present. He stated the variation
14 being more than 50% is due to the property line not being parallel with the building's construction.

15
16 Chairman Bradley asked if there were any questions. He then asked if there is a reason the design had to
17 be flush with the garage in order to maintain the existing nonconformity by less than one foot which
18 would obviate the need to increase the existing nonconformity. Mr. Letzter responded they are
19 attempting to keep the addition in line with the existing building and not create a 6-8 inch jog which would
20 also affect the roofline. He stated the proposal would be more aesthetically pleasing and referred to the
21 HPC's appreciation that the proposed addition would keep in line with the existing building. Mr. Letzter
22 added since it is a painted brick building, they were able to keep it flush and allow it to appear as if it had
23 always been there.

24
25 Chairman Bradley noted there are no audience members to comment and called the matter in for
26 discussion. Ms. Hanley stated her initial consideration was to vote against the request but the alternatives
27 of shrinking the addition, etc. did not make sense. She then stated she is struggling to see where the
28 request met the hardship standard. Ms. Leister stated the standards are met with reasonable return being
29 the only questionable standard and commented it did not make sense for a home of this type to have a
30 shed. She concluded by stating due to the size of the ask, she is fine with the request. Mr. Haller agreed
31 with the comments made and referred to the de minimus amount of the request and the HPC's comments.
32 He also stated the home next door is located 65 feet away and there would not be a hardship in that
33 regard. Mr. Haller stated the difficulty related to the home not being squarely sited on the lot and he
34 would vote in favor of the request. Chairman Bradley stated he would be in support of the request as well
35 noting some of the anomaly derived from the awkward lot shape and the penalty being placed on the
36 garage in terms of where it was originally situated. He stated the modest addition would improve the site
37 and result in an adequate amount of storage which is not an automatic guarantee. Chairman Bradley also
38 referred to the issue of possible precedent setting but the request is due to the variation being 50% for
39 an actual de minimus amount. Ms. Hanley concluded she would be in favor of the request.

40
41 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to recommend approval as included on page 7. A motion to
42 recommend approval of the variation was made by Mr. Haller and seconded by Ms. Hanley. A vote was
43 taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

44 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Leister

45 NAYS: None

46
47 **New Business:**

- 48 a. December 8, 2025, Meeting - Quorum Check

1 The Board Members discussed their availability.

2

3 **Adjournment:**

4 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Hanley and
5 seconded by Mr. Haller. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

6 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Leister

7 NAYS: None

8 The meeting adjourned at 7:19 p.m.

9

10 Respectfully submitted,

11

12 Antionette Johnson

13 Recording Secretary

14