

**WINNETKA PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
NOVEMBER 19, 2025**

**Members Present:**

Layla Danley, Chairperson  
Jonathan Alt  
Christopher Blum  
Matthew Bradley  
Chris Enck  
King Poor  
Kate Van Vlack

**Members Absent:**

Mamie Case  
Cyrus Subawalla

**Non-Voting Members Present:**

Bridget Orsic

**Village Staff:**

Scott Mangum, Community Development Director  
Ann Klaassen, Assistant Director of Community  
Development

**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 September 24, 2025, and October 22, 2025, Regular Meeting Minutes:**

Chairperson Danley asked for a motion to approve the September 24, 2025, regular meeting minutes. A motion to approve the September 24, 2025, meeting minutes was made by Mr. Bradley. The motion was seconded by Mr. Alt. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 7 to 0:

AYES: Alt, Blum, Bradley, Danley, Enck, Poor, Van Vlack

NAYS: None

NON-VOTING: Orsic

Chairperson Danley asked for a motion to approve the October 22, 2025, regular meeting minutes. A motion to approve the October 22, 2025, meeting minutes was made by Mr. Poor. Mr. Bradley seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 7 to 0:

AYES: Alt, Blum, Bradley, Danley, Enck, Poor, Van Vlack

NAYS: None

NON-VOTING: Orsic

**Public Comment:**

No comments were made at this time.

**Community Development Report:**

Mr. Mangum stated the special use permit for Sit Still Kids was approved by the Village Council, as well as the approval of a zoning text amendment regarding solar panels.

**Continued Applications:**

1 a. **Case No. 25-21-SU: 564 Lincoln Avenue - Corley North Shore LLC Real Estate Office: An**  
2 **application seeking approval of a Special Use Permit submitted by Corley North Shore LLC, as the**  
3 **prospective lessee of the commercial space located at 564 Lincoln Avenue to allow a real estate office**  
4 **in the C-2 General Retail Commercial Overlay District. The property is currently owned by 562-72 Lincoln**  
5 **Avenue, LLC. This item was continued from the October 22, 2025, Plan Commission meeting. The**  
6 **Applicant has withdrawn this application. The Plan Commission will not be taking any action on this**  
7 **application.**

8 Chairperson Danley noted the applicant withdrew the application.  
9

10 **New Applications:**

11 a. **Case No. 25-25-SD: 458 Sunset Road and 464 Sunset Road: Applications seeking approval of (i)**  
12 **a Final Plat of Subdivision to consolidate the two existing lots known as 458 Sunset Road and 464 Sunset**  
13 **Road into a single Lot of Record, which requires (a) a zoning variation to permit the existing residence**  
14 **at 464 Sunset Road to observe less than the minimum required side yard setback from the west**  
15 **property line; (b) a finding of "No Material Increased Adverse Impact" for the existing residence at 464**  
16 **Sunset Road, which does not provide the required building line articulation; and (c) a Special Use Permit**  
17 **to allow the consolidation that is greater than two times the minimum required lot size for an interior**  
18 **lot in the R-5 Single Family Residential Zoning District. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this**  
19 **request.**

20 Ms. Klaassen stated the request is to consolidate two existing lots into a single lot of record to  
21 accommodate an addition to the 464 Sunset residence. She summarized the requested variation, special  
22 use permit and finding of "no material increased adverse impact" being sought. Ms. Klaassen then  
23 identified the property's location, zoning classification and size for both parcels and existing  
24 improvements. She also identified current photos noting the applicant resided at 464 Sunset and acquired  
25 the 458 Sunset property in 2023. Ms. Klaassen stated the demolition permit application for 458 Sunset  
26 was reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission and was approved without delay. She then  
27 described the consolidated lot's measurements and the utility easement required by the Water and  
28 Engineering Department.  
29

30 Ms. Klaassen confirmed the subdivision request complied with zoning standards with the special use being  
31 required since the consolidation would result in a lot measuring more than two times the minimum  
32 required lot area. She noted since this is the second time the Commission has considered a special use for  
33 a residential consolidation, it may help to note that the typical special use standards the Commission  
34 would normally consider applied in this case and that the Zoning Ordinance allowed for conditions to be  
35 placed on such approvals which she summarized. Ms. Klaassen stated the applicant's preliminary plans  
36 for their intentions for the consolidated lot were provided for the Commission to determine whether the  
37 proposed plans are consistent with the special use standards along with any conditions they felt are  
38 appropriate.  
39

40 Ms. Klaassen summarized in detail the zoning relief necessary for the consolidated lot due to the increased  
41 lot size. She stated the proposed addition complied with the zoning regulations for the proposed lot and  
42 referred to the preliminary elevations provided by the applicant. Ms. Klaassen stated the Village's  
43 Engineering Department would review the stormwater regulations and proposed development to ensure  
44 stormwater is managed on site when the building permit is submitted, which will include engineering  
45 plans. She then summarized the Historic Preservation Commission's consideration of the request with the  
46 ZBA to review the side yard setback variation at its December 8, 2025, meeting. Ms. Klaassen summarized  
47 the Commission's role in considering the request which she identified on page 34 of the agenda packet.  
48 She then stated following the applicant's presentation, public comment and Commission discussion, the

1 Commission may decide to continue the matter to a date certain or make a motion to recommend  
2 approval or denial noting no public comment has been received. Ms. Klaassen asked if there were any  
3 questions.

4  
5 Chairperson Danley also asked if there were any questions. Trustee Orsic asked if this is the first R-5  
6 request being considered under the new ordinance for lot consolidations. Ms. Klaassen confirmed that is  
7 correct for a single family residential project. Mr. Bradley questioned the reasoning as to whether the 2x  
8 minimum was established as the minimum threshold point whereby the special use standards are  
9 required in that they are applying R-5 standards to a property which would essentially become an estate  
10 sized lot. Ms. Klaassen explained the discussion at the Village Council level. Trustee Orsic referred to the  
11 concern relating to maintaining the neighborhood character. Mr. Bradley stated his second question  
12 related to conditions and asked if the seven standards were established to provide the Commission with  
13 guidance in terms of what could be done on the consolidated lot. Ms. Klaassen responded yes and that if  
14 the proposed plan is thought to be appropriate but the Commission did not think further expansion for  
15 the home would be appropriate conditions on setbacks or building size could be recommended.

16  
17 Mr. Blum referred to page 12 and the highlighted language in the subdivision code Section 16.12.010 and  
18 asked for clarification and whether it represented an additional standard or a condition. Ms. Klaassen  
19 responded it is a consideration for the Commission to make. Mr. Blum asked if the proposed addition's  
20 net result would result in a net gain in impermeable surface following the home to be torn down. Ms.  
21 Klaassen summarized the figures in Table 4 on page 10. No additional questions were raised at this time.

22  
23 Chairperson Danley swore in those speaking to this matter. Tom DeCoste of Hackley & Associates  
24 Architects stated he represented the applicants and offered to answer any questions. He added the special  
25 use request is new to him in terms of the R-5 district and described Ms. Klaassen's presentation as  
26 complete.

27  
28 Mr. Enck asked if the proposal is schematic in nature or if it is ready to be submitted for permitting. Mr.  
29 DeCoste responded what they have is what they are planning on the proposal together with any minor  
30 changes required. He stated they are planning to submit plans before the holidays in an effort to begin  
31 construction in the spring. Mr. Blum questioned the square footage increase. Mr. DeCoste identified the  
32 existing square footage for 464 Sunset and stated following project completion, the GFA would measure  
33 approximately 5,982 square feet. Mr. Enck referred to the allowable impermeable square footage for the  
34 two lots and asked if there would be a net increase following consolidation. Mr. DeCoste responded since  
35 approval for the demolition was received, he estimated there would be a slight reduction based upon the  
36 improvements to be torn down which would be more beneficial to the neighborhood and the east  
37 neighbor. He noted both buildings have taken on water due to the homes being so close together but  
38 since the amount of impervious coverage would be removed due to the driveway removal, it would be  
39 very beneficial to the east neighbor with final drainage plans to confirm there would not be any issues for  
40 the neighbors. Ms. Van Vlack asked if there are plans for compensatory water storage on the property  
41 although that is not in the Commission's purview. Mr. DeCoste stated if there is an overall net increase of  
42 25%, they are required to install compensatory storage but the drainage plan has not yet been finalized.  
43 No additional questions were raised at this time.

44  
45 Chairperson Danley noted there are no audience members present to comment and called the matter in  
46 for discussion. She reiterated this is the first time the Commission has considered such a request in the R-  
47 5 district where they are considering the combining of two existing lots which are compatible in character  
48 and size to the surrounding lots which would result in the lot measuring more than twice as large as the

1 lots surrounding it which required a special use permit.

2  
3 Trustee Orsic stated the special use process was put in place for properties which would become two  
4 times larger since some consolidations have worked against the Village's goals she identified. She stated  
5 the request would result in a home becoming significantly larger than the surrounding homes which is  
6 what this process was designed for. Mr. Blum agreed with the comments made and described the area as  
7 unique with the area being designed as dense for a reason. He stated the consolidation would result in  
8 them not doing something which moved toward a Village goal although keeping them separate lots with  
9 separate structures there is very consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and for that reason, he would  
10 recommend against the consolidation.

11  
12 Mr. Enck summarized the Historic Preservation Commission's consideration of the request and stated  
13 while the proposed addition would not be maxed out on the property, he referred to the amount of  
14 demolitions they have considered which resulted in much larger homes being built. He stated a home  
15 much larger could be built down the road with this approval. Chairperson Danley stated the Commission's  
16 purview is to consider what fundamentally happened to the lots and referred to the Comprehensive Plan  
17 discussion. She stated the consolidated lot would measure over two times more than surrounding lots  
18 which would significantly change the neighborhood character and she would vote against the special use  
19 request with the zoning issues falling by the wayside.

20  
21 Mr. Alt referred to the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and the precedent which would be set in creating lots  
22 which would fundamentally change the entire neighborhood. Ms. Van Vlack agreed with the comments  
23 made and stated since this is the first request of this type, she referred to subsequent requests which  
24 would follow suit. She stated without those types of guardrails in place, she would vote against the request  
25 since they do not know what implications would happen down the road although the request is well  
26 thought out and designed.

27  
28 Mr. Poor agreed with the comments made and agreed it would be precedent setting. He then referred to  
29 the amount of work which went into the Comprehensive Plan and for the Commission to agree to this  
30 type of request. He commented it is a nice proposal but there is a reason the Comprehensive Plan was  
31 created and to approve the request would undermine the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Poor concluded he  
32 would not vote in favor of the request. Mr. Bradley referred to their previous discussion relating to  
33 protecting and preserving the diversity of housing stock as a goal in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan but  
34 that it did not mean lot consolidations are bad. He stated any lot consolidation would result in larger lots  
35 and that requiring conditions were meant to be a check on this type of rare situation. The Commission  
36 Members discussed the matter at length.

37  
38 Mr. Blum stated he is not concerned with regard to precedent in this instance due to the fact that the  
39 request in his opinion did not meet the standards on an ad hoc basis. He described this process as the  
40 guardrails and added lot consolidation should be reviewed as a rarity.

41  
42 Chairperson Danley swore in those speaking to this matter. Tim lida stated with regard to the  
43 Commission's discussion relating to inconsistent lot sizes, he described the varying lot sizes of the  
44 neighboring lots and lots across the street. Ms. Van Vlack stated they are aware of the minimum lot size  
45 in the R-5 district, which is 8,400 square feet but they do not have information on the average size of each  
46 property in this particular area and without that context, this request did stand out. She referred to the  
47 sizes of several properties in the R-4 and R-5 district. Ms. Van Vlack referred to her previous concern  
48 relating to what is the limit although their plan is well thought out. She added in terms of the Commission's

1 consideration, the consolidated lot would result in an R-2 sized lot as opposed to an R-5 lot.

2  
3 Mr. Iida asked how any type of lot consolidation can be done if the lots are already over the minimum  
4 square footage. Mr. DeCoste advised the Commission of their initial consideration of subdividing the lot  
5 and selling off a portion of 458 Sunset to the east neighbor. He referred to the difficulties relating to any  
6 possible additions as well as their initial thought to subdivide and sell off a portion of the lot which would  
7 have required two lot consolidations which he described as taking a very big risk. Chairperson Danley  
8 responded there are plenty of lot consolidations and there are a set of standards the Commission has to  
9 evaluate for each consolidation when it hit a certain benchmark. She informed the applicant a special use  
10 would not be necessary if the lot did not measure more than two times the size and reminded the  
11 applicant the Commission is an advisory body.

12  
13 Chairperson Danley then asked for a motion. Mr. Blum made a motion to recommend denial of the special  
14 use permit to allow consolidation of 458 Sunset and 464 Sunset based on the record, the documents  
15 reviewed and the presentation in that the consolidation would not be consistent with the standards for  
16 granting a special use permit. He referred to standard nos. (a)-(f) as well as Section 16.12.010 noting no  
17 decision was made with regard to the zoning request. He then recommended denial of the application of  
18 the final plat of subdivision as proposed. Ms. Van Vlack seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the  
19 motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

20 AYES: Alt, Blum, Danley, Enck, Poor, Van Vlack  
21 NAYS: None  
22 NON-VOTING: Bradley, Orsic

23  
24 **New Business.**

25 a. December 17, 2025, Regular Meeting – Quorum Check.

26 The Commission Members discussed their availability.

27  
28 **Adjournment:**

29 Chairperson Danley asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Alt and seconded  
30 by Mr. Poor. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 7 to 0:

31 AYES: Alt, Blum, Bradley, Danley, Enck, Poor, Van Vlack  
32 NAYS: None  
33 NON-VOTING: Orsic

34 The meeting was adjourned at 8:03 p.m.

35  
36 Respectfully submitted,

37  
38 Antionette Johnson  
39 Recording Secretary