

**WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 8, 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: Scott Mangum, Director of Community Development

Call to Order & Roll Call:

Chairman Bradley called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. Roll call was taken of the Board Members present.

Approval of Meeting Minutes.

Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to approve the November 10, 2025, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the November 10, 2025, meeting minutes was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Mr. Ritter. 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 stated the Village Council approved a zoning ordinance text amendment to allow for roof mounted solar panels as well as the variation request for the 20 Fox Lane addition. He also stated the 458-454 Sunset Road consolidation application was withdrawn after its presentation to the Plan Commission. No questions were raised at this time.

Continued Cases:

a. Case No. 25-16-SD: 936 Sunset Road: Applications seeking approval of a Final Plat of Subdivision to allow a two-lot subdivision of 936 Sunset Road, which requires variations to allow Proposed Lot 2 to (i) provide less than the minimum required lot area for an interior lot; and (ii) provide less than the minimum required rectangular buildable area. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request. This item was continued from the October 13, 2025, Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

Mr. Mangum confirmed the application being presented to the Board is the exact same application as previously presented and the applicant provided additional analysis in terms of options for dividing the property. He then summarized the application's prior presentation as well as summarized in detail the alternate options, zoning variations and subdivision code variations necessary for both options to divide the lot lines. Mr. Mangum confirmed the applicant planned to proceed with their original request. He advised the Board of the items they are required to consider and noted no additional public correspondence was received. Mr. Mangum then stated following the applicant's presentation, public comment and Board discussion, the Board may either continue the hearing to a specific date or consider a motion recommending approval or denial of the variations. He then asked if there were any questions.

1 Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. Ms. Leister asked if variations were other
2 examples of previously approved with regard to the rectangular lot constraint. Mr. Mangum responded
3 he is not aware of any variations but would need to review. Chairman Bradley questioned the rationale
4 to enforce the rectangular buildable lot requirements for non-rectangular lots. Mr. Mangum stated it is
5 generally to demonstrate that the lot is still buildable even if it is large enough and met other
6 requirements. Mr. Haller asked for clarification as to whether there would be additional
7 nonconformities that would exist with regard to option 1. Mr. Mangum stated those would be the two
8 new issues that would be created along with the variations being requested. No additional questions
9 were raised at this time.

10
11 Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Christopher Canning, 1000 Skokie Road,
12 Wilmette, introduced himself and Dan Creaney, the project engineer who created options 1 and 2. Mr.
13 Canning referred to their prior presentation and Mr. Creaney's suggestion of what a possible home
14 could look like on lot 2 as well as the concerns raised with regard to the Skokie Ditch. He also referred to
15 the previous discussion with regard to homes flooding on Meadow. Mr. Canning stated the request is to
16 bring the lots back to the pre-1976 configuration. He referred to the PC's positive recommendation and
17 summarized that discussion for the Board as well as the previous discussion of the request with this
18 Board. Mr. Canning stated both options being presented are possible but have drawbacks which he
19 described to the Board. He stated while they have shown that both options are possible and for a home
20 to be built on lot 2 with the Village Engineer's approval, going back to the pre-1976 condition would be
21 the best option and would be best for the neighborhood.

22
23 Dan Creaney, 450 Skokie Blvd., referred the Board to illustrations and identified the home's positioning
24 on the lot for both options. He stated although both options are viable, they would result in trading
25 variations. He noted they have successfully built several homes and have done renovations in the flood
26 plain which he identified for the Board.

27
28 Chairman Bradley asked why not option 1 which would result in a conforming lot 2 and if it would make
29 more sense to encumber lot 1 in terms of buildability. Mr. Canning responded they do not know if there
30 would be construction on that lot or not. He stated if they went with option 1, it would result in the loss
31 of 4,500 square feet on lot 1. Mr. Canning stated a lot depth variation would have to be granted for lot
32 2. He then asked for a recess for a discussion with the applicant.

33
34 Chairman Bradley called the meeting back to order. Mr. Canning asked for the request to be continued
35 to the January 2026 meeting in order to perform calculations and address the Board's questions.

36
37 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to continue the request to the January 12, 2026, meeting. A
38 motion to continue the matter to the January 12, 2026, meeting was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded
39 by Mr. Ritter. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

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

41 NAYS: None

42
43 **New Business:**

44 a. January 12, 2026, Regular Meeting - Quorum Check

45 The Board Members discussed their availability.

46
47 **Public Comment:**

48 No comments were made at this time.

1 **Adjournment:**

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

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

5 NAYS: None

6 The meeting adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

7
8 Respectfully submitted,

9
10 Antionette Johnson
11 Recording Secretary