

**WINNETKA PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 17, 2025**

Members Present:

Layla Danley, Chairperson
Jonathan Alt
Christopher Blum
Mamie Case
Chris Enck
King Poor
Cyrus Subawalla
Kate Van Vlack

Members Absent:

Matthew Bradley

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 November 19, 2025, Meeting Minutes:

Chairperson Danley asked for a motion to approve the November 19, 2025, meeting minutes. A motion was made by Ms. Van Vlack and seconded by Mr. Poor to approve the November 19, 2025, meeting minutes. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 8 to 0:

AYES: Alt, Blum, Case, Danley, Enck, Poor, Subawalla, Van Vlack

NAYS: None

NON-VOTING: Orsic

Public Comment:

No comments were made at this time.

Community Development Report:

Mr. Mangum stated there is nothing new to update. Ms. Klaassen informed the Commission the consolidation application for 458 and 464 Sunset, presented to the Commission at the last meeting, has been withdrawn.

New Applications:

a. **Case No. 25-29-SD: 829 Foxdale Avenue and 833 Foxdale Avenue:** Applications seeking approval of a Final Plat of Consolidation to consolidate the two existing lots into a single lot of record, which requires (i) variations to allow the existing residence at 833 Foxdale Avenue to: (a) observe less than the minimum required side yard setback from the northerly property line, which is due to an increase in the minimum required side yard setback as a result of the proposed increase in total lot area and increase in average lot width; and (b) not provide the required building line articulation along the north side buildings walls; and (ii) a finding of "No Material Increased Adverse Impact for the existing

1 **detached garage at 829 Foxdale Avenue which observes less than the minimum required rear yard**
2 **setback from the east property line. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**

3 Ms. Klaassen referred to an illustration of the property and location which she identified for the
4 Commission, as well as its zoning classification, size and existing improvements. She stated the
5 Comprehensive Plan designated the property and surrounding properties as appropriate for single family
6 residential uses and the use of the site is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan land use designation
7 and R-5 zoning. Ms. Klaassen then identified the site's photos noting the applicant resides in 883 Foxdale
8 and submitted a demolition application for 829 Foxdale which was approved by the Historic Preservation
9 Commission without delay. She described the proposed consolidated lots' measurements, the proposed
10 addition and detached garage noting building plans have not yet been submitted. Ms. Klaassen also
11 summarized the variations being requested, the nonconformities being eliminated and created, the
12 setbacks, as well as the sizes of similar neighboring lots. She stated the ZBA is to consider the application
13 at its January 12, 2026, meeting. Ms. Klaassen noted the Village Engineering and Water and Electric
14 Departments are not requiring easements, She also noted that the applicant is working with staff to
15 finalize the necessary signature blocks on the plat. She stated the Commission is to consider whether the
16 proposed consolidation is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and complied with the subdivision
17 code. Ms. Klaassen then stated following the applicants' presentation, public comment and Commission
18 discussion, the Commission may decide to take action one of two options: (i) continue the item to a date
19 certain; or (ii) consider a motion to recommend approval or denial. She noted draft language for a
20 recommendation of approval or denial is included in the packet and that staff did not receive any written
21 comments from the public. Ms. Klaassen then asked if there were any questions.

22
23 Chairperson Danley referred to Figure 4 and asked for clarification with regard to similarly sized lots. Ms.
24 Klaassen clarified the information for the Commission. Mr. Enck asked if R-4 and R-5 zoning is behind the
25 property. Ms. Klaassen identified the properties on Lincoln which are R-4 as well as some lots on Tower
26 Road. Ms. Van Vlack asked if the 15,000 square foot resultant lot would be measured the same as R-3
27 zoned lots. Ms. Klaassen confirmed the proposed lot size would be similar to the minimum required R-3
28 lot area of 16,000 square feet. No additional questions were raised at this time.

29
30 Chairperson Danley swore in those speaking to this matter. Chip Hackley of Hackley & Associates
31 Architects summarized the work he has done in the Village and on this property. He stated the proposed
32 plan would maintain the neighborhood continuity and scale with a seamless addition which would
33 improve the property. Mr. Hackley noted the proposed plans have not been finalized and discussed the
34 setback issues resulting from the consolidation. He also stated the removal of one of the garages would
35 be a nice component of the plan and reduce the combined property's impermeable effect. The applicants'
36 team provided no additional comments and Mr. Hackley then asked if there were any questions.

37
38 Chairperson Danley also asked if there were any questions. A Commission Member questioned the
39 existing home's square footage. Mr. Hackley responded the proposal would be under the maximum
40 allowable FAR. A Commission Member then questioned the home's square footage with the addition. Mr.
41 Hackley referred to the challenges with regard to drainage and the property's slope. No additional
42 questions were raised at this time.

43
44 Chairperson Danley asked for public comment. Jason Alcorn, 837 Foxdale, stated the proposal would be
45 an improvement for the neighborhood. He referred to specific language with regard to the northern
46 property owner and stated he wanted to ensure no variations are granted to the setback of the current
47 structure with the proposed addition as well as for articulation.

48

1 Colin Cross, 821 Foxdale, stated his issue is that combining the two Foxdale lots would change the
2 community nature. He described the neighborhood as an old world community due to the small lot sizes.
3 Mr. Cross stated he is opposed to larger 100 foot lots on Foxdale which has a reputation as one of the
4 most unique neighborhoods in the Village which is affordable for the influx of young families. He then
5 commented on 841 Foxdale and questioned what would happen if the larger lot is sold and a larger home
6 is built. No additional comments were made at this time.
7

8 Chairperson Danley called the matter in for discussion. Trustee Orsic commented that both neighbors are
9 right. She noted that there are already larger lots here, unlike the application considered last month. She
10 stated the decision they made last month was due to it being precedent setting. Trustee Orsic stated in
11 this particular case, she would be in favor of the request due to the fact there are similar lots. Chairperson
12 Danley referred to the prior discussion relating to preserving existing housing stock and referred to the
13 nearby larger homes in the R-4 district. Mr. Blum stated the request is approximately 1,000 feet under the
14 standard or 45%. He also stated it is important to consider the entirety of Foxdale and referred to the
15 items the Commission is to consider and specific standards he identified. He also stated the request would
16 not support the plan in that it would eliminate two smaller more affordable homes.
17

18 Mr. Enck stated he also appreciated both views from the public comments and stated the proposed design
19 in this particular instance would fit in better with the neighborhood. He referred to previous discussions
20 for demolition applications and stated the lower scale and size of the addition would help to maintain the
21 street feel more so than what could otherwise be built there. Ms. Case agreed with the comments made
22 and referred to the fact the property is not large enough to go through the special use permit
23 consolidation process in connection with lot size. She also agreed with the discussion with regard to the
24 Foxdale uniqueness and that she is somewhat concerned what would happen with the next application
25 to combine two Foxdale lots. Ms. Case questioned whether the Trustees would consider that possibility
26 which would result in the loss of the R-5 characteristics. She added while the proposal is nice looking, they
27 should consider future possibilities. Trustee Orsic informed the Commission she could bring up the issue
28 at the next Village Council meeting.
29

30 Mr. Blum stated for this area, the home would remain an R-5 home with an R-3 size and referred to
31 instances for homes which were built pre-code. Mr. Alt stated R-4, R-5 and R-3 lots are there for a reason
32 and agreed the Foxdale area is special due to the small lot size and affordability and commented
33 eliminating such housing stock in the R-5 district did not make sense. He then referred to setting a
34 precedent which would change the neighborhood fabric and he would vote against the request. He also
35 agreed with Mr. Blum's comment to not create an R-3 sized home in the R-5 district and referred to the
36 Comprehensive Plan's goals with regard to housing stock.
37

38 Mr. Subawalla agreed with Mr. Alt's comments with regard to incrementally breaking up the
39 neighborhood fabric and scale diversity. He stated he is on the fence. Ms. Van Vlack stated they are
40 struggling with the fundamental issue that they cannot answer in terms of maintaining housing stock,
41 neighborhood character and affordability. She stated while they do need to keep smaller housing stock,
42 she referred to the issue of teardowns by developers. Ms. Van Vlack then stated in considering 849
43 Foxdale which was built in 2005, the guidelines which were not considerably different at that time and
44 how that property was allowed be consolidated at that time. She also stated going from an R-5 to an R-4
45 is not as big of a jump but they must find a way to fundamentally address the issue as these matters come
46 before them. Ms. Van Vlack concluded she would be in support of the request.
47

48 Mr. Poor stated in considering the Sunset matter discussed last month, he referred to the discussion of

1 not setting precedent but described the situation as similar enough. He agreed Foxdale is a unique area
2 which is the type of area the Comprehensive Plan was designed to promote. Mr. Poor concluded he would
3 vote against the request.
4

5 Chairperson Danley stated she would take a straw poll of the Commission Members and noted her
6 preference is to not combine R-5 lots. She then stated while the property is located next to the R-4 district
7 and one home would be maintained and a special use is not being requested, she did not see within the
8 standards they are reviewing, she would be in favor of the request with the provision that both garages
9 would be removed. Chairperson Danley also referred to the finding being made of no increased material
10 adverse impact being a condition. The Commission Members then identified their positions in detail for
11 the straw poll.
12

13 Chairperson Danley indicated the Commission appeared to be split, 4:4 and asked the Commission
14 Members if they felt any additional information is needed to vote on the matter. Ms. Klaassen noted that
15 the Commission should work towards making a recommendation to the Village Council one way or the
16 other. Trustee Orsic informed the Commission if there is a split vote, that is important for the Trustees to
17 know that there is a bigger issue. Chairperson Danley added the Commission Members' concerns have
18 been noted for the record.
19

20 Chairperson Danley then suggested they go through the standards to identify those which are not met.
21 Mr. Blum referred to the discussion that the matter is something the Village Council needs to further
22 consider.
23

24 Chairperson Danley then asked for a motion. Mr. Poor moved to recommend denial of the application.
25 The motion was seconded by Mr. Blum with the statement that the request is inconsistent with the
26 Comprehensive Plan. A vote was taken and the motion passed, 5 to 3:

- 27 AYES: Alt, Blum, Case, Poor, Subawalla
 - 28 NAYS: Danley, Enck, Van Vlack
 - 29 NON-VOTING: Trustee Orsic
- 30

31 **New Business.**

- 32 a. January 28, 2026, Meeting – Quorum Check.

33 The Commission Members discussed their availability.
34

35 **Adjournment:**

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

- 38 AYES: Alt, Blum, Case, Danley, Enck, Poor, Subawalla, Van Vlack
 - 39 NAYS: None
 - 40 NON-VOTING: Trustee Orsic
- 41

42 The meeting was adjourned at 8:08 p.m.
43

44 Respectfully submitted,
45

46 Antionette Johnson
47 Recording Secretary