

**WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 12, 2026**

Zoning Board Members Present: Matt Bradley, Chairman
Mark Haller
Lynn Hanley
Michael Ritter

Zoning Board Members Absent: Kathryn Leister
Mike Nielsen
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 7:01 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 December 8, 2025. meeting minutes. A motion to approve the December 8, 2025. meeting minutes was made by Mr. Ritter and seconded by Ms. Hanley. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Ritter

NAYS: None

Community Development Report.

Mr. Mangum noted there has been no action on any items since the last meeting.

Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to take the agenda out of order and move up Case No. 26-03-V for 614 Cherry Street. A motion was made to move agenda item 5(c) to 5(a) by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Mr. Ritter. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Ritter

NAYS: None

Continued Cases:

a. **Case No. 25-14-V2: 175 DeWindt Road:** An amended application seeking approval of zoning variations to allow construction of a second-floor addition to the existing residence at 175 DeWindt Road. The requested variations would permit the proposed improvements to (i) exceed the maximum permitted gross floor area; and (ii) provide less than the minimum required front yard setback from the west property line. The Zoning Board of Appeals has final jurisdiction on this amended request. This item was continued from the August 11, 2025, and October 13, 2025, Zoning Board of Appeals meetings.

1 Mr. Marx summarized the GFA and front yard setback variations requested and the previous discussion
2 for this matter. He noted the front yard setback request remained unchanged and a variation is requested
3 for encroachment into the required front yard setback which he identified in an illustration. Mr. Marx
4 stated in response to comments made, the proposed addition has been reduced in size and the applicant
5 provided more information with regard to the home's existing condition to reflect a more accurate GFA
6 which changed the variation's nature from major to standard. He noted the existing residence is
7 nonconforming and summarized the resulting GFA. He referred to the original and revised floor plans
8 which he described for the ZBA. Mr. Marx then referred to written comments received relating to the
9 request and stated following the applicant's presentation, public comment and Board discussion, the
10 Board may either continue the matter to a date certain to provide time to address any questions or
11 comments or consider a motion to adopt the resolution to approve or deny the variations with draft
12 resolutions included on page nos. 86-107. He then asked if there were any questions.

13
14 Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time. Chairman
15 Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter.

16
17 Christopher Canning, 1000 Skokie Blvd., Wilmette, stated he is representing the applicants, Emily and John
18 Thomas, and also introduced Scott Walker, the builder, along with Healy Rice, the architect. He
19 summarized their efforts made to make the numbers right and discussed the revised plan submitted as a
20 result of the comments made noting two variations are being requested for the front yard setback and
21 GFA. Mr. Canning described the square footage reductions contained in the revised plan and explained
22 the reasoning for not wanting to dig down in connection with flooding and storm water concerns.

23
24 Scott Walker explained how certain walls were adjusted and the shallower pitched roof was removed
25 along with the creation of a dormer for architectural character. He stated there would also be a major
26 square footage reduction which eliminated privacy concerns to the south with the request providing the
27 needed storage. Mr. Walker explained how the roof pitch created headroom and additional GFA.

28
29 Ms. Hanley asked what are the current and existing roof heights. Mr. Walker provided the information for
30 the Board. Chairman Bradley questioned the flagpole calculation relating to the variation requested. Mr.
31 Walker explained how the flagpole attributed to the amount of the variation being requested and
32 represented a hardship. Ms. Rice explained the plan to create a taller attic over the garage.

33
34 Chairman Bradley then asked for public comment. Courtney Nelson, 130 Evergreen, stated her home is to
35 the south and would be the most impacted by the request. She explained their position to protect and
36 preserve their family space and quality of life. Ms. Nelson referred to the noise with regard to the amount
37 of construction in the neighborhood. She stated the proposed addition would significantly affect their
38 property and alter the character of the locality and as well as their light and air, etc. Ms. Nelson stated the
39 home is already maxed out and the proposed space would be used as living space as opposed to storage.
40 She asked if the request is approved, for the applicant to wait until next winter to build and plant a row
41 of evergreens along their side of the fence.

42
43 David Nelson, 130 Evergreen, stated the hardship needed to be met in order for the request to be
44 approved and stated the applicants were aware of the property's restrictions when they bought the home
45 and asked for that to be factored into the Board's analysis.

46
47 Chairman Bradley asked if the applicant would like to respond. Mr. Walker referred to the amended south
48 elevation with the skylights which would not allow for a view into the rear property. The Board Members

1 reviewed the aerial view map on Figure 1. Mr. Walker provided further information relating to views to
2 surrounding properties and also identified the area where the pool would be located. Mr. Canning asked
3 for the opportunity to discuss any conditions the Board may impose with the applicant.
4

5 Chairman Bradley noted a unanimous motion would have been made and provided the applicant with their
6 options. He then closed public comment and called the matter in for discussion.
7

8 Ms. Hanley referred to her initial concerns relating to the first two standards due to the enormous scale
9 of the original project. She stated while the property is a flag lot, it is not unique but it did create a GFA
10 calculation challenge. Ms. Hanley stated since the request was significantly scaled down, it made the
11 requested variation more palatable along with the dormer and window removal on the south side in
12 response to neighbors' comments. She concluded she would lean toward approval. Mr. Ritter agreed with
13 Ms. Hanley's comments and stated the GFA overage is not a result of increased impermeable area. He
14 stated he is sympathetic to the rear neighbors' concerns and commented the applicant's team did a good
15 job in minimizing the proposed addition's size. He questioned whether the glare concern raised would be
16 an issue. Mr. Walker responded light reflects off glass. Mr. Ritter then stated he would be inclined to
17 approve the request without conditions.
18

19 Mr. Haller stated he appreciated the size reduction and the rear yard character appearance which would
20 be changed. He stated would lean in favor of the request and referred to the comments relating to the
21 room's use and whether the Board should consider the basis for the room's use relating to hardship relief.
22 Ms. Hanley and Chairman Bradley stated that the room's use is not relevant and referred to the home's
23 lack of a basement. Chairman Bradley also commented on the usability of the flag lot area and the GFA
24 calculations. He then summarized how he considered the standards and his position due to the inability
25 of the request to meet the reasonable return standard. He then stated he would be amenable to
26 conditions with regard to the timing of the pool project and the current project.
27

28 Mr. Haller stated if he would consider conditions it would be landscaping to ameliorate the visual impact,
29 not timing of construction. Ms. Hanley stated she would not be comfortable dictating adding landscaping
30 as a solution. She also referred to the difficulty relating to the lack of a basement and that the proposal
31 has been reduced from the original proposal.
32

33 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to approve the request as indicated on page no. 86. A motion to
34 approve the request was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Mr. Haller. A vote was taken and the
35 motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

36 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Ritter

37 NAYS: None
38

39 **New Cases:**

40 a. **Case No. 26-03-V: 614 Cherry Street:** An application seeking approval of zoning variations to
41 allow construction of a covered porch addition and work beyond ordinary repair and maintenance to
42 the existing legally nonconforming residence at 614 Cherry Street. The requested variations would
43 permit the proposed improvements to (i) provide less than the minimum required side yard setback
44 from the west property line; and (ii) perform structural changes necessary to provide a new window
45 opening in the legally nonconforming west side building wall. The Zoning Board of Appeals has final
46 jurisdiction on this request.

47 Mr. Marx summarized the variations being requested and identified the property's location, zoning
48 classification and views of the property. He then summarized the request to replace the rear stoop, the

1 home's legal nonconforming status as well as a new window opening in the nonconforming side building
2 wall. Mr. Marx noted the detached garage is also legally nonconforming in terms of its location but would
3 not change. He identified the location of the proposed porch addition in an illustration for the Board as
4 well as rear and side building elevations. Mr. Marx stated two written comments were received and
5 included as Attachment E in the packet. He then stated the Board may either continue the matter to a
6 date certain in order to address questions or comments or consider a motion to approve or deny the
7 request with resolutions on page nos. 194-207. Mr. Marx asked if there were any questions.
8

9 Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time. He then
10 swore in those speaking to this matter.
11

12 Healy Rice, the project architect, introduced herself along with Brian Axline, the property owner. She
13 stated the request is to remove and replace the existing porch in the rear of the property which would be
14 slightly larger. Ms. Rice also stated the existing stairway to the basement would be removed and referred
15 to a window well on the driveway side. She stated the proposed porch would serve as a mudroom and
16 summarized the setback issues. Ms. Rice stated the one story addition would align with the existing home
17 on the second floor. She noted an existing window would be removed with a new window added for the
18 bathroom in the same wall. Ms. Rice also stated they have received neighborhood support and asked if
19 there were any questions. She added there is ample separation between the two properties.
20

21 Chairman Bradley asked if there were any questions from the Board or the audience. No questions were
22 raised at this time and no public comments were made. He then called the matter in for discussion.
23

24 Ms. Hanley described the request as a simple approval and stated she would be in favor of the request.
25 Mr. Ritter agreed with Ms. Hanley's comment and stated the changes would be minimal. He stated he
26 would be in favor. Mr. Haller and Chairman Bradley also agreed with the comments made. Chairman
27 Bradley noted the side yard setback would be improved and described the request as straightforward.
28

29 Chairman Bradley then asked for a motion to approve the request as indicated on page no. 194. A motion
30 to approve the request as presented was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Mr. Haller. A vote was
31 taken and the motion unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

32 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Ritter

33 NAYS: None
34

35 **b. Case No. 26-01-V2: 671 Lincoln Avenue: An application seeking approval of a zoning variation**
36 **to allow construction of a circular driveway in the front yard of 671 Lincoln Avenue. The requested**
37 **variation would permit the proposed improvement to exceed the maximum permitted front yard lot**
38 **coverage. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**

39 Mr. Marx identified the property's location, zoning classification and site photos of the property and
40 surrounding properties. He summarized the front yard lot coverage variation being requested and
41 identified the driveway, fence and front entry gates. Mr. Marx stated the request is to expand the
42 driveway to a circular driveway with a new curb cut and the increase in impermeable lot coverage and
43 front yard lot coverage. He noted two written comments from neighbors were received and included in
44 the agenda packet. Mr. Marx stated following the applicant's presentation, the Board may decide to either
45 continue the matter to a date certain to allow for time to address questions or comments or make a
46 motion to recommend approval or denial of the variation with draft language included on page nos. 139-
47 140. He then asked if there were any questions.
48

1 Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time. He then
2 swore in those speaking to this matter.

3
4 Scott Price, the project manager and Sam Everly, the landscape contractor with Midwest Arbor,
5 introduced themselves to the Board. Mr. Price stated they were retained to do interior work and refurbish
6 the home purchased approximately one year ago. He stated they planned to restore the circular driveway
7 which was previously removed primarily due to safety concerns due to the amount of traffic the home
8 generated. Mr. Price described the plans for the proposed driveway and drainage work to ensure water
9 management is sufficient.

10
11 Chairman Bradley asked if there were any questions. Mr. Ritter asked the applicant if they considered
12 installing a turnaround which would result in a lower amount of impervious surface. Mr. Price responded
13 they did not but can consider it. Ms. Hanley referred to the site plan. Mr. Price confirmed there is a three
14 car garage but the third bay is unusable. Mr. Everly stated due to the radius, it would be difficult to get
15 out. Chairman Bradley stated the home is iconic and referred to the amount of exposure relating to the
16 home. He asked for the specific reasons which motivated the circular driveway. Mr. Price responded the
17 proposed design lined up with what was there before as well as what was in the Home Alone movie. He
18 explained the difficulties for the workers and visitors to the home which is currently unoccupied.

19
20 Chairman Bradley referred to Attachment D from the former owners with regard to the space in the rear
21 to allow for a turnaround. He stated while the request is a balance of safety and restoration, he asked to
22 what extent is the issue of the turnaround not feasibly already there with what the previous owner did to
23 the property. Mr. Price responded the issue related more to the guests as opposed to those backing in
24 and out of the garage. He stated the new ownership chose to remain anonymous who have more children
25 and vehicles than the prior owners.

26
27 Chairman Bradley also asked if efforts were made to solicit help from the Village and police department
28 to attempt to minimize the amount of disruption. Mr. Price noted the ownership family has met with the
29 police chief and other Village members to discuss this issue. He also stated the plan was presented to the
30 Chief of Police and the Fire Chief in order to obtain their input with the knowledge they cannot control
31 the amount of people who gather at the property.

32
33 Ms. Hanley stated while she appreciated there is a safety hazard, she described it as a safety issue of the
34 applicant's own making which would draw more people to see the home. She stated there are ways to
35 keep the home from being seen and from being an attraction. Chairman Bradley stated the home was
36 existing nonconforming and if the request was for any other home in the Village, it would be a nonstarter
37 in terms of the justification for installing this amount of overage.

38
39 Chairman Bradley referred to the proposed overage for the turnaround the applicant claimed is the
40 minimal amount necessary to allow vehicles to safely exit the property facing forward. Mr. Price stated
41 while it is unusual to go back to a condition that was previously grandfathered in, the plans would allow
42 for a large detention system to account for the driveway. He also stated the driveway could be minimized
43 to 12 feet. No additional questions were raised at this time.

44
45 Chairman Bradley stated the Board would first take a break which would be followed by public comment.

46
47 Kristen and Gavin Cross, 663 Lincoln, stated they moved to the home knowing what they were dealing
48 with and stated they are not here in opposition but want to know the intentions in terms of safety. Mr.

1 Cross stated it is their understanding that the owners do not live in the home and have done nothing to
2 address security concerns. He described the proposal as a solution for one home but a poor solution for
3 others while they all have similar concerns with regard to their driveways. Mr. Cross stated their question
4 to the Village is how the situation would be managed going forward. Mrs. Cross also stated the fact that
5 it is a neighborhood should be considered and they are concerned with safety with deliveries which can
6 be addressed in numerous ways and which would not make the home look like a movie set. She stated
7 the new owners would not live in the home full time and reminded everyone that it is a neighborhood
8 with safety being everyone's concern.
9

10 Melissa and Michael Howard, 664 Lincoln, stated they are in the process of building a new home across
11 from the property. She informed the Board they installed a camera due to the amount of people in the
12 neighborhood and has changed their home's design to address privacy and safety concerns. Mrs. Howard
13 stated their side of the street experienced more traffic and referred to the use of their driveway by visitors
14 for photos. She explained the amount of traffic which made exiting the property very difficult. Mr. Howard
15 referred to the aerial view and asked for the engineers to address the amount of impermeable surface in
16 terms of water drainage. He also referred to aesthetics with regard to landscaping which can mitigate the
17 appearance of a driveway. Mr. Howard then stated the larger issue related to the Village addressing the
18 context concern issues for the unique block with regard to the amount of traffic. He stated while they are
19 not opposed to the circular drive, the Village benefitted from the home but the people on the block pay
20 the larger price and asked for grace to be extended to them in terms of the cost they bear. Mrs. Howard
21 also asked if tour buses can be stopped or funneled in certain ways and asked for a more cohesive plan to
22 be achieved which would benefit everyone.
23

24 Taron Giniat, 682 Lincoln, stated the amount of traffic from 9 to 5 is much quieter and her biggest concern
25 is that this is a security issue of the applicant's own making and calling the matter a safety concern is
26 disingenuous. She described the amount of traffic in the neighborhood and questioned whether the
27 requested permanent change is worth it for a temporary convenience especially when the owners do not
28 plan to live in the home full time.
29

30 Kathy Howlett, 650 Lincoln, stated she has been working with Mr. Mangum with regard to possible
31 solutions and stated they appreciated the various entities working with them on this matter. She then
32 stated with regard to safety concerns, she referred to the amount of small children in the neighborhood
33 and stated while it is an iconic home, she asked the Board to recommend conditions for the new owners
34 to have security for the property to take the burden off the Police Department who have provided
35 excellent response. No additional comments were made at this time.
36

37 Chairman Bradley closed public comment and asked the applicant if they would like to respond. Mr. Price
38 thanked the audience for their comments and stated the owners purchased the home for their families'
39 and friends' enjoyment and they cannot be in the home all the time. He stated it would not be a museum,
40 Airbnb or an attraction. Mr. Price stated with regard to safety, the owners have installed several cameras
41 and have been in discussions with their security team regarding more cameras on the streetscape as well
42 as being open to working with the Village.
43

44 Chairman Bradley called the matter in for discussion and outlined the items the Board is to consider. Ms.
45 Hanley noted if they were to deny the request, it would not set a standard for the denial of any circular
46 driveway on the street. She stated with regard to the standards she had difficulty with the first three
47 standards which she explained to the Board. Ms. Hanley stated she would not vote in favor of the request.
48 Mr. Ritter stated he only had trouble with the first standard. He stated while he understood the safety

1 concerns, there are a variety of things the owners can do to alleviate some of the problem and offered a
2 solution for vehicles to line up in the driveway. Mr. Ritter stated he also would not vote in favor of the
3 request.

4
5 Mr. Haller stated he had a problem with standard nos. 1, 2 and 7. Chairman Bradley stated the home
6 would continue to grow in terms of its adoration which qualified as a unique circumstance. He stated he
7 disagreed it would be a benefit to the Village and stated ample evidence was provided by the applicant of
8 the intention to return the home to its 1990's form. Chairman Bradley stated to put back the
9 grandfathered front yard lot coverage would increase the concern and agreed there are safety concerns
10 for the street which need to be abated. He stated there are several standards that have not been met
11 which he described in detail. Chairman Bradley then stated he would not be in favor of the request and
12 asked if there were any other comments. No additional comments were made at this time.

13
14 Chairman Bradley advised the applicant of the Board's position and offered them the option to revisit the
15 matter based on the Board's comments or proceed with a vote on a recommendation to the Village
16 Council. Mr. Price agreed to continue the matter to allow discussions with the owners.

17
18 Chairman Bradley then asked for a motion to continue the matter to the February 9, 2026, meeting. A
19 motion was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Mr. Ritter. A vote was taken and the motion
20 unanimously passed, 4 to 0:

21 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Ritter

22 NAYS: None

23
24 c. **Case No. 25-16-SD: 936 Sunset Road: Applications seeking approval of a Final Plat of Subdivision**
25 **to allow a two-lot subdivision of 936 Sunset Road, which requires variations to allow Proposed Lot 2 to**
26 **(i) provide less than the minimum required lot area for an interior lot; and (ii) provide less than the**
27 **minimum required rectangular buildable area. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**
28 **This item was continued from the October 13, 2025, and December 8, 2025, Zoning Board of Appeals**
29 **meeting. The applicant is amending its request, which requires new public notice of the amended relief**
30 **requested. The amended application will be considered by the Zoning Board of Appeals on February 9,**
31 **2026. The Zoning Board of Appeals will not be taking any action on this item at its January 12, 2026,**
32 **meeting.**

33 No action was taken by the Board on this agenda item.

34
35 d. **Case No. 25-29-SD: 829 Foxdale Avenue and 833 Foxdale Avenue: Applications seeking approval**
36 **of a Final Plat of Subdivision to consolidate the two existing lots into a single lot of record. As part of**
37 **the Final Plat approval, the application includes a request of approval of zoning variations to permit the**
38 **existing residence at 833 Foxdale Avenue to (i) observe less than the minimum required side yard**
39 **setback from the north property line, which is due to an increase in the minimum required side yard**
40 **setback as a result of the proposed increase in total lot area and average lot width; and (ii) not provide**
41 **the required building line articulation along the north side building walls. The Village Council has final**
42 **jurisdiction on this request.**

43 At the request of the Applicant, this item was pulled from the agenda. The Board did not discuss this
44 agenda item.

45
46 **New Business:**

47 a. **February 9, 2026, Meeting - Quorum Check.**

48 The Board Members discussed their availability.

1 **Public Comment:**

2 No comments were made at this time.

3

4 **Adjournment:**

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

7 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Ritter

8 NAYS: None

9 The meeting adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

10

11 Respectfully submitted,

12

13 Antionette Johnson

14 Recording Secretary