

**WINNETKA PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
JANUARY 28, 2026**

**Members Present:**

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

**Members Absent:**

Cyrus Subawalla

**Non-Voting Members Present:**

Bridget Orsic

**Village Staff:**

Scott Mangum, Community Development Director  
Ann Klaassen, Assistant Director of Community  
Development  
Christopher Marx, Associate Planner

**Village Attorney:**

Peter Friedman  
Courtney Trefil

**Call to Order & Roll Call:**

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Danley at 7:05 p.m. Ms. Klaassen took roll call of the Commission Members present.

**Approval of December 17, 2025, Regular Meeting Minutes:**

Chairperson Danley asked for a motion to approve the December 17, 2025, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the December 17, 2025, regular meeting minutes was made by Mr. Bradley and seconded by Mr. Poor. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 8 to 0:

AYES: Alt, Blum, Bradley, Case, 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 there has been no action on any items to present to the Commission.

**New Applications:**

a. **Case No. 25-28-SU: 225 Sheridan Road - Centennial Beach: An application seeking approval of a Special Use Permit to allow installation of fencing on the existing beach. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**

Peter Friedman outlined the public hearing requirements and procedures to be followed in connection with the Centennial Beach agenda item.

1 Ms. Klaassen summarized the Park District's proposal to install two chain link fences to provide an  
2 enclosed area for off leashed dogs for review by the Commission with the applicant seeking a  
3 recommendation of approval for a special use permit. She identified the Commission's role in the review  
4 and summarized the administrative and public review processes and referred to a table for the  
5 Commission's review. Ms. Klaassen noted the proposed fences' appearance is not within the  
6 Commission's purview and would be reviewed by the Design Review Board ("DRB").  
7

8 Ms. Klaassen stated since the property is located on Lake Michigan, it would be subject to lakefront  
9 construction and steep slope regulations and noted the proposed fencing is not located within the steep  
10 slope zone. She then summarized the lakefront construction regulations and the review and permit  
11 approval procedures as well as the public trust doctrine. Ms. Klaassen then identified the property's  
12 location and zoning classification which is located in the lakefront preservation overlay district. She stated  
13 public parks and recreational facilities are allowed as a special use in the R-2 district and summarized the  
14 appropriate Comprehensive Plan and land use designations.  
15

16 Ms. Klaassen referred to beach images in an illustration and identified the existing improvements with the  
17 applicant to provide additional detail relating to the proposed two rows of chain link fencing which she  
18 described in detail to the Commission as well as the existing dog beach use and its access. She also  
19 summarized the Zoning Ordinance amendment relating to the refinement of the front lot line along the  
20 lake. Ms. Klaassen noted that at 4 feet in height the proposed fences comply with the maximum permitted  
21 height of 6.5 feet. She then informed the Commission the ZBA is scheduled to consider the special use  
22 permit at its February 9, 2026, meeting and the DRB is scheduled to consider a Certificate of  
23 Appropriateness for the design of the proposed fencing on February 19, 2026, with the Village Council  
24 having final jurisdiction.  
25

26 Ms. Klaassen stated the Commission is to consider the six special use standards included on page 19 of  
27 the agenda packet and following the applicant's presentation, public comment and Commission  
28 discussion, the Commission may decide to: (i) act on the application with a recommendation, (ii) direct  
29 Village staff and the Village Attorney to prepare a draft recommendation with or without conditions and  
30 written findings and determinations for consideration at a subsequent meeting, (iii) direct the applicant  
31 or Village staff to provide new or additional information in connection with the application or (iv) take  
32 such other action as may be permitted by law. She then asked if there were any questions.  
33

34 Chairperson Danley also asked if there were any questions. Ms. Van Vlack asked if dogs have ever been  
35 allowed off leash on the property before there was a fence. Ms. Klaassen responded there has not been  
36 a special use permit approved for that and there are leash laws. She then stated she could not answer as  
37 to whether Cook County considered it a dog park or a dog friendly area. Mr. Blum referred to recreation  
38 as a permitted use and asked if the request had to be approved or meet those qualifications. Ms. Klaassen  
39 confirmed the request for the proposed improvements had to meet the six special use standards. No  
40 additional questions were raised at this time.  
41

42 Chairperson Danley swore in those speaking to this matter. Hal Francke of Meltzer Purtil and Stelle  
43 introduced himself as the Park District's attorney and provided an overview of their presentation to the  
44 Commission. He noted they attempted to address in their presentation the public comment already  
45 received with the expectation of more public comment to be made. Mr. Francke then described the dog  
46 beach as a community amenity and that the request would allow the Park District to continue to operate  
47 the dog beach in accordance with law and the legal regulations as well as allow users of the dog beach in  
48 compliance with the law. He stated the proposed fencing would further public safety and maintain

1 shoreline access and connectivity along the lakefront and would not require any zoning variation requests.

2  
3 Mr. Francke then provided an overview of the Winnetka leash law as well as a detailed summary of the  
4 Cook County regulations. He also referred to Illinois state law and language in the Illinois Animal Control  
5 Act. Mr. Francke stated Costa Kutulas, Director of Parks and Maintenance for the Park District, would now  
6 provide the Commission with a history of the Centennial dog beach.

7  
8 Costa Kutulas stated he would provide a history of the dog beach which was established in 1995. He noted  
9 the Park District installed temporary chain link fencing from 2009-2015 similar in design to the proposal  
10 which did not require permits. Mr. Kutulas stated the Winnetka Master Plan for the lakefront was then  
11 undertaken from 2014-2016 with the decision to remove the deteriorating fence. He outlined the creation  
12 of the dog beach committee to review other beach locations to relocate the Centennial dog beach and its  
13 findings. Mr. Kutulas stated in 2023, their staff was directed by the Executive Director to install the  
14 temporary fencing which was pulled due to improper permitting. He noted the Park District board adopted  
15 the ordinance requiring leashes at the beach. Submittals to the IDNR and the Army Corp of Engineers  
16 (“ACOE”) for the permit request were made in April 2025. Mr. Kutulas stated following the fence and  
17 debris cleanup, he referred to approvals received from the IDNR and other agencies for their permit  
18 process with the ACOE and Cook County approvals to follow shortly.

19  
20 Mr. Kutulas then described the project overview which included delineation between a temporary  
21 Centennial dog beach versus Centennial dog beach fencing. He also described the proposed fencing in  
22 detail which would have a 4 foot height and extend approximately 15 feet into the lake. Mr. Kutulas then  
23 referred to illustrations of the prior fencing from 2010 as well as illustrations of the proposed fencing  
24 which he described in detail. Mr. Kutulas then outlined the existing parking conditions with no change in  
25 use being proposed and described the dog season timeline and timeline of average use. He also described  
26 neighboring dog beaches and their uses in detail. He then summarized the project’s regulatory review  
27 process as well as their responses to the first round of review comments. Mr. Kutulas stated Mr. Francke  
28 would now address the public trust doctrine and additional finer project points.

29  
30 Mr. Francke stated in response to the public concerns raised, he referred to the public trust doctrine  
31 summary and provided additional information in that regard. He noted it stated that the state cannot sell  
32 submerged land to a private party, but it can permit its improvement with structures such as wharfs, docks  
33 and piers that improve the use of the lake for public purposes without impairment of the public’s interests.  
34 He stated based on its provisions, the IDNR issued the permit previously referenced and reviewed the  
35 Park District’s application and concluded that allowing the proposed fencing would not obstruct or  
36 interfere with navigation, is an acceptable encroachment per the Park District code, it would not impair  
37 the rights, interests or uses of the public and is not likely to cause bank or shoreline instability or other  
38 littoral properties. Mr. Francke further described additional provisions from the doctrine and summarized  
39 in detail the applicant’s response that the special use standards have been satisfied. He asked for the  
40 Commission to recommend approval of the fencing and for the entire application to be concluded quickly  
41 so that the fencing can be installed. Mr. Francke then asked if there were any questions.

42  
43 Chairperson Danley asked the Commission Members if they had any questions. Ms. Van Vlack asked if  
44 there is any record of unintended interactions between dogs and humans in the event additional security  
45 measures are needed. Mr. Francke responded there have been no concerns at the Park District level  
46 although there may have been testimony in the public comments received. Ms. Van Vlack asked what the  
47 depth of the water is where the 15 feet of fence is in the water. Mr. Kutulas stated there have been no  
48 documented records of interactions with dogs or citations although there were concerns which led to the

1 fence being installed in 2009 at Elder Lane Park, which has been closed for the last five years. He added  
2 the water depth at the end of the 15 feet would range from 1 to 1.5 feet.

3  
4 Ms. Van Vlack noted dog park regulations require four enclosed walls and water is not a barrier. She stated  
5 to call the area a dog park would not then be accurate in terms of Cook County regulations. Mr. Francke  
6 stated the word "enclosed" is used in the Cook County regulations but is not defined and the question  
7 related to the lake being considered as part of the enclosure. He then identified several similar examples  
8 of other dog beaches having the fourth side barrier being the lake. Ms. Van Vlack questioned whether it  
9 would need to be redefined as a dog friendly park. Mr. Francke stated the term "dog friendly park" is not  
10 clearly defined and having the fence extend across the length of the shoreline to serve as the fourth barrier  
11 is not desirable. Ms. Van Vlack stated they have to determine which rules need to be defined and applied.

12  
13 Trustee Orsic referred to the 2010 photo and fence and asked if the new fence would be in the same exact  
14 location. Mr. Kutulas explained that the fence in the photo is approximately 20-30 feet south of the  
15 proposed fence location. He noted to enlarge it and keep it more close to what it is or what it was  
16 originally to go further to the north. Mr. Kutulas stated by design that it is very similar. He noted it would  
17 be smaller than the previous dog park by approximately 40 feet.

18  
19 Mr. Blum asked if the proposal is for a dog park or for a dog friendly area. Mr. Francke explained the  
20 differences in the language between the Cook County ordinance for a dog park and the Village ordinance  
21 which did not distinguish between the two terms of off leash dogs or a dog friendly area. He confirmed  
22 the Park District wanted to be in compliance with the law. Mr. Blum then referred to the second and fifth  
23 standards and whether the lake is considered as a second property. Mr. Francke responded the  
24 application of special uses standards for adjoining properties are those that are used, occupied and  
25 enjoyed by neighbors. He confirmed there is fencing in the Lake Bluff example which is not a chain link  
26 fence with the remaining examples to have at least one chain link portion. Mr. Kutulas explained how the  
27 dog beach operated seasonally. He also summarized in detail the survey response for the dog beach  
28 location.

29  
30 Ms. Case asked if other municipalities have gates in terms of traversing the beach. Mr. Kutulas referred to  
31 Lake Bluff and identified a gate on the southbound side and described security procedures in other  
32 locations. Mr. Bradley asked when the Cook County regulation was passed. Mr. Kutulas responded the  
33 Park District was made aware in 2021 or 2022 that they were out of compliance with the county. Mr.  
34 Bradley asked why the Park District put their ordinance into effect to disregard it, and for over 30 years  
35 there has been negligence by multiple entities in terms of being aware of Cook County regulations that  
36 required dog beaches to operate. Mr. Kutulas explained how they sought to become compliant in 2009  
37 when the fence was put in place to have a north safety boundary and to ensure they are following the  
38 proper permitting and procedures. Mr. Francke added the dog beach had already been operating after  
39 the ordinance went into effect in 2010 and could be perceived as being grandfathered in. Mr. Bradley  
40 asked why two gates are needed. Mr. Kutulas explained the reasoning for the off-leashing and on-leashing  
41 area in a secured area. He also explained the rationale for the distance of the 15 feet of fencing into the  
42 water and the rationale for having 240 linear feet of shoreline as opposed to the 170 feet decided on the  
43 Park District Master Plan. He then explained how the request complied with the first two standards  
44 although residents are required to pass through two gates to gain access to the beach through the dog  
45 beach with compliance including the installation of signage. He referred to the number of obstructions  
46 which prevent people from walking along the shoreline. Mr. Francke also stated the Commission has the  
47 ability to recommend conditions relating to this concern.

48

1 Mr. Poor referred to other chain link fences at other dog beaches and to a letter submitted which stated  
2 that none of them protrude 15 feet into the water. Mr. Francke confirmed they all have fencing at some  
3 level and the Gillson Beach photo was taken at a time of year when the fence was not in the water. No  
4 additional questions were raised at this time.

5  
6 Chairperson Danley asked for public comment and for the comments to focus on issues which have not  
7 been raised. She then swore in those speaking to this matter.

8  
9 John Root referred to Section 6.8.20 of the Village ordinance prohibiting dogs from running at large. He  
10 stated an exception to the ordinance would be approved to have this fence and referred to a photo of  
11 Gillson Beach which showed a fence at the water line. Mr. Root also referred to photos of other beaches  
12 where the fences do not extend into the lake.

13  
14 Joanna Karatzas from Winnetka described the plans for the off leash dog beach as vague and misleading  
15 and she read her statement into the record. She asked for the special use permit to be denied.

16  
17 Laurie Peterson read Mary Garrison's letter into the record who asked for the special use permit request  
18 to be denied.

19  
20 Mark Hecht from Winnetka described the proposed plan as an ill-conceived use of Village and Park District  
21 property with there being better ways to handle the issue. He suggested entirely prohibiting dogs from all  
22 lakefront property during regular swimming hours and allow everyone to freely use the entire lakefront.  
23 Mr. Hecht also suggested the use of stone jetties with the suggestion that these alternatives be used for  
24 a couple of years to determine if they are effective.

25  
26 Jude Overly, a 33 year Fuller Lane resident, stated she has never seen any aggressive behaviors over her  
27 years of using the beach and there is no need to have a fence to protect dogs and residents. She described  
28 incidents of dogs having issues with fences. Ms. Overly referred to one particular non-Winnetka resident  
29 who hoped for the fence and asked for the application to be denied and for the dog beach to be left open  
30 for all residents and their dogs.

31  
32 Susie Schreiber, past Park District commissioner and a past member of this Commission, read a statement  
33 into the record which referred to the numerous amount of accidents and deaths in Illinois beach state  
34 parks and along the shorelines as well as the lack of Illinois shoreline safety regulations. She concluded by  
35 asking for the terminology of shoals not to be used in reference to Centennial beach.

36  
37 Irene Smith, a 40 year Winnetka resident, referred the Commission to a photo of Centennial Beach and  
38 described the Park District's convoluted proposal to have a fence in the lake. She stated creating a cage  
39 for the limited number of Winnetka pass holders did not make sense. Ms. Smith stated the waters are  
40 navigable and did not contain shoals and asked for the special use permit be denied.

41  
42 Angie Dahl, a 40 year Winnetka resident, stated she has served as a Park District President and on several  
43 Village advisory boards. She described the unsafe and impassable condition of the beach which has  
44 occurred over the years. Ms. Dahl stated when the public went to the IDNR to ask for clarification with  
45 regard to several lakefront matters, the response was that the Village could have denied all of the  
46 approvals since the Village has final jurisdiction over the lakefront. She then referred to the amount of  
47 complaints with regard to the proposal and asked the Commission to deny the request.

48

1 Alexandra Nichols, 900 Mt. Pleasant, stated there are serious safety concerns with fences at the dog beach  
2 and there has been a violation of the doctrine of public use. She then read her statement into the record  
3 and asked for the special use permit be denied.

4  
5 Peggy Martay, a 50 year Winnetka resident, read her statement into the record and asked for the special  
6 use permit to be denied.

7  
8 Steve Juliusson, a 20 year Winnetka resident, read his statement into the record and asked for the special  
9 use permit to be denied.

10  
11 Susan Curry, 375 Hawthorn, stated the dog beach and park are important to the community and the  
12 described discussions relating to moving some of those facilities to other parts of the area as off. She  
13 described the dog beach as a family beach and stated they can all come together find a way for everyone  
14 to enjoy the beach. Ms. Curry also stated she had not heard of any issues regarding safety or security with  
15 there being diversity across the waterfront and concluded nothing needed to be changed.

16  
17 Katie Stevens referred to the restrictive covenant signed between Orchard 2020 and the Park District  
18 which did not include a fence permit at that time and would freeze Centennial Beach's use for 50 years.  
19 She stated the fencing may become permanent and may end up on private land with a land swap. Ms.  
20 Stevens also referred to access limitations with fencing becoming a nuisance and referred to specific code  
21 requirements.

22  
23 David Stevens, Winnetka resident, referred to the referenced water depth which would be well over 3  
24 feet and would present a restriction in terms of those who want to use the beach.

25  
26 Ted Wynnychenko asked for the special use permit to not be approved and referred to the half-truths  
27 being presented at this meeting. He also referred to fences and restrictions at other beaches, the lack of  
28 shoals, etc. Mr. Wynnychenko questioned the Park District's right to put a fence across the high water  
29 mark area and referred to the binding exchange agreement in place with regard to the overlay district  
30 requirements which would result in private land ownership.

31  
32 Melissa Meizel, a 30 year Winnetka resident, referred to the 460 linear foot proposal and contemplated  
33 use by dog owners which she described as an excessive allocation of resources. She also referred to  
34 whether it would be a dog beach, dog park and that "temporary" would result in "until further notice."  
35 Ms. Meizel stated there has been no investigation in connection with fences at other beaches other than  
36 the one which supported the applicant's position. She concluded they are being treated with ambiguity,  
37 obfuscation, distortion, etc. and asked for the special use permit to be denied. No additional comments  
38 were made at this time.

39  
40 Chairperson Danley closed public comment and asked the applicant if they would like to respond at this  
41 time.

42  
43 Mr. Francke clarified the reason as to why Mr. Kutulas explained the term "temporary fencing" in some  
44 places and not others. He also stated with regard to the plan being presented in bits and pieces, the Park  
45 District is working on plans for Elder and Centennial Beaches following the Commission's consideration of  
46 the prior plan in 2025 which is what was intended by the term "temporary." Mr. Francke also referred to  
47 the written comment relating to guidelines with regard to temporary approval which the Park District  
48 would not be opposed to. He stated with regard to the dog beach size, if these concerns are shared and

1 recognizing the shared beach and making it a condition that the Park District explore alternatives including  
2 a design which did not require pass through. Mr. Francke stated there are alternatives to address a  
3 number of responses made.  
4

5 Chairperson Danley called the matter in for discussion and summarized the issue presented to the  
6 Commission as to whether the fencing met the standards. Mr. Alt stated he would not be in favor for a  
7 number of reasons and referred to the waste of time and money the Park District continued to bring to  
8 the Commission and others. He stated while the presentation was strong, he asked the applicant to put  
9 together a plan that is safe and would work for the community. Ms. Van Vlack stated the Commission  
10 should not decide what the dog beach should be called and although delineation would have been helpful,  
11 she identified the tasks the Commission is to consider. She stated based on the presentation, it is not clear  
12 that the proposal met that documented necessity and she also had an issue of approving an item  
13 categorized as temporary. Ms. Van Vlack concluded she would not vote in favor of the request.  
14

15 Mr. Enck agreed with the comments made and stated generally, if a fence is needed for use separation  
16 but it is only three sided, it did not meet that requirement and no one wants a four sided fence. He stated  
17 extending the fence an arbitrary distance into the lake did not solve the issue. Ms. Case agreed with the  
18 comments made and stated standards (a) and (b) have not been met. She stated she is concerned with  
19 regard to safety in terms of the fence in the water and having to go through four air locks to get to the  
20 beach. Ms. Case stated the Commission is being asked to approve something in a vacuum when they do  
21 not know what the rest of the proposal would be. Mr. Blum agreed with the comments made and  
22 indicated the ZBA may address the issue of increased parking. He then referred to the restrictive covenant  
23 issue and asked that they find a path forward to get the beaches open. Mr. Blum concluded most of the  
24 standards have not been met and asked the Village Attorney to draft language which outlined the  
25 Commission's opposition.  
26

27 Mr. Poor stated he came to the similar conclusion as the rest of the Commission Members and described  
28 his use of the dog beach. He stated a 15-foot fence in the lake would present security issues for dogs who  
29 love the water. Mr. Poor stated the dog beach existed prior to 2010 and worked well. He described the  
30 risks and safety issues a 15-foot fence presented and the request did not satisfy the first two standards  
31 and he would vote against the request. Mr. Bradley stated there may be a call for everyone to work  
32 towards a temporary condition and viable path which would bide some time in connection with the issues  
33 between the prior plan and future plans for Centennial and Elder Beaches. He stated a strict standard  
34 interpretation of the standards would put a zero sum solution on the table. Mr. Bradley stated the beaches  
35 cannot be left alone and littoral drift among other issues needed to be addressed. He concluded by stating  
36 a short term solution needed to be reached while a longer term plan can be achieved. The Commission  
37 Members agreed a solution is needed.  
38

39 Trustee Orsic informed the Commission dog beach pass owners came to a Village Council meeting and  
40 stated they are not in favor of fences or wedded to this location. She stated while there has not been a  
41 fence there for a period of time, she referred to the dangers of having children and dogs play in the water  
42 with a submerged fence. Trustee Orsic referred to the wood slat temporary fence at Highland Park and  
43 agreed a solution needed to be reached for Elder Beach to be opened. Chairperson Danley agreed with  
44 Mr. Bradley's comments and reiterated her statement at the time the entire plan was presented to the  
45 Commission is that in making a decision, they all want the beaches to be open. She stated she is concerned  
46 with the first two standards and referred to the safety concerns raised with regard to children and dogs.  
47 Chairperson Danley stated having a fence in the water would not serve to address the safety concerns.  
48 She also referred to the difficulty if they were to impose conditions which would be numerous as well as

1 the interaction between those beach goers and dog owners with a solution being made that took that  
2 into account with the posted sign being insufficient. Chairperson Danley concluded she is not in favor of  
3 the request.

4  
5 Mr. Francke asked if the Park District could present a plan that eliminated the fencing in the water and  
6 provided for a by-pass for public access around the dog beach at a future Plan Commission meeting. The  
7 Commission was not receptive to an amended plan being presented to them after all the public comments  
8 related to the submitted plan. Chairperson Danley suggested the applicant can present those options to  
9 the ZBA. She then asked for a motion.

10  
11 Mr. Blum moved to recommend denial of the special use request permit and to direct the Village Attorney  
12 and Village staff to prepare written findings and determinations consistent with the Commission's  
13 comments and the record from this public hearing for proposed consideration at the Commission's next  
14 meeting. Ms. Case seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 7 to 0:

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

16 NAYS: None

17 NON-VOTING: Bradley, Orsic

18  
19 **b. Case No. 26-02-SU: 736 Elm Street - Solidcore: An application seeking approval of a Special Use**  
20 **Permit submitted by Solidcore, as the prospective lessee of the commercial space located at 736 Elm**  
21 **Street to allow a personal fitness facility in the C-2 General Retail Commercial Overlay District. The**  
22 **property is currently owned by MDG Winnetka One, LP. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this**  
23 **request.**

24 Mr. Marx summarized the special use permit requested and identified the property's location in the One  
25 Winnetka development and zoning classification with the proposed space to be occupied in the  
26 Commercial Overlay District. He then identified the Overlay District boundaries as well as the proposed  
27 use in an illustration for the Commission. Mr. Marx summarized the business operations, number of  
28 employees and hours of operation which would be appointment-only classes. He also summarized the  
29 proposed parking plan and use occupancy in detail. Mr. Marx summarized the One Winnetka final planned  
30 development approval, the partial approval of special use findings for medical and financial service uses  
31 and noted cultural recreational and entertainment uses, which includes personal fitness facilities, did not  
32 receive partial approval in the One Winnetka planned development with all 12 special use standard being  
33 applicable that are provided on pages 101 and 102 of the agenda packet.

34  
35 Mr. Marx stated following the applicant's presentation, public comment and Commission discussion, the  
36 Commission may decide to either continue the application to a date certain to allow time to address any  
37 questions or comments or consider a motion recommending approval or denial of the special use permit  
38 with draft language included on pages 101-102. He then asked if there were any questions.

39  
40 Chairperson Danley referred to the Commission's prior discussion regarding the allowance for special use  
41 permits and asked what information is there available on other building tenants other than the Ballyhoo  
42 restaurant. Mr. Mangum referred to the Charles Schwab and the Winnetka Aesthetic Studio approved  
43 special uses as well as the Arkadia restaurant which would be a permitted use in the development. He  
44 noted there is one additional special use application which was submitted for a medical-related use as  
45 well as another restaurant concept which would be a permitted use. Chairperson Danley asked if there  
46 were any questions.

47  
48 Ms. Van Vlack asked if any of the remaining space available would be a restaurant or special use. Mr.

1 Mangum confirmed all of the spaces have been leased. He stated they do not have all of the information  
2 available yet for the upcoming special use request. Ms. Klaassen confirmed there are limits for medical  
3 and financial special uses. Ms. Van Vlack asked how many potential retail spaces remain on Elm Street.  
4 Mr. Mangum stated there are no retail spaces remaining. No additional questions were raised at this time.  
5

6 Chairperson Danley asked for the applicant's presentation. She swore in those speaking to this matter.  
7 Melanie Nifong, Solidcore Senior Director of Operations and Sean Jackson of DxU Architects introduced  
8 themselves to the Commission. Chairperson Danley referred to the proposed hours of operation and the  
9 applicant's other locations around the country. She asked if there has been discussion whether the  
10 proposed schedule would generate the same amount of people as in their other locations. Ms. Nifong  
11 stated other suburban locations have a fully robust schedule which she described for the Commission.  
12 She noted their closest location to the Village is in Buffalo Grove which has over 600 members. Ms. Nifong  
13 also described the demographic. Mr. Bradley stated he is concerned with regard to the evening hours and  
14 whether the space would compete with other uses such as a restaurant. Mr. Jackson identified the existing  
15 parking on Lincoln and Elm as well as the dedicated spaces in the One Winnetka development. He noted  
16 their patrons would not all drive to the location which include those using the train. Mr. Jackson also  
17 stated a parking analysis was previously done for the entire One Winnetka development. Mr. Bradley also  
18 questioned the noise component. Mr. Jackson responded it would be in the 40-50 decibel range, and they  
19 have a consultant which provided recommendations for their locations which include the fact that  
20 residents are located above the location. Ms. Nifong estimated 50% of their locations are in mixed use  
21 buildings.  
22

23 Chairperson Danley asked the applicant if they considered any other properties. Mr. Jackson responded  
24 the applicant's real estate team reviewed other properties in the area. Ms. Nifong stated they had to close  
25 their Vernon Hills location during Covid. Chairperson Danley asked if there were any questions.  
26

27 Ms. Van Vlack questioned the in-person staff makeup which Ms. Nifong described for the Commission.  
28 Mr. Jackson confirmed there would be times no music is being played during in the 10 minute gap between  
29 classes and stated they were advised by an acoustical engineer in terms of sound. Ms. Nifong described  
30 the coaching staff and noted the door would be locked. Mr. Blum stated he is concerned with regard to  
31 double counting parking spaces in terms of overlap. Ms. Nifong added no shower amenities would be  
32 provided.  
33

34 Mr. Poor stated while he appreciated the acoustical mitigation efforts, he referred to the residential units  
35 above and asked if they would be able to hear music. Mr. Jackson explained the way in which the space  
36 would be defined. He informed the Commission the acoustical report can be provided to the Commission.  
37 Ms. Nifong noted sound testing is done prior to opening their locations. Ms. Van Vlack asked what would  
38 be done to keep with the building's aesthetic in terms of signage. Mr. Marx explained that the applicant  
39 was asked to provide a general context for the proposed signage for consideration by the DRB and referred  
40 to the elevation renderings. He also noted backlit lighting was originally proposed for the sign but it was  
41 changed to external illumination. No additional questions were raised at this time.  
42

43 Chairperson Danley stated there is no one in the audience to comment and called the matter in for  
44 discussion.  
45

46 Ms. Case stated this is not the right venue for this use and referred to the amount of issues relating to  
47 parking. She stated the Commission was under the impression that the developer would seek retail or  
48 restaurant uses as opposed to another special use. Ms. Case identified several special use businesses in

1 the area and stated given the parking use by the applicant, parking would be full constantly. She concluded  
2 this space would not be a good fit for this use. Mr. Blum agreed with Ms. Case's comments and stated if  
3 the Overlay District is worth having, the requirements should be enforced. He stated there should be some  
4 semblance of retail in the front and he would not be in favor of the request.

5  
6 Mr. Poor stated he appreciated the applicant's presentation and agreed with the comments made. He  
7 stated he would not be in favor of the request. Trustee Orsic stated while there is a demographic which  
8 would like the use, she suggested the applicant look for another location. She questioned why the  
9 developer did not come to the meeting to further explain the request. Mr. Alt stated while they want the  
10 business in the community and there is a demand for it, he referred to the One Winnetka project being  
11 an idea for a decade and there has not been a demand for a retailer in this space. He questioned whether  
12 this business would be a more modern use for the space and stated this type of business would be  
13 attractive to the area and would draw a diverse demographic. The Commission Members discussed similar  
14 cases which were denied and the Commission Members summarized their positions.

15  
16 Mr. Enck stated his initial concern related to parking and referred to other special uses which generate  
17 foot traffic for other businesses. He commented it would be nice if the use was in an area which supported  
18 other businesses. Mr. Bradley stated his initial thought was to recommend approval and agreed with Mr.  
19 Alt's comments relating to hanging on to retail uses at the cost of denying other businesses. He questioned  
20 why they would deny a use that would be preferred by the younger generation and good for the Village.  
21 Mr. Bradley also stated he is concerned with the door being locked and commented the number of people  
22 in and out of the use would be beneficial. He agreed parking is an issue and commented they should not  
23 recommend denial of a cool and upcoming use.

24  
25 Chairperson Danley commented while the proposed use may be a great idea and a good business draw  
26 for the Village, she would feel better if it was in a different location. She also stated she is concerned with  
27 regard to standard nos. 5 and 7 and referred to the post office site development and the draw on parking.  
28 Chairperson Danley stated there would not be a pedestrian draw with only special uses in the area and  
29 described the process as unfair to the applicant. She stated if they were to accept the premise that this  
30 would only be a special use building, they would kill any type of pedestrian nature for the area.  
31 Chairperson Danley concluded it came down to the space they are evaluating and whether the use met  
32 the standards and in this instance, it did not and she would not be in favor of the request. The Commission  
33 Members discussed whether the application would have been approved at a different point in time.

34  
35 Chairperson Danley took a straw poll of the Commission Members and asked for a motion. A motion was  
36 made by Mr. Poor to recommend denial of the special use request. The motion was seconded by Mr.  
37 Blum. A vote was taken and the motion passed, 5 to 3:

38 AYES: Blum, Bradley, Case, Danley, Poor

39 NAYS: Alt, Enck, Van Vlack

40 NON-VOTING: Orsic

41  
42 **New Business.**

43 a. February 25, 2026, Meeting – Quorum Check.

44 The Commission Members discussed their availability.

45  
46 **Adjournment:**

47 Chairperson Danley asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made and the motion was  
48 seconded. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 8 to 0:

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

2 NAYS: None

3 NON-VOTING: Orsic

4 The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

5

6 Respectfully submitted,

7

8 Antionette Johnson

9 Recording Secretary