

**WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 9, 2026**

**Zoning Board Members Present:** Matt Bradley, Chairman  
Mark Haller  
Lynn Hanley  
Kathryn Leister  
Mike Nielsen  
Michael Ritter  
Todd Vender

**Zoning Board Members Absent:** None

**Village Staff:** Ann Klaassen, Assistant Director of Community  
Development  
Christopher Marx, Associate Planner

**Village Attorney:** Peter Friedman

**Call to Order & Roll Call:**

Chairman Bradley called the meeting to order at 7:00 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 January 12, 2026, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the January 12, 2026, meeting minutes was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Mr. Nielsen. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 7 to 0:

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

NAYS: None

**Community Development Report.**

Ms. Klaassen stated there is no Community Development Report.

**Continued Cases:**

a. **Case No. 25-16-SD: 936 Sunset Road:** An amended application seeking approval of a Final Plat of Subdivision to allow a two-lot subdivision of 936 Sunset Road, which requires a zoning variation to allow Proposed Lot 1 (936 Sunset Road) to provide less than the minimum required lot depth. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request. This item was continued from the October 13, 2025, and December 8, 2025, Zoning Board of Appeals meetings.

Ms. Klaassen provided a detailed summary of the ZBA's previous consideration of the request. She stated in addition to the zoning variation for lot depth the amended subdivision request also requires two subdivision code variations to allow the side lot line of proposed lot 2 to abut the rear lot line of proposed lot 1 and the creation of a lot with a side lot line that is not perpendicular to the street line for the proposed lot 2. Ms. Klaassen stated the Plan Commission would consider the request at its February 25, 2026, meeting. She noted while the subdivision code variations are not within the Board's purview, they are

1 being provided to the ZBA to ensure they have information with regard to all of the relief being requested.  
2 Ms. Klaassen stated following the applicant's presentation, public comment and ZBA discussion, a ZBA  
3 Member may make a motion to continue the request to a date certain or consider a motion  
4 recommending approval or denial of the request. She noted no additional public correspondence was  
5 received and asked if there were any questions.

6  
7 Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time. He then  
8 asked for the applicant's presentation and swore in those speaking to this matter.

9  
10 Christopher Canning, 1000 Skokie Blvd., Wilmette, introduced himself along with the property owners,  
11 Bob and Susan Marren, and Dan Creaney, the project engineer. He summarized the consideration of their  
12 previous proposal and stated they have amended the application to include option 1 for the two lot  
13 subdivision where the proposed lot 2 met the minimum lot area and rectangular area requirements with  
14 no variation necessary and with a lot depth variation for lot 1. Mr. Canning stated the amended plan will  
15 be presented to the Plan Commission and referred to the updated standards included in the packet. He  
16 then asked if there were any questions.

17  
18 Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time. He then  
19 asked for public comment. No comments were made at this time. Chairman Bradley called the matter in  
20 for discussion.

21  
22 Chairman Bradley described the request as straightforward and asked for the Board's comments. Mr.  
23 Haller stated the applicant took the Board's comments into consideration and described the request as a  
24 reasonable compromise which reduced the number of required variations. He stated he would vote in  
25 favor. Mr. Nielsen agreed the applicant came back with what the Board considered was the best idea and  
26 stated he would vote in favor. Ms. Hanley agreed with the comments made and stated the variation  
27 necessary to make the subdivision work is more in line with the standards and would be less likely to alter  
28 surrounding properties.

29  
30 Chairman Bradley referred to finding 2(a) for the proposed lot 1 relating to the playhouse. Ms. Leister and  
31 Mr. Ritter both agreed with the comments made and stated they are in favor. Chairman Bradley stated  
32 the Board appreciated the revised proposal and referred to the neighbors' concerns and the fully  
33 compliant lot 2 which would have allowed for a new home to be built. He stated the request met the  
34 standards and the condition of the playhouse structure removal would resolve the minimum required  
35 corner setback requirement.

36  
37 Chairman Bradley then asked for a motion to recommend approval as included on page 17. A motion as  
38 stated by Chairman Bradley was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Mr. Haller. A vote was taken and  
39 the motion unanimously passed, 7 to 0:

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

41 NAYS: None

42  
43 ***b. Case No. 26-01-V2: 671 Lincoln Avenue: An application seeking approval of a zoning variation***  
44 ***to allow construction of a circular driveway in the front yard of 671 Lincoln Avenue. The requested***  
45 ***variation would permit the proposed improvement to exceed the maximum permitted front yard lot***  
46 ***coverage. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request. The Applicant has withdrawn this***  
47 ***application. The Zoning Board of Appeals will not be taking action on this application.***

48 The application was withdrawn and no action was taken on this item.

1 **New Cases:**

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

5 Chairman Bradley opened the public hearing for this matter and noted the Park Board held a special  
6 meeting on February 5, 2026, and the Park District authorized a revised proposed plan which has not yet  
7 been submitted to the Village or the Village staff. He suggested continuing the matter to the March 9,  
8 2026, meeting to allow the applicant to make a substantive presentation on the revised plan and provide  
9 the Board and Village staff time to review those materials.

10  
11 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to continue the matter to the March 9, 2026, meeting. A motion as  
12 stated by Chairman Bradley was made by Ms. Hanley.

13  
14 Hal Francke of Meltzer, Purtill & Stelle stated the Park District supported continuing the matter to March  
15 9, 2026. He described the matter as unusual and stated the request is being presented due to the opening  
16 of Elder Beach and to secure the dog beach and for it to be in compliance with various ordinances and  
17 Cook County regulations. Mr. Francke stated the matter has to be presented to all three bodies and has  
18 to be approved by various municipalities and government organizations. He referred to the number of  
19 concerns the Plan Commission raised and the suggestion for the applicant to come back with a revised  
20 plan with a special meeting held by the Park District Board and alternative plans devised. Mr. Francke  
21 stated they would still like to proceed before the Board this evening on the plan, which was considered  
22 by the Plan Commission, to go over the fundamental issues related to the fencing and introduce them to  
23 the alternate plan to obtain the Board's input to take back to the next Park Board meeting on February  
24 26, 2026.

25  
26 Chairman Bradley stated while he appreciated the expediency, he referred the amount of material to be  
27 reviewed and the applicant would have the opportunity at the March meeting to present the alternative  
28 plan. He stated the Board has never reviewed materials that had not yet been presented to or viewed by  
29 the Village staff or the public. Chairman Bradley then stated special meetings can be held to move the  
30 matter forward if necessary.

31  
32 Chairman Bradley asked the Board Members if they would like to continue the matter or allow the  
33 applicant to present the revised plan. All of the ZBA Members agreed with the suggestion to continue the  
34 matter to allow more time to review the actual plan to the March 9, 2026, meeting. Mr. Haller then  
35 seconded the motion. The Board Members then discussed their availability for the March 9, 2026,  
36 meeting. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 7 to 0:

37 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Leister, Nielsen, Ritter, Vender

38 NAYS: None

39  
40 Peter Friedman informed the public that since the matter was continued, they are not allowed to take  
41 testimony or public comment since it would not be part of the public hearing record.

42  
43 b. **Case No. 26-04-V2: 1086 Fisher Crescent Lane: An application seeking approval of a zoning**  
44 **variation to allow construction of a new single-family residence at 1086 Fisher Crescent Lane. The**  
45 **requested variation would permit the proposed residence to provide less than the minimum required**  
46 **corner yard setback from Fisher Crescent Lane. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**

47 Mr. Marx summarized the requested variation and identified the property's location, size and zoning  
48 classification as well as the zoning lot's conditions and easements in detail. He stated the demolition

1 application was approved by the Historic Preservation Commission without delay and referred to site  
2 photos, the plat of survey excerpt with the approximate buildable area and proposed site plan for the  
3 home. Mr. Marx also referred to proposed building elevations as well as the zoning standards the Board  
4 is to consider. He stated two written comments were received from neighbors. Mr. Marx then stated  
5 following the applicant's presentation, public comment and Board discussion, the Board may decide to  
6 either continue the matter to a date certain to allow time to address questions or comments or make a  
7 motion to recommend approval or denial of the requested variation with draft language included on page  
8 no. 375. He asked if there were any questions.  
9

10 Chairman Bradley referred to an illustration and questioned the minimum front yard, minimum side yard  
11 and minimum corner yard setbacks. Mr. Marx responded the setbacks would be the same for the existing  
12 and proposed home with the exception being for front yard setback when the block average setback is  
13 taken into account. Mr. Marx and Ms. Klaassen provided additional detailed information with regard to  
14 the setbacks of the existing residence. Mr. Haller referred to the Crescent easement. Mr. Marx clarified  
15 the easement areas for the Board. No additional questions were raised at this time.  
16

17 Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Eamon Murphy, the architect for the project,  
18 described the challenges with the property and the applicant's ownership and history of the building and  
19 site. He stated besides the property being 70% legally nonconforming, it was built in numerous stages and  
20 the home is noncompliant in several areas. Mr. Murphy stated they would like to create a home which  
21 would fit their family. He noted the buildable lot area is 25% and referred to the buildable square footage  
22 area. Mr. Murphy described how the new home's design would require the minimum number of  
23 variations. He then referred to two large trees in the southwest corner of the site which limited the  
24 buildable area which he described in detail.  
25

26 Mr. Murphy stated they understand the difficulties in requesting variations for new construction and  
27 described the 25% buildable area limitation as a hardship and they would try to appropriately scale a new  
28 home to be appropriate for the neighborhood. He noted they are not requesting relief for RLC, FAR or  
29 impermeable lot coverage and they are dealing with extremely restrictive setbacks. Mr. Murphy identified  
30 the proposed setback for the new L-shaped home which would create a courtyard and provide visual  
31 interest opportunities along the road.  
32

33 Chairman Bradley asked what alternatives were explored with regard to the trees and how close the trees  
34 are to the house. Mr. Murphy responded it is 17 feet clear to the tightest portion of the home. He stated  
35 they never tried to re-site the home in its current position and referred to development on the easement  
36 which never took place. Mr. Murphy also described difficulties with regard to the existing home's  
37 condition which limited options for the new home's siting. He stated they never planned to fit as much  
38 possible square footage into the buildable area as they can. No additional questions were raised at this  
39 time.  
40

41 Chairman Bradley asked for public comment. No comments were made at this time. He then called the  
42 matter in for discussion.  
43

44 Ms. Hanley stated she would recommend approval and described the request as small in terms of the  
45 encroachment. She stated the aesthetic would not alter the character of the street and the hardship  
46 related to the lot's shape due to the private easements which resulted in a small buildable area. Mr. Leister  
47 agreed the lot is difficult and commented the variation requested is reasonable. She stated she would also  
48 recommend approval. Mr. Ritter agreed with the comments made and referred to the amount of time the

1 applicant spent to minimize the encroachment. Mr. Vender stated he was initially concerned with regard  
2 to precedent and referred to the context of the lot's limitations and the applicant deciding not to maximize  
3 the buildable lot area. Mr. Nielsen stated a smaller home would still result in reasonable return and  
4 referred to the unique lot and geometry. He stated with all things considered; the applicant is not trying  
5 to maximize every inch. He stated reducing the screen porch size would make it more conforming and he  
6 is undecided at this time. Mr. Haller stated he would lean toward recommending approval and agreed  
7 with the comments made. He stated he respected the attempt to keep the large trees which would result  
8 in retaining some elements which are part of the neighborhood character. Mr. Haller also stated there is  
9 an easement for an established roadway and the observed setback from the road is greater. He concluded  
10 he would be in favor of the request. Chairman Bradley commented he did not feel good asking for  
11 variations for new construction. He referred to the reasonable return standard and agreed while the  
12 property is unusual, easements or irregular or existing nonconforming lots are not uncommon. Chairman  
13 Bradley stated while the amount is de minimus, he questioned whether any amount is justified in  
14 connection with the first standard and the applicant knew of the lot's limitations at the time the property  
15 was acquired. He then stated the new home can be modified and that the first standard has not been  
16 met.

17  
18 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to recommend approval as indicated on page 9. A motion as stated  
19 by Chairman Bradley was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Mr. Ritter. A vote was taken and the  
20 motion passed, 5 to 2:

21 AYES: Haller, Hanley, Leister, Ritter, Vender

22 NAYS: Bradley, Nielsen

23

24 **New Business:**

25 a. March 9, 2026, Meeting - Quorum Check

26 The Board Members previously discussed their availability.

27

28 **Public Comment:**

29 No comments were made at this time.

30

31 **Adjournment:**

32 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Hanley and  
33 seconded by Mr. Nielsen. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 7 to 0:

34 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Leister, Nielsen, Ritter, Vender

35 NAYS: None

36 The meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

37

38 Respectfully submitted,

39

40 Antionette Johnson

41 Recording Secretary