

**WINNETKA PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 25, 2026**

**Members Present:**

Layla Danley, Chairperson  
Matthew Bradley  
Mamie Case  
Chris Enck  
King Poor  
Cyrus Subawalla  
Kate Van Vlack

**Members Absent:**

Jonathan Alt  
Christopher Blum

**Non-Voting Members Present:**

Bridget Orsic

**Village Staff:**

Scott Mangum, Community Development Director  
Ann Klaassen, Assistant Director of Community  
Development

**Village Attorney:**

Peter Friedman

**Call to Order & Roll Call:**

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Danley at 7:03 p.m. Ms. Klaassen took roll call of the Commission Members present.

**Approval of January 28, 2026 Meeting Minutes:**

Chairperson Danley asked for a motion to approve the January 28, 2026, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the January 28, 2026, meeting minutes was made by Ms. Case and seconded by Ms. Van Vlack. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 7 to 0:

AYES: Bradley, 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 provided the Commission with an update on the Solidcore special use permit application.

Chairperson Danley first outlined two procedural issues in connection with tonight's meeting and moved to consider the 936 Sunset Road application to the end of the agenda. No comments were made at this time from the Commission Members. Chairperson Danley then stated with regard to Case No. 25-05-SU for 730 Elm Street which related to the One Winnetka development, she summarized the significant concerns and issues raised with regard to non-retail uses on the first floor and the special use standards being met. She suggested the matter be deferred to the next meeting in order for additional information to be provided. Chairperson Danley then asked for a quorum check for the March 25, 2026, meeting. The Commission Members discussed their availability.

**1 Recommendations:****2 a. Case No. 25-28-SU: 225 Sheridan Road - Centennial Beach: Consideration of approval of**  
**3 written findings and recommendation of the Plan Commission on the Special Use Permit application**  
**4 to allow installation of fencing on the existing beach at 225 Sheridan Road.**

5 Chairperson Danley referred to the findings and recommendations included in the agenda packet as  
6 Attachment A2 on page 16 of the packet and asked for a motion to approve the written findings and  
7 recommendations to deny the special use as requested by the applicant. A motion as stated by  
8 Chairperson Danley was made by Mr. Poor and the motion was seconded by Ms. Case. A vote was taken  
9 and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

10 AYES: Case, Danley, Enck, Poor, Subawalla, Van Vlack

11 NAYS: None

12 NON-VOTING: Bradley, Orsic

**13**  
**14 New Applications:****15 a. Case No. 25-24-SU: Winnetka Congregational Church - 725 Pine Street: An application seeking**  
**16 approval of a Special Use Permit to allow a childcare center to operate in the existing church. The**  
**17 Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**

18 Ms. Klaassen summarized the request to lease space in the existing church building to operate a  
19 childcare center with the applicant seeking a recommendation of approval of an amendment to a special  
20 use permit which she described to the Commission. She identified the property's location, zoning  
21 classification and the limited amount of additional uses allowed in addition to single family residential  
22 uses. Ms. Klaassen stated the Comprehensive Plan designated the property as appropriate for uses she  
23 identified and that the applicant's use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan land use designation  
24 and R-2 zoning. She then referred to site illustrations and outlined the number of employees and hours  
25 of operation and noted there are no plans for expansion. Ms. Klaassen stated if in the future, the  
26 applicant decided to add a playground, they would have to request special use approval. She stated the  
27 applicant received preliminary approval from the DCFS in order to move forward which is contingent  
28 upon minor facility modifications and Village approval.

29  
30 Ms. Klaassen described plans for employee parking with the applicant having provided a traffic study  
31 and noted the Village Engineer offered recommendations on the application which she described for the  
32 Commission. She stated the ZBA would consider the request at a special meeting on March 16 and  
33 referred to the standards they are to consider. Ms. Klaassen then stated following the applicant's  
34 presentation, public comment and Commission discussion, the Commission may decide to either  
35 continue the matter to a date certain to allow time to address questions or comments or recommend  
36 approval or denial with draft language for a motion provided in the packet. She noted additional  
37 correspondence was received and provided to the Commission. Ms. Klaassen then asked if there were  
38 any questions.

39  
40 Chairperson Danley also asked if there were any questions. Ms. Van Vlack asked if the playground  
41 discussion had been tabled. Ms. Klaassen responded the applicant is not currently proposing a  
42 playground. Mr. Subawalla asked how many church members and employees there are. Ms. Klaassen  
43 responded the applicant can answer that question. Ms. Van Vlack asked if the Commission is to consider  
44 timely drop-off plans. Chairperson Danley responded that could be part of their consideration.

45  
46 Chairperson Danley swore in those speaking to this matter.

47  
48 Amy Falkowski, Winnetka Congregational Church Director of Operations, introduced Pastor Paulo

1 Franca, Julie McConnell, Chair of Congregation, Christie Sullenberger, committee member, Dan  
2 Brinkman of Gewalt Hamilton Associates and Victor Cuebas of Jumpstart Early Learning Services. Ms.  
3 Falkowski summarized the church's history in the community and stated they discussed their proposed  
4 plans with neighbors whose only concern related to traffic. She stated the traffic study resulted in little  
5 to no traffic in the neighborhood.

6  
7 Ms. Falkowski referred to the space which would be renovated and described their collaboration with  
8 Jumpstart which would result in resolving the community's need for additional childcare. She also  
9 summarized the capacity which would increase incrementally. Ms. Falkowski then referred to  
10 illustrations and identified drop-off and pickup locations. She stated with regard to the traffic study,  
11 since it would be a daycare and not a school, she described the traffic pattern and their willingness to  
12 resolve any issues that may arise. Ms. Falkowski referred to an illustration of the long driveway and  
13 described the process as having a smooth transition. She informed the Commission they have  
14 coordinated their approval with DCFS and confirmed there would be no footprint expansion. Ms.  
15 Falkowski concluded by describing how the request would be beneficial for the community.

16  
17 Chairperson Danley referred to Slide 16 which contained the parking lot outline and asked for the  
18 specific family directive in terms of a specific traffic pattern. Ms. Falkowski described the entrance and  
19 exit through the parking lot circle. Mr. Subawalla asked how many church employees would come to the  
20 building during school days. Ms. Falkowski provided the staffing schedule for the Commission. Mr.  
21 Subawalla asked if the property entrance is within 150 feet of Pine, Prospect and Lincoln. Ms. Falkowski  
22 responded it is less than 150 feet.

23  
24 Mr. Poor referred to the Village Engineer's comments relating to the need for ongoing modifications or  
25 monitoring how it would work and asked if they would be open to considering meeting with the Village  
26 Engineer or neighbors after a few months of operation to determine its effectiveness. Ms. Falkowski  
27 confirmed they would. Mr. Cuebas described their operations in terms of volume for their other two  
28 locations which operate under a staggered start and release time. He also stated they do not have a  
29 playground onsite and described how outdoor time is utilized.

30  
31 Mr. Bradley asked if the capacity is set by code. Ms. Falkowski confirmed that is correct. Mr. Cuebas  
32 informed the Commission the 64 figure for maximum capacity was derived by ratio and class size. He  
33 also described the classroom makeup in terms of the children's ages as well as the pickup times and  
34 staff accommodation times for the rush periods. Mr. Cuebas then provided background check and  
35 liability insurance information for their staff. Chairperson Danley asked if there is a structured  
36 curriculum. Mr. Cuebas confirmed that is correct and described the curriculum to the Commission. Ms.  
37 Case asked how infant drop-off is handled, which would impact traffic and parking. Mr. Cuebas  
38 described the drop-off process, which varied on how families want it handled.

39  
40 Mr. Enck referred to the Harkness House, which had limited daycare options and asked if they discussed  
41 with them or the Winnetka Community Nursery School in terms of need. Ms. Falkowski confirmed they  
42 have and stated they would relieve pressure for families on the waiting list. She stated the model would  
43 be similar to Jumpstart's other locations. Mr. Cuebas provided further information with regard to  
44 electronic sign in and sign out. Ms. Van Vlack stated while she understood the concerns raised with  
45 regard to traffic and the fact that there is an off-street area for parents to utilize, a lot of consideration  
46 was provided in that regard. She also asked how many homes were included in the 150 foot area in  
47 terms of impact. Ms. Falkowski estimated 60 homes with their having received a response from only one  
48 family which attended the open house. Mr. Bradley asked if the facility would be ADA compliant. Ms.

1 Falkowski informed the Commission there is an elevator and ADA bathrooms. She added that section of  
2 the building is fully ADA compliant. No additional questions were raised at this time.

3  
4 Chairperson Danley asked for public comment. She swore in those speaking to this matter.

5  
6 Bob Forbes, 684 Pine Street, stated he is a 27 year resident and described the parking and traffic  
7 situation as well as the potential for accidents. He stated consideration needed to be given during peak  
8 times. Mr. Forbes also referred to the Pine and Maple intersection and stated with the new commercial  
9 use, there would be more traffic. He stated the One Winnetka development would also add more traffic  
10 in the area.

11  
12 Beckley Maggio, a Winnetka resident and Harkness House president, stated they have had several  
13 conversations with the church with regard to the child care need. She agreed there is no formal drop-off  
14 with day care uses and stated she is concerned with regard to the student/teacher ratio and the possible  
15 violation of DCFS regulations. Ms. Middleton stated the entire facility would need to be secure during its  
16 hours of operation. She also questioned the time the traffic study was conducted and stated the parking  
17 and traffic concerns should not be taken lightly. Ms. Middleton concluded by stating while there is a  
18 need for additional child care options, she is concerned with regard to safety of students in connection  
19 with parking and the lack of an outside playground facility.

20  
21 Julie McConnell, Chair of Winnetka Congregational Church, described their visioning process which  
22 included being a bigger part of the community and the need expressed for day care facilities by  
23 neighbors. She stated there would be no footprint change and minimal interior changes. No additional  
24 comments were made at this time.

25  
26 Chairperson Danley closed public comment and asked the applicant if they would like to respond.

27  
28 Ms. Falkowski stated in response to Harkness House comments, they have approval by DCFS and there  
29 are no issues with regard to security and children/teacher ratios. She stated with regard to traffic and  
30 parking; they are willing to work to make changes after they begin operations if issues arise and it is  
31 their intent to not be a neighborhood nuisance. Mr. Bradley referred to the pickup and drop-off pattern  
32 and asked if it would create concerns in connection with DCFS ratios. Mr. Cuebas confirmed that was  
33 part of their approval process. Chairperson Danley referred to commercial truck traffic. Mr. Cuebas  
34 explained how the food van caterer would drop off food early in the morning. Mr. Subawalla questioned  
35 the right-of-way width at Pine and Prospect. Dan Brinkman stated he did not have that information and  
36 described the process of how traffic counts were taken and observations and the traffic study being  
37 done on a Thursday in December. Mr. Poor referred to the comments raised with regard to the effect of  
38 One Winnetka on traffic. Mr. Brinkman explained the process which took into account growth and five  
39 year projections. Mr. Poor questioned whether traffic signs would be utilized similar to those used in  
40 school zones. Mr. Brinkman explained the difficulty of school zone signage utilization and stated he is  
41 not aware of the requirement for such a commercial use. Ms. Klaassen stated they could look into what  
42 would be required to install such signage. Ms. Van Vlack commented on the safety issues and parking in  
43 the area. No comments were made at this time.

44  
45 Chairperson Danley called the matter in for discussion. Trustee Orsic stated with parking and traffic  
46 being the biggest concern, she referred to a preschool in a church in the city which was able to work out  
47 issues. She also stated neighborhood parents would walk and there would be varied hours with  
48 staggered amounts of traffic. Trustee Orsic agreed with Mr. Poor's suggestion to ensure any issues be

1 discussed and resolved. Mr. Poor commented the presentation was thoughtful and agreed there are  
2 traffic concerns which he indicated are manageable. He stated the church is agreeable to manage any  
3 issues with monitoring of the situation over the first several months which he would suggest as a  
4 condition. Mr. Poor added signage and speed limits should also be investigated. He concluded he would  
5 vote to recommend approval with the modifications he suggested. Mr. Subawalla stated the request  
6 would be good for the community and traffic should be done in a multi-directional flow. He also  
7 suggested limiting parking on the Prospect side of the street and that there would be numerous vehicles  
8 onsite at any given time. Mr. Subawalla concluded the proposal would be very valid for the community.  
9

10 Ms. Case agreed with the proposal and the need for additional childcare opportunities for the  
11 community. She stated she is very concerned with regard to the pickup/drop-off situation and agreed  
12 with the one way traffic suggestion. Ms. Case referred to the amount of activity in the area and agreed  
13 conditions should be placed on the recommendation. Mr. Enck referred to the difficulty in finding  
14 childcare in the area and stated the proposal would be in line with the Comprehensive Plan and would  
15 be a benefit to the community. He stated the other concerns raised are resolvable and agreed there are  
16 ways in which to resolve any issues. Mr. Enck also referred to the amount of traffic at Harkness House  
17 and suggested working with the Village Engineer and the Police Department with regard to Pine Street.  
18

19 Ms. Van Vlack agreed with the comments made and stated it would be important to establish rules in  
20 terms of traffic for those using the facility. She also stated there are many preschools set within  
21 neighborhoods and referred to the amount of traffic on Sundays which was not mentioned in the traffic  
22 study. Ms. Van Vlack then stated with the cell phone alert suggestion, she would encourage a system  
23 utilizing more of an advanced warning system rather than encouraging cell phone use while driving. She  
24 also stated turning around in driveways should be prohibited. Ms. Van Vlack concluded there is a need  
25 for child care options and agreed the proposal would represent a great use of the unused space. Trustee  
26 Orsic agreed with Ms. Van Vlack's comments with regard to cell phone use and referred to geo tracking,  
27 which they would be using. Mr. Bradley referred to the roundabout as a unique solution that other day  
28 care schools do not have to alleviate congestion and agreed with the conditions suggested which would  
29 be difficult to enforce. He suggested exploring starting with a lower child count to ensure a smooth  
30 traffic flow as opposed to having 64 children initially. Chairperson Danley agreed with the comments  
31 made and agreed there is a community need with the main concern relating to traffic with specific  
32 issues she identified. She then stated she did not agree that streets need to be turned into one way  
33 direction and she would suggest the condition of having a defined traffic plan submitted with the  
34 application to direct parents in terms of the pickup and drop-off function.  
35

36 Chairperson Danley then asked for a motion and referred to page no. 407 with the condition as stated.  
37 Mr. Poor moved to recommend approval of the request based on the Commission Members' collective  
38 comments. He stated a condition for approval should be a requirement of a traffic flow and parking plan  
39 reviewed and approved by the Village Engineer and the Police Chief to be made to the Village Council.  
40 Mr. Poor also stated a condition of approval would be the benefit of having a monitoring function of  
41 one, two or three months with the Village Engineer, Police Department and neighbors to ensure any  
42 issues are resolved. He stated the issue of signage should be taken up with Public Works. Chairperson  
43 Danley asked Mr. Friedman if there is a way to include the parking and traffic plan condition as a  
44 recommendation of approval. Mr. Friedman confirmed it has been done before in terms of a specific  
45 review period with Village monitoring being done to ensure compliance.  
46

47 Mr. Poor moved to recommend approval of the request conditioned upon a traffic flow plan prepared  
48 by the church, and approved by the Village Engineer and Police Department, that would be included in

1 any presentation made to the Village Council. Ms. Case seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the  
2 motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

3 AYES: Case, Danley, Enck, Poor, Subawalla, Van Vlack

4 NAYS: None

5 NON-VOTING: Bradley, Orsic

6

7 Ms. Case left the meeting at this time.

8

9 **b. Case No. 26-05-SU: 730 Elm Street, Suite 120 - DUET Audiology Clinic: An application seeking**  
10 **approval of a Special Use Permit submitted by DUET audiology clinic, as the prospective lessee of the**  
11 **commercial space located at 730 Elm Street, Suite 120, to allow a medical office in the C-2 General**  
12 **Retail Commercial Overlay District. The property is currently owned by MDG Winnetka One, LP. The**  
13 **Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**

14 The Commission Members previously moved to defer the discussion of this item to the March 25, 2026,  
15 meeting.

16

17 **c. Case No. 25-16-SD: 936 Sunset Road: An amended application seeking approval of a Final Plat**  
18 **of Subdivision to allow a two-lot subdivision of 936 Sunset Road, which requires (i) variations to allow:**  
19 **(a) proposed Lot 1 to provide less than the minimum required lot depth; (b) a side lot line abutting a**  
20 **rear lot line; (c) a side lot line that is not perpendicular to the street line; and (ii) a finding of "No**  
21 **Material Increased Adverse Impact" for existing improvements on proposed Lot 1 (936 Sunset Road)**  
22 **which (a) observe less than the minimum required front yard setback from Sunset Road; (b) observe**  
23 **less than the minimum required corner yard setback from Higginson Lane; and (c) exceeds the**  
24 **maximum permitted width for a front-facing garage door. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on**  
25 **this request.**

26 Ms. Klaassen summarized the discussion on the application from the September 2025 meeting as well as  
27 the ZBA's consideration of the request. She then identified the amendments made to the subdivision  
28 request which included compliance with zoning requirements for the south lot (Lot 2) with the north lot  
29 (Lot 1) requiring relief from the minimum lot depth requirement. Ms. Klaassen referred to a table  
30 showing the prior and current zoning requirements. She also stated the proposed amended subdivision  
31 required two variations from the subdivision code which she identified for the Commission and referred  
32 to illustrations for the Commission's review. Ms. Klaassen noted the amended subdivision would not  
33 create zoning nonconformities on the proposed Lot 1 and one of the existing playhouses would have to  
34 be removed to accommodate the new lot line dividing the two lots. She then identified the existing  
35 nonconformities which would remain.

36

37 Ms. Klaassen identified the factors the Commission is to consider with regard to the proposed  
38 subdivision and stated following the applicant's presentation and Commission discussion (she noted  
39 there were no members of the public in attendance), the Commission may decide to either continue the  
40 matter to a date certain to allow time to address questions or comments or consider a motion to  
41 recommend approval or denial of the request with draft language included in the packet. She noted no  
42 additional public comments were received regarding the amended plan and asked if there were any  
43 questions.

44

45 Mr. Poor referred to a prior 2014 zoning case and asked if the ZBA denied the request for variations for  
46 something similar. Ms. Klaassen responded the similar application was withdrawn prior to presentation  
47 to the Commission with the concerns related to the flood plain. She confirmed no home was built on Lot  
48 2. Chairperson Danley noted Mr. Blum was on the ZBA at that time and described the flood issues and

1 home appearance at that time. She asked if there were any other questions. No additional questions  
2 were raised at this time.

3  
4 Chairperson Danley asked for the applicant's presentation and swore in those speaking to this matter.  
5 Christopher Canning, 1000 Skokie Blvd., Wilmette, introduced himself and Dan Creaney, the civil  
6 engineer, and Susan Marren, the property owner, to the Commission. He first disclosed his previous  
7 working relationship with Mr. Poor and summarized the September 2025 request and the 2014 ZBA  
8 presentation in detail. Mr. Canning also described their attempts to rectify the concerns which resulted  
9 in the current presentation of Option 1 and how the lot lines would be configured. Mr. Canning  
10 addressed how the subdivision would meet various standards relating to the side lot line and their  
11 request for a finding of no material increased adverse impact. He then asked if there were any  
12 questions.

13  
14 Chairperson Danley also asked if there were any questions. Mr. Poor referred to the variation for the  
15 side lot line which would abut the rear lot line. Mr. Canning confirmed that is correct and would result in  
16 the same condition as it existed in 1976. Mr. Poor also referred to the Lot 2 depth requirement which  
17 would become part of Lot 1. Mr. Canning referred to illustrations and explained the issues which related  
18 to the configuration. He also explained their response to the concerns the Commission raised and the  
19 various items the Commission is to consider. No additional questions were raised at this time.

20  
21 Chairperson Danley noted there are no members of the public present to comment and called the  
22 matter in for discussion. Mr. Bradley referred to an illustration and summarized the ZBA's review of the  
23 request. Chairperson Danley described the proposal as a better solution and stated she had no problem  
24 with the request as presented. Ms. Van Vlack described the proposal as a great solution and she would  
25 be in favor of the request. Mr. Enck and Mr. Subawalla agreed with the comments made and stated they  
26 would recommend approval. Mr. Poor stated his concern is that there are certain things that cannot be  
27 avoided and the driver of the request is building a home in the flood plain and the concerns with regard  
28 to flooding. He also referred to the neighbors' concerns. Mr. Poor stated then with regard to restoring  
29 the home to the 1976 condition, there are a lot of different factors which were not a concern at that  
30 time. He referred to several substantial rain events over the years and the work done by the Village  
31 Council in terms of mitigation. Mr. Poor stated if the request was not located in a flood plain, there  
32 would be no issue and that any compensatory storage required may not be adequate to alleviate  
33 concerns. Chairperson Danley informed Mr. Poor that the Commission discussed these issues  
34 significantly in September. Mr. Poor and the Commission Members explained their positions in  
35 significant detail.

36  
37 Chairperson Danley asked for a motion as indicated on page 272 which included a condition to remove  
38 the playhouse. Mr. Enck moved to recommend approval of the proposed Marren's Resubdivision Final  
39 Plat known as 936 Sunset Road into two new lots of record in the final plat of subdivision which  
40 subdivision required the variations listed on page 272 with the condition of the removal of the  
41 playhouse. Ms. Van Vlack seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed, 4 to 1:

42 AYES: Danley, Enck, Subawalla, Van Vlack

43 NAYS: Poor

44 NON-VOTING: Bradley, Orsic

45  
46 **New Business.**

47 a. March 25, 2026, Meeting – Quorum Check.

48 The Commission Members previously discussed their availability.

1 **Adjournment:**

2 Chairperson Danley asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Bradley and  
3 seconded by Mr. Enck. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 7 to 0:

4 AYES: Bradley, Case, Danley, Enck, Poor, Subawalla, Van Vlack

5 NAYS: None

6 NON-VOTING: Trustee Orsic

7 The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

8

9 Respectfully submitted,

10

11 Antionette Johnson

12 Recording Secretary