

**WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES  
MARCH 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:** Scott Mangum, Director of Community Development  
Ann Klaassen, Assistant Director of Community Development

**Village Attorney:** Peter Friedman

**Call to Order & Roll Call:**

Chairman Bradley called the meeting to order at 7:04 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 February 9, 2026, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the February 9, 2026, meeting minutes was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Mr. Ritter. 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.**

Mr. Mangum stated there is no Community Development Report.

**Continued Cases:**

***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. This item was continued from the February 9, 2026, Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.***

Ms. Klaassen provided a summary of the prior presentation of the matter as well as a detailed summary of the Village approval process. She stated due to the fact that the property is located along Lake Michigan, it is subject to the lakefront construction ordinance and the steep slope regulations. Ms. Klaassen noted the proposed fencing is not located within the steep slope zone; it is located east of the toe of the bluff with the lakefront construction regulations giving the Village the authority to review and approve improvements along, adjacent to and within the lake that require permits from the U.S. ACOE, IDNR, MWRD and the Illinois EPA. She then summarized the Public Trust Doctrine.

1 Ms. Klaassen then identified the property's location, zoning classification and explained that public parks  
2 and recreation facilities are allowed as a special use in the R-2 district. She also noted that given the  
3 property remained under public ownership, the Lakefront Preservation Overlay District regulations  
4 currently do not apply but would apply should the ownership of any part of the public park and beach  
5 become privately owned. Ms. Klaassen referred to images of the beach in illustrations taken during  
6 various times of the year.

7  
8 Ms. Klaassen stated in response to comments made at the January 28, 2026, Plan Commission meeting,  
9 the applicant submitted an amended plan and summarized its comparison to the prior plan with the  
10 purpose of the fencing to provide an enclosure to allow dogs to be off leash year round. She described  
11 the revised fencing plan and its access to the beach. Ms. Klaassen also summarized the linear footage of  
12 the proposed dog beach and the remaining portion of the beach being used as a passive beach, as well as  
13 the intended staffing of the passive beach. She then summarized the parking on site and the policies  
14 currently in place regarding parking and the possible restrictions the Park District has suggested. Ms.  
15 Klaassen summarized the amended plan which included the addition of a west fence 4 feet in height and  
16 a gate system located 12 feet from the existing sea wall to allow the public to traverse the beach without  
17 entering the dog area. She also summarized the south fence's length and location in detail. Ms. Klaassen  
18 referred to a detailed illustration of the north fence and the ordinary high water mark and the definition  
19 of the front yard setback and the requirements in that regard. She also referred to an illustration of the  
20 south fence.

21  
22 Ms. Klaassen summarized the January 28, 2026, Plan Commission's consideration of the special use permit  
23 and its recommendation of denial. She stated the DRB is tentatively scheduled to consider a Certificate of  
24 Appropriateness at its March 26, 2026, meeting and once all three advisory bodies have completed their  
25 reviews, the Village Council would then consider the request. Ms. Klaassen summarized the Board's role  
26 in reviewing the application with the standards included on page 22 of the agenda packet. She noted the  
27 additional public correspondence that was received was distributed by email this afternoon and hard  
28 copies are provided on the dais. Ms. Klaassen stated following the applicant's presentation, public  
29 comment and Board discussion, the Board may decide to act on a recommendation to direct the Village  
30 staff and Village Attorney to prepare a draft recommendation with or without conditions and written  
31 findings and determinations for consideration at a subsequent meeting or direct the applicant or Village  
32 staff to provide additional information. She then asked if there were any questions.

33  
34 Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. Ms. Hanley asked since the applicant provided  
35 the amended application, would they have to go back before the Plan Commission. Ms. Klaassen  
36 responded the Plan Commission made a recommendation of denial on the original application and were  
37 not interested in seeing an amended plan. She stated the amended plan would be presented to the DRB  
38 unless there are further changes as a result of the Board's meeting. No additional questions were raised  
39 at this time.

40  
41 Chairman Bradley asked for the applicant's presentation and swore in those speaking to this matter. Hal  
42 Francke of Meltzer Purtil & Stelle began by summarizing the conversation with regard to the amended  
43 plan and the suggestion to the Plan Commission to allow the presentation of a revised plan. He referred  
44 to the PowerPoint presentation and identified their presentation outline which included a background  
45 review of the project, applicable laws and regulations, the history of the Centennial Dog Beach, the  
46 purpose of the current project and fencing, the state of additional permits for which they have applied,  
47 address the issues that arose as a result of the Public Trust Doctrine and why the special use standards  
48 have been satisfied by the current application.

1 Mr. Francke summarized the request to install fencing to create an off leash dog beach area with the goal  
2 to allow everyone to allow their dogs to run recreationally off leash and which did not involve the need  
3 for any zoning variations. He stated they are attempting to be in conformance with the Winnetka leash  
4 law with violators being subject to fines. Mr. Francke also stated Cook County regulations require dog  
5 parks to be fully enclosed as well as for the dog beach to have a security element.

6  
7 Costa Kutulas, Winnetka Park District Director of Parks and Maintenance, began by summarizing the  
8 project plan purpose and conformance with the regulations. Mr. Francke mentioned the various Village  
9 and governing body standards. He summarized the dog beach's history, leash law adoption and the fence  
10 installation which was done six years ago. Mr. Kutulas summarized the Master Plan adoption and the  
11 creation of the Dog Beach Advisory Committee and the steps taken with regard to the dog beach location  
12 and reopening of Centennial Beach. He summarized the prior plan's consideration and the amended plan  
13 which addressed the various concerns raised.

14  
15 Mr. Kutulas referred to an illustration which outlined the number of dog beach users over various periods  
16 of time, the number of passes sold and hours of operation. He then provided information with regard to  
17 the new fence addition which would allow beach users to access the beach without traversing through  
18 the dog beach. Mr. Kutulas stated there would be a stand-alone fence system which would utilize the  
19 existing infrastructure for the proposed fences and provide for its removal during the offseason in winter  
20 months. He then described how the electronic key fob system would function and their plans to update  
21 signage.

22  
23 Mr. Kutulas described how the site on the north portion was reduced in half with the beach set to be a  
24 passive human beach without swimming as it has operated in the past. He stated they still planned to  
25 maintain parking as previously proposed and noted the subject was brought up with their Park Board. Mr.  
26 Kutulas then referred to the suggestions of special conditions being imposed in terms of parking  
27 limitations if it is determined necessary after the proposed operation had begun. He referred to  
28 illustrations of the existing dog beach, the area to be fenced off, the northern passive beach and the 12-  
29 foot bypass as well as drone images.

30  
31 Mr. Kutulas then identified the Alternate Plan 1 approved by their Park Board and included in the packet.  
32 He confirmed that in the amended plan with regard to the north fence line, they attempted to maximize  
33 the views as much as possible by following the beach contour along with the fencing and referred to  
34 several illustrations which outlined the proposal in detail. Mr. Kutulas noted the survey would be updated  
35 in the near future. He then explained several illustrations of the improvements in significant detail. Mr.  
36 Kutulas also explained how the safety concerns were addressed, which allowed them to maintain all of  
37 the required standards.

38  
39 Mr. Francke stated with regard to the Public Trust Doctrine and permit conditions issued to the owner of  
40 205 Sheridan Road and the IDNR and Village permits for the 205 Sheridan Road improvements; he referred  
41 to the reference to allowing continual public access to the shoreline. He explained how the proposed  
42 route of access made the most sense in terms of public safety. Mr. Francke then summarized the manner  
43 in which the amended plan satisfactorily responded to the special use standards and asked for the Board  
44 to recommend approval of the plan.

45  
46 Chairman Bradley asked if there were any questions for the applicant. Ms. Hanley questioned peak season  
47 usage. Mr. Kutulas provided information with regard to entry/exit for pass usage. He stated currently, on  
48 leash is required and there is signage which is not currently enforced with them exploring enforcement

1 options. Ms. Hanley asked if most Winnetka parks are considered on leash dog parks. Mr. Kutulas  
2 responded any park site with a playground did not permit dogs on leash and provided additional  
3 information with regard to on leash and off leash dog parks. He also provided information with regard to  
4 three beach sites which were considered for dog beach parks and explained the location and its  
5 involvement in terms of their Master Plan.

6  
7 Mr. Haller asked if any statistics were maintained with regard to how long a person occupied the beach.  
8 Mr. Kutulas stated the average length of user time was not specifically obtained and estimated the usage  
9 to be 1-1.5 hrs. Mr. Haller asked once the fence is installed, would it be an exclusive area for pass owners.  
10 Mr. Kutulas confirmed that is correct and provided the percentages for resident and non-resident users.  
11 He explained how the gate at the top of the bluff would be electronically controlled and would not be  
12 staffed. Mr. Kutulas further explained how the controlled access gates would operate and how authorized  
13 fob owners would access the beach. Mr. Haller asked when the steel groin at the south end was created.  
14 Mr. Kutulas estimated it may have been installed in the 1950's. He also explained how access to the stairs  
15 needed to be permitted. Mr. Kutulas added all signage would be addressed and they would work with the  
16 Village in that regard.

17  
18 Mr. Ritter asked if a fob is needed to exit. Mr. Kutulas confirmed a fob is not needed for exit. Ms. Leister  
19 referred to the modular chain link fencing and if it would extend to the high water mark. Mr. Kutulas  
20 confirmed its location. Ms. Leister asked if they considered moving the fence portion to the high water  
21 mark as it changes to preserve the view. Mr. Kutulas responded their consideration was driven by Cook  
22 County regulations for fencing and that views were part of the consideration.

23  
24 Chairman Bradley asked when was the last time a formal survey was done by the Park District in terms of  
25 feedback. Mr. Kutulas explained how their Master Plan was recently completed which included surveys.  
26 Chairman Bradley asked if they had Village feedback that an off leash dog beach is a top priority for the  
27 Park District. Mr. Kutulas explained in detail how the feedback was obtained in terms of how the dog  
28 beach evolved with it being a consistent theme as a preference from the community to identify the best  
29 location for it. He also explained how beaches are categorized and considered as passive beaches.  
30 Chairman Bradley asked if the plan is considered to be temporary in connection with the Elder Beach  
31 development. Mr. Kutulas stated they received direction from their Park Board and are still working  
32 through that concept. Chairman Bradley referred to the stairway access point which he described as a  
33 choke point. Mr. Kutulas informed the Board they planned to have attendants to mitigate any concerns  
34 with the beach being accessed by a sole staircase. Chairman Bradley stated this situation of people and  
35 dogs using the same access point would create a public safety concern issue. Mr. Francke stated in  
36 response of the 2% of people who would want the dog park, he explained the amount of caucus  
37 participants and referred to the number of people who live in the Village. He also referred to the court  
38 case which stated park districts are subject to local zoning regulations and summarized their  
39 interpretation.

40  
41 Chairman Bradley referred to an illustration of the revised proposed fence placement. Mr. Kutulas  
42 explained the reasoning for the fence placement which related to safety, requirements and maintenance.  
43 Chairman Bradley stated a special use can't be approved that requires trespass. Mr. Francke stated with  
44 regard to any concerns relating to trespassing, the Board could require it be addressed with a condition  
45 that an easement be granted. He added the access issue had already been addressed by the Village and  
46 the IDNR.

47

1 Chairman Bradley then referred to parking and questioned how the proposal would drive the increased  
2 amount of users. Mr. Kutulas responded they previously provided data submitted by Kimley Horn and  
3 described how people would walk, bike, etc. to the site. He stated it may only be a big draw initially and  
4 they would monitor it moving forward with the imposition of a condition if the Board felt it necessary. Mr.  
5 Francke and Mr. Kutulas stated the implication of conditions could be imposed after the use has been  
6 operational. Chairman Bradley questioned the timeline for the dog beach operation. Mr. Kutulas  
7 responded enforcement would be discussed with the Park Board with the intent to allow it to operate as  
8 it currently did.

9  
10 Mr. Haller asked the applicant if they considered challenges in reopening other locations for a possible  
11 dog park and beach. Mr. Kutulas responded they were given direction by their Park Board in 2022 to  
12 proceed with the plan with no instruction to consider other beach or park locations. He also referred to  
13 existing beach impediments which function similarly to fences. Mr. Francke identified neighboring  
14 communities with dog beaches with fences and noted the original plan was not withdrawn and addressed  
15 the prior concerns relating to intermingling between beach goers and dogs.

16  
17 Chairman Bradley then asked for public comment and swore in those speaking to this matter.

18  
19 Kimberly Marsh, Forest Street, stated she is a daily dog beach user and referred to the fob in compliance  
20 with regulations. She then raised concerns with having her dog on a leash going down the stairs with  
21 others and also that she is against a fence on the beach. Ms. Marsh then stated the claim that Cook County  
22 Animal Control required a fence on the beach is not a truthful statement.

23  
24 John Root, a Winnetka resident, stated for the stairs going down to the beach, you cannot step off of them  
25 since they would have railings on both sides. He stated with regard to the trespass issue; he questioned  
26 how the plan can be approved which required trespass. Mr. Root also stated the easement was previously  
27 addressed with no action taken to obtain an easement at that time.

28  
29 Angie Dahl, a 40 year Winnetka resident, identified her previous roles in Village government and  
30 summarized the application the Board is being asked to consider which is a revised application to allow  
31 fencing at Centennial Beach. She stated the reason behind the continued application for the special use  
32 permit is because of a proposed donation agreement and restrictive covenant between a private property  
33 owner and the Park District. Ms. Dahl identified the issues created by the fence installation and read the  
34 remainder of her statement into the record. She concluded by asking for the application to be denied.

35  
36 Mary Garrison, a 40 year Winnetka resident, identified her previous roles in Village government and asked  
37 for her letter in opposition to the proposal be included in the record. She stated her three main points  
38 include: (i) no fence should be installed on the beach, (ii) fence installation in the water created safety  
39 risks and (iii) and that precedent mattered. Ms. Garrison asked for the application to be denied.

40  
41 Linda Welch, a 40 year Winnetka resident, stated she is a year round user of all of the beaches and  
42 commented the fence is unwanted by the Winnetka community which she described as unsightly. She  
43 also stated it would be extremely unsafe for the reasons stated and they are unsure as to whether it would  
44 be permanent.

45  
46 Allen Welch, Willow Road, stated he is an avid beach user and previous member of the Dog Park Selection  
47 Committee. He clarified the position that they chose Tower Beach over the proposed location which  
48 would not be good for people or dogs.

1 Susie Schreiber, a 40 plus year Village resident, identified her previous positions in Village government  
2 and her concerns with regard to water levels and sand accumulation. She stated there would be safety  
3 issues with regard to the fence and water conditions. Ms. Schreiber referred to the underwater fence piles  
4 which should have been removed and suggested there be an alternative solution to share with a  
5 neighboring community. She also referred to the signage wording limitations.

6  
7 Susan Curry, 375 Hawthorn, stated she is an active dog beach user, which she described as a happy place  
8 with not a lot of accidents. She referred to documentation which showed that parks, water and sand are  
9 the best places for dogs and humans. Ms. Curry also referred to the number of people who have used the  
10 amenity over the past 30 years effectively, which has not been a concern other than the issue in  
11 connection with one property line. She stated if suggestions can be made to make it better, those options  
12 should be explored to allow people to continue to enjoy the beach.

13  
14 Dave Robertson stated he grew up in the area and having seen the proposal, he asked the Board to deny  
15 the application to create the dog park which would only benefit the adjacent neighbor.

16  
17 Peggy Martay, a 50 year Winnetka resident, stated her concerns related to safety and water levels. She  
18 also referred to the amount of time and money spent on unacceptable plans and asked for the request to  
19 be denied.

20  
21 Steve Juliesson, a 20 year Hubbard Woods resident, referred to the five years the Park District has worked  
22 with one neighbor on a plan to keep people away from his beach and the numerous people, agencies and  
23 amount of money spent on the project. He offered t-shirts to the Board which depict the Park District's  
24 efforts.

25  
26 David Stevens, a 37 year resident, stated he appreciated the Park District's attempts to address the  
27 concerns raised. He referred to the reduction in the dog beach area and little gain to the use of the other  
28 beach. Mr. Stevens then stated a comprehensive plan needed to be done which is all inclusive and which  
29 did not only relate to one portion with a full plan needed in order to move forward with the project.

30  
31 Ted Wynnychenko commented the Park District presentation included lies and half-truths and is the same  
32 presentation which was denied last year which he summarized for the Board. He stated the property  
33 owner's allowance of an easement to allow access to the beach is unlikely. Mr. Wynnychenko also referred  
34 to the dog beach's prior removal and plans to move it to Tower Beach, which he described as a better  
35 location. He concluded by questioning the Park District's true agenda.

36  
37 Katie Stevens stated that she lives on the lake and this plan is worse than the previous plan. She said the  
38 cage would be underwater and dangerous. Ms. Stevens stated no fence should be in the lake and that  
39 this would be a private fence.

40  
41 Melissa Meizel stated the proposed plan did not achieve the goal of making dogs and their owners happy  
42 and the fundamental design principles for such a facility have been embraced which she outlined for the  
43 Board. She also referred to the riparian rights language on signage. Ms. Meizel urged the Board to  
44 discourage this manner of proceeding and to deny the request. No additional public comment was made  
45 at this time.

46  
47 Chairman Bradley offered the applicant the opportunity to respond. Mr. Francke stated he understood  
48 the number of concerns raised and the process they are undertaking worked which he described to the

1 Board. He then referred to the concern related to the dog leash law change. Mr. Francke also responded  
2 to the comment relating to the dog beach needing to be totally enclosed and referred to the regulation  
3 which required a dog beach to be completely enclosed. He stated they are attempting to accommodate  
4 everyone's concerns and asked the Board to find their response reasonable.  
5

6 Chairman Bradley closed public comment, called the matter in for discussion and referred to the standards  
7 on page 22. Mr. Ritter stated with regard to all of the concerns raised by various people regarding public  
8 safety and health, that standard has not been met. He also stated he is concerned with regard to potential  
9 danger in connection with the fencing particularly when the water rose. Mr. Ritter also described the  
10 fence as unsightly and would get worse as the fence deteriorated. He added he is in favor of having a dog  
11 beach and referred to the inordinate amount of time and money spent in an attempt to get the fence built  
12 when there would only be a limited amount of users. Mr. Ritter concluded for those reasons, he would  
13 recommend denial.  
14

15 Mr. Vender stated he would be curious to hear the reactions in that the alternative plans addressed the  
16 concerns previously discussed before and how the concerns were addressed with regard to the  
17 neighboring owner. He stated there would be a logical delineation in terms of the path and although the  
18 plan design is not within the Board's purview, the proposed plan appeared incomplete in that some of the  
19 proposed structures described as temporary plans appeared disjointed. Mr. Vender stated he would first  
20 like to hear the remaining Board Members' comments.  
21

22 Ms. Leister stated she appreciated the comments made and the presentation which she described as very  
23 helpful. She stated she would lean against recommending special use permit approval and agreed with  
24 the comments in connection with standard (a) which included concerns with dogs and people using the  
25 same set of stairs, fencing in the water during high water levels, and the tight area between the rock wall  
26 and the fence during high water periods. Ms. Leister stated with regard to standard (b), the fence would  
27 have a negative visual impact for beach users although the revised plan attempted to address that  
28 concern. She stated with regard to standard (f), the trespassing issue caused by not having an easement  
29 in place should have been addressed since the issue was raised at previous meetings. Ms. Leister stated  
30 she is also concerned relative to the number of dog park users compared to the number of Village  
31 residents.  
32

33 Ms. Hanley agreed with the comments made with regard to safety issues and described the request as  
34 the tail wagging the dog with an attempt to get the dog park done on a temporary basis. She questioned  
35 the priority of the dog beach and the attempt to shoehorn it on the beach which would create safety  
36 issues. Ms. Hanley described the plan as not well thought out as part of a larger effort to increase beach  
37 access as a community. She also stated it would not benefit the general welfare of the entire community  
38 in this location and the plan as presented did not meet the first standard.  
39

40 Mr. Nielsen stated the initial plan presented by the Park District contained great items and the revised  
41 plan removed everything except for the dog beach. He stated the request felt short of all of the standards  
42 except for standard (d). Mr. Nielsen stated he would not recommend approval.  
43

44 Mr. Haller agreed with the comments made and stated the request failed many of the standards the Board  
45 is tasked to evaluate and questioned by the continued efforts to make modifications necessary to stick  
46 with this exact plan as opposed to rethinking all of the other options to satisfy dog owners in a safe manner  
47 with no obstructions on the beach or in the water. He questioned the thought process between balancing  
48 the needs of rights and enjoyment of dog owners versus the remaining 98% of Village residents. He stated

1 the request failed straightforwardly against the standards and he would not recommend approval of the  
2 request. Mr. Haller also added he did not like the precedent the request would set.

3  
4 Chairman Bradley stated he agreed with the comments made and referred to the first standard and stated  
5 while the fence would create safety in terms of the lack of safety without it, the regression to a mixed use  
6 of Centennial Beach having a north and south beach with testimony made in that the stairway would  
7 cause additional concern which would cause issues for those using the stairs. He commented he was  
8 disappointed at the revised plan since it incorporated many of the concerns previously raised by the initial  
9 plan. Chairman Bradley also stated there would be parking issues although he appreciated the Park District  
10 testimony with regard to adjustments made to the fence siting. He also stated it is currently difficult to  
11 walk the shoreline with the fence installation serving to increase safety with regard to the cliff area which  
12 he described as a thoughtful adjustment.

13  
14 Chairman Bradley stated the Board is only to review plan merits and although other locations were  
15 considered, that would not be the basis that the standards are not met and specifically referred to  
16 standard nos. 1, 2 and 5. He referred to the parking issues in connection with beach users and dog park  
17 users. Chairman Bradley stated his biggest concern related to safety and the applicant would continue to  
18 operate an off leash dog beach together with opening Elder Beach. He commented he hoped the applicant  
19 would be able to come up with a compromise by the time the request is presented to the Village Council.  
20 Chairman Bradley also referred to the previous alternative discussed to provide access at differentiated  
21 times to the beach for dog owners.

22  
23 Chairman Bradley stated it appeared there were enough votes to vote against an approval  
24 recommendation and asked the applicant if they would like to continue the matter to a future meeting to  
25 make alterations or proceed to a final vote which would include the Village Attorney preparing Findings  
26 of Fact for vote at the next Board meeting or at a special meeting. Mr. Francke responded they would  
27 prefer the Board proceed to vote.

28  
29 Chairman Bradley first asked for a quorum check for the March 16, 2026, special meeting. The Board  
30 Members discussed their availability and it was confirmed there would be a quorum. Chairman Bradley  
31 then asked for a motion to direct the Village Attorney to prepare Findings of Fact and a recommendation  
32 against approval for consideration at the March 16, 2026, special meeting. A motion as stated by Chairman  
33 Bradley was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Mr. Haller. A vote was taken and the motion  
34 unanimously passed, 7 to 0:

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

36 NAYS: None

37  
38 **New Cases:**

39 a. **Case No. 25-29-SD: 829 Foxdale Avenue and 833 Foxdale Avenue:** An application seeking  
40 approval of a Final Plat of Consolidation to consolidate the two existing lots into a single lot of record,  
41 which requires variations to allow the existing residence at 833 Foxdale Avenue to: (a) observe less than  
42 the minimum required side yard setback from the northerly property line, which is due to an increase  
43 in the minimum required side yard setback as a result of the proposed increase in total lot area and  
44 increase in average lot width; and (b) not provide the required building line articulation along the north  
45 side building walls. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request. *Due to the Zoning Board of*  
46 *Appeals' scheduled consideration of Case No. 25-28-SU, 225 Sheridan Road, Centennial Beach, this item*  
47 *will be continued to a special Zoning Board of Appeals meeting on March 16, 2026.*

48 The agenda item was continued to the March 16, 2026, special meeting.

1       b. **Case No. 25-24-SU: Winnetka Congregational Church - 725 Pine Street:** An application seeking  
2 approval of a Special Use Permit to allow a childcare center to operate in the existing church. The Village  
3 Council has final jurisdiction on this request. *Due to the Zoning Board of Appeals' scheduled*  
4 *consideration of Case No. 25-28-SU, 225 Sheridan Road, Centennial Beach, this item will be continued*  
5 *to a special Zoning Board of Appeals meeting on March 16, 2026.*

6 The agenda item was continued to the March 16, 2026, special meeting.

7  
8 **New Business:**

9       a. March 16, 2026, Special Meeting and April 13, 2026, Regular Meeting - Quorum Check.

10 The Board Members previously discussed their availability for the March 16, special meeting, so they  
11 discussed their availability for the April 13, 2026, regular meeting.

12  
13 **Public Comments:**

14 No comments were made at this time.

15  
16 **Adjournment:**

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

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

20 NAYS: None

21 The meeting adjourned at 10:06 p.m.

22  
23 Respectfully submitted,

24  
25 Antionette Johnson

26 Recording Secretary

27