

**WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 16, 2026**

Zoning Board Members Present: Matt Bradley, Chairman
Mark Haller
Kathryn Leister
Mike Nielsen
Michael Ritter

Zoning Board Members Absent: Lynn Hanley
Todd Vender

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 7:01 p.m. Roll call was taken of the Board Members present.

Community Development Report.

Mr. Mangum informed the Board there were no actions taken on items by the Village Council since the last Board meeting. He provided an update on 1086 Fisher and 936 Sunset as well as for Village Council consideration regarding a zoning text amendment for corner lots with three frontages.

Public Comment:

No comments were made at this time.

Recommendations and Determinations:

a. **Case No. 25-28-SU: 225 Sheridan Road - Centennial Beach: Consideration of approval of findings and recommendation of the Zoning Board of Appeals on the Special Use Permit application to allow installation of fencing on the existing beach at 225 Sheridan Road.**

Chairman Bradley confirmed there would be no staff presentation and asked for clarification that the Board Members reviewed the Findings and Recommendations included in the agenda packet and asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time. He then asked for a motion to approve.

A motion to approve the Findings of Fact was made by Mr. Nielsen and seconded by Mr. Ritter. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

AYES: Bradley, Haller, Leister, Nielsen, Ritter

NAYS: None

New Cases:

a. **Case No. 25-29-SD: 829 Foxdale Avenue and 833 Foxdale Avenue: An application seeking approval of a Final Plat of Consolidation to consolidate the two existing lots into a single lot of record, which requires variations to allow the existing residence at 833 Foxdale Avenue to: (a) observe less**

1 **than the minimum required side yard setback from the northerly property line, which is due to an**
2 **increase in the minimum required side yard setback as a result of the proposed increase in total lot**
3 **area and increase in average lot width; and (b) not provide the required building line articulation**
4 **along the north side building walls. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**

5 Ms. Klaassen summarized the application to request the consolidation of two existing lots into a single
6 lot of record and identified the property's location, zoning classification and lot size of both lots as well
7 as the existing improvements. She referred to photos of both lots noting the applicant resided at 833
8 Foxdale which they acquired in 2005 with the adjacent parcel purchased in 2024. Ms. Klaassen noted a
9 demolition permit was approved by the HPC for 829 Foxdale.

10
11 Ms. Klaassen stated the consolidation would create a single buildable lot measuring nearly 15,000
12 square feet and the applicant planned to build an addition on the south side of the existing residence at
13 833 Foxdale and a detached garage. She identified plans to maintain both garages during construction
14 for storage. She noted the consolidation complied with zoning lot size standards, which she identified
15 for the Board and noted it would create one conforming lot. Ms. Klaassen also noted if a consolidation
16 resulted in a lot measuring more than two times the minimum lot size or more than two times the
17 minimum required average lot width, a special use permit would be required and confirmed the
18 application did not require a special use permit.

19
20 Ms. Klaassen described the two necessary zoning variations in detail as a result of the consolidation and
21 the nonconformity which would be eliminated. She summarized the Plan Commission's (PC)
22 consideration of the request and its recommendation of denial and noted the Board is to review the
23 request with regard to eight zoning standards. Ms. Klaassen referred to emails received in connection
24 with the request and stated following the applicant's presentation, public comment and Board
25 discussion, the Board may decide to either continue the matter to a date certain to allow time to
26 address questions or comments or make a motion to recommend approval or denial of the requested
27 variations with draft language included on page no. 187. She then asked if there were any questions.

28
29 Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. He referred to the 2x the minimum lot area
30 and average lot width provision requiring approval of a special use permit. No questions were raised at
31 this time.

32
33 Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Chip Hackley of Hackley & Associates
34 Architects stated he represented Stephen and Deanna Nied and described the request as a technicality
35 in terms of the application of zoning and lot consolidation. He stated the existing home is currently
36 nonconforming and once the lots are consolidated, larger side yard setbacks are required. Mr. Hackley
37 summarized the plan to maintain the existing home at 833 Foxdale, remove the 829 Foxdale home and
38 expand the 833 Foxdale home which would also eliminate a narrow shared driveway. He stated their
39 intent is to maintain the continuity on Foxdale and a new home could result in a very large home and
40 affect the block contextually. Mr. Hackley referred to the home's front elevation illustration and
41 preliminary plans and described the renovation to be done to the home.

42
43 Chairman Bradley asked if there were any questions. Mr. Nielsen asked if the consolidation assumed any
44 further variations. Mr. Hackley responded there would be none and described the relief obtained on the
45 south side of the property once the home is taken down. Mr. Haller referred to the existing north side
46 elevation and home design and asked if their intent is to mimic the character in terms of the home's
47 design elements. Mr. Hackley confirmed that is correct as well as improve some of the home's details.
48 He also described the distance between the home and the lot line.

1 Chairman Bradley referred to the first standard with regard to whether 833 Foxdale would be able to
2 obtain a reasonable return as well as sizes of neighboring homes which are existing nonconforming. He
3 asked why the home could not otherwise yield a reasonable return without consolidation. Mr. Hackley
4 responded the most important consideration in connection with reasonable return related to how the
5 lot is used and referred to the shared driveway removal which represented a dangerous and
6 uncomfortable situation. He also stated it is not possible to have two driveways on both lots. Chairman
7 Bradley stated the driveway situation was not sufficiently addressed at the PC meeting. He also referred
8 to the third standard and precedent setting on Foxdale. Mr. Hackley responded it would not set a
9 precedent and is dependent on how it would be handled. Chairman Bradley stated their attempt is to
10 preserve 833 Foxdale with consolidation as opposed to removing the home at 829 Foxdale and a new
11 home being built. Mr. Hackley confirmed that is correct.

12
13 Deanna Nied stated they have lived at 833 Foxdale for over 20 years, which she described as historic.
14 She stated they have lived with the shared driveway situation for quite some time and were fortunate to
15 be able to purchase the home next door which was not in good shape. Mrs. Nied stated the request
16 would allow them to resolve the driveway situation and asked if there were any questions. No questions
17 were raised at this time.

18
19 Chairman Bradley asked for public comment and swore in those speaking to this matter. Andy Cripe
20 read his comments into the record. He noted he owned the home from 2005-2015 and summarized his
21 position to recommend approval of the request. Mr. Cripe also described the structural issues in the
22 home and stated the uniqueness of the situation related to more than the narrow shared driveway
23 situation which he explained as the homes' proximity and driveway slope impeded views. He then
24 stated renovating the home to make it viable would not be practical and asked for the consolidation
25 request be granted to allow the applicants' home to remain. Mr. Cripe then asked if there were any
26 questions.

27
28 Jason Alcorn stated he lived to the north of the applicants' home and agreed the homes on Foxdale are
29 tight and nonconforming. He stated as long as nothing else on the property changed, he had no problem
30 with the home. Mr. Alcorn agreed with Mr. Cripe's analysis of the home and with regard to meeting the
31 standards, otherwise allowing a new home to be built on 829 Foxdale would create an encumbrance
32 with regard to the homes' proximity as opposed to allowing it to remain a vacant lot.

33
34 Evan Meister, 825 Foxdale, stated he is a commercial builder in Chicago and with regard to preservation
35 and neighborhood character, he described the applicants as neighborhood stewards. He referred to the
36 street's character and described it as an eclectic street. Mr. Meister stated if the request is not
37 approved, the lot would end up in the hands of a spec developer which would not contribute to
38 neighborhood character. He stated the request would improve the neighborhood.

39
40 Christina Cripe, former 829 Foxdale resident, stated she agreed with the comments made and the
41 request would contribute to the town's overall aura and asked for the consolidation to be approved. No
42 additional comments were made at this time.

43
44 Chairman Bradley called the matter in for discussion and referred to the standards the Board is to
45 consider. Mr. Haller stated after having reviewed the standards, he referred to the first two standards in
46 particular and referred to the 829 Foxdale home which is in disrepair and requires substantial expense
47 to repair. He stated if it is removed and a new home built, there would be a challenge in terms of the
48 shared driveway. Mr. Haller stated there are unique circumstances with regard to both properties and

1 the consolidation would not otherwise physically change anything on the street. He stated the
2 alternative to tear down both homes and build a new home would result in a risk to the neighborhood
3 character and he would lean toward recommending approval.
4

5 Mr. Ritter agreed with Mr. Haller's comments and added the home would be attractive with the
6 addition of green space. He stated given the alternative and while the first two standards were not
7 clearly met, he would be in favor of recommending approval. Ms. Leister stated her initial thought was
8 not to recommend approval in connection with the second standard and that the addition would change
9 the character of the locality. She stated after hearing the testimony, the 8-foot driveway is tighter than
10 is more typically seen and with the plan to maintain the existing home's character and the neighbors'
11 comments, she would be in favor of the request.
12

13 Mr. Nielsen referred to three particular standards and the written comment received and determined
14 there are three options including tearing down both homes which would result in one large home out of
15 character for the neighborhood, tear down one home to allow 833 Foxdale to have a larger lot or the
16 proposed plan. He stated the proposed plans for the home made a big difference for him and while the
17 home would be larger, hearing the public comment with regard to the shared driveway and safety
18 issues, he would be in favor of the request. Mr. Nielsen concluded the proposal is by far the best option.
19 Chairman Bradley stated with regard to the zoning relief requested, he would be in support of the
20 request although the reasonable return standard is difficult to meet and referred to the amount of
21 homes which do not have driveways.
22

23 Chairman Bradley then asked for a motion to recommend approval as noted on page 12. A motion as
24 stated by Chairman Bradley was made by Mr. Nielsen and seconded by Ms. Leister. A vote was taken
25 and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

26 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Leister, Nielsen, Ritter

27 NAYS: None
28

29 **b. Case No. 25-24-SU: Winnetka Congregational Church - 725 Pine Street: An application seeking**
30 **approval of a Special Use Permit to allow a childcare center to operate in the existing church. The**
31 **Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**

32 Ms. Klaassen stated the request is for an amendment to a special use permit to lease space in the
33 existing church to Jumpstart Early Learning Services to operate a childcare center. She noted the existing
34 special use permit was granted in 1998 which she described to the Board. Ms. Klaassen identified the
35 property's location, zoning classification and existing improvements as well as a limited range of
36 additional uses. She then referred to existing site photos and employees and students which would
37 occupy the space. Ms. Klaassen noted the proposed plan did not include any building or parking lot
38 expansion or playground with an amendment needed to the special use if a playground is proposed in
39 the future. She stated the applicant received preliminary DCFS approval and DCFS required final
40 approval by the Village and minor facility modifications. Ms. Klaassen identified staff parking and noted
41 a traffic impact study was prepared by Gewalt Hamilton and provided in the application materials. She
42 then read the recommendations provided by the Village Engineer.
43

44 Ms. Klaassen summarized the PC's consideration of the request with a recommendation of approval and
45 conditions. She also identified the six special use standards the Board is to consider and stated following
46 the applicant's presentation, public comment and Board discussion, the Board may decide to continue
47 the matter to a date certain or provide a recommendation with draft language included on page nos.
48 216 and 217. Ms. Klaassen then asked if there were any questions.

1 Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time.

2
3 Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Amy Falkowski presented the request on
4 behalf of the applicant and clarified the special use application request is for a day care and not a pre-
5 school. She summarized the church's history and how they have participated in the community. Ms.
6 Falkowski stated they discussed the proposed plan with the neighbors and had a traffic study
7 performed. She added they are prepared in terms of traffic with regard to the proposed use. She then
8 stated the request is in response to the community's needs and is in response to the Comprehensive
9 Plan.

10
11 Ms. Falkowski stated in response to the questions raised, she explained the capacity in terms of children,
12 teachers and size of the space. She referred to an illustration and described the entrance, security
13 systems and traffic flow pattern. Ms. Falkowski also explained their hours of operation and noted a
14 playground is not a DCFS requirement. She also explained the parking spaces which would be occupied
15 by the minimal number of employees. Ms. Falkowski added the drop-off and pickup process is efficient
16 and has been successfully implemented in their other locations. She outlined the minor interior changes
17 to be done to accommodate the use. Ms. Falkowski stated the proposed use would bring neighborhood
18 vitality, jobs and increased business patronage. She also informed the Board that DCFS reviewed the
19 building and indicated once the minor modifications have been approved, they would provide their final
20 approval.

21
22 Ms. Falkowski explained the traffic study conducted in the neighborhood which determined there would
23 be no significant impact during heavy traffic hours. She outlined how the circular driveway would be
24 used and that signage would be installed to direct traffic with directions also provided to parents. Ms.
25 Falkowski referred to the findings that there would be very little change in terms of traffic and provided
26 additional information in terms of staging and preparation in terms of pickup and drop-off. She stated
27 there would be no issues in terms of utility usage and confirmed there would be no changes outside.
28 Ms. Falkowski reiterated the need for daycare in the Village and asked if there were any questions.

29
30 Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. Mr. Haller asked if they anticipated if at
31 capacity whether they would be able to transition vehicles without a queue. Ms. Falkowski confirmed
32 that is correct and explained how the queue would operate as well as the anticipated traffic pattern. Mr.
33 Nielsen questioned the increase in the number of children from 8 to 64. Ms. Falkowski confirmed the 64
34 figure represented DCFS capacity. She also explained their response to Lincoln Avenue which was not
35 addressed in the traffic study as well as the traffic flow from Green Bay Road. Ms. Falkowski confirmed
36 they would address any issues that arise and confirmed there have been no complaints in terms of
37 Sunday traffic.

38
39 Victor Cuebas explained the admission and application process to the Board and noted the application
40 included preferred drop-off and pickup times. Chairman Bradley referred to the first standard and
41 questioned the applicant's background and verification process which Mr. Cuebas explained in detail to
42 the Board. Mr. Haller questioned the involvement of those higher in the organization than the applicant.
43 Mr. Cuebas explained they have a corporate office to which they report. No additional questions were
44 raised at this time.

45
46 Chairman Bradley asked for public comment and swore in those speaking to this matter. Dave
47 Robertson stated he is a church member and is familiar with the parking lot, the lots which were built

1 and their usage. He stated double parking may be the only issue with the main issue related to the
2 existing parking lot off Prospect.

3
4 Colleen Root stated she is also a church member and described her route to the church used several
5 times daily. She stated the traffic patterns can be managed and commented on her pleasure in terms of
6 how the special use application was handled. No additional comments were made at this time.

7
8 Chairman Bradley called the matter in for discussion. Mr. Ritter stated the primary impediment to him
9 with regard to the standards related to the traffic and parking issue and referred to the applicant's
10 attempts to address the issues. He stated he had no problem with the request. Ms. Leister agreed with
11 Mr. Ritter's comments and stated her only concern related to traffic and parking. She stated the correct
12 analysis had been done and the situation would not be made worse than it is currently. Mr. Nielsen
13 referred to the standards related to parking, access roads and properties in the immediate vicinity and
14 the access off Prospect and Lincoln that he is fine with. He stated with regard to standard (d) relating to
15 parking and congestion, he referred to the Community House and nursery school and the number of
16 children and drop-off. Mr. Nielsen also referred to the existing amount of traffic from Pine off of Green
17 Bay Road and questioned the impact of both schools doing drop-offs at the same time.

18
19 Mr. Haller stated he is also familiar with the church and its activities. He referred to difficulties with the
20 circular driveway and the ability of users to navigate the circumstances. Mr. Haller stated he is minimally
21 concerned with the amount of traffic from Pine to Green Bay Road and the ability of the church to deal
22 with issues as they come up. He stated the use would definitely benefit the community and concluded
23 he would be in favor of the request. Chairman Bradley informed the Board of the PC's discussion with
24 regard to the need for additional daycare solutions and collaboration. He stated he is also concerned
25 with regard to the traffic chokepoint and referred to traffic flow requirements being addressed prior to
26 Village Council approval in terms of how traffic flow and communication with parents would be
27 navigated. Chairman Bradley concluded that otherwise the standards have been met and asked for a
28 motion to recommend approval of the special use request as indicated on page 216.

29
30 A motion as stated by Chairman Bradley was made by Mr. Haller and seconded by Mr. Nielsen. A vote
31 was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

32 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Leister, Nielsen, Ritter

33 NAYS: None

34
35 **New Business:**

36 a. April 13, 2026, Meeting - Quorum Check

37 The Board Members discussed their availability.

38
39 **Adjournment:**

40 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Ritter and
41 seconded by Ms. Leister. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

42 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Leister, Nielsen, Ritter

43 NAYS: None

44 The meeting adjourned at 8:58 p.m.

45
46 Respectfully submitted,

47 Antionette Johnson

48 Recording Secretary