

**WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES  
MAY 11, 2026**

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

**Zoning Board Members Absent:** Michael Ritter

**Village Staff:** Scott Mangum, Director of Community Development  
Christopher Marx, Associate Planner

**Call to Order & Roll Call:**

Chairman Bradley called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm. Roll call was taken of the Board Members present.

**Community Development Report.**

Mr. Mangum provided an update on the 829-833 Foxdale lot consolidation application.

**Continued Cases:**

a. **Case No. 26-07-V2: 286 Ridge Avenue:** An application seeking approval of a zoning variation to allow construction of a swimming pool at 286 Ridge Avenue. The requested variation would permit the proposed pool to provide less than the minimum required corner yard setback from the north property line along Mt. Pleasant Street. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request. This item was continued from the April 13, 2026, Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. The Applicant is requesting this item be continued to the June 8, 2026 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

Jim Murphy informed the Board after reviewing the zoning ordinances, he could not find where a pool would cause any setback issues which primarily related to buildings and site lines. Chairman Bradley stated the Board did not have the applicant's materials in front of them and the Village officials would help him understand why setback standards are being applied to the pool.

Chairman Bradley then asked for a motion to continue the 286 Ridge Avenue matter to the June 8, 2026 meeting. A motion as stated by Chairman Bradley was made by Mr. Haller and seconded by Ms. Hanley. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

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

NAYS: None

**New Cases:**

a. **Case No. 26-10-V2: 1412 Scott Avenue:** An application seeking approval of a zoning variation to allow expansion of the driveway at 1412 Scott Avenue. The requested variation would permit the driveway to exceed the maximum permitted front yard lot coverage. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.

Mr. Marx summarized the application for the driveway expansion and variation for maximum front yard lot coverage. He identified the property's location, existing improvements, zoning classification as well as site photos of the property. Mr. Marx noted the home was constructed in 1997 with a legally

1 nonconforming front-facing garage that would not be permitted under the current zoning code. He  
2 summarized the front yard lot coverage variation being requested and the existing driveway easement  
3 for the neighboring property in detail.  
4

5 Mr. Marx stated no comments were received regarding the application and following the applicant's  
6 presentation, public comment and Board discussion, the Board may decide to either continue the  
7 matter to a date certain to allow time to address questions or comments or make a motion to  
8 recommend approval or denial of the requested variation with draft language included on page nos. 8  
9 and 9. He asked if there were any questions.  
10

11 Mr. Haller asked for the calculation covered by the easement for the west neighbor. Mr. Marx  
12 responded it was measured to be 153.06 square feet. No additional questions were raised at this time.  
13

14 Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Adam Rothschild, the applicant and  
15 homeowner, stated that the home was purchased in July, 2024, after which time they realized there  
16 were driveway issues. He described the three front facing garage doors and stated that due to the  
17 driveway's narrowness, it is difficult to maneuver into the outer garage bays which also created  
18 landscaping issues. Mr. Rothschild stated the issue created major safety concerns for the motorist and  
19 pedestrians which he described to the Board. He also described his background in terms of evaluating  
20 property safety issues and referred to a 2007 photo from Google Maps Streetview which depicted a  
21 larger driveway. Mr. Rothschild stated the request would serve to restore the previously existing  
22 functionality of the driveway which is smaller than the previous condition. He added that the neighbors  
23 have no concerns with the request and asked the Board to recommend approval of the request. Mr.  
24 Rothschild then provided photos to the Board for their review.  
25

26 Ms. Hanley referred to the east side of the driveway and asked if consideration was given to installing  
27 less pervious material to offset the amount of impervious being requested. Mr. Rothschild responded  
28 that area related to the first 30 feet. Mr. Marx noted any surface material which would allow for walking  
29 access or a vehicle to be driven over is counted toward impervious lot coverage and front yard lot  
30 coverage, even if the material was capable of being pervious. Mr. Nielsen asked if the applicant had  
31 three vehicles and Mr. Rothschild responded they have two vehicles. No additional questions were  
32 raised at this time.  
33

34 Chairman Bradley asked for public comment. No comments were made at this time. He then called the  
35 matter in for discussion.  
36

37 Ms. Hanley stated she had no problem with the request since it represented a safety issue as opposed to  
38 an aesthetic issue. She also stated there is a hardship with regard to the west easement. Mr. Haller  
39 stated after viewing the property and the amount of overage, he referred to the easement offset  
40 compared to what is allowed. Mr. Haller then stated in considering the difficulty in terms of access, he  
41 would recommend approval. Mr. Nielsen stated he is against the request and referred to the fact that  
42 the house was constructed with a three-car garage. He also referred to the reasonable return standard  
43 and described a three-car garage as a luxury item which did not meet that standard. Mr. Nielsen  
44 concluded he would be against the request. Ms. Leister stated she leaned toward approval and viewed  
45 the easement as a hardship. She agreed with the difficulty in maneuvering and stated the safety  
46 concerns raised were a legitimate concern. Mr. Vender agreed with Mr. Nielsen with regard to the three  
47 car garage concerns. He also referred to the safety concerns raised. Chairman Bradley agreed with the  
48 safety concerns and stated easements did not make a property unique. He also described the existing

1 driveway as nonfunctional. Chairman Bradley stated the first two standards are difficult to meet and for  
2 the easement and the ability to use the garage in the manner expected, he suggested the Board  
3 recognize the opportunity to correct what was designed. He concluded the standards have largely been  
4 met.

5  
6 Chairman Bradley then asked for a motion to recommend approval as noted on page nos. 8 and 9. A  
7 motion to recommend approval of the variation request was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Mr.  
8 Haller. A vote was taken and the motion passed, 5 to 1:

9 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Leister, Vender

10 NAYS: Nielsen

11  
12 **b. Case No. 26-11-V: 1287 Scott Avenue: An application seeking approval of a zoning variation to**  
13 **allow construction of a second-floor addition to the existing residence at 1287 Scott Avenue. The**  
14 **requested variation would permit the addition to exceed the maximum permitted gross floor area.**  
15 **The Zoning Board of Appeals has final jurisdiction on this request.**

16 Mr. Marx summarized the variations requested and identified the property's location, zoning  
17 classification and site photos. He stated the request is to add a second-floor addition which he described  
18 for the Board along with the existing and proposed floor plan elevations. Mr. Marx noted while the  
19 home is existing nonconforming, the proposed addition would otherwise comply with zoning  
20 requirements. He stated no written comments were received and following the applicant's presentation,  
21 public comment and Board discussion, the Board may decide to either continue the matter to a date  
22 certain to allow time to address questions or comments or make a motion to adopt the resolution to  
23 approve or deny the requested variations with draft language included on page nos. 41 and 56. He asked  
24 if there were any questions.

25  
26 Chairman Bradley stated since the property is existing nonconforming, he questioned the Roofed Lot  
27 Coverage and Gross Floor Area measurements and how they were calculated. Mr. Marx explained that  
28 they are ultimately proportional to the size and dimensions of the subject property. He explained to the  
29 Board the manner in which the property is compliant and where it is nonconforming. No additional  
30 questions were raised at this time.

31  
32 Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Theresa Rose, the applicant and homeowner,  
33 and Rob Friedman, the architect, introduced themselves to the Board. Mrs. Rose stated that the home  
34 was purchased in September 2025 at which time they were presented plans by the seller's agent in  
35 terms of what the home could become with the intention of adding a bedroom to make the home more  
36 functional for the family.

37  
38 Mr. Nielsen referred to the small amount of deviation in the variation request and asked the applicant if  
39 they considered making the addition smaller. Mr. Friedman confirmed that it was considered and  
40 explained the alternatives they considered, noting that the proposed addition best matched the shape  
41 and aesthetics of the existing house. Mr. Haller asked if they considered articulating the rear roof. Mr.  
42 Friedman stated they want to maintain the home's architectural integrity. Chairman Bradley asked if the  
43 new bathroom would be the master bath. Mrs. Rose stated it would be an on-suite bathroom. Ms. Leister  
44 referred to the amount of similar homes on 50-foot lots and asked if they considered converting the  
45 garage into a first-floor master bedroom and building a detached garage, which is more feasible because  
46 of zoning code requirements. Mrs. Rose confirmed they looked into it and explained why that would  
47 create awkward and mismatched floorplans and would not be practical for the layout of the house. No  
48 additional questions were raised at this time.

1 Chairman Bradley asked for public comment. No comments were made at this time. He then called the  
2 matter in for discussion.  
3

4 Chairman Bradley described the request as straightforward. Ms. Hanley referred to the small lot with a  
5 small ratio of permitted bulk and coverage, and noted the applicant's family makeup and the zoning  
6 requirements in place. She stated she would lean toward denying the request and stated the request did  
7 not warrant a variation with there being room in the remaining available GFA ratio to work with. Ms.  
8 Hanley stated the first two standards have not been met. Ms. Leister stated she also leaned toward  
9 voting against the request and referred to the standards not being met although the variation  
10 percentage seemed de minimis. She then stated there may be ways to trim down the request. Ms.  
11 Hanley agreed the request could be reduced to affect the variation amount requested. Mr. Marx  
12 clarified the amount of GFA counted with a pitched roof of the house and how upper-floor GFA is  
13 determined.  
14

15 Mr. Vender stated with regard to reasonable return, the request is a de minimis ask and referred to  
16 ways in which the request can be reduced. He commented the proposed design is better and would be  
17 more functional. Mr. Vender stated he would vote in favor of the request. Mr. Nielsen stated while the  
18 variation amount requested is small, the standards are being picked apart in that they are not met. He  
19 stated he is torn in terms of his vote and is leaning toward voting against the request. Mr. Haller agreed  
20 with Ms. Leister's comments and asked if the proposed addition is reduced 5 feet in the rear, would that  
21 area relieve the amount counted toward GFA. He then stated he struggled with regard to finding a way  
22 to give the applicant 100 square feet with his vote leaning toward no. Chairman Bradley stated the first  
23 standard has definitely not been met although the property is unique in ways he outlined. He stated for  
24 a project this small and the applicant has 315 square feet to use, the home would not look right if they  
25 were required to strictly adhere to the standards and a denial would become punitive. Chairman Bradley  
26 referred to the applicant's proposal for a modest amount of GFA. Mr. Haller added due to the number of  
27 small nonconforming lots in the Village, to deny a modest request of this type could result in more lot  
28 consolidations. The Board Members discussed their positions in detail.  
29

30 Chairman Bradley took a straw poll of the Board Members' positions. He then asked for a motion to  
31 approve the request as included on page 41. A motion to approve the request as presented was made  
32 by Mr. Nielsen and seconded by Mr. Vender. A vote was taken and the motion passed, 5 to 1:

33 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Leister, Nielsen, Vender

34 NAYS: Hanley  
35

36 **New Business:**

37 a. June 8, 2026 Meeting - Quorum Check.

38 Chairman Bradley thanked Mr. Vender for his service on the Board. The Board Members discussed their  
39 availability.  
40

41 **Public Comment:**

42 No comments were made at this time.  
43

44 **Adjournment:**

45 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Hanley and  
46 seconded by Mr. Nielsen. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

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

48 NAYS: None

1 The meeting adjourned at 8:18 pm.

2

3 Respectfully submitted,

4

5 Antionette Johnson

6 Recording Secretary

7