

**WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES
JUNE 8, 2026**

Zoning Board Members Present: Matt Bradley, Chairman
Mark Haller
Lynn Hanley
Kathryn Leister
Bob Lind
Michael Ritter

Zoning Board Members Absent: Mike Nielsen

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

Call to Order & Roll Call:

Chairman Bradley called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. Roll call was taken of the Board Members present.

Approval of Meeting Minutes.

Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to approve the May 11, 2026, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the May 11, 2026, meeting minutes was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Mr. Ritter. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

AYES: Bradley, Hanley, Leister, Lind, Ritter

NAYS: None

Community Development Report.

Mr. Mangum provided the Board with an update on the Centennial Beach application as well as the Village Council approvals for the applications attached to 1412 Scott Avenue and 725 Pine Street. He also stated there would be several engagement opportunities in connection with the former post office site and two open houses would be held. Mr. Mangum then stated there would be an open house held with regard to the Village's streetscape plan. He informed the Board that Teska Associates is the consultant on the post office site project with S.B. Friedman analyzing the economics of site concepts. Mr. Mangum stated there would be the ability to provide feedback on the website for the post office site project. No questions were raised at this time.

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, and May 11, 2026, Zoning Board of Appeals meetings. The Applicant is requesting this item be continued to the July 13, 2026, Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to continue the matter to the July 13, 2026, meeting. A motion as stated by Chairman Bradley was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Leister. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 5 to 0:

1 AYES: Bradley, Hanley, Leister, Lind, Ritter

2 NAYS: None

3
4 **New Cases:**

5 a. **Case No. 26-12-V: 9 Warwick Road:** An application seeking approval of zoning variations to
6 allow construction of an addition and work beyond ordinary repair and maintenance to the existing
7 legally nonconforming residence at 9 Warwick Road. The requested variations would permit the
8 proposed improvements to (i) provide less than the minimum required side yard setback from the north
9 property line; and (ii) perform structural changes necessary to provide a new window opening in the
10 legally nonconforming north side building wall. The Zoning Board of Appeals has final jurisdiction on
11 this request.

12 Mr. Marx summarized the request for variations for side yard setback and new window openings in a
13 nonconforming side building wall. He identified the property's location, existing improvements, zoning
14 classification and site photos. Mr. Marx summarized the zoning variation granted for the existing garage
15 in 1993 and referred to front elevation views. He described the property's nonconforming status and the
16 request for a first and second floor addition and dormer additions on the garage, noting that the proposed
17 garage dormers would be compliant with zoning. Mr. Marx then described how the specific rooms would
18 be configured for the first and second floors and referred to proposed elevation renderings. Mr. Haller
19 arrived at 7:08 p.m.

20
21 Mr. Marx noted that the proposed addition would maintain the existing north side yard setback but still
22 require a variation for side yard setback. He also explained that the proposed window openings within
23 that nonconforming building wall required a variation. He further stated that all other aspects of the
24 proposed addition would comply with zoning code. He stated that no written public comments were
25 received and that following the applicant's presentation, public comments and Board discussion, the
26 Board may decide to either continue the case to a date certain to allow time to address questions or
27 comments or make a motion to adopt the resolution to approve or deny the variations with draft
28 resolutions included on page no. 48-67 of the agenda packet. He then asked if there were any questions.

29
30 Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. Ms. Hanley asked if the proposed outdoor
31 shower area along the north property wall factored in the side yard setback variation. Mr. Marx responded
32 that it is compliant with the maximum fence height requirement and is not enclosed space, so it would be
33 regarded as a permitted encroachment. No additional questions were raised at this time.

34
35 Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Chip Hackley of Hackley & Associates Architects
36 introduced himself to the Board and provided additional project information to the Board. He described
37 the home and the proposal to build over the existing one-story section of the house as well to infill a small
38 area at the northwest corner. Mr. Hackley referred to the proposed project's zoning compliant aspects
39 and the proposal would allow sensitive alterations to be made to an architecturally significant home. He
40 referred to the handout which indicated the request would present minimal impact and referred to the
41 west elevation. Mr. Hackley explained the aspects of the home which would remain the same.

42
43 Chairman Bradley asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised at this time. He then asked
44 for public comment. No comments were made at this time. Chairman Bradley called the matter in for
45 discussion.

46
47 Chairman Bradley summarized the variations requested and asked the Board Members for any comments.
48 Ms. Hanley stated the request is fine and the side yard setback would not increase although the visual

1 impact would be minimally increased. She also stated the north side neighboring property affected by the
2 window addition is a good distance away and no objection was raised. Ms. Hanley concluded there are no
3 issues with the standards. Ms. Leister agreed with Ms. Hanley's comments and stated the home's
4 footprint would not change. She commented that the proposed plan is attractive and referred to the fact
5 the neighbor affected is not in opposition. Mr. Ritter agreed with the comments made and stated he is in
6 favor. Mr. Haller stated he is also in favor of the request and an alternative plan would create architectural
7 deficiencies. Mr. Lind agreed with the comments made. Chairman Bradley agreed with the comments
8 that were made and noted for the record that since the structure on the property is existing
9 nonconforming, the continuation of the nonconformity is not automatically allowed or approved and
10 referred to instances where existing nonconformities were worsened. He noted that the applicant's
11 testimony and the proposed project was keeping in character with the home.

12
13 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to approve the resolution for the requested variations as indicated
14 on page no. 48. A motion as stated by Chairman Bradley was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Mr.
15 Haller. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

16 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Leister, Lind, Ritter

17 NAYS: None
18

19 **b. Case No. 26-13-V: 1252 Spruce Street: An application seeking approval of zoning variations to**
20 **allow construction of an addition and work beyond ordinary repair and maintenance to the existing**
21 **legally nonconforming residence at 1252 Spruce Street. The requested variations would permit the**
22 **proposed improvements to (i) provide less than the minimum required side yard setback; (ii) provide**
23 **less than the minimum required total side yard setback; and (iii) perform structural changes necessary**
24 **to provide new window openings in the legally nonconforming east and west side building walls. The**
25 **Zoning Board of Appeals has final jurisdiction on this request.**

26 Mr. Marx identified the property's location, zoning classification, size, and existing improvements. He then
27 referred to the property's building elevations and the plat-of-survey. Mr. Marx explained the property's
28 nonconforming conditions and side yard setback measurements. He summarized the proposed second
29 floor additions and identified a portion of the proposed second-floor addition which would cantilever over
30 the first floor and count towards Gross Floor Area and the side yard setback. Mr. Marx also identified the
31 front, rear, and side building elevations and proposed window openings within nonconforming side
32 building walls.

33
34 Mr. Marx summarized the three variations requested. He then stated no public comment was received
35 with regard to the application and following the applicant's presentation, public comment and Board
36 discussion, the Board may decide to either continue the matter to a date certain to allow time to address
37 questions or comments or make a motion to adopt the resolution to approve or deny the variations with
38 draft resolutions included on page nos. 89-108 of the agenda packet.
39

40 Chairman Bradley asked if there were any questions. Ms. Hanley asked for clarification with regard to the
41 statement that the second floor could be built in a conforming manner which Mr. Marx explained to the
42 Board in significant detail. No additional questions were raised at this time.

43 Chairman Bradley then swore in those speaking to this matter. Barb McCarthy, the architect for the
44 project and the representative for the applicant, explained the home's brick layout and how the proposed
45 addition would be positioned. She stated the homeowners would like to remain in the home and the
46 raised ceiling height and more windows would make the primary bedroom suite more functional as well
47 as make the addition look intentional and cohesive. No questions were raised at this time.
48

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 Ms. Hanley stated since they are working with existing nonconformities, keeping the same footprint and
5 extending the home up, there would be minimal impact. She stated she had no issues with the proposal
6 and the standards have been met and she is in favor of the request. Mr. Haller, Mr. Lind, Ms. Leister and
7 Mr. Ritter agreed with Ms. Hanley's comments and concluded they are all in favor. Chairman Bradley
8 stated he is also in support of the application and asked for a motion to approve the resolution for the
9 request as indicated on page no. 89.

10
11 A motion to approve the resolution for the variations as presented was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded
12 by Mr. Lind. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

13 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Leister, Lind, Ritter

14 NAYS: None

15
16 **c. Case No. 26-14-V: 705 Oak Street: An application seeking approval of a zoning variation to allow**
17 **a fence along a portion of the west property line of 705 Oak Street. The requested variation would**
18 **permit the fence to exceed the maximum permitted height. The Zoning Board of Appeals has final**
19 **jurisdiction on this request.**

20 Mr. Marx identified the property's location, zoning classification, size, and construction date of 2002
21 following an approved ordinance that changed the property's zoning to its current designation. He
22 referred to illustrations of the home, surrounding views and building elevations as well as identified the
23 area of the fence installation. Mr. Marx stated the request is to replace an existing fence installed last year
24 with a fence height of 8 feet in various segments. He stated the higher fence height is being requested in
25 order to screen elements of trash receptacles, mounted equipment, and vehicular traffic of the
26 multifamily building of the neighboring property.

27
28 Mr. Marx noted no public comments were received and following the applicant's presentation, public
29 comment and Board discussion, the Board may decide to either continue the matter to a date certain to
30 allow time to address questions or comments or make a motion to adopt the resolution to approve or
31 deny the requested variation with draft resolutions beginning on page 123 of the agenda packet. He asked
32 if there were any questions.

33
34 Mr. Haller referred to Figure 4 and asked for clarification with regard to the open black railed fence and
35 wooden fence. Mr. Marx clarified the fence location and where its height would be staggered. The Board
36 Members referred to Figure 7 and Mr. Marx provided additional information as well as the fence's
37 material composition to the Board.

38
39 Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Jeffrey Bucklew, the applicant, informed the
40 Board they moved into the house one year ago and repaired the fence as well as made other
41 improvements to the property. He stated they planned to remove the existing hedge, extend the fence to
42 a higher height to provide an additional barrier with the property next door. Mr. Bucklew identified the
43 wrought iron fence on the wall which belonged to the neighboring property and informed the Board they
44 explored several options and explained the proposal's details to the Board.

45
46 Chairman Bradley referred to Figure 8 and questioned the areas where the 8 feet fence height is
47 measured. Mr. Bucklew clarified the five areas for the Board and explained the property's pitch. Mr. Marx
48 referred to page nos. 119-120 of the agenda packet which provided a more detailed proportion of the

1 fence height to the buildings. Mr. Bucklew further explained where the fence's 8-foot height would be
2 located and possible areas where the height can be reduced. The Board Members discussed how the fence
3 height would screen neighboring equipment.
4

5 Mr. Haller questioned if the wall height could be adjusted and the fence installed on top and whether that
6 would require a variation. Mr. Marx referred to the established boundaries between the subject property
7 and neighboring property and the fence directly on top of the retaining wall would lead to the same issue
8 and would be measured from the lowest adjacent natural grade. No additional questions were raised at
9 this time.
10

11 Chairman Bradley asked for public comment and swore in those speaking to this matter. Ray James stated
12 a photo of the fence from the street would be helpful. Mr. Bucklew noted the length to where the fence
13 would start would be 17 feet from the front property line.
14

15 Mark Hoegler, a resident of 711 Oak Street and condominium board member, stated the condominium
16 board is fine with the fence and proposed landscaping. No additional comments were made at this time.
17 Chairman Bradley called the matter in for discussion.
18

19 Chairman Bradley referred to the difficulty of fence heights being able to satisfy the reasonable return
20 standard and prior considerations made with regard to similar applications. Mr. Haller stated he is
21 sympathetic to the applicant's plight and the neighboring property with larger mechanical equipment. He
22 stated the request is reasonable and referred to the sight line coming down as you get closer to the
23 sidewalk in terms of the grade. Mr. Haller concluded as long as the fence stepped down toward the front
24 of the home, it would be fine to permit the 8-foot height where needed.
25

26 Mr. Ritter referred to the uniqueness of the property being located next to the condominium building and
27 the 8-foot-high section would not extend the fence's entire length. He stated it would enhance the home
28 to screen the mechanicals and dumpster and he would be in favor of the request. Ms. Leister agreed with
29 the comments made and stated there should be conditions to require the fence be 6 feet in height toward
30 the front of the property. Ms. Hanley stated that while she is sympathetic to the applicant's plight, she
31 did not agree with an 8-foot fence height which she commented is imposing. She stated the ordinance
32 allowed 8 feet in height next to commercial properties and suggested landscaping be used as a buffer.
33 Ms. Hanley concluded she would not be in favor of the request. Mr. Lind agreed while an 8-foot fence
34 would be imposing, he would be in favor of a 7 or 7.5 feet fence and stated since there is no objection
35 from the neighbors, he would be in favor. Chairman Bradley stated he is also sympathetic to the request
36 and referred to the neighboring properties on either side which he described is unique. He referred to
37 how it would appear without landscaping and approaching the property from the west. Chairman Bradley
38 suggested a height of 7.5 feet would provide a sufficient barrier as a condition with him leaning toward
39 approval. He added there were no concerns from the neighbors.
40

41 Chairman Bradley then asked for a motion to approve the resolution for the request as included on page
42 no. 123 of the agenda packet. A motion was made by Mr. Ritter and seconded by Lind. A vote was taken
43 and the motion passed, 4 to 2:

44 AYES: Bradley, Leister, Lind, Ritter

45 NAYS: Hanley, Haller
46

47 **New Business:**

- 48 a. July 13, 2026, Meeting - Quorum Check.

1 The Board Members discussed their availability.

2
3 **Public Comment:**

4 No comments were made at this time.

5
6 **Adjournment:**

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

9 AYES: Bradley, Haller, Hanley, Leister, Lind, Ritter

10 NAYS: None

11 The meeting adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

12
13 Respectfully submitted,

14
15 Antionette Johnson

16 Recording Secretary

17