

VILLAGE OF



KENILWORTH, IL

**Village Board of Trustees
Meeting
January 20, 2026**

Call to Order

President Kaz called to order the meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Village of Kenilworth at 7:03 p.m. on January 20, 2026, inviting all meeting participants to review the agenda available from a number of sources. She then took time to address the agenda item #VB4 concerning consideration of a Request for a Planned Unit Development at 515-519 Park Drive, citing procedural protocol, the Board’s desire to hear from all interested parties, and asking everyone recognized by the Board to observe respectful decorum and wise usage of their time allotted.

Roll Call

President Kaz requested a roll call, and the results were as follows:

Trustees:	
Trustee Tim Ransford	Present
Trustee Christopher Ottsen	Present
Trustee Amy Hannus	Present
Trustee John Gottschall	present
Trustee Matthew Lojkovic	Present
Trustee Joseph Vitu	Present
President Cecily Kaz	Present

A quorum was present in person.

Others Recorded as in Attendance:

Village Officials and Staff:

Michael Gagnon	Village Clerk
Peter Shadek	Village Treasurer
Kathy Thake	Village Manager
Heather McFarland	Assistant to the Village Manager
Megan Mack	Village Attorney

1 Donicio Silva Village Police Chief
2 Jordan Schmidt Management Analyst
3 Donald Leicht Superintendent of Public Works
4

5 **Others, signing in as displayed in Participant List:**
6

7	Louis Keiler	Jeanne Keiler
8	Jim Lawson	Patricia Corbett
9	JT Mohr	Laura Divecchio
10	Sybil Benson	Marjie Zander
11	Davis Hayes	Vivian Vahlberg
12	Emily Wilson	Eric Miller
13	Paul Ardizzoni	Steve Economen
14	Mike Cottick	Shamus McLaughlin
15	Vivaan Mehta	Kylee Rader
16	David Rader	David Joyce
17	Laura Fitzpatrick	Ian Fisher
18	Anna Fisher	Jeanne Malnati
19	Mark Malnati	Sam Sachs
20	Rick Gordon	Prathvi Hegde
21	Alice Read	Anna Simpson
22	Patrick Day	Kathy Kirrish
23	Greg Kirrish	Jon Biasseti
24	Mike Kelly	Stacey Sunderland
25	Lois Stanley	

26
27
28 **Approval of Minutes**

29
30 President Kaz asked if there any questions or comments regarding the following minutes:

- 31
- 32 A. Village Board – December 9, 2025
- 33 B. Village Board – December 9, 2025 Executive Session
- 34

35 Hearing none, President Kaz then asked for a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Trustee Lojkovic
36 so moved, and Trustee Gottschall seconded the motion.

37
38 **A roll call vote was taken as follows:**

39
40 For: Ransford, Ottsen, Hannus, Gottschall, Lojkovic, Vitu
41
42 Opposed: None

43
44 The roll call tally was six votes in favor, and none opposed. President Kaz declared the minutes approved.
45
46
47

1 **Approval of the Warrant List**

2

3 President Kaz asked Trustee Gottschall to report on the Warrant List. He highlighted Class B payments as
4 payroll related and Class A warrant payments for work on the ongoing Lakefront Improvement Project (LIP),
5 the Village's Property and Casualty Insurance premium, and for the Village's Health Insurance Program.

6

7 Hearing no further comments from the Board, President Kaz asked for a motion to approve the warrants as
8 presented. Trustee Ottsen so moved, and Trustee Vitu seconded the motion to approve the Class A warrants
9 in the amount of \$815,857.11 and to ratify the Class B warrants in the amount of \$189,549.22.

10

11 **A roll call vote was taken as follows:**

12

13 For: Ransford, Ottsen, Hannus, Gottschall, Lojkovic, Vitu

14

15 Opposed: None

16

17 The roll call tally was six votes in favor, and none opposed. President Kaz declared the warrants approved and
18 ratified.

19

20 **Village President's Report**

21

22 **A. Beach Construction Update (Bulley and Andrews)**

23

24 President Kaz began her report by apologizing for her failure to follow the meeting agenda sequence properly
25 and then introduced representatives from Bulley & Andrews LLC, a construction management firm assigned to
26 the ongoing Lakefront Improvement Project (LIP). Mr. Michael Cottick reviewed a slide presentation which
27 reviewed the present project status for safety, financial standing after the addition of an access ramp to the
28 project, pending change orders due to unforeseen construction challenges, use of project contingency funds,
29 days of work lost due to prohibitive weather conditions for outside work, and construction progress
30 submittals and pending materials procurement. He then presented the Board with photos of progress
31 achieved in the demolition and excavation phase of the project, culminating in a drone assisted video
32 presentation of the present condition of the project.

33

34 Trustees discussed the likelihood of more unforeseen construction challenges, the status of infrastructure
35 installations, the likelihood of more weather-related delays, and the status of pressures on the critical
36 completion path. Mr. Cottick and his colleague Mr. Paul Attizoni addressed those concerns to the Board's
37 satisfaction. Hearing no further discussion among the Board, President Kaz opened the floor to questions
38 from the public. There were none. President Kaz then thanked the representatives of Bulley & Andrews for
39 their presentation and stated that this would conclude her report.

40

41 **Regular Scheduled Business**

42

43 President Kaz began consideration of Regular Scheduled Business by reading Items for Consideration by
44 Omnibus Vote aloud as follows:

45

1 **A. Items for Consideration by Omnibus Vote**

2 1. Resolution Authorizing the Use of the Municipal Partnering Initiative (MPI) Contractual
3 Pricing Pursuant to Government Joint Purchasing Act, 30 ILCS 525/0.01, et. seq., with
4 Advanced Tree Care for the 2026 Tree Trimming Program in the Amount of \$25,000

5
6 2. Resolution Authorizing Execution of an Easement Agreement with Commonwealth Edison
7 for a Relocated Vault Near 604 Green Bay Road

8
9 President Kaz then asked whether any Trustees would like to take any item out of Omnibus Consideration.
10 They did not. Trustees clarified the Easement Agreement with Commonwealth Edison. Hearing no further
11 comment from the Board, President Kaz opened this discussion to the public. Village resident Mr. David Joyce
12 questioned the need to relocate the Commonwealth Edison vault and clarified the Village’s expectation of
13 cost for doing so. Village resident Ms. Jeanne Keiler inquired about the status of this need when the property
14 was originally purchased. Village Manager Thake addressed those questions to their satisfaction.

15
16 President Kaz then asked for a motion to authorize the resolutions as stated. Trustee Ransford so moved, and
17 Trustee Ottsen seconded the motion.

18
19 **A roll call vote was taken as follows:**

20
21 For: Ransford, Ottsen, Hannus, Gottschall, Lojkovic, Vitu

22
23 Opposed: None

24
25 The roll call tally was six votes in favor, and none opposed. President Kaz declared the resolutions authorized.

26
27 **B. Items for Consideration by Individual Vote**

28 3. Presentation and a Resolution to Accept Planning Technical Assistance Services Delivered
29 by the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

30
31 President Kaz then moved to Items for Consideration by Individual Vote on the agenda by asking Management
32 Analyst Jordan Schmidt to present on this item. He reviewed the history of the Village’s application for a
33 technical assistance grant from the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning to assist the Village in the
34 development of a comprehensive Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) which resulted in the receipt of \$8,000 in
35 assistance. Consequent to this receipt the Village must enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement with
36 CMAP to receive the service requested. Mr. Schmidt then asked Ms. Prithvi Hegde, Planner for the Chicago
37 Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) to discuss this arrangement in more detail. Ms. Hegde introduced
38 her colleague Mr. Patrick Day, Principal Planner for CMAP and then proceeded to engage the Board’s
39 attention. Ms. Hegde reviewed CMAP’s responsibilities for coordinating the planning of capital improvement
40 projects among 284 municipalities residing in 7 counties located in northeastern Illinois. Having developed a
41 broad planning outline for the future of the region, known as ON TO 2050, CMAP endeavors to coordinate the
42 pursuit of capital improvement projects among its many clients by offering technical planning assistance
43 adhering to the ON TO 2050 principles at a low cost to its applicants. Ms. Hegde described CMAP’s present
44 portfolio of over 200 ongoing CIPs as being large in size, scope or cost, having long-term usefulness and

1 permanence, and requiring non-recurring expenditures. The services provided by CMAP include reviewing
2 existing CIP processes the Village employs, providing recommendations to increase the capacity for the Village
3 to develop efficient and effective CIPs, assisting in the development of a 5-Year CIP and a Summary 10-YR CIP,
4 and identifying opportunities to incorporate the principles espoused in CMAP's ON TO 2050 planning
5 guidelines. Ms. Hegde went on to describe how a CIP is used to identify, prioritize and schedule projects and
6 purchases using research on existing conditions affecting the CIP, public engagement to help prioritize
7 activities, and training workshops for staff to evaluate and maintain long-term projects. She concluded her
8 remarks by offering three steps to be taken by the Village: 1.) selecting a consultant to support the project; 2.)
9 creating a steering committee to guide community engagement throughout the project; and 3.) setting a
10 target kickoff date early in FY 2026. Trustees clarified the scope of CMAP's ON TO 2050 guidelines and
11 services. Mr. Day and Ms. Hegde responded to these inquiries to the Board's satisfaction. Mr. Day concluded
12 the remarks by complimenting the Village for their efforts to create a professional CIP.

13
14 President Kaz then asked for a motion to authorize the resolution as stated. Trustee Gottschall so moved, and
15 Trustee Ottsen seconded the motion.

16
17 **A roll call vote was taken as follows:**

18
19 For: Ransford, Ottsen, Hannus, Gottschall, Lojkovic, Vitu

20
21 Opposed: None

22
23 The roll call tally was six votes in favor, and none opposed. President Kaz declared the resolution authorized.

24
25 4. Action on the Following Items Pertaining to a Request for a Planned Unit Development at
26 515-519 Park Drive:

27
28 a) Public Hearing to Consider a Certificate of Appropriateness

29
30 President Kaz then turned to Item #B4a on the Board agenda by convening a Public Hearing to Consider a
31 Certificate of Appropriateness related to a Planned Unit Development at 515-519 Park Drive at 7:41 p.m. and
32 asking the Village Clerk to call the role. The results were as follows:

33
34 Trustees:

35	Trustee Tim Ransford	Present
36	Trustee Christopher Ottsen	Present
37	Trustee Amy Hannus	Present
38	Trustee John Gottschall	Present
39	Trustee Matthew Lojkovic	Present
40	Trustee Joseph Vitu	Present
41	President Cecily Kaz	Present

42
43 President Kaz then asked Mr. Michael Blue, Vice President of Planning for Teska Associate, Inc. to present on
44 this item. Mr. Blue began by reviewing the process for approving a Planned Unit Development (PUD) that
45 requires the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA). He established that the PUD was reviewed by
46 the Plan Commission (PC) which voted to recommend denial of the PUD with a vote of 4 for denial and 2 for

1 approval. The Certificate of Appropriateness was reviewed by the Architectural Review Commission (ARC)
2 which voted to recommend denial of the COA with a vote of 5 for denial, 1 abstention, and 1 absent. The final
3 decision regarding this item rests with the Village Board after the completion of the Public Hearing presently
4 in session. He reviewed four main categories of zoning regulations that impact the PUD application: 1.)
5 Permitted and Special Uses; 2.) Maximum Height Requirements; 3.) Minimum Yard Requirement; and 4.)
6 Schedule of Parking Requirements. He then reviewed specifics of the project pointing out the variance that
7 needs to be granted to approve the PUD. He then listed the four options the Board has for responding to the
8 PUD as presented: 1.) approving the Special Use Permit (SUP) and the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA);
9 2.) denying the SUP and COA; 3.) remanding consideration of the SUP and COA back to the Architectural
10 Review Commission (ARC) and/or the Plan Commission (PC) with specific instructions on aspects of the
11 requested SUP and COA for further review and consideration; or 4.) continuing to discuss the item as
12 presented among the Board. Mr. Blue then concluded his remarks.

13
14 Hearing no further discussion with Mr. Blue, President Kaz thanked him for his remarks and then invited Mr.
15 Michael Freiburger and Mr. Reed Edwards from RED3 Development, LLC, developers of the project, to present
16 on this item. Mr. Freiburger began his remarks by reviewing the process he and his colleagues have pursued
17 to bring the development concept before the Board. He turned to specific details of the proposed project, the
18 present status of the project site, and the need for a variance from the height limit for the project found in
19 the zoning code presently. He presented details of the proposed project by floor including the fourth-floor
20 penthouse that is directly affected by the height limit requirement. He reviewed efforts to minimize the
21 impact of the penthouse on sightlines, plans for a “green roof” around the living structure, plans to preserve
22 the existing tree canopy, a rendering of the architectural design from the front, from the side, and from the
23 back, as well as during the summer months, and during the winter months

24
25 Trustees commented that natural obstructions to selected sightlines do not change the fact that the building
26 will be significantly taller than surrounding structures. Mr. Freiburger continued his presentation showing
27 various renderings of the project from different perspectives to provide further context. He then reviewed
28 public documents regarding development in the area that were used to shape the dimensions of the
29 proposed SUP. To demonstrate the level of demand among real estate buyers for the project’s housing units,
30 Mr. Freiburger asked a local realtor, Ms. Laura Fitzpatrick to comment on the project’s desirability. She
31 reviewed her professional credentials and status as a long-standing Kenilworth resident. She profiled a large
32 section of the home-buying population that would find the proposed project highly desirable. Mr. Freiburger
33 concluded his remarks by describing the zoning requirements that were met with this proposed project and
34 the changes that were made in concert with the desires of the ARC, and presented a list of enhancements he
35 is willing to consider in order to convince the Board that approving the SUP would provide public benefit to
36 the Village. He concluded by reviewing less desirable development concepts that do meet all zoning
37 requirements and suggesting these would be less desirable to the Village. President Kaz thanked Mr.
38 Freiburger for his presentation and opened discussion among the members of the Board.

39
40 Trustees clarified the need for the fourth-floor penthouse to the success of the project, the parking
41 accommodations, the square footage of the retail space to be included, the approximate changes to the
42 property tax collections before and after the construction of the project, any historical precedence to
43 exceeding the 40’ variance allowed presently under the zoning code or addressing height variances using
44 setbacks, the possibility of acquiring adjacent properties, the placement of HVAC infrastructure, any traffic
45 impact studies relating to the project, the disposition of the retail space, aspects of the project’s impact on
46 shade to surrounding buildings, and commercial logistics for supporting the retail businesses.

47
48 Hearing no further discussion among the Board, President Kaz opened the discussion to the members of the
49 public. Village Attorney Mack began by swearing in all participants in accordance with the mandates of a

1 Public Hearing. Resident Mike Kelly of 504 Park Drive commented on the impact of the height of the building
2 on him personally, the process followed, the existence of a petition against approving the project, and the
3 importance of following zoning requirements. Resident Alice Read agreed with the previous speaker and
4 supported denying the height variance as being out of step with the Village character. Resident Anna Simpson
5 of 336 Sterling Road and member of the Kenilworth Plan Commission voiced her support of the project and
6 asked the Board to give the process more time for the participants to negotiate for changes that would be
7 acceptable to both sides.

8
9 Resident Greg Kirrish of 524 Melrose Avenue for over 30 years provided examples of individual real estate
10 transactions that impacted changes to the zoning code during that time that have resulted in an increase of
11 property values for surrounding properties. He urged the Board to stay within those established rules.
12 Resident Kathy Kirrish of 524 Melrose spoke about the traffic consequences of the increased residential
13 density in the area which will make the area less safe. Resident David Joyce of 534 Wayland Avenue reviewed
14 his personal history with the Village of Kenilworth and related it to the origins of the zoning restrictions
15 designed to keep Kenilworth a quiet residential community. He thought the project would make too high an
16 impact on the density of the Village and urged the Board to follow the recommendation of the ARC and PC by
17 denying the request of the developer. Resident Eric Miller of 522 Melrose reviewed his 58-year history of
18 living in the Village and supporting the bird population. He expressed satisfaction with many Village initiatives
19 but felt the proposed PUD would threaten the harmony of supporting the Village's natural habitat and was
20 not in keeping with the it's residential character. Resident Jeanne Keiler of 551 Park Drive urged the Board to
21 consider safety concerns more carefully citing personal experience to demonstrate the existing pressures on
22 parking and traffic and suggesting the proposed PUD will only worsen the problem. She felt there should be
23 greater scrutiny of the potential impact of the PUD on traffic and safety.

24
25 Resident Mark Malnati of 442 Warwick expressed support for the PUD citing how attractive it would be to him
26 as a potential residence allowing him to address existing health concerns while enabling him and his wife to
27 continue to live in close proximity to extended family. He related a personal experience with a similar project
28 requiring a zoning variance that had a satisfactory outcome and felt the PUD as proposed would too.
29 Resident Ian Fisher of 142 Abingdon expressed support for the present effort to improve the Village's housing
30 stock. He suggested that the current economic forces affecting the feasibility of a project that could satisfy
31 existing zoning restrictions could change in the future and urged the Board to be patient when considering a
32 variance to overcome those present economic realities. Resident Lois Stanley urged the Board to continue
33 pursuing the process of working within the present zoning restrictions. Resident Marjie Zander expressed
34 concern about the "findings of fact" included in the PUD application that could nullify its qualification for a
35 variance. She expressed support for following the zoning code as it presently exists. Louis Keiler of 551 Park
36 Drive clarified the author of "findings of fact" in the PUD application suggesting that they were insufficient.
37 Resident Emily Wilson at 415 Sterling did not support the variance application because of concerns about
38 height violations, density, safety, and incompatibility with Kenilworth's residential character. This concluded
39 the public comment period for the public hearing.

40
41 Hearing no further discussion, President Kaz requested a motion to close the public hearing. Trustee Ottsen
42 so moved, and Trustee Vitu seconded the motion.

43
44 **A roll call vote was taken as follows:**

45
46 For: Ransford, Ottsen, Hannus, Gottschall, Lojkovic, Vitu

47
48 Opposed: None

49

1 The roll call tally was 6 votes in favor, and none opposed. President Kaz declared the public hearing closed at
2 9:17 p.m.

3
4 President Kaz then turned to Item #B4b on the Board agenda.

5
6 b) Ordinance Granting a Special Use Permit to RED3 Development LLC for a
7 Preliminary Planned Unit Development and Approving a Certificate of
8 Appropriateness

9
10 After Village Attorney Mack reviewed the options available to the Board for action on this item which
11 included: 1.) approving the Special Use Permit (SUP) and the Certificate of Appropriateness (COA); 2.) denying
12 the SUP and COA; 3.) remanding consideration of the SUP and COA back to the Architectural Review
13 Commission (ARC) and/or the Plan Commission (PC) with specific instructions on aspects of the requested SUP
14 and COA for further review and consideration; or 4.) continuing to discuss the item as presented among the
15 Board. President Kaz turned to the Board members for comments. Trustees acknowledged the input of
16 specialized commissions like ARC and PC, the developers of the project, and resident input. They echoed
17 concern for careful judgment when considering the approval of development proposals in general, and those
18 requiring a variation from the Village's Zoning Code in particular. They recognized the careful consideration
19 undertaken by both the ARC and PC and the resulting recommendation by both groups to deny the
20 application for variance. They went on to describe concern about striking a potential imbalance between
21 providing a benefit to the developer by granting the zoning variance without receiving a requisite benefit in
22 the best interests of the Village. They expressed a frustration with the pace of development in the Village and
23 acknowledged the developer's expressed desire to make whatever economically feasible changes to the
24 project he could to gain the Board's approval of the SUP and COA. A consensus was reached to continue
25 discussion among the Board regarding the specific instructions on aspects of the requested SUP and COA for
26 further review and consideration by the ARC and/or the PC that will be included when the item is remanded
27 back to them. An upcoming Committee of the Whole meeting scheduled for January 26, 2026, recast as a
28 Special Meeting of the Board, was identified as the forum for this discussion. President Kaz recognized
29 resident Jeanne Keiler who sought clarification of the finding of facts referred to in the SUP and COA request.
30 Village Attorney Mack addressed those concerns. Resident David Joyce asked for clarification on public
31 participation during this Special Meeting. Village Attorney Mack addressed those concerns. President Kaz
32 reminded meeting participants that they are always welcome to write to the Board to express any concerns
33 they have.

34
35 Hearing no further discussion, President Kaz asked for a motion to continue the discussion of this item among
36 the Board at a Special Meeting scheduled for January 26, 2026 at 6:00 pm. Trustee Vitu so moved, and
37 Trustee Ransford seconded the motion.

38
39 **A voice vote was taken as follows:**

40
41 For: A majority

42
43 Opposed: A minority

44

1 President Kaz declared the motion adopted.

2

3 President Kaz then turned to reports from staff and asked Police Chief Silva to address the Board.

4

5 **Report from Staff**

6 A. Community Development

7 B. Finance

8 C. Police

9

10 Chief Silva reviewed his monthly report on police activity for the prior month. These included traffic safety in
11 the school area of the Village, home security surveillance, and community engagement. There was no
12 significant criminal activity to report for this time period. He announced changes he will be making to the
13 tabulation of police activity statistics going forward and reviewed staffing developments and professional
14 training activity.

15 D. Public Works

16 There was nothing to report.

17 E. Legal Counsel

18 There was nothing to report

19 F. Village Manager

20 Village Manager Thake reviewed payment activity of property taxes due the Village from Cook County.

21

22 **Business from the Public**

23

24 President Kaz asked whether there was any business from the public on items not on the agenda. There was
25 none.

26

27 **Adjourn**

28

29 Having no further business, President Kaz asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Trustee Lojkovic so
30 moved, and Trustee Ottsen seconded the motion.

31

32 **A voice vote was taken as follows:**

33

34 For: All

35

36 Opposed: None

37

38 President Kaz declared the meeting adjourned at 9:43 p.m.

39