



VILLAGE · OF · WINNETKA

Incorporated in 1869

Winnetka Plan Commission

Meeting Notice

Wednesday, May 25, 2016

The **Winnetka Plan Commission** will convene a regular meeting on Wednesday, May 25, 2016 in the Council Chambers of Winnetka Village Hall, 510 Green Bay Road, Winnetka, Illinois, at **7:00 P.M.**

Agenda

1. Welcome of new Plan Commission members Andrew Cripe (Village Trustee) and Mary Hickey (Zoning Board of Appeals)
2. Adoption of January 27, 2016 and February 24, 2016 meeting minutes;
3. Discussion and adoption of Plan Commission public hearing rules and procedures.

Note: Public comment is permitted on all agenda items.

The Village of Winnetka, in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, requests that persons with disabilities, who require certain accommodations to allow them to observe and/or participate in this meeting or have questions about the accessibility of the meeting facilities, contact the Village ADA Coordinator, at 510 Green Bay Road, Winnetka, Illinois 60093 (telephone: (847) 716-3541; T.T.Y.: (847) 501-6041), no less than 3 working days before the hearing date.

**00WINNETKA PLAN COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 27, 2016**

Members Present: Tina Dalman, Chairperson
Caryn Rosen Adelman
Mamie Case
Jack Coladarci
Dana Fattore Crumley
John Golan
Keta McCarthy
Jeanne Morette
John Thomas

Non-voting Members Present: None

Members Absent: Chris Blum
Paul Dunn
Carol Fessler
Louise Holland

Village Staff: Brian Norkus, Assistant Director of Community
Development

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Dalman at 7:00 p.m.

Chairperson Dalman stated that the first agenda item related to the adoption of the September 30, 2015 and October 21, 2015 meeting minutes. She stated that Mr. Thomas has made a good recommendation and that in the future for any Commission members who have corrections, clarifications and modifications to get those in to Mr. Norkus ahead of time or after the meeting so that they do not take up time during the meeting which is the proposal. Chairperson Dalman asked if anyone objected.

Ms. Adelman referred to the minutes containing misquotations.

Chairperson Dalman noted that the draft and corrected minutes are posted on the Village's website. Chairperson Dalman asked Ms. Adelman if she is requesting that there be some notation in the record which indicated that a Commission member has corrected the record. She commented that is a good point and that she agreed with Ms. Adelman's recommendation. Chairperson Dalman then stated that they would leave it as it is unless anyone else has any objection. She stated that Mr. Thomas has some corrections to be made to the minutes.

Mr. Thomas stated that he had no corrections and made a motion to approve the September 30,

2015 meeting minutes.

Ms. McCarthy stated that she had a question about the minutes and referred the Commission to page nos. 23 and 27 that Ms. Case brought to her attention with regard to the subdivision and the recommendations. She stated that the question is that when Chairperson Dalman asked if there was public comment, the discussion went on to Richard Sobel's comments with regard to One Winnetka. Ms. McCarthy asked if that made sense in terms of where it is placed in the minutes.

Chairperson Dalman stated that this was not the meeting where the Commission only took public comment with regard to One Winnetka.

Mr. Golan referred to the meeting where the Commission took public comment and where Mr. Sobel spoke again.

Chairperson Dalman stated that with regard to the rush for that, they had spent so much time and had six or seven meetings with extensive public comment and that every time the Commission asked for public comment, their discussion got truncated. She stated that they wanted to make sure that they had their discussion and deliberation. Chairperson Dalman stated that contrary to public belief, the Commission did not have to provide for public comment immediately following an agenda item so long as there is an opportunity for public comment at any time during the meeting. She then confirmed that the placement is correct and noted that there is a motion.

Mr. Thomas asked as a matter of forum at the back end of the minutes, there are recommendations and conditions and that the Commission asked the Village Council to pay attention to One Winnetka and that they came up with an 8 to 2 vote. He then stated that in the newspapers and public material, the applicant has been saying that the 8 to 2 vote supported their proposal with no mention of the conditions and that it is misleading. Mr. Thomas asked if there is anything they can do to correct that or should they let it ride and wait for the Village Council.

Chairperson Dalman stated that it is very clear that the Commission's recommendation was conditioned and that they should keep in mind that it is only a recommendation and that those conditions can be reviewed, considered or ignored by the Village Council. She agreed that it is very misleading.

Mr. Thomas stated that he is content with what the Commission has here.

Ms. Adelman stated that they could ask the speaker for a retraction.

Chairperson Dalman asked the Commission members to make sure that everyone is comfortable with the conditions. The Commission members agreed that is fine.

Chairperson Dalman then stated that there is a pending motion with regard to the approval of the September 30, 2015 meeting minutes. Ms. McCarthy seconded the motion. The meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

Chairperson Dalman then asked if there were any comments or corrections to be made to the

October 21, 2015 minutes. No comments were made at this time. She then asked for a motion.

A motion was made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Mr. Golan to approve the Plan Commission meeting minutes from October 21, 2015. The meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

Consideration of Proposed Subdivision of 5 Indian Hill Road (Continued From November 2015 Meeting)

Chairperson Dalman noted that she was not at the meeting but that she read the minutes. She then swore in everyone who would be speaking on this matter.

Mr. Norkus stated that he would provide a brief staff discussion first. He began by stating that the request was introduced at the October meeting and that following the applicants' presentation and public comment, the matter was continued to request that the Village staff provide additional background information. Mr. Norkus stated that in addition to public comment, in the packets of material and as stated at the October meeting, two communications were received in November which were erroneously left out of the packet. He noted that the emailed and hard copies are here. Mr. Norkus then stated that with regard to the October meeting, the Commission requested that the Village staff provide additional context to the specific application since the request is for relief from the subdivision code and the zoning code.

Mr. Norkus then stated that to provide the Commission with additional context, included in the packet of materials as Attachment C is the result of the Village staff's lookback at the Commission's request in connection with the history of subdivision applications from 1990 to the current date. He indicated that there is a summary in the report from page nos. 18 to 31 describing the 50 subdivision requests submitted to the Village and summarizing that 17 applications of these 50 that include a request from the zoning code or subdivision code relief. Mr. Norkus then stated that he would like to point to one particular element of the report in that it breaks down the subdivision by the different types and variations involving lot splits. He noted that they are highlighted from page nos. 25 to 34. Mr. Norkus also stated that of the lot split applications, there are nine total lot splits with five of those having variations approved. He added that one lot split variation was denied and that three were withdrawn by the applicant.

Mr. Norkus also stated that provided in the package on page 2 are the identities of the location of subdivision property in the boundaries of the surrounding R-2 zoning district and included an attachment of the rundown of lot sizes in the R-2 district which includes a wide range of lot sizes ranging from 10,000 square feet to 85,000 square feet for the subject property. He indicated that it is rather unique in that there is quite a bit of variation in lot size in the R-2 district.

Mr. Norkus informed the Commission that the variations being requested with this subdivision are discussed on page nos. 5 to 9 of the agenda report. He noted that there are four categories of relief being requested by the subdivision which are described in detail in the packet.

Mr. Norkus then stated that in October, the first variation was for the lot to have less than the minimum 200 foot lot depth. He referred the Commission to an illustration and also referred to Figure 3 in the packet of information on page 5 and that the illustration showed the measurement

of the lot depth for both proposed lots. Mr. Norkus noted that the west lot is measured in depth from east to west based on the ordinance definitions and procedures which stipulate that lot depth be measured from its extreme line. He then stated that for the east lot, by virtue of the adjacent street to the north, the lot depth is measured from the street to the north to south lot line. Mr. Norkus also stated that the east lot would have a nonconforming 160 foot depth. He then stated that he would like to remind the Commission that the lot depth variation request is under the jurisdiction of the zoning ordinance but that it is also a component of the subdivision request.

Mr. Norkus went on to state that the second request is for relief from the minimum rectangular area requirement. He stated that the October agenda report noted that the application required relief from the rectangular area requirement for both lots. Mr. Norkus then stated that in researching the subdivision variation history, it was determined that the application did not require relief from that standard. He stated that there is a lot of information in the packet and that they determined that there was a scrivener's error in 2002 when zoning was introduced and the unintended change to the zoning language and made the rectangular area requirement more difficult to achieve than was previously written. Mr. Norkus also stated that there was consultation with the Village Attorney and the Village staff determined that the application did not need relief from the rectangular area requirement.

Mr. Norkus then stated that with regard to the third variation request for GFA, due to the fact that the west lot would have a proposed size of 38,698 square feet and that while it complied with the minimum lot area requirements, it would be inadequately sized to accommodate the size of the existing home and garage. He also stated that the Village has a limit of the bulk of structures on residential lots in relation to the lot's size. Mr. Norkus stated that for the existing improvements on the west lot based on the proposed configuration of the two lots, the home and garage would exceed the maximum permitted GFA for the west lot by 262 square feet. He added that with regard to the variation, it is a standard variation request considered by the ZBA.

Mr. Norkus informed the Commission that the Commission's jurisdiction in terms of requests for relief related to standard no. 4 which prohibited the creation of a condition where a side yard would abut a rear yard. He then referred the Commission to Figure 6 on page 8 of the agenda report which was used in October to illustrate the basis for the amendment to the subdivision code in 1999 and that the new language related to the fact that a subdivision shall not be created which would result in a side yard abutting a rear yard. Mr. Norkus also referred the Commission to an illustration and stated that there is one particular difficulty in that side lots abutting rear lots is perceived to be more disruptive than regular lots. He stated that the illustration was a significant factor to amending that code. Mr. Norkus also referred the Commission to an illustration of other side yards abutting rear yards.

Ms. Adelman asked Mr. Norkus if the history is because of the Historical Society.

Mr. Norkus responded that the Ash and Linden subdivision complied with the code at that time.

Ms. Adelman asked if it applied after that.

Mr. Norkus stated that language was drafted which prohibited conditions like that. He then

referred the Commission to an illustration of the current application which has a similar condition with side lot lines abutting rear lot lines. Mr. Norkus stated that with regard to the easterly lot, he identified the side lot line as well as the front yard and the other side yard. He noted that it abutted the rear yard of the Church Road property. Mr. Norkus also stated that the west lot would be nonconforming existing between lots 1 and 2 and that the west lot has a rear lot line which he identified for the Commission which abutted the side line of the other lot.

Ms. Adelman questioned the flag portion of the lot.

Mr. Norkus stated that by definition, it is referred to as a flag lot which is owned by the applicants and which provided access to the subject property.

Ms. Adelman asked if it counted toward square footage.

Mr. Coladarci responded that it did not.

Chairperson Dalman asked if it counted toward the total coverage.

Mr. Norkus informed the Commission that there was a similar recent amendment which excluded the access way to not be considered as part of the lot area.

Mr. Thomas asked how did they count impermeable and permeable surface.

Mr. Norkus stated that to some degree, it is relevant and that to the extent that the lot area is considered a part of the lot area for zoning purposes, while it is saying that it is not a part of the lot area, all impermeable surfaces in that access way would count toward the maximum permitted.

Chairperson Dalman stated that to be clear, although they are seeking a subdivision which needed four variations and three of which are under the ZBA's purview, one is before the Commission. She also confirmed that there is no overlapping jurisdiction over the other three.

Mr. Norkus confirmed that is correct.

Ms. McCarthy asked with regard to the east lot, is the side lot going toward west lot.

Mr. Norkus confirmed that is correct and that is only to consider lot lines.

Ms. McCarthy then asked if the flag is the driveway.

Mr. Norkus confirmed that is correct and that it is used to access the coach home. He then referred to it as private property and a private drive.

Chairperson Dalman asked why the easterly lot line is not the front yard.

Mr. Norkus responded that when a lot has an abutting street as on north, by definition, it is the front yard.

Ms. Adelman asked how did they get into the other property if it is not accessed by Indian Hill.

Mr. Norkus stated that the east lot access continued from the flag.

Chairperson Dalman stated that the applicant is saying that part of the hardship is that the property is surrounded by three streets so what is the front yard. She stated that it is dictated by code.

Ms. Case asked if the driveway was added and if the applicants were always there. She also asked if the east lot would only have Church Road access.

The applicants confirmed that is correct.

Mrs. Gill added that there is a brick wall there.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other comments for Mr. Norkus.

Mr. Thomas stated that to clarify, the scrivener's error was a typo which was not caught.

Mr. Golan asked why is the side yard and rear yard conflict a part of the Commission's jurisdiction versus zoning.

Mr. Norkus responded that it is the standard of the subdivision code. He also stated that it was seen at the time of the amendment as an approach mechanically to address this concept. Mr. Norkus stated that it is assumed because it is quantitative in nature and more quality in nature in terms of a side yard abutting a rear yard and that it is best to have it as a subdivision standard.

Mr. Golan then asked how many side yard-rear yard conflicts exist. He noted that he has five near him and that he imagined that they are commonplace in the Village.

Mr. Norkus indicated that he cannot guess but that they are not infrequent.

Chairperson Dalman agreed that it is common.

Mr. Norkus stated that the illustration identified two instances where they exist on adjoining properties.

Chairperson Dalman asked if the problem was the adopted restriction in 2002.

Mr. Norkus stated that it was the Village's attempt to minimize the creation of additional conflicts.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other questions.

Ms. McCarthy stated that the larger home is on the west lot. She then asked that by subdivision, what did that mean for the existing structure. Ms. McCarthy also asked if any consideration was given on the existing home.

Mr. Norkus stated that reducing the lot size had many consequences such as they cannot do a future addition or expand the size of the home without zoning relief.

Ms. McCarthy stated that the pool overlapped but questioned if the other structures fit.

Mr. Norkus stated that the existing nonconformity is explained in the agenda report and that the home and garage are both closer than the required setback from the north property line. He also stated that the pool would be closer than the requirement setback from the north lot line and that the coach home would be closer than required to the setback.

Ms. Adelman referred to the intent of owners in the future.

Mr. Coladarci stated that is part of the subdivision ordinance. He then referred the Commission to page 9 and the last paragraph and stated that they had that question at the last meeting. Mr. Coladarci stated that with regard to what the neighbors are getting at with their comments, the burden is on the petitioner to show difficulty, hardship and injustice. He noted that increasing salability is not what the ordinance intended to address and that as it was stated back then, the applicants can subdivide the property and can sell it for money. Mr. Coladarci stated that the question was how hardship was demonstrated in the past.

Mr. Norkus stated that he cannot provide ample samples.

Chairperson Dalman stated that Ms. Case's concern is if it is approved, it creates a nonconformity for the existing structure and that it would be very difficult for future owners to ask for a variation. She stated that it would be very difficult to satisfy that once the subdivision is created. Chairperson Dalman also stated that the nonconformity would not be created over time but when the action was that of an owner and that it is reasonable to expect that a future owner would have a hard time getting a variation.

Mr. Coladarci asked what if they were to level everything and clear the lot.

Chairperson Dalman stated that they can do that and the new construction would have to conform.

Mr. Thomas referred to the ZBA and the new building not creating a variation.

Ms. Case stated that if the west lot is cleared, the front is the small side and the back is the side yard of the abutting lot.

Chairperson Dalman indicated that it is important to hear from the applicants and how they thought about the issues. She stated that the Commission would give them an opportunity to respond to the comments.

Lisa Rizzolo introduced herself to the Commission as the architect and stated that she would provide background. She informed the Commission that the two homes and the coach home were built in 1922 as the Wynwyd Estate. Ms. Rizzolo then stated that in 1999, the applicants restored

the home and coach home and added a pool and a pool house. She informed the Commission that the current lot measured 1.96 acres and that the uniqueness of the lot is that it contained roads on all four sides. Ms. Rizzolo added that she is not sure if there is another lot in Winnetka like this. She also stated that it is noteworthy that the main home is addressed as 5 Indian Hill and that the coach home has an address of 116 Church Road with separate utilities and bills.

Chairperson Dalman asked did they consider it an historical lot prior to the establishment of the plat act regulations.

Ms. Rizzolo responded that they did not.

Chairperson Dalman then asked when were the separate addresses established.

Mrs. Gill responded before they bought the home.

Mr. Norkus informed the Commission that the zoning ordinance is silent on street addresses as far as that being a standard for being a determination of a lot's status.

Ms. Rizzolo then stated that they spent a lot of time with Mr. Norkus to figure out where the front side yard is, etc. She also stated that in terms of the surrounding neighborhoods, she identified the north lot ranges on an illustration with the lot sizes of the homes. Ms. Rizzolo also identified the rear yard, front yard and side yard of both lots and stated that the lots would still be substantially larger than the surrounding lots. She then identified the lots to Church and the lot sizes which are smaller than the proposed lots.

Ms. Rizzolo stated that the request is to subdivide the property into two lots. She identified lot 1 on the illustration for the Commission which has the home, coach house and garage. Ms. Rizzolo also identified the entrance which would remain the same and the driveway to Church. She then identified lot 2 and the entrance off of Church and informed the Commission that the new lot would contain the guest home, pool and the existing pool home. Ms. Rizzolo noted that they would not be touching any trees with the subdivision. She then stated that the lots meet the minimum lot size requirement of 24,000 square feet and 25,200 square feet for the corner lot.

Ms. Rizzolo informed the Commission that what they were struggling with is the side yard to rear yard which she identified for the Commission. She stated that she would like to point out that they understand why the code is in effect. Ms. Rizzolo stated that now, it is a 220 foot deep lot and that they have garages in the backs of the properties and noted that their side lot goes to their garages. She also stated that the side lot in the R-2 district is a 12 foot minimum and that there is 39.23 feet which she indicated is substantially further away than the code requirement. Ms. Rizzolo then identified the 25 foot backyard on the east and 39 feet which resulted in 64.23 feet from the side yard to the back yard.

Ms. Adelman stated that with regard to the lots on Church, she referred to the home closet to the driveway and 112 Church and asked if their garage is not accessed from the driveway.

Ms. McCarthy stated that there is a separate driveway.

Ms. Rizzolo stated that the subdivision stated that there must be unusual conditions and that this lot is an unusual condition. She stated that it contained roads on all four sides and that it is an oversized lot and that by the subdivision, it would still be larger than any of the larger properties around them. Ms. Rizzolo referred the neighbors' concerns with regard to changing the character of the neighborhood and stated that it would be much larger. She also stated that if the home on lot 2 was to come down, it would have to meet the requirements of the footprint which would result in a win-win with the new home being located further away. Ms. Rizzolo added that with regard to impervious surface and the neighbors' concerns, that is a zoning issue. She informed the Commission that with regard to the traffic to Church and Indian Hill, lot 2 would always exit to Church. Ms. Rizzolo also referred to the openness to the golf course as well as the fact that there is an abundance of trees. She then referred the Commission to an illustration of the trees and reiterated that the lots would be substantially larger than the neighboring lots.

Ms. Case asked if they cannot access the east lot off of Indian Hill.

Ms. Rizzolo responded that they could not and referred to 6 to 12 foot wall. She noted that the other side is owned by the golf course. Ms. Rizzolo indicated that they could pursue talking to the country club and that they would not be thrilled if a hole was cut in the wall.

Ms. Case questioned whether they would want access off of Indian Hill and is that allowable.

Ms. Rizzolo responded that the land is owned by the country club.

Chairperson Dalman stated that with regard to changing the access, would that change the character of the rear yard, side yard, etc.

Mr. Norkus stated that they would have to drive through that and that they would have to acquire a portion of the property and it would become additional front yard. He also stated that the rear yard would become the front yard.

Ms. Rizzolo asked if they wanted a driveway there, would they have to come before the Commission.

Mr. Norkus confirmed that is correct.

Ms. McCarthy stated that the other issues would still be there.

Mr. Golan asked why would the west lot be small enough which makes the home nonconforming.

Ms. Rizzolo stated that as they looked at it, part of it related to trees. She informed the Commission that there is a 30 foot high evergreen and that they want to stay away from those.

Mr. Norkus informed the Commission that it would require another variation by jogging the side lot lines and that it would not be permitted under the subdivision code. He also stated that the subdivision ordinance contemplated side lines perpendicular to front lot lines and for them to be

straight.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other questions. She then asked how does hardship affect the variance request.

Mr. Golan stated that if there was no road to the north, the front of the home would be the rear yard.

Mr. Norkus stated that if Indian Hill did not abut, he identified the front yard for lot 2 and the side yard and rear yard for lot 2.

Mr. Golan stated that either way, it would be nonconforming.

Ms. Adelman stated that you can replace trees or a wall and asked what if they did not own part of the wall.

A gentleman in the audience identified the front doors and rear yard and stated that the ordinance flips the yard.

Mr. Thomas asked why can the property line not be run through trees.

Chairperson Dalman stated that would create difficulty.

Mr. Coladarci asked why the wall that fronts on the street is not fully owned by the property.

Ms. Rizzolo responded that is where it falls on the property. She then stated that it is a private street and is part of the other property.

The gentleman stated that it was back in time before the subdivision and that part of the wall was theirs and other properties.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other questions. No additional questions were raised by the Commission at this time. She then asked if there were any questions from the audience. Chairperson Dalman asked for the audience to be mindful of repeat commentary.

Dana Connell informed the Commission that he and his wife live at 2 Indian Hill and that there would be other neighbors who would like to speak whose time might be limited and that he would like to explain their position. He also stated that he was confused when they first got together in October and that he worked hard to understand what the issues were. Mr. Connell informed the Commission that he provided a six page letter signed by 14 of them against the request and that as Mr. Norkus noted, the letter was not initially in the packet and has since been rectified. He stated that he initially planned to focus on the side yard and rear yard issue and if there was an existing zoning conformity issue that they need to decide. Mr. Connell then stated that if they deny the request on the side yard abutting the rear yard issue, but that if there was an existing zoning conformity issue, he referred to Section 16.12.10(b)4 and stated that it should be left to the Commission.

Mr. Connell then stated that the burden is on the applicant to show why the subdivision request should be granted. He stated that it is undisputed that the proposed subdivision would result in two side lot lines that would abut rear lot lines. Mr. Connell informed the Commission that if the subdivision is granted, there would be two neighbors at 102 Church and 112 Church who would have their rear yards abut the side yards of the neighbors from lot 2. He stated that the opposition was understandable and made known.

Mr. Connell also stated that the proposed situation is expressly prohibited by the ordinance which he read to the Commission. He stated that with regard to the history of the provision, it was passed in 1999 by the Village Council with regard to the ordinance and resolution which noted that the placement of side yards abutting rear yards is not favored by the American Planning Association and site planning which he commented is for obvious reasons. Mr. Connell then stated that Mr. Coladarci pointed out that the only way for the applicants to get around this express prohibition is if they can fit into the exception from Section 16.12. He informed the Commission that they have addressed this on page nos. 3 to 4 of their letter which he referred to as a narrowly drawn exception and that it created a series of at least four hurdles that the applicants would have to get over.

Mr. Connell stated that the first hurdle is that the applicants have to show that the property has an unusual size or shape or that it is surrounded by such development or unusual conditions. He then stated that the property does not have an unusual shape and that it is rectangular. Mr. Connell stated that secondly, the roads which surround the property are the same roads that were there when the applicants purchased the property. He stated that the second hurdle is that the applicants have to show that the application of subdivision rules would create real difficulties and substantial hardships or injustices which he stated is not the case here and that there are no real difficulties or substantial hardships. Mr. Connell informed the Commission that the property is currently listed for sale for \$5,695,000. He added that of all of those 50 subdivision applications, this is only the second one since 1990 where the applicants have to make everything work and have to get permission from the ZBA and the Commission in terms of the subdivision and zoning requirements. Mr. Connell stated that he had a lot of trouble seeing that there is a hardship or injustice here.

Mr. Connell then stated that with regard to the third hurdle, the applicants have to show that they would be developing the land in a reasonable manner. He stated that the applicants have asked to ignore the requirement. Mr. Connell then stated that the fourth hurdle with the subdivision related to the public health, safety, welfare and convenience being protected. He noted that their welfare and convenience as neighbors would be impacted.

Mr. Connell then referred to the discussion about the different cases before the Commission and to show why the applications were denied. He noted that an overwhelming majority of the subdivisions did not require relief and that only 17 required relief. Mr. Connell noted that with regard to the five which were granted, there were a lot less significant issues in connection with the rear yard abutting the side yard. He stated that he asked Mr. Norkus has the Commission since 1999 when the ordinance was passed ever approved an exception to ignore the side yard and rear yard issue and that the answer was that it never happened. Mr. Connell noted that there was only one application in 50 which involved rear yards abutting side yards which was not approved and

was withdrawn. He stated that if the Commission concluded to approve the subdivision for a side yard abutting a rear yard, they would be creating a precedent. Mr. Connell also stated that there has never been such a subdivision of a lot that was granted since the ordinance was passed in 1999. He concluded by stating that explained why the neighbors were opposed and why the Commission should deny question.

Chairperson Dalman stated that to clarify and elaborate, regardless of the subdivision, it would not be conforming.

Mr. Connell referred the Commission to page 10 with regard to other factors for consideration which identify four and that in the event of an existing nonconformity, the ordinance required the Commission to make a determination.

Mr. Norkus stated that they touched briefly on the nonconformities of the coach home relative to the setback and the other nonconformity. He stated that in addition to the rear yard and side yard, the Commission is also to consider the nonconformity in the context of the subdivision and to determine whether there would be a material increased adverse impact.

Ms. Morette questioned whether the solid brick line which is the outer line existed today. She also asked if the subdivision line is in the middle. Ms. Morette then referred to 112 Church and 102 Church which are nonconforming already.

Mr. Norkus responded that the current single lot front yard of lot 1 is identified and that for lot 2, the rear yard is abutting the rear yard. He stated that the crux is whether it would be worthy of granting relief. Mr. Norkus noted that the ordinance provides precise language in terms of what constituted a rear yard, front yard and side yard and that the front is the narrower of the two streets and that the others then fall into place.

Mr. Connell stated that it is close and that the burden is on the claimant. He then stated that because there would be a clear violation of the subdivision ordinance, the issue is whether they have met the burden and that there are four hurdles for the Commission to consider to grant the subdivision.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other comments.

Joan Hudson informed the Commission that they did a subdivision a few years ago and that the lot was subdivided from the original lot. She also stated that part of the side yard abutted a backyard and that they had success with that three years ago.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other comments.

Ernie Macvicar, 1 Indian Hill, stated that he supported the points Mr. Connell made. He stated that he would like to add that first, the property is unique in that it is bordered on four sides. Mr. Macvicar then stated that if one of the roads was imposed on the property after its purchase by the applicants, they would have his sympathy. He noted that the property is as it was then and that there has been no change. Mr. Macvicar also stated that the property already had multiple

variations and that to do a subdivision would be adding more. He then stated that when it is done, at what point are there too many variations on a property. Mr. Macvicar stated that lastly, with regard to permeable land and the way that the lot lines are drawn, the subdivided property to the east would be bigger. He stated that the home which was built is massive and that there is lot of square footage. Mr. Macvicar referred to riding bicycles and that when there is a lot of rain, the road flooded. He added that the water would run to the west and would impact the other neighbors.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other comments.

Laura Connell, 2 Indian Hill, stated that in the Village, there have been so many new construction homes with the maximum allowable buildable area on a property. She noted that theirs is the only one which is not new construction and that so much has been built that fulfilled the requirements that when one is proposed that does not fulfill the requirements, it should be denied.

Karen Hawkins, 3 Indian Hill, stated that she would like to reiterate Ms. Adelman and Mrs. Connell's comments. She added that she signed the document.

Barb Sheridan, 7 Indian Hill, informed the Commission that she lived to the west of the applicants and agreed with the comments made.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other comments. No additional comments were made by the audience at this time. She then stated that there would be discussion and deliberation from the Commission. Chairperson Dalman asked the Commission members if they had any other questions for Mr. Norkus.

Ms. McCarthy asked will it set a precedent or exceptions as identified in the packet.

Chairperson Dalman stated that there would only be a precedent if all of the facts are the same. She noted that there are a lot of distinguishing characteristics and that she did not know how many lots of this size have similar restrictions and character.

Mr. Coladarci stated that the decisions are not a precedent to subsequent cases.

Chairperson Dalman asked the Commission to remember that they are making a recommendation to the Village Council and that they are not the final decision maker. She noted that the request would also go to the ZBA and the Village Council.

Mr. Thomas asked if the Village recommended that it would be ok, would that set a precedent.

Ms. Adelman stated that whether or not they like the subdivision, but the rear yard to side yard issue set aside is taking into consideration the increase in the amount of the existing nonconformity.

Chairperson Dalman confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Coladarci referred the Commission to page 7 of the materials with regard to the buildable area as a result from the subdivision demonstrates a bind of the neighbors. He noted that the property has been for sale for a while and that it is a big amount of land. Mr. Coladarci stated that the lot is supposed to be big in this district. He also stated that with regard to the square footage of all of the surrounding properties, this one being the biggest would not make it out of character with others in the area. Mr. Coladarci stated that the question comes down to whether the case has been made for the subdivision and referred to the Connells' letter which said it. He stated that when you say that you have to show and the burden is on the petitioner to show that there is more than to the potential to sell the east lot. Mr. Coladarci then stated that in connection with the size of the buildable lot, it is a big property and taking into account the trees, it will be bigger than other homes in the neighborhood. He stated that it is more than just having streets on three sides and that condition was prior to the applicants' purchase. Mr. Coladarci stated that the code tells them that they have to have a showing and not just lip service of hardship which has not been shown yet. He stated that is the reason that the ordinance was written the way it was and that it is the Commission's job to preserve the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Coladarci concluded by stating that the applicants have not met that burden.

Mr. Thomas stated that he did not agree with Mr. Coladarci's comments and that he is glad that he is not on the ZBA. He referred to the side yard and rear yard not rattling the cage. Mr. Thomas added that the 102 Church and 112 Church neighbors did not bother him and that he would approve the request.

Ms. Morette referred to having a property on the market a long time and difficulty in selling it and that it is large is a big hardship to her. She noted that the issue existed already on the west lot as the subdivision goes and described it as a matter of semantics. Ms. Morette also stated that they would not be changing anything and that the subdivision would go down the middle of the property. She then stated that the lots after the subdivision would be so large and would have green spaces between the yards which are larger than most. She concluded by stating that there would be not public health or safety issues.

Ms. Adelman stated that she is all over the place. She then referred to the brick wall and garages and the one piece which looked at the golf course. Ms. Adelman described it as a great property and that there is an opportunity to have two great properties. She indicated that she did not see the hardship with that and that the Commission is responsible for dealing with the rear yard to side yard issue. Ms. Adelman stated that there are lots of other rear yard to side yard situations and that she would abstain from the vote and is not comfortable with the decision.

Ms. Case stated that she agreed with Mr. Coladarci's comments and that she did not feel that the burden has been met. She also stated that technically, it would not set a precedent, but that if they were to look at the entire R-2 district in the Indian Hill area, there are lot of other larger properties but that if the applicants cannot sell the property or if the home is skewed awkwardly on the property, she stated that she felt that they would go right go down the same route as well. Ms. Case stated that she found that the fact that there is an ordinance, there is a reason for this and that they should not mess with it.

Ms. McCarthy stated that she is undecided. She indicated that she understood the concerns of the

neighbors and that there are two very large properties. Ms. McCarthy also stated that is very evident when there. She also stated that she is uncomfortable how the lot would be divided in terms of square footage. Ms. McCarthy stated that on the other hand, Mr. Coladarci stated that the lots would be smaller and that the average size of all of the lots is 34,000 square feet and that these would be 34,000 square feet and 36,000 which she commented are big lots. She then stated that made her think that the lot could be divided and that she should say yes but that there are other concerns. Ms. McCarthy concluded by stating that she did not know which way she would be leaning toward the fact and that since they are large lots, perhaps it should be but that unfortunately, divided.

Mr. Golan stated that he agreed with all of the comments made and at the end of the day, the burden is on the owners to show that there is a hardship which he stated he is not sure was done. He also stated that they have to show that the property would be developed in a reasonable manner and that they have no idea how the property will be developed and if it would be developed in a reasonable manner.

Ms. Crumley stated that she would agree and that in order to determine whether there is a hardship, they do not have all of the facts and information. She then stated that it is going to be difficult to sell at over \$5 million and that it would not be a property which would sell instantly since the available buyers would not be the same pool of buyers of a smaller lot. Ms. Crumley stated that in and of itself constituted a hardship. She stated that she also agreed that the lots would be big regardless which she did not see as an issue but that if they were go to what the ordinance says, she is not sure that it has been met.

Chairperson Dalman stated that she would like to echo the pros and cons. She described it as a challenging application and that they rarely see a subdivision application where it resulted in two lots satisfying the minimum lot requirements and that it is an extremely large lot. Chairperson Dalman indicated that it is one of the largest lots in Winnetka. She then stated that while it meets the minimum lot requirements, but they have no good provision with regard to the rear yard and side yard issue.

Chairperson Dalman then stated that with regard to bulk in the Village, there are conflicts all over and that there is unfairness there yet there was something which was recently adopted. She described the proposal as being thoughtfully done but that she did not see justification for the variance request. Chairperson Dalman also stated that if they approve the subdivision, she questioned how they would address the nonconformity with the existing structure. She indicated that she is not comfortable making a recommendation to approve.

Mr. Thomas asked how long has the property been on the market.

Chairperson Dalman stated that is not in the official record and that it is clear that if it has been a long time, there is a hardship. She also stated that they would be looking at a couple of homes' views being wiped out if the second lot is sold.

Ms. Adelman stated that they cannot take the real estate market as a contention.

Mrs. Gill stated that is not their intention.

Chairperson Dalman stated that there has been good evidence, testimony and discussion to be sent to the Village Council to make a determination. She then asked for a motion on a recommendation. Chairperson Dalman referred to there not being enough votes to support and questioned whether they should make a recommendation for nonconforming buildings.

Mr. Norkus stated that they should not.

Chairperson Dalman then referred the Commission to page 10 in the packet of materials and asked for a motion to recommend to the Village Council the denial of the application for variance from Section 16.12.010(d) with regard to no side lot line abutting a rear yard lot line.

A motion was made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Mr. Golan. A vote was taken and the motion was passed 5 to 2 with one abstention.

AYES:	Dalman, Case, Coladarci, Golan, McCarthy
NAYS:	Morette, Thomas
ABSTAINED:	Adelman

Consideration of Request for Special Use Permit Request by Verizon Wireless for Wireless Facilities at 554 Green Bay Road

Mark Layne of Insite, Inc., of Oakbrook Terrace, IL, introduced himself as representing Verizon Wireless. Mr. Layne explained that the proposed installation differs from traditional equipment installed by carriers on large towers. He explained that this proposed antenna is being requested to supplement the backbone network by providing additional capacity for data usage, particularly during peak usage periods.

Mr. Layne explained that the proposed antenna at 554 Green Bay Road would be providing additional data capacity near the downtown Winnetka Metra station on Elm Street, which experiences high data demand during peak periods. He explained that the proposed antenna would be a very simple, small installation attached to an existing chimney of a commercial building.

Ms. Adelman asked for clarification on whether the antenna would serve Metra operations, or whether it would serve riders and passengers.

Mr. Layne explained that the antenna would provide for a better customer experience by Verizon network customers in and around the station area.

Mr. Norkus clarified that while there are images in the agenda report for various existing installations downtown, the proposed antenna would be located on a commercial building north of the downtown Chase Bank parking lot.

Ms. Adelman asked why the building owner wouldn't be the applicant in such requests.

Chairperson Dalman explained that the applicant will generally be the party that is able to detail the need for such facilities, with the cellular providers providing engineering studies and technical details.

Mr. Norkus explained that the property owner has provided consent to the Village acknowledging support for the application being filed.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other board questions or concerns.

Mr. Coladarci asked for clarification of the before and after photos, stating that it is not clear what the difference is proposed to be.

Mr. Layne stated that it is a very small panel antenna which will be painted to match the background color of the brick chimney.

Mr. Coladarci stated that it would appear that the installation wouldn't be particularly visible to anyone unless they knew what they were looking for.

Chairperson Dalman stated that the installation is small in comparison to other installations.

Ms. Adelman questioned whether there are any security issues to be concerned with relative to unauthorized persons hacking into the network.

Mr. Layne stated that Verizon's network uses a licensed part of the frequency spectrum, as do all wireless carriers, and that the spectrum is reserved for wireless carriers.

Chairperson Dalman invited comments from the audience, noting that there were none.

Ms. McCarthy asked Mr. Norkus if this is a significant piece of equipment.

Mr. Norkus stated that the proposed installation itself is small in comparison to typical network buildout, with the small "underbuild" installation consisting of a single antenna measuring 1' x 2'. He noted that information in the staff report provides a look back at the earlier technology used with initial network build out, elsewhere within the Village. Mr. Norkus stated that the current proposal is very streamlined and has a very small presence compared to other traditional installations.

Mr. Norkus stated that the Village's zoning regulations relating to wireless network equipment address the technology at the time of adoption, and therefore deal more with the traditional network equipment versus the small "underbuild" technology which is now becoming more common. He noted that Village staff will likely be exploring options for streamlining the approval process for smaller installations such as the current application.

Ms. McCarthy stated that this application appears to be much less intrusive than some of the others highlighted in the agenda report.

Chairperson Dalman noted that there appeared to be no controversy over this application, asking if a Commission member would like to make a positive recommendation to the Village Council for the Special Use Permit.

A motion was made by Mr. Coladarci, seconded by Mr. Thomas to recommend approval of the Special Use Permit application by Verizon Wireless for the proposed installation at 554 Green Bay Road.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 9 to 0.

AYES: Dalman, Golan, Adelman, Case, Coladarci, Crumley, McCarthy, Morette, Thomas
NAYS: None

Consideration of Special Use Permit Request by Saints Faith Hope and Charity, 150 and 191 Linden Street

Chairperson Dalman noted that a member of the public approached the Commission and asked for the hearing to be continued. She stated that with regard to protocol, unless there is a reason or procedural defect such as information not being sent out to people or on the website or if the applicant changed the application, they would not continue the hearing unless there is a due process issue. Chairperson Dalman stated that request can be reiterated during the public comment portion of the meeting.

Mr. Norkus stated that with regard to the agenda materials and public comments, they have received additional comments and that he would hand out them after the presentation. He also stated that the applicant provided additional clarifying plans and that what is most significant is the more detailed landscape plan which he would also hand out to the Commission.

Jon Talty of OKW Architects informed the Commission that he is a Winnetka resident and has chaired the BCDC and has two children at the church school. He then thanked everyone for their attendance. Mr. Talty then introduced Father O'Donovan, the project team engineers, KLOA and Katherine Talty, the landscape architect.

Mr. Talty began by stating that the church has been part of the community since 1939 and takes its role as an anchor seriously. He stated that as a result, they constantly evolve and improve on their role for the community and the people who are part of the parish community. Mr. Talty then stated that two years ago, there was a dialog between the Father and other advisors to discuss the need for a parish center. He noted that the group met over several months and decided what gathering space they want to be assembled in terms of programming and architectural solution and the cost for the parish and the school which led to the catholic campaign in 2015 and which resulted in raising the funds necessary to move the project forward.

Mr. Talty stated that the project considered many different sites on the campus. He stated that at the get go, what was critical was sensitivity to the community and the impact, storm water management, the notion of pedestrian and vehicular safety, the 325 school children and mass

attendees and the aesthetics of how the project evolved.

Mr. Talty then referred the Commission to an illustration of the context imagery. He described it as a bird's eye view of the campus looking west. Mr. Talty noted that the lot is home to the parish center and the open field across the street which is part of the dialog as well with regard to athletic turf field. Mr. Talty also referred the Commission to an illustration of the existing surrounding properties, the boundaries of the field and the current state of the property and identified the existing conditions. He also identified the areas east and west of Linden. Mr. Talty then stated that on the east side of Linden, there is the church and school and a rectangular play lot, all of which is impermeable surface. He noted that there is no storm water management and that they were sensitive with regard to how to add footprint to the building.

Mr. Talty described circulation for the site as a challenge. He identified the access from Hill and Linden and off of the circular drive to the gym anchored by the bell tower. Mr. Talty stated that there is chaos navigating the traffic of the school and the church and that the solution was to provide a semblance of order. He then identified the area west of Linden which is the open field. Mr. Talty informed the Board that it is an underutilized property owned by the church. He stated that the intent of the improvements is to further activate the area through the introduction of an artificial turf field and associated play areas for the children. Mr. Talty stated that now, the parking lot is used for play with cones which now occur in a more controlled area which would be used on a more frequent basis with the artificial turf.

Mr. Talty then stated that the proposed plan is the hatched area east of church which is the parish center. He stated that the gathering space would be used for church, administrative functions of the school and other events which serve a lot of masters. Mr. Talty informed the Board that it would have a 5,000 square foot footprint with a basement and that it would be a single story building with a basement. He stated that the parking they would be creating east of that space would be a much more regular reflection of how traffic can maneuver in the future. Mr. Talty also referred to the one way traffic off of Hill circulating north through the site. He then stated that the traffic engineer and Mrs. Talty would get into that in greater detail. Mr. Talty also noted that the green space around the perimeter would be incorporated with a new landscaped area where there is all asphalt now.

Mr. Talty went on to state that they would cut off the circulation from the circular drive at the bell tower. He noted that they are sensitive to traffic flow and that to cut off that diagonal access would give them a much more controlled environment. Mr. Talty reiterated that the site currently has zero storm water management and that the projects addresses storm water management on the east and west sides of Linden taking into account the field and play area to the south. He informed the Commission that the plan was presented before the ZBA last month and received a full consensus and approval for the variation on the setbacks on Hill, Winnetka Avenue and Linden for the field given the deemed structure and that they are dealing with two front yards and that the ZBA approved the variation last month.

Mr. Talty also stated that they planned to create a parking neutral solution. He indicated that they recognized the fact that most institutional parking is a challenge. Mr. Talty informed the Commission that they would not be taking parking away from the current condition. He noted

that the lot east of the church has 88 parking spaces and that the solution would result in the same number at 88. Mr. Talty then stated that to accommodate that, they picked up parking on the Linden right-of-way of the Village. He noted that those are the angled spots west on Linden in the right-of-way. Mr. Talty informed the Commission that it came about as the result of conversations with the Village staff. He stated that the original schemes had utilized the lot across the street which is now the proposed field and that the Village staff suggested investigating the utilization of the right-of-way and allow for parking west on Linden in the same manner as the east side of Linden.

Mr. Talty then referred the Commission to an illustration of the building. He identified the building access from the church itself and the entry on the north side adjacent to the stone terrace. Mr. Talty stated that there would be gathering space for office functions and independent mechanical systems and a small kitchen on the lower level with administrative components. Mr. Talty stated that it would also free up space elsewhere on the campus so that the school can be better utilized and expand its needs for the future and growth. He also stated that he wanted to stress that as part of the building addition, that it would be accessible for all of the parish community. Mr. Talty informed the Commission that gatherings, meetings and events are now held in the gym auditorium or other places on campus.

Mr. Talty stated that the materials also included elevations of the building to show the context and sensitivity to the church. He then identified the east elevation and aerial views and massing of the building in comparison to the existing church. Mr. Talty finally identified a graphic representation of how it would look from the circular drive and bell tower.

Bill Loftus introduced himself as the Director and President of Spaceco Engineering in Rosemont and informed the Commission that he would address storm water management. He began by stating that they studied the existing site conditions and identified the fact that the site is nearly 100% impervious. Mr. Loftus stated that with the addition of landscaping, that would be one component of the storm water component and represent the ability of storm water to infiltrate that area. He stated that at this stage in the process, they calculated the volume that they would be required to provide which he estimated to be approximately one acre foot which amounted to one foot of water over one acre of real estate or approximately 325,000 gallons of water.

Mr. Loftus then stated that for this project, since it is bisected by Linden and because the disturbed areas are similar in size, the detention would be almost split roughly approximately 50-50 with half of it to be provided in the form of an underground vault in an area just south of the church in the triangular shaped area between the northeast corner of Winnetka Avenue and Linden. He stated that it is important to note that the sheet flow that is experienced today with very little structures in the parking lot is contributory to an already overburdened storm sewer system on Winnetka Avenue. Mr. Loftus then stated that the sewer east of Linden is 15 inches and that it jumps to 21 inches. He stated that under the existing conditions, that sewer is really overburdened and that the installation of the underground vault would improve that situation. Mr. Loftus noted that the vault would not release the water and that it would be restricted and that as engineers, they have to answer to the Village and the MWRD in terms of storm water management to ensure that they adhere to all of the ordinances.

Mr. Loftus went on to state that with regard to the west side of the property and the existing field, there has been a lot of discussion with regard to how to provide for storm water management. He informed the Commission that in May 2015, the MWRD changed the ordinance in terms of a volume reduction. Mr. Loftus stated that since the 1970's, the MWRD only required civil engineers to control the rate at which they send storm water to the infrastructure and that has failed in a lot of communities. He stated that now, they are looking for a reduction in the volume of water to be sent to the infrastructure. Mr. Loftus then stated that they do not have the greatest soil in the state and referred to the sands in northwest Indiana and that they have to work with what they have. He stated that the proposal is for the athletic field to take advantage of the sub base of a stone base which would provide a structure for the field to be built on and that the MWRD recognized that approximately 33% of that stone base which they called voids or air space and would be taking in a storm event the amount of water similar to the way that natural soil worked and that the top soil has air molecules that will be filled by water molecules similar to a situation of non-compacted topsoil.

Mr. Loftus then referred the Commission to an illustration which contained a number of lines bisecting the field which is depicted as an underdrain system to capture the water from the stone voids so that over time, they can drain the field. He then referred to the neighbors who raised a legitimate concern at the ZBA meeting with regard to fines, sediments and maintenance of the stone voids as a method of detention. Mr. Loftus stated that in connection with sediment filling those voids, care has to be taken so that the stone remained pure. He informed the Commission that the life of the field is somewhat finite. He stated that the voids would be viewed again to make sure they are maintained for detention. Mr. Loftus then stated that since the ZBA meeting, they are proposing to conduct additional topography survey work into the rear yards of some of the neighbors. He also stated that with the neighbors' permission, they would be going onto those properties and identifying the finished floor elevations and checking the drainage in the rear yards and how it related to the development. Mr. Loftus then asked if there were any questions.

Ms. McCarthy stated that she presumed that Mr. Loftus saw Steve Saunders' report and that he had a few questions such as restricting draining from the parking lot and the left turn.

Mr. Talty stated that the traffic engineer can speak to those questions.

Chairperson Dalman asked if water would infiltrate the turf and then go through the gravel base and then the pipes.

Mr. Loftus responded that the pipes would convey the water like a like French drain. He stated that the water would permeate the turf and stone layer, then go below to the underdrain to control the water which is recognized as volume control.

Chairperson Dalman stated that in heavy rain events, would they see pooling of water since infiltration is saturated on the turf.

Mr. Loftus stated that if the turf is laid flat, that is possible. He then stated that with the existing topography, the east side would drain to the southwest and fall 6 feet to the vault which is properly positioned. He then identified the vault outline in an illustration for the Commission. Mr. Loftus

then stated that they are proposing to pick up drainage in an underground system and the property line. He noted that the south side of the site would drain due south and that there may be a basin existing which picked up in the improvements.

Chairperson Dalman stated that with regard to the blacktop they would be getting rid of and the decreasing impervious surface, she asked by how much.

Mr. Talty responded 25%.

Mr. Loftus described it as a significant reduction. He then stated that with regard to the way that the ordinance was drafted, not only would they be providing detention but also for the new building.

Mr. Coladarci asked what would overwhelm the detention system.

Mr. Loftus responded a 100 year storm. He stated that with regard to the release rate and storage for a 100 year event, they would provide for something greater. Mr. Loftus also stated that for a 100 year event, they did not have enough data. He then stated that for the Village and storm events and rain intensity, both ordinances are from 1970 and referred to the rainfall data which increased for a 100 year rate event to 9½ inches of rain.

Mr. Coladarci asked for the rain which would flood the west side of the Village, what would the design for water overflow and with the field, he referred to the layout of the field to dump on the neighbors or if they planned to retain the water on the field until it is able to go to the vault.

Mr. Loftus responded that they are obligated to route a 100 year storm to detention. He then stated that in the case of the east side, they are obligated to take all of the water and get it into the vault. Mr. Loftus also stated that the west side would get to the detention pond and that it cannot run into the neighbors. He informed the Commission that it is called uncontrolled release.

Mr. Coladarci stated that they want to make sure for the neighbors that in the event of a 100 year storm, it would not cause water to dump to their yards.

Mr. Loftus agreed that the water is better off outside. He described it as a reasonable request that they cannot answer now and that they have to look at where the foundations are and how the rear yards convey water north to south of the neighbors. Mr. Loftus also stated that they want to make sure that there are no obstructions in the neighbors' rear yards. He added that they can do it when they are done.

Mr. Talty informed the Commission that the vault would have a trapezoid shape and he stated that how much is on the field would be how much water it would hold.

Mr. Loftus informed the Commission that it would hold 325,000 gallons and that half of that would be held in the detention system on the west side while the east side would hold the same amount of water.

Mr. Thomas asked why not build a bigger vault on the other side of the street.

Mr. Loftus indicated that was brought up at the other school across the street. He noted that the vaults are very expensive and that the Village is sensitive in terms of the cost of storm water management issues.

Mr. Talty reiterated that there is currently zero storm water management on the field now.

Mr. Golan referred to the storm water talk and whether they would be digging up an acre of property of the field.

Mr. Loftus stated that the Village would tie into its storm water management and make a contribution. He then stated that for that kind of region, detention is the best way to handle storm water. Mr. Loftus also stated that they have a sizable enough acreage for their project.

Chairperson Dalman stated that there are jurisdiction dictational limits that they cannot ask the applicant to solve for the Village project.

Mr. Golan stated that it represented an opportunity for the Village to help the residents.

Ms. Crumley questioned the parking on Linden and referred to the Village recommending the use of Linden to solve the problem.

Mr. Talty stated that it was recommended as an alternative to investigating angled parking in the right-of-way by the Village staff.

Ms. Adelman questioned whether the Village staff had the authority to suggest that.

Mr. Norkus informed the Commission that the Village staff met with the applicant and that given the tradeoffs, there are solutions between parking and the field. He indicated that neither solution is without benefits or drawbacks. Mr. Norkus then stated that the Village staff recommended that they consider the placement of parking in the right-of-way which would have less of an impact on the adjoining residences as opposed to open space. He indicated that ultimately, it would be the Commission's decision as to which approach is appropriate.

Chairperson Dalman stated that the Village Council would have the authority to decide how to use what in terms of the right-of-way. She then stated that to the north, you see a big right-of-way and that the Village allowed it to be green space.

Ms. Adelman asked if the field would be for the church parish and community.

Mr. Talty responded that it would be open to residents and the neighborhood. He noted that there would be a fence around the perimeter and that it is not restricted space.

Ms. Case questioned whether the church would get the deed to the parking spaces on the Linden right-of-way. She then stated that Mr. Saunders mentioned that because the replacement spaces

would be located on the right-of-way which would increase the percentage of parking located on Village rights-of-way to 67.8%. Ms. Case asked if the parking spots are for use only for the parish but that they are Village property so that anyone can park there.

Mr. Talty confirmed that there would be no restriction.

Ms. Case then stated that because it is in a residential area, she asked if they would be moving the play equipment across the street.

Mr. Talty confirmed that is correct and stated that the play area now is the grass field which deteriorated quickly due to the amount of use. He described it as a mud pit and that it holds water. Mr. Talty stated that the purpose is to activate it and use it for recess.

Javier Milan of KLOA informed the Commission that they did a traffic and parking study. He stated that he would like to point out that they agreed with Mr. Saunders' comments and to implement the recommendations which came up. Mr. Milan stated that the project would enhance drop-off and pick up.

Mr. Milan then stated that with regard to the existing conditions, he identified the ingress drive off of Hill and that the Linden access is close to the intersection. He stated that there is a big problem in the morning and that they need to do something about that. Mr. Milan also stated that in the afternoon, vehicles enter the horseshoe and form lines. He informed the Commission that they did a tally and saw 21 vehicles in the cues. He then referred to the students being brought to the school in the first line of vehicles which load, then leave, etc. which he described as very efficient.

Mr. Milan stated that they felt that there was a way to improve it. He then referred the Commission to an illustration and stated that the access drive would move further northeast in order to allow a one way circulation to achieve more control at the pickup and drop-off area. Mr. Milan also stated that it would help to avoid conflict of that close proximity. He stated that they would be able to accommodate and load 19 to 20 spaces and that it would be more efficient than the way it is done now. Mr. Milan added that they would also be loading from the side as opposed to the front which would result in a much faster process than it is today.

Mr. Milan then stated that with regard to Winnetka Avenue parking now, he stated that it should be restricted if the cue is long enough since they do not want to block through traffic. He indicated that there are other things that can be done and referred to the exit with two options in order to spread the load. Mr. Milan informed the Commission that the load stacking can be increased in an area which he identified for the Commission. He then stated that with regard to grades 1 through 8 and then for the smaller children, he identified the loading area and stated that it would be spread into two areas. Mr. Milan indicated that the horseshoe can be used for the older children as well. He stated that overall, it would be a better plan with more control and which would be much clearer.

Mr. Milan stated that with regard to parking, it was a suggestion by the Village staff to have 15 spaces there. He then stated that in connection with the observations which were done, the parking would not be detrimental to the traffic flow. Mr. Milan indicated that there is a similar

situation downtown on Lincoln with angled parking in both areas. He also stated that there would be a crosswalk for the children to the playground and that they can install a pedestrian activation beacon or signs. Mr. Milan described it as a good plan in terms of making it a better delineation for drop-off and pickup over the condition today.

Chairperson Dalman asked if it would enhance the sight distance for Winnetka Avenue and Linden.

Mr. Milan identified the asphalt and vehicles which are parked at the corner. He then stated that with regard to landscaping, the vehicles would be pushed further north and that there would be a much better view and that there would be nothing blocking the view. Mr. Milan also stated that they would not be changing the radiuses. He then stated that they may create some kind of bump out treatment which he identified on the illustration and that one consideration of creating the bump out is that it would slow traffic while still allowing vehicles to make the turn and that it would improve sight distance even more. Mr. Milan added that they would be creating buffer zones to cross with the aid of a teacher and described it as one of the safety improvements they are looking into.

Chairperson Dalman asked if it is a dangerous intersection.

Mr. Milan confirmed that is correct and stated that they would be increasing the sight lines and improving the intersection. He noted that there would be the same width for two way traffic and that they would be narrowing the distance for pedestrians to walk.

Ms. Adelman stated that the Park District thought about the master bike plan and that Winnetka Avenue was a major consideration. She then referred to the New Trier children and that they talked about sidewalks, etc.

Mr. Thomas stated that the master bike plan would require rebuilding all of the streets in town.

Chairperson Dalman stated that they should make sure that as part of the transportation plan, that the Park District coordinate.

Ms. Case asked if they would be maintaining the parking on Winnetka Avenue.

Mr. Milan responded that it would remain the way it is and that there would be pickup and drop-off restriction with those times.

Ms. Case then asked how many spaces are currently along the play field.

Mr. Milan responded that there are currently 88 spaces in the lot and that because of the new configuration, they would be losing spaces. He noted that there would be a net neutral impact on parking.

Mr. Coladarci stated that it would be better to not have the Village lose the right-of-way for 15 spaces. He then referred to there being more ease of access for the church as opposed to what is

necessary for the plan.

Mr. Talty stated that the parkway would be relocated west. He then stated that the spirit is to say to keep vehicles from going into the community on heavy use days. Mr. Talty also referred to the consideration for older congregation members and described the proposal as a good compromise for all parties.

Mr. Coladarci then described the parking in other situations with churches. He asked how can they say to put in diagonal parking for older or young families and enforce it.

Mr. Talty stated that there is parallel parking on the street now.

Chairperson Dalman stated that she understood Mr. Coladarci's comments with regard to parking and that they cannot control it.

Mr. Coladarci then stated that they would be setting a precedent of saying it is a matter of comfort. He also referred to taking out greenspace anyway with the ballfield. Mr. Coladarci then asked what would happen when another church comes in with a similar request.

Mr. Talty stated that the situation is unique to the parcels and that there are no residences immediately adjacent.

Mr. Coladarci stated that the applicant is asking the Village to give up the right-of-way and that it would be hard for the Village to deny another request.

Chairperson Dalman indicated that there are few places where there is the potential to do that.

Ms. Adelman stated that they relied on the Village staff to give the Commission recommendations.

A woman in the audience stated that it was not addressed and that the playfield is available for use by the general public. She then referred to having parking by the field for families and that she did not see where they have to give it to everyone and that it is unique here.

Chairperson Dalman stated that she agreed with the comments made. She stated that it is also a school.

Mr. Talty noted that they own both sides of the street. He then stated that in the defense of Village staff, the initial study used 1/3 of the field as a parking lot. Mr. Talty indicated that the neighbors may not like that alternative versus open space. He then stated that he hoped as a compromise to capture what they could on the street and to protect the open qualities of the field.

Katherine Talty introduced herself to the Commission as the landscape architect and a parent of children at the school. She then referred to the overreaching goals and a planting plan. Mrs. Talty referred the Commission to an illustration and devising the plan with KLOA and the engineers to park the site and develop an overall plan. She informed the Commission that the initial goal was to provide the facility necessary for the parish and school programming. Mrs.

Talty also stated that the outdoor space would be to support the parish center. She stated that the school would like to utilize a surface which is not asphalt for recess and other activities.

Mrs. Talty stated that the next goal was to stay contextual. She stated that they wanted to incorporate elements into the area without it appearing like a brand new development. Mrs. Talty also stated that they wanted to make sure that it fit into the context of what is there. She informed the Commission that the goal was to create a sense of place and that now, there is a fragmented field with worn grass and obscured trees and that the campus to the east is bordered by a fence and is primarily asphalt and a building. She also stated that they wanted to make sure that it is consistent from the west and east sides. Mrs. Talty noted that most important is the promotion of the safety of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. She added that the big asphalt space is traversed by children and vehicles and that the plan would create passages for pedestrians around the perimeter of the lot.

Mrs. Talty went on to state that with regard to design, the edge of the lot would have pedestrian access. She then stated that from the door to the school, there would be bicycle racks consolidated in the area near the door. Mrs. Talty also stated that there would be a new playset in the angled portion of the school building and identified the gym for the Commission. She noted that the play equipment would be located closer to the gym and identified the completely paved and asphalt portion of the site for the Commission. Mrs. Talty stated that now, they would have a designated sidewalk.

Mrs. Talty informed the Commission that they would be increasing the amount of greenspace in the corner which she identified for the Commission. She also stated that there would be a row of trees together with plantings. Mrs. Talty noted that now, the entire lot has a chain link fence which she described as not very ornamental and that it would be replaced with an ornamental fence along the perimeter along Hill and which would keep the children contained on school property.

Mrs. Talty then stated that on the west side, they are proposing the use of a synthetic turf field. She stated that now, it is a natural grass field and that in the fall with football, it is quickly torn up with intense use. Mrs. Talty also stated that it becomes unusable with inclement weather. She stated that they cannot have recess there and that it is not utilized during the day. Mrs. Talty informed the Commission that they would like to use the field for extracurricular activities and for recess and gym. She stated that it could also accommodate another playset on the side of the field which she identified for the Commission.

Mrs. Talty then referred the Commission to an illustration of the site amenities. She noted that the play pieces would be sculptural in view with a color palette which would blend in natural green. Mrs. Talty then identified all of the green space which would remain. She informed the Commission that they worked with the Village forester. Mrs. Talty then identified the neighbors on Chestnut and their backyards. She noted that the field would be located 12 feet away from the side property line which is the current setback. Mrs. Talty stated that the intent is for all of that vegetation to remain intact and that they intend to supplement it where it is spotty.

Mrs. Talty stated that they had questions from the neighbors and offered to work with them in terms of the aesthetics of the field and that there are meetings scheduled for the following day.

She also stated that the neighbor to the north had questions at the ZBA and did not want a solid wood fence on the property line. Mrs. Talty noted that they planned to do a short, more transparent fence.

Mrs. Talty then stated that the handout showed the plant list and amenities sheet. She also stated that they intend to install a few lights in the lot and that they would be pedestrian scaled fixtures. Mrs. Talty then identified the existing fixtures at the bell tower which are 10 feet in height. She noted that there would be no lighting proposed for the field and that all of the lighting would be internal to the lot. Mrs. Talty stated that concluded her presentation and asked the Commission if they had any questions.

Chairperson Dalman also asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Thomas referred to the comment that they are battling over the schedule.

Chairperson Dalman then asked for a show of hands for those who intended to speak. She referred to continuing the matter and stated that the Commission would now take public comment.

Katie Carden introduced herself to the Commission as the school principal and that she is representing the teachers, particularly the gym teacher. She began by stating that the mission of the school is to educate children in terms of heart, mind, body and soul and that currently, they do not have the outdoor space to do that. Ms. Carden stated that they are looking forward to the opportunity to be able to have more outdoor space for physical education and other activities. She stated that Mrs. Talty covered some of the reasons that the field is not practical for use for recess.

Ms. Carden informed the Commission that some of the things that the gym teacher would like to do outside included basketball, football, soccer and kickball and that they estimated that between august and October, they would be able to use the field. She identified the most popular sports at recess as basketball, football and soccer and that they are looking forward to have a safer and softer place to play. Ms. Carden then stated that in the spring, the gym teacher would love to have the opportunity to do soccer, field hockey as well as track and field. She informed the Commission that presently, they cannot take part in the presidential fitness running program since the gym does not allow the space for that. Ms. Carden stated that the gym teacher has also reported that she cannot have the children play hockey or soccer in the gym due to the constraints of the space.

Ms. Carden then stated that many of the points have already been made and that she felt that this can help the community as a whole for many different reasons. She stated that she has had many past and former students approach her in connection with doing buddy programs or sports, special needs and opening it up to all members of the community. Ms. Carden stated that this would be a great way for them to be able to provide buddy baseball, soccer, etc. She also stated that having the additional space would allow them to have more recreational activities as well as for other children in the community, particularly those with special needs. Ms. Carden then stated that there would be value in the children being able to see senior citizens spending time with them outside. She stated that in conclusion, the school children would definitely utilize and benefit from the enhanced space on the campus.

Ms. Carden stated that she had two issues to address with regard to parking and informed the Commission that the morning drop-off is not an issue. She then identified the drop-off times in the morning in two locations on the campus. Ms. Carden stated that they were having some issues in connection with the afternoon pickup and that to meet the needs of the neighborhood as well as to keep the children safe, they hired a crossing guard to ensure safety.

Warren James, 1083 Cherry, stated that he has studied the plans and commented that they strike a nice balance between the needs of the parish and the concerns of the community. He stated that he would like to reinforce the fact that there is no storm water detention now and that if the plan is approved, it would be positive for the community. Mr. James also stated that he attended services at the church and that the changes in the configuration of the parking lot would be greatly appreciated by all.

Dan Considine, 1225 Whitebridge Hill Lane, stated that he is a 40 year parishioner of the church and that he would like to speak to the field. He informed the Commission that his three children went to school there and that the field is muddy and that it is about time that they look at the improvement of it. Mr. Considine also referred to the chief financial officer [of the high school] and the fact that they put in a summer field in Chicago and the Chicago Park District, the Pritzker Foundation and which he described as a jewel in the Pilsen district. He then stated that when he purchased his home, he recognized that there was a vacant lot next door and that there would be development which resulted in a 15,000 square foot home being put up. He concluded by describing it as a good project and that he hoped that the Commission would give it a positive recommendation.

Timothy Earle, 175 Chestnut, informed the Commission that he lives at the corner of the play yard. He then asked for the aerial photographs. Mr. Earle referred to the illustration and stated that the playfield is described as a mess. He commented that it looked good to him. Mr. Earle then identified his home and other homes near. He stated that you have to realize that the homes were built in 1916 well before the church was built in 1939 and that it is an old community. Mr. Earle stated that he has watched over the years as the church built into what appeared to be industrial space which he described as an all residentially zoned area.

Mr. Earle stated that there would be a lot of impact here and it is not appropriate for a residential community. He then stated that there is a nice view of the plans presented by the landscape architect. Mr. Earle noted that there is no photograph of what the turf would look like and that it would be one color green all year around. He described it as a sterile land and that now, it is a natural area which he commented is a wonderful place for the birds and other animals. Mr. Earle also described it as a park like environment and that it is appropriate to the church.

Mr. Earle stated that when the church was built, the whole area was residential. He stated that he had various problems with the taking of Village land for parking and that they would lose the walking area. Mr. Earle also stated that it would create problems with turning and that it would affect visibility. He added that it is not a good parking area.

Mr. Earle then stated that he has never heard complaints in connection with parking in the area. He also stated that for old and young families, restricting parking made sense to him. Mr. Earle

then identified one area where there is no parking during school hours and that they would be creating permanent parking where there is currently no parking. He commented that he liked the idea of being able to meet with the church. Mr. Earle stated that they have to realize that the church did not reach out to the neighbors until they were made to. He concluded by stating that he felt that they could get a good, mutual solution for that area and that the church should talk to the neighbors first.

Meghan Birns, 84 Indian Hill, stated that in response to a few of the parking issues, she stated that she would rather not have the field become a parking lot. She described that as an eyesore and that she cannot imagine that any of the neighbors would want the green space to become a parking lot. Ms. Birns stated that a more viable solution would be to put the vehicles in the spot that the Village suggested which she commented would make more sense and would make the residents happy. She then stated that since the church was built in 1939, it would be interesting to note how many residences were in the area before 1939 and that everyone who purchased homes in the area knew that the church was there. Ms. Birns then stated that as far as the landscaping, it would be nice to have a landscaped area which would add to the value of the neighborhood and that the most important issue that the entire neighborhood would benefit from would be the storm water improvement. She concluded by stating that she is very much in favor of the development.

Wes Mueller, 147 Chestnut, informed the Commission that he lives directly adjacent to the field. He stated that he would welcome meeting with the church and that from his perspective, they should be able to find a solution which is also viable. Mr. Mueller stated that his concern related to the concern of the rubber pellets of the field. He also stated that he understood the concern with regard to space and that a large portion of the green space would be taken out and artificial turf put in its place. Mr. Mueller then stated that there needed to be careful consideration of how that would happen.

Susan Kroeger, 81 Locust, stated that she would like to reiterate the thoughtful consideration of the plan and welcome community input to the plan.

Robert Smith introduced himself to the Commission as the Executive Director of the Winnetka Park District and informed the Commission that he was approached several times with regard to misinformation in the community that the Park District is considering turning their natural baseball fields into synthetic turf and that there is no truth to that. He stated that he wanted the record to reflect that there has been no discussion with regard to the rumor.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other comments.

Davison Massey, 133 Chestnut, informed the Commission that the neighbors found out about the process five or six days before the ZBA meeting and that there has been no talking or sharing. He added that they were all startled. Mr. Massey then stated that he is not an expert to answer the issues which were discussed. He stated that he can tell what a 5 inch rain would do to the situation and that he understood that better than the cubic foot references. Mr. Massey also stated that he cannot speak to the designs of the system.

Mr. Massey then informed the Commission that he has lived in his home for 30 years and that he

has never seen the grass cut or any attempt to seed or aerate the field and that there has been zero upkeep. He also stated that the field is in a lot better shape than what they are saying and referred to the neglect on the part of the church. Mr. Massey indicated that there may be limited resources perhaps and described the project as expensive. He then referred to the money it would take to upkeep the field.

Mr. Massey also stated that with regard to parking spaces, there is no reason for the Village to deed land for church use for parking which is the result of their desire to build a new building. He described it as an attempt to solve the problems created by the development and shove them to the residential properties. Mr. Massey then informed the Commission that the church used the field in the fall and the spring and described it as a transit point for animals. He also stated that those parking spaces would congest further an already congested area in the front of the church. Mr. Massey stated that they can deal with the site lines on Linden and that if there are vehicles there, you cannot see oncoming traffic. He referred to the church losing parking spaces due to their desire to build a new building and that he could not see the Village giving up the parkway and field which would shrink and move everything west toward the neighbors.

Mr. Massey agreed that congestion during church and other services is a problem for people in the Village and that if they increase traffic by having vehicles park laterally, it would intensify the use.

Mr. Massey then stated that with regard to the artificial turf, it is used at the Skokie Playfield and one another school and that he has read about it in terms of both sides of the issue. He noted that there are a number of articles as to whether it would be an appropriate use by children and others, how it would breakdown in the sunlight, the air effect, etc. Mr. Massey stated that it is made from old rubber tires and that they should know that it would not affect the health of anyone down the road. Mr. Massey informed the Commission that he is not in favor of artificial turf at all and commented that it would be an eyesore and green year round for the homes on Linden which are setback by roughly the same amount. He also stated that you would see the turf beyond the setback of the homes.

Mr. Massey then stated that the project would institutionalizing residential property and would change the nature of the neighborhood in a big way. He reiterated that they were not given a say in the process and informed the Commission that he complained at the ZBA meeting. Mr. Massey also stated that in connection with the plan presented at the DRB meeting, the applicant changed one portion which was presented to the ZBA and identified the change. He noted that the DRB postponed its consideration of the matter so that the neighbors can talk to the church and that there is a proposed meeting.

Chairperson Dalman noted that the meeting would be held the next day and that they welcome everyone to submit written comments.

Rebecca Massey thanked everyone for being patient and described the presentation as wonderful. She stated that she would like to comment with regard to the parkway being taken away and that the Village would be giving up the parkway. Mrs. Massey then stated that the field would be encroaching into their yard and identified their home for the Commission. She stated that her concern is for the playground and that she did not know what it would be like for her front yard.

Mrs. Massey also stated that with regard to the artificial turf, they do not know what is the outcome of the material and that she wanted to speak for the rights of the children to have a healthy environment. She also stated that in connection with the parking lot, there was no consideration of the encroachment and that with regard to the trees, she asked why jeopardize it and the natural look. Mrs. Massey informed the Commission that a lot of people are concerned with losing the space and like the progress of the development. She then asked for more details with regard to the playground and that she did not want an institutional look in her front yard.

Phil Sheridan identified himself as a church parishioner and stated that he has seven children. He stated that he would like to speak to the concerns they have with regard to the environment and the health care risks. Mr. Sheridan stated that there is scientific data which addressed the concerns. He then stated that artificial turf was first developed in 1964 and that type of turf being proposed has a layer of infill made from recycled tires. He then stated that to date, there have been 10,000 fields in place which are used by children and adults and that to date, there has not been one environment impact statement that there is a negative issue by any governmental bodies or medical special societies. Mr. Sheridan then referred to studies by the Institute of Public Health and their conclusion and that the use of synthetic turf did not cause any elevated health risks and that they found that the substances in high concentrations had no higher hazard than the background levels in the adjacent areas. He also stated that with regard to the concentration of heavy metals and other factors, it would be below regulatory limits. Mr. Sheridan concluded by stating that in terms of the health risk assessments, no children or neighbors would be exposed to an increased environmental risk.

Michael Bush, 66 Fox Lane, stated that he has two children who play football and that he can say first hand that the field is not in good shape and that he would object to the comment that it is in decent shape. He informed the Commission that the school seeded it four times. Mr. Bush also stated that with regard to 327 children, he is concerned with the progress of the field. He then stated that the parish has a reason for the request and the parents want to make sure that the best product possible is put down.

John Dwyer, 252 Forest, stated that in 1955, there were two homes on the lot on the west and east sides of Linden and that the property was donated to the parish for its use as they wish. He then referred to there being a lot more children out there and that the applicant has done a great job of addressing the concerns. Mr. Dwyer informed the Commission that he has been a coach for 15 years and that he knew turf which he commented would be an enhancement to the area. He then referred to 1945 since the special use permit, the criteria for the evaluation of a recommendation as to whether the request is consistent with the policy statements of the Comprehensive Plan which the Village staff put together and that it required more discussion. Mr. Dwyer stated that he would propose given the fact that the neighbors have any opposition and that since there is a meeting scheduled for tomorrow, that the matter be continued for the parties to meet. He stated that the neighbors will attend the meeting and that something will happen there. Mr. Dwyer concluded by stating that it is his hope that an agreement can be reached and that if they continue the discussion, they would hear back how that meeting went.

Mr. Coladarci then recommended that the Commission table the matter to the next meeting as well as the Domino's case.

Ms. Crumley stated that if there is a meeting tomorrow and there are changes which may occur, she asked would the request go back to the ZBA and the DRB.

Chairperson Dalman responded no and referred to what happened with the One Winnetka application. She stated that the position is that it would be up to the Village Council to decide and that if the Village Council decided that the ZBA needed to see what the Commission saw, they can make that decision.

Chairperson Dalman then asked for a motion to continue the matter to the next meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Ms. McCarthy. A vote was taken and the motion was unanimously passed, 9 to 0.

AYES: Adelman, Case, Coladarci, Crumley, Dalman, Golan, McCarthy, Morette, Thomas
NAYES: None

Chairperson Dalman confirmed that the matter would be continued to the next meeting which is February 24, 2016.

Consideration of Request for Special Use Permit Request by Domino's to locate a take-out/delivery restaurant in the C-2 Retail Overlay District at 1009 Green Bay Road

Ray Montez introduced himself as a Domino's franchisee with locations throughout the Chicago metropolitan area, including a current location at 57 Green Bay Road in Glencoe. He stated that Domino's requires franchisees to remodel their stores on a regular basis, and the current location is of an inadequate size for modern store layout requirements.

Mr. Montez explained that their plans involve relocating the existing Glencoe location to the vacant storefront at 1009 Green Bay Road at the corner of Green Bay and Scott Avenue. He explained that the space will be remodeled and will incorporate Domino's "pizza theater" layout, which brings the preparation of food out of the rear of the store, and places the work out in the open where customers can better see the work that goes into the product.

Mr. Montez noted that the space is approximately 1,110 square feet, and is located adjacent to the Village's parking deck which will allow delivery drivers to use the Village parking deck, allowing the on-street parking to be used by customers.

Mr. Montez explained that the store design incorporates very limited signage, limited to the awning above the storefront. He explained that the storefront windows will have a very open feel to it, as compared to other stores which have been referred to as "box stores" due to the stacking of pizza boxes in the window. He stated that the proposed new location will also have softer colors, and the awning will match the color of adjacent storefronts.

A Commission member asked if there would be any seating for dine in customers, noting that there

appeared to be seating shown on the plan at the front of the store.

Mr. Montez clarified that the seating shown is for customers waiting for their pizza, where they can observe the operation while waiting. He stated that store design will use softer colors, white tile, and softer lighting and a more warm and inviting space.

Mr. Montez explained that while some locations have expanded their carryout business, the Glencoe location has had a difficult time due to the parking problems at the current space. He stated that they don't expect a significant increase in carryout due to the compact delivery area and therefore expect delivery to still be a preferred option for most customers.

Mr. Montez stated that they were very happy to find the subject location but then found out that they needed zoning approval. He stated that they are hopeful they will receive approval from the Plan Commission and Village Board, and hope to start construction the day after the Village Council approves the request.

A Commission member questioned whether the location will be accessible to skaters using the ice in Hubbard Woods Park.

Chairperson Dalman stated that it would likely be too far away to walk in skates. She stated that she likes the fact that the applicant will be using the Village parking deck, which is currently underutilized.

Mr. Montez stated they are really excited about the new location, stating that the current space is only thirteen feet wide, and the at the new space will be much more open and inviting.

Mr. Golan stated that the area is somewhat darkly lit, and stated that the new space will contrast and be brightly lit, and might be either fluorescent or incandescent.

Mr. Montez clarified that lighting at the front of the store will recessed can lights in the ceiling, and wall finishes will be warmer darker colors.

Mr. Golan clarified that years ago when McDonalds came to Winnetka they had to jump through many hoops to make sure the location didn't look like a typical McDonalds. He stated that his concern is that as one drives down the street there might be one storefront which is brighter than all of the others.

Chairperson Dalman noted that the location is set back from the street.

Mr. Montez invited the Commission to view the recently remodeled Wilmette location to see the appearance which he stated would be very similar.

Ms. McCarthy questioned whether there will be congestion with commuters arriving at the adjacent Metra station and whether there will be conflicts with delivery drivers. She questioned what the peak delivery periods would be, explaining that a lot of commuters use Scott Avenue.

Mr. Coladarci noted that traffic study looked at delivery operation and described the peak period as 7-9 PM, with higher volume on Fridays.

McCarthy questioned whether they might be a conflict with pedestrians at the parking garage entrance.

Mr. Montez stated that the traffic engineering study included having someone look at the operation and analyzing the traffic patterns during the peak period.

Ms. Crumley questioned how many drivers will be driving at the peak time.

Mr. Montez stated that there may be five drivers.

Mr. Golan noted that there had previously been concerns with Domino's drivers relating to the 30 minute delivery guarantee causing reckless driving.

Mr. Montez stated that Domino's no longer offers that guarantee, but explained that the preparation time for an order is approximately five minutes which gives 20-25 minutes even without the 30 minute guarantee. He stated that while that is they still strive to offer quick delivery, they no longer target or guarantee a 30 minute delivery. Mr. Montez stated that Domino's has an extensive process both for employing drivers initially as well as monitoring driving records every six months.

Mr. Montez stated that drivers must have at least 2 years driving experience and thus over 18 years of age, and can't have more than two violations in 3 years, and no major moving violations in 5 years.

Mr. Golan stated that the Commission is often discussing the loss of retail businesses, and that in this case we are adding one. Mr. Golan made a motion, seconded by Ms. McCarthy to recommend approval of the Special Use Permit application by Domino's for the proposed location at 1009 Green Bay Road.

RESOLUTION

1. That the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the Special Use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, comfort, morals, or general welfare;
2. That the Special Use will not be substantially injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity which are permitted by right in the district or districts of concern, nor substantially diminish or impair property values in the immediate vicinity;
3. That the establishment of Special Use will not impede the normal and orderly development or improvement of other property in the immediate vicinity for uses permitted by right in the district or districts of concern;
4. That adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress in a

- manner which minimize pedestrian and vehicular traffic congestion in the public ways;
5. That adequate parking, utilities, access roads, drainage, and other facilities necessary to the operation of the Special Use exists or are to be provided;
 6. That the Special Use in all other respects conforms to the applicable regulations of this and other Village ordinances and codes;
 7. The proposed special use at the proposed location will encourage, facilitate and enhance the continuity, concentration, and pedestrian nature of the area in a manner similar to that of retail uses of a comparison shopping nature;
 8. Proposed street frontages providing access to or visibility for one or more special uses shall provide for a minimum interruption in the existing and potential continuity and concentration of retail uses of a comparison shopping nature;
 9. The proposed special use at the proposed location will provide for display windows, facades, signage and lighting similar in nature and compatible with that provided by retail uses of a comparison shipping nature;
 10. If a project or building has, proposes or contemplates a mix of retail, office and service-type uses, and the retail portions of the project or building shall be located adjacent to the sidewalk. The minimum frontage for each retail use adjacent to the sidewalk shall be twenty (20) feet with a minimum gross floor area of four hundred (400) square feet. In addition, such retail space shall be devoted to active retail merchandising which maintains typical and customary hours of operation;
 11. The proposed location and operation of the proposed special use shall not significantly diminish the availability of parking for district clientele wishing to patronize existing retail businesses of a comparison shopping nature.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Winnetka Plan Commission finds that the proposed Special Use Permit application for the property at 1009 Green Bay Road is consistent with the above standards for the granting of a Special Use Permit.

Passed by a vote of 9 in favor and 0 opposed.

AYES: Adelman, Case, Coladarci, Crumley, Dalman, Golan, McCarthy, Morette, Thomas
NAYS: None

Public Comment

No additional comments were made by the audience at this time.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:07 p.m.

January 27, 2016

Page 37

Respectfully submitted,

Antionette Johnson

**WINNETKA PLAN COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 24, 2016**

Members Present: Tina Dalman, Chairperson
Mamie Case
Jack Coladarci
Dana Fattore Crumley
Carol Fessler
Louise Holland
Jeanne Morette
John Thomas

Non-voting Members Present: Chris Blum

Members Absent: Caryn Rosen Adelman
Paul Dunn
John Golan
Keta McCarthy

Village Staff: Brian Norkus, Assistant Director of Community
Development

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Dalman at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Norkus informed the Commission that minutes from the January 27, 2016 meeting were not yet available.

**Consideration of Special Use Permit Request by Saints Faith Hope and Charity,
150 and 191 Linden Street (Continued From Previous Meeting)**

Chairperson Dalman stated that it would make sense since the applicant's group has met with the neighbors and submitted some additional material, it would be best to start out the meeting by walking through what has changed and any updates they have.

Jon Talty of OKW Architects introduced himself to the Commission and stated that he would be speaking on behalf of Father Martin O'Donovan and the parish community of Saints Faith Hope and Charity. He also introduced Katherine Talty, the landscape architect, Bill Loftus from Spaceco Engineering and Javier Millan from KLOA parking and traffic consulting.

Mr. Talty began by stating that the charge as of January 27, 2016 was to meet with the neighbors which took place on January 28, 2016 with six of the neighbors. He then stated that they met with the three neighbors who own the property to the west of the athletic field as well as one neighbor

who is located kitty corner to the athletic field to the north and west and the neighbor across Chestnut from him and the neighbors immediately to the north which represented all of the neighbors who had concerns or questions with regard to the pros and cons in connection with the development of the field. Mr. Talty informed the Commission that the graphics that they have before them tell that story. He also stated that the plan image on the left hand side represents the changes that they have made and that the image on the right hand side represented the preexisting condition that the Commission saw last month.

Katherine Talty informed the Commission that they met with the neighbors and listened to all of their concerns with regard to the development of the property which she identified as the west campus. She stated that as a result of that meeting, they were able to make the following changes. Ms. Talty then stated that they reduced the overall size of the synthetic turf field by approximately 15% or 27,000 square feet. She stated that they narrowed the field in an effort to give them a little more space along the west property line. Ms. Talty then stated that they increased the setback from 12 feet to 15 feet as shown on the plan.

Ms. Talty also stated that they reviewed the plant material and made some changes in the variety of the plant material to be used around the field. She informed the Commission that on the landscape plan, they removed the evergreens from the plan at the request of the neighbors and added plants that are intended to attract wildlife, specifically birds.

Ms. Talty stated that they changed the fence type that was proposed along the north property line at the request of the neighbors directly to the north of the field to an open picket fence since they would like to see the field and activity on the field. She noted that they were more specific on the specification for the synthetic turf and specifically the infill system which works with the turf. Ms. Talty stated that they specified a virgin material versus recycled materials, which also will keep the radiant heat down on the field, addressing another concern of an adjacent neighbor.

Ms. Talty stated that the final change included modifications to the angled parking on the east side of Linden Street. She noted that there is currently angle parking on the east side, but they have added green island bump outs which will improve safety for pedestrians while also serving to reduce vehicle speeds. She stated that three bump outs will delineate the parking spaces and control the movement of pulling in and out of those spaces, while giving crossing pedestrians an area of refuge and protection. Ms. Talty also stated that as a result, the crosswalk that is to the north side of the parking lot and referred to the center of the athletic turf field, she noted that they jogged that intentionally to allow more space between the angled parking to the immediate north of the crosswalk. She stated that this was a tweak in order to provide more safety to the pedestrians crossing. Ms. Talty also stated that they intend to look at some other safety measures of that midblock crosswalk that would be used for student crossing.

Ms. Talty stated that represented a synopsis of the changes to the plan and that they believe that the neighbors are now in support of the plan and that they have had neighbors come to the DRB meeting and speak in favor of the plan as they have amended it. She added that they have met with them a second time in order to let them have a chance to preview the changes which were made before they went to the public hearing. Ms. Talty then identified areas where they would be creating green islands similar to what you would see in a parking lot.

Chairperson Dalman stated that it is great that the applicant met with the neighbors and listened to their concerns. She referred to the change in the applicant's programmatically goals and asked if the change in shortening the turf would change the types of activities that the school can engage in. She stated that she wanted to make sure that they are mindful that although they are attempting to address everyone's concerns, they are also not giving them less than what the school needed.

Ms. Talty responded that they appreciated that question and stated that they came to the rationale of the field in that originally, they were trying to get as much space as they could to provide opportunities for play in a variety of ways. She then stated that the second revised iteration represented a rational yardage of turf and that they are able to get to stripe of a walking track around the perimeter that made sense of 1/9th of a mile. Ms. Talty noted that it would still provide key opportunities and that it is a more refined view on their part of what the turf was and what it really needed to serve. She also stated that overall with regard to the impervious surface, it was reduced from what they requested as a variance from the ZBA and that they minimized their play surface as much as they possibly could and got more detailed in connection with the size of all of those elements.

Chairperson Dalman asked about the elimination of the evergreens and that it sounded like the things they were doing to screen the use is what the neighbors did not want and that they wanted visibility.

Ms. Talty agreed that is correct and stated that all of the elements which included the privacy fence and evergreens were to screen the view from the neighbors thinking they would find it a nuisance. She then stated that the neighbors enjoy the openness of the field which was their intent the entire time to keep it an open field. Ms. Talty added that they were pleasantly surprised that the neighbors wanted to see the field be open.

Ms. Case questioned whether the hard court area included basketball hoops.

Ms. Talty informed the Commission that they are not proposing permanent basketball hoops and described it as a utilitarian generic space which could be used for different activities.

Ms. Case asked if the rubberized surface for the jungle gym is the brownish surface. She stated that when you drive down Hill Road, it is mainly a residential street except for the main campus of the church. She also stated that they would be offloading into an area which she identified all of their gym class and outdoor activity and that it is an area which has always been a field and has never had something like that there before. She stated that she is wondering if along the street side of it, it should be screened a little more.

Ms. Talty responded that they will address that and that perhaps the illustration did not tell the story well and noted that it is pretty wooded along that border and that their intent is to keep as much of that as they can. She noted that they have to review it with the Village Forester in order to make sure that the trees are viable. Ms. Talty stated that the intent is to keep that area screened and that there will be potentially new landscaping in that area.

Ms. Case commented that it would be nice to keep something there and referred to the use of evergreens. She then stated that from the street, they would be having something that has never been there before as part of that neighborhood. She also commented that it is a big change and that it should not be made to look like a park and that it is a residential street. She then stated that it should look more attractive as opposed to running into a jungle gym.

Ms. Talty reiterated that their goal is for it to not be seen.

Chairperson Dalman stated that the applicant was very thoughtful with regard to the color palette.

Ms. Talty informed the Commission that with regard to the play equipment colors, modern equipment elements are very thin and that there would not be big chunky plastic pieces. She noted that they are more comprised of metal beams and cables. Ms. Talty then stated that when the children are not on them, they tend to go away visually.

Ms. Case stated that the applicants were thoughtful by putting more natural looking pieces on the side where there was previously a field.

Chairperson Dalman asked Ms. Holland if she had any questions or concerns since she was not at the previous meeting.

Ms. Holland informed the Commission that she spoke with Mr. Talty with regard to the questions she had and didn't have any other questions.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other questions.

Chairperson Dalman questioned the impact of the reduction of the playfield size with regard to storm water drainage. She asked the applicant to clarify the stormwater detention plans for those Commission members who were not present at the last meeting.

Mr. Loftus informed the Commission that the plan now offered them more opportunity for some storm water with the reduction in the field size with the reconfiguration of the hardcourt and the play surface. He stated that there will be a combination and that they have made a commitment with the Village and the district for the project as well as the MWRD ordinance. Mr. Loftus stated that it was 325,000 gallons of water which they would retain on the site which is not there today and which would be held approximately 50% on the east side and 50% on the west side. He added that is the water they are responsible for in a permitting sense on their property and that they are asked to hold that water back and ultimately is tributary to the sewer system on Hill Road. Mr. Loftus stated that if water comes from offsite, they would have an obligation to also accept that water by Illinois drainage law and that with regard to the increased 15 foot setback from the neighbors, they had always proposed a storm sewer running down the tree line and that what they are looking to do now for that extra couple of feet is to move that storm sewer line right under the west edge of the field and surgically put in drainage laterals to the rear yards of those homes.

Mr. Loftus also informed the Commission that they have conducted since their last meeting additional field work and that the neighbors were kind enough to let their crews onto their private

property. He stated that the question was asked about the conveyance of storm water impacting those homes and that they shot the lowest openings of those homes and foundations and found that they were at an elevation they were comfortable with and that the water would continue to flow north to south. He stated that there was also testimony from a neighbor with regard to an existing storm sewer that they were not able to locate in a rear yard and that there might have been too much snow cover to find it. Mr. Loftus stated that they believe that they have made all of the accommodations they were asked to.

Mr. Loftus then informed the Commission that Steve Saunders has done his initial review and has not offered any comments on their civil engineering as of yet. He stated that would come during their final engineering procedure to agree with the final concept of water he quoted and that Mr. Saunders also understood the challenges with regard to volume control which represented an attempt all over the county to introduce more absorption of storm water into soils.

Chairperson Dalman asked for clarification regarding the he figures represented preliminary calculations, and would be subject to further review and final review and approval by the Village.

Mr. Loftus confirmed that is correct. He stated that at this point, as a design team, the engineers have to make certain assumptions and make sure that nothing they do from an engineering standpoint would alter what they are looking at today from a land planning standpoint. Mr. Loftus then stated that the Village engineer would have to be comfortable enough with the numbers. He stated that they would get into the final figures as they proceed with the application.

Mr. Thomas stated that at the last meeting, he asked a question if there was a possibility or any usefulness with building a large storm water vault underneath and that there several answers, one of which is that it cost a lot of money and whether it could be part of the Village's overall plan. He stated that secondly, he had no idea whether it would be useful where it is located and that it may not be a flow path of the storm water that they are attempting to deal with at Willow Road and Hibbard Road.

Mr. Loftus responded that he has not had that discussion with Mr. Saunders but that he is familiar with the Winnetka study. He explained that the study is addressing a huge watershed area and that he did not want to guess at what kind of chamber they would be talking about in this area. Mr. Loftus stated that it would be an extremely expensive storm water solution.

Mr. Thomas stated that the point is if the Village is going to try to develop a plan to take care of the stormwater, it may be comprised of a series of different measures. He stated that it would be up to the Village, as opposed to the applicants here, to determine whether there would be any benefit to providing extra stormwater capacity at this location.

Mr. Loftus stated that is exactly the theory that this new volume control component of the Cook County ordinance is implementing and that the Village has adopted. He then stated that all of these little pieces of infrastructure which is the design they are using here is to promote infiltration. Mr. Loftus stated that as everyone knew, the existing sewers on Winnetka Avenue are small and that every developer which comes in would not only provide for what is required but that the ordinance is making up for the sins of the past in incremental steps.

Chairperson Dalman asked for clarification regarding flooding in some of the neighbors' backyards, questioning whether the new drainage system would be collecting some of that runoff.

Mr. Loftus responded that they would not be blocking or damming any water which would come from neighboring properties, so that to the extent adjacent properties drain toward the Church playfield property, the system will be collecting that water and providing a positive outlet for it.

Chairperson Dalman stated that they have heard that some of those neighbors' backyards flood and that their situation may be alleviated a little bit but that there couldn't be any guarantee.

Mr. Loftus stated that 325,000 gallons of water of new storage would provide additional capacity and for some types of storm events it will make a difference for neighbors.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other questions from the Commission.

Chairperson Dalman stated that if the Commission had questions, they would open the meeting to public comment first and that they would then close public comment and have their deliberations at which time they can talk about it then. She then asked if there were any other questions for the applicant or their consultants from the Commission. No additional comments were made at this time. She then stated that the Commission would now take public comment and swore in those that would be speaking on any matter on the agenda. Chairperson Dalman asked for the audience to limit their comments to three minutes.

Katherine Mazzocco, 180 Linden, stated that she has lived directly across the street from the church's bell tower for 30 years. She stated that although they are not members of the church, they have enjoyed the atmosphere of the church. Ms. Mazzocco stated that they have learned how to navigate traffic in terms of events being held at the church. She then stated that she did not know why they were not contacted with regard to the proposal and that she would have had a lot of points to make.

Ms. Mazzocco stated that first, for 30 years, she has four children who are grown and the traffic is so busy then as well as Linden which she described as a popular place to turn into town. She then stated that she did not think that diagonal parking on Linden is a good idea and that it should be set aside for slower traffic areas and referred to the amount of room needed to navigate. Ms. Mazzocco then stated that having diagonal traffic on both sides of the street and the amount of traffic in that area, she described it as a huge "T" in town. She informed the Commission that she has been hit once in 30 years by someone pulling out of the diagonal spot.

Ms. Mazzocco then stated that with regard to drainage, when there is heavy rainfall, their home is tall and skinny and becomes an island in terms of water flowing from Ridge as well as the impervious surface on the property and that there is water flowing on either side of their home. She then stated that they have done a lot of things to their home and that they do have a storm sewer in their backyard which cost them \$15,000. Ms. Mazzocco stated that if Faith Hope is going to do some work, it would be something to consider for not just the playing field but for the surface period coming from Ridge which is an east-west water movement. She suggested that

something be done about that water movement. Ms. Mazzocco concluded by reiterating that she is very seriously concerned with regard to diagonal parking on Linden Street.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other comments. No additional comments were made by the audience at this time. She then stated that the Commission would hold their deliberations.

Ms. Case stated that she lives in that neighborhood and for the record is a parishioner at Faith Hope. She stated that she tended to agree that Linden is a main thoroughfare into town. She stated that in her opinion, the Village granting that parking would set a precedent. She also stated that they discussed at the last meeting that a lot of other churches do not have parking lots and that people park on the street and walk to the church. She described the applicant's plans as fantastic and the fact that they are going to move some of their athletics over to the lot, she agreed that it is very tight parking and those 15 parking spaces are very narrow. She stated that with angled parking on both sides of the street together with bump outs so that people will drive slower, there would be people pulling out at the same time along with vehicles coming down the street. She stated that she believed that the Village should keep the green space on that side of the street and that it is not the Village's responsibility to provide parking for the church.

Chairperson Dalman stated that the difference here is that there is a school and that they have staff and that they have to provide parking for their staff. She then stated that the question is where are they parking now and whether this would improve it for the neighborhood or not.

Ms. Case stated that the parking on the other side of the street is not filled during the week unless there is a funeral or something on Linden. She stated that although it is used, it is not a filled lot all day. She then stated that this may be for overflow parking that they are trying to put on the other side of the street for Sunday services and other events.

Ms. Crumley stated that she saw her point and that she also saw that there are other areas where there is no parking and that when it is a busy time, it can compound the traffic. She then stated that she did want to hear from the traffic study and admitted that she did not drive around the area regularly.

Ms. Holland asked what the width of Linden would become at the beginning of the additional parking going south to Hill Road and that if becomes narrower, what is the result of the width for the two way street.

Chairperson Dalman also questioned how did that compare to other locations where there is angled parking on both sides in the Village.

Mr. Talty stated that before Mr. Millan provided the Commission with an answer, the reason for the angled parking is for those extraordinary moments and that it is intended to be public parking for the people who use it as a public and private amenity for the church. He then stated that there is going to be a demand for parking and that they are attempting to keep the parking from bleeding into the neighborhood more than it already does. Mr. Talty also stated that they are aware that there are people who are not keen on having vehicles parked in front of their homes on a regular

basis for different events. Mr. Talty then informed the Commission that staff parking is all along Ridge and that the Linden parking is dedicated to the school and more importantly, the church.

Mr. Talty stated that aside from keeping parking out of the neighborhood itself, the first alternative was to put parking on the field which is what led to this dialog in the first place. He stated that after discussion with the staff, he referred to their conclusion that a parking lot there with lights, etc. would not be a good idea. Mr. Talty reiterated their desire to get parking off of the street and the fact that there is parallel parking on Linden currently which is being displaced by angled parking.

Javier Millan introduced himself to the Commission as a senior consultant with KLOA. He stated that with regard to the questions and concerns raised, he informed the Commission that Linden would not be narrowed and that it would have the same width for vehicles traveling north and south. Mr. Millan then stated that with regard to the islands, he referred to them as refuge areas and that if they did not have them, there would be pedestrians trying to cross the street in between vehicles that are parked and that there would not be room for pedestrians to see whether there is room for them to cross the street. He stated that the purpose is to give more elbow room for the pedestrians that are waiting to cross.

Mr. Millan then stated that with regard to angled parking and some of the problems that are with the traffic, he offered that having angled parking on both sides similar to that in the downtown area tended to create a traffic moderating device since there would now be maneuvers that people would have to be aware of, such as someone backing out of a parking space. He then referred the Commission to an illustration and stated that if there was no angled parking, it would be more open and the potential to encourage someone to speed. Mr. Millan stated that with angled parking, there would be a visual cue for the driver to slow down. He reiterated that the bump outs would not result in the street being narrower but would create an area for pedestrians such as when the children are crossing the street at recess.

Mr. Millan again stated that his opinion is that this would be a good traffic moderating device and that it would work as it does in the downtown area. He also stated that the roads downtown carry a little more traffic than what Linden carries and that it would lend itself to that purpose.

Chairperson Dalman stated that to clarify, during school hours now, according to the plans, no one can parallel park in front of that lot. She then stated that it appeared as though you would have more space if you took the parallel parking out and angling it and that with parallel parking, is it into the street more.

Mr. Talty stated that the net result is that the road would be wider.

Mr. Coladarci asked if for the new proposal, there would be 15 new spaces.

The applicant confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Coladarci then stated that after doing a rough estimate, there are about eight spaces there now with parallel parking and that there would be a net increase of six spaces.

A question was raised as to whether the streets such as Lincoln are wider.

Mr. Millan confirmed that is correct and added that it would still allow for two way traffic while creating the sense of having to be careful since someone may be backing out.

Ms. Fessler questioned whether there were other traffic moderating devices such as signage or a light, which might also be used to improve safety.

Mr. Millan responded that one of the ideas that they discussed last time was what can be done for the pedestrians such as the use of a push button with a beacon. He then stated that they have to be careful not to have too many signs because it would start to clutter and people would disregard them. Mr. Millan also commented that less is more and that he would warn against putting too many signs up that people would ignore.

Chairperson Dalman noted that the bumpouts are new, and questioned whether the walkway would be raised.

Mr. Millan stated that he did not think that it would be raised and that with regard to New Trier, the typical crosswalks that you see are those with only two lines. He also referred to step ladder ones and angled ones and described the step ladder configuration as having two lines of paint and being similar to going up a ladder and that the angled ones, instead of being straight, they are at an angle. Mr. Millan stated that the last two examples are called high visibility crosswalks because it has been proven that it gives more of a visual cue to the driver as opposed to the use of lines only. He then stated that while all three are acceptable, you see the high visibility ones at schools such as New Trier. Mr. Millan stated that in areas with high amounts of visibility, they are being changed to these types of crosswalks.

Ms. Fessler questioned the possibility of using a sign to make people aware that they are in a school zone.

Mr. Millan stated that could be done.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Thomas asked if they did not do angled parking for 15 spaces, there would still be parallel parking for eight spaces and they would not be having this discussion. He also stated that the additional parking spaces would mostly be used for funerals and Sundays.

Mr. Talty informed the Commission that at the DRB meeting, they had some parents speak whose children participate in sports on the athletic field and the fact that there is cuing that takes place when they pick up the children in the evening, the vehicles line up along the side of the road. He then stated that if they had an angled spot to pull into and be stationary rather than being along the edge of the road, they would feel better about it and for their children getting in and out of vehicles. He also stated that the hope for the field is that over time for it to become an active public amenity in the summer and when school is not in session and that there would be children playing on the

turf like they do at the Skokie playfield. Mr. Talty stated that this amenity is going to encourage this type of use and that even though it would be for another seven or eight vehicles, he described it as a positive thing and that those would be public spaces which would work well with the field development.

Mr. Talty also stated that the Winnetka Bible Church around the corner has the exact same situation and that they have angled parking now on the west side of the street in the Village right-of-way to accommodate the capacity that is necessary there.

Ms. Fessler questioned whether that is a wider street.

Mr. Talty responded that he did not know if the street is wider.

Ms. Holland stated that the street in question is Birch Street and that it is much wider north of Elm Street.

A question was asked from the audience whether the fire department needed to have a certain amount of room in terms of access.

Mr. Talty responded that there has been no dialog with the fire department but that given the fact that they would not be impacting the width of the travel lanes, they should have no issue with what they are doing.

Chairperson Dalman stated that to clarify what the applicant stated in connection with the Winnetka Bible Church, which was one situation where there was a precedent for providing parking in the right of way.

Mr. Talty stated that represented parking in the right-of-way and that it has happened before. He added that they would be replacing the right-of-way west of those vehicles as well as installing a new sidewalk and improving the landscape buffer.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other questions.

Ms. Holland noted that there were homes on that side of Birch and that the church bought those homes and tore them down and asked to use that space. She noted that there was a home at Elm and at Spruce which was purchased by the church and that they built new accommodations.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other questions. She then stated that she noticed that they have a new format for their draft findings and asked Mr. Norkus if there is any recommendation as to how they go about discussing the draft findings.

Mr. Norkus informed the Commission that the format itself is similar to what the Commission has seen before. He then stated that depending on the case before the Commission and the concerns the Commission identifies, there are two different options here which include going through each one of the findings and discussing them individually or the other alternative which has worked relatively well in some cases, would be for Commissioners who have concerns about particular

findings not being met, to identify those which they feel are not met, to pull those out for discussion.

Chairperson Dalman stated that hopefully, everyone has had a chance to go through the draft findings which are written in the alternative, affirmative and negative. She then stated that taking the assumption that they are taking it in the affirmative, she asked the Commission members if anyone had any objections or concerns which they would like to discuss or if there is any finding that they would not be able to support.

Chairperson Dalman stated that if there are couple of findings and they discuss them, ultimately, after the discussion ended on all of the findings, if there are some findings that they do not think the application did not meet the criteria of following the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan as identified in the findings, at some point they would vote and that if the majority of the Commission felt either way that it did not meet the standards or is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, she would assume that the majority's decision would carry. She stated that there would be an opportunity for a dissenting opinion which would be noted for the record. Chairperson Dalman then stated that the purpose of the discussion is to find out if others share your views.

Mr. Coladarci suggested that everyone make their comments and that then, they address the findings. He then commented that the amended plan that the applicant provided is excellent overall given the fact that they engaged with the neighbors and addressed the concerns raised by the neighbors. Mr. Coladarci stated that as the neighbors expressed at the first meeting where there was a lot of surprise by the neighbors in terms of what the plan was, he stated that the church has addressed that with the reduction in the size of the plan and the attempt to make it more pleasing to the eye of those who pass by.

Mr. Coladarci then stated that his objection to the plan still comes down to parking and only to the extent that it requests the conversion of a Village right-of-way green space into parking. He stated that to put in 15 spaces to replace eight spaces which would result in the gain of approximately seven spaces and that the vehicles on Sunday would have access that they would not currently if it were filled up, he stated that seemed to be a minimal improvement for a minimal change in the church's plan if the Commission was to not recommend angled parking but did recommend the rest of the parking as proposed by the applicant and that it would only impact seven vehicles. Mr. Coladarci referred to the Bible Church being used as an example and he stated that when you drive by the church on Ridge, there are parallel spaces along that side and that they have gotten relief once to put that in. He then stated that he did not think it was necessary to move spaces this close to the church for only seven spaces and that to take away that green space and to impact traffic, it is clear and common sense if there were a lot of spaces where people were pulling out in two directions plus the egress or entrance spot which is also right there on Linden, it would become very tricky in terms of traffic. Mr. Coladarci stated that refusing the request for diagonal parking would have a minimal effect on the overall plan and would permit the plan to go forward and address the concerns with regard to diagonal parking.

Mr. Thomas commented that he is much impressed by what the applicant has done in response to the neighbors' concerns. He stated that he has much less concern than Mr. Coladarci has

expressed in connection with parking. Mr. Thomas stated that when he hears that picking up and dropping off children in the late afternoon at the field would be easier with the angled parking, that convinced him that it is a perfectly reasonable thing to propose and for him to accept as part of the Commission. He then stated that if he had to vote on the plan including the parking change, he would be in favor of it.

Ms. Crumley stated that she agreed with Mr. Thomas' comments and that it is eight spaces which is not a huge amount of spaces. She also stated that while there are walking people, there are also people with small children who they want to be out in the community and using the community. Ms. Crumley stated that is something that they have to think about from the perspective of people moving here and making this their home. She also stated that she traveled a lot for work and goes to different villages and that she thinks that the traffic study which was presented is very true and that it has been her experience that when you do have those types of spaces, you do slow down and that it is easier in terms of visibility and safer for children. Ms. Crumley then stated that driving in other villages with parallel parking on both sides of the street, there is really not the room that you think you have. She then stated that the comments and the traffic study swayed her and that she is fine with the plan as is.

Chairperson Dalman stated that in looking at some of the goals and objectives to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, you can see it either way. She stated that having recently attended very large funerals at the parish, it struck her in terms of how far the traffic went into other areas of the community and that to try to address a way to condense and bring more of those parking spaces closer to the church not only for younger families, she referred to the fact that the average age in Winnetka is 47 and that they have heard that it is an aging community from all of the demographics, there are a lot of seniors who live in the area and that it would present an opportunity for them to have closer access. Chairperson Dalman stated that one person seeing it as a safety issue for the opposite reasons, she would see it as a safety issue.

Chairperson Dalman then stated that in looking specifically at some of the policy goals of the Comprehensive Plan, to ensure safe and attractive access to educational and community institutions which is finding no. 13 and finding no. 15 to make sure that they do not have an adverse impact on the residential character of the surrounding residential neighborhoods, you can say that consolidating the parking and the angled parking would help with that. She also referred to finding no. 16 to encourage government and non-governmental institutions thinking that the church is an institution to work with their constituents, neighbors and the Village to minimize the impact of traffic and parking on surrounding residential streets and that for those reasons, she would take the flip to Mr. Coladarci and say that the applicant has done a great job and that the whole application is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Holland stated that on the parking issue, she would agree with Mr. Coladarci that the eight spaces would be important as long as there and stated that she is not quite sure that this is such a tiny crosswalk but that it would go from bump out to bump out and would probably be safe enough. She stated that the only other objective that she had related to finding no. 5 and commented that the church is a magnificent example of classic architecture. Ms. Holland stated that the question she had related to the gathering space with the bump out and referred the Commission to page 14 of the materials and that it allowed the gathering space to the north to have

eight tables if it is used as a dining area. She stated that the problem she is having from an architectural standpoint is the bump out and then referred the Commission to page 19, she stated that it struck her as a residential bay window which she stated is a problem to her when you have such a classical structure.

Ms. Case stated that going back to parking, she agreed with Mr. Coladarci that it is not the Village's responsibility to provide eight parking spaces. She then commented that it is not really that significant in the scheme of all this and that it is going to be used for big events. She then stated that she lived in the neighborhood and that for moms and dads pulling into the crosswalk at the light, it worked as it is now. She stated that adding angled parking is going to be more of a liability than a plus in the long term because the street is narrower and is not as wide as the street for the Winnetka Bible Church. She then stated that as far as voting on the whole application, she would vote in favor of the application as a whole but preserve parking as an issue.

Ms. Morette stated that she is very satisfied with the revised plan and commented that the applicant did a great job in responding to the neighbors' concerns. She then stated that she is not a parking expert and that they have heard from the parking experts and was satisfied with the applicant's response.

Ms. Fessler stated that churches in neighborhoods are part of Winnetka and referred to the use of the play fields and recreational areas and vehicles coming to the area for big events. She then referred to dropping off and commented that it would be much safer to pull into parallel parking and questioned whether that would be worth the investment by the Village in the right-of-way and the safety of the children. Ms. Fessler also stated that she did not think it adds to traffic issues. She stated that the parking they have designed is very nice and appropriate and would be a nice investment for that area and referred to the applicant reaching out to the community and being responsive to their issues.

Mr. Thomas stated that under Roberts Rules of Order, he asked if Chairperson Dalman is allowed to vote in terms of the quorum.

Chairperson Dalman stated that under Winnetka's rules, she is always allowed to vote.

Chairperson Dalman stated that the findings are to be informally scored and evaluated in terms of conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. Chairperson Dalman stated that in listening to the Commission members' comments, putting aside the parking that the application is in conformance with all of the goals, visions and other statements which have been pulled out of the Comprehensive Plan. She stated that the concern is that she did not know how they would handle which visions and goals of the Comprehensive Plan for the two Commission members who had concerns with parking are still struggling with.

Mr. Norkus stated that the Commission may prefer to identify any issues which are found to be inconsistent with the Plan, and discuss those, versus going through all 16 findings. He stated that once it is determined how many issues are found to be consistent or inconsistent with the plan, the Commission would then have a better feel for whether to vote to recommend approval or denial.

Mr. Coladarci stated that he can make a motion and see if anyone seconded it to modify the plan with regard to parking, to see if the motion would pass or fail. He then made a motion to condition the Commission's approval of the plan on eliminating the diagonal parking on the west side of Linden, in favor of parallel parking on the west side of Linden.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas. On a voice vote the motion failed.

A motion was made by Ms. Morette to adopt the findings of the Winnetka Plan Commission with regard to the consistency of the Saints Faith Hope and Charity special use permit with the Village of Winnetka Comprehensive Plan and a motion to adopt the 16 findings listed as identified in the agenda report.

Mr. Thomas seconded the motion.

Ms. Holland stated that she is concerned and the Commission's job is to go through the findings and to come out with them.

Chairperson Dalman stated that she presumed that everyone had read the findings and that if they had an objection, to raise them.

Mr. Coladarci stated that it would be important to do them individually rather than as a whole so that when they get to the finding with regard to parking and he disagreed, he can vote no.

Ms. Crumley stated that as a person who practiced a lot of board type of law, you just need to go through the findings and say aye or nay for each one and that they do not need two separate motions.

Chairperson Dalman stated that they would go through the findings one by one. She then read each of the findings in the affirmative and asked the Commission members to note if there were any objections.

**Findings of the Winnetka Plan Commission
Regarding
Consistency of the Saints Faith Hope and Charity
Special Use Permit
with the Village of Winnetka Comprehensive Plan**

After considering the application, the Commission makes its findings as follows,

Chapter II - Vision, Goals and Objectives

- (1) The proposed special use is consistent with the Goal to "Preserve and enhance those public assets, public lands, natural resources and architecturally significant structures that create the attractive appearance and peaceful, single-family residential character of the Village." [Community Goals: Village Character and Appearance; page 2-1].
- (2) The proposed special use is consistent with the Goal to "Support educational excellence and the enrichment of Winnetka's religious and cultural environment". [Community Goals: Educational and Community Institutions; page 2-1].
- (3) The proposed special use is consistent with the Goal to "Limit commercial, institutional and residential development within the Village to minimize the potentially adverse impacts on adjacent residential neighborhoods and to prevent the need for significant increases in infrastructure (streets, parking, utilities, sewers) and other community resources (schools, parks, recreational facilities, etc.)" [Community Goals: Growth Management; page 2-2].
- (4) The proposed special use is consistent with the objective to "Ensure that commercial, institutional and residential development is appropriate to the character of and minimizes the adverse impact on its surrounding neighborhood" [Village Character and Appearance: Objective #1; page 2-2].
- (5) The proposed special use is consistent with the objective to "Recognize the critical role of the Village's historic architecture in defining Winnetka's unique character in public, institutional, commercial and residential areas, and encourage its preservation" [Village Character and Appearance: Objective #3; page 2-2].
- (6) The proposed special use is consistent with the objective to "Encourage organizations, schools, religious institutions, businesses, and citizens in their efforts to beautify the Village"; [Village Character and Appearance: Objective #7; page 2-2].
- (7) The proposed special use is consistent with the objective to "Protect residential neighborhoods and homes from the encroachment of incompatible land uses and traffic patterns." [Residential Areas-Single Family Residence Objectives: Objective #3; page 2-3].

Mr. Coladarci stated that this finding is not consistent with regard to the traffic patterns.

- (8) The proposed special use is consistent with the objective to "Maintain the quiet ambience of residential neighborhoods"; [Residential Areas-Single Family Residence Objectives: Objective #5; page 2-3].
- (9) The proposed special use is consistent with the objective to "Use high quality design and materials when constructing public improvements. Enhance the beauty of improvements with appropriate decorative details, artwork, or sculpture"; [Village Character and Appearance: Objective #13; page 2-3].
- (10) The proposed special use is consistent with the objective to "Recognize the critical importance of educational, religious and other community institutions to Village residents"; [Educational and Community Institutions: Objective #1; page 25].
- (11) The proposed special use is consistent with the objective to "Maintain an atmosphere in which diverse cultural, educational and religious organizations may flourish and in which special activities for residents of all ages may be enhanced"; [Educational and Community Institutions: Objective #2; page 2-5].
- (12) The proposed special use is consistent with the objective to "Engage in a public process that balances institutional goals and minimizes any adverse impact to the character of the adjacent residential neighborhood"; [Educational and Community Institutions: Objective #3; page 2-5].
- (13) The proposed special use is consistent with the objective to "Ensure safe and attractive access to educational and community institutions. Pursue improvements that address public safety as well as traffic, congestion and parking"; [Educational and Community Institutions: Objective #5; page 2-5].

Two Commission members objected to finding no. 13.

- (14) The proposed special use is consistent with the Goal to "Preserve or expand the quantity, quality and distribution of open space and recreational opportunities", and to "protect the Village's natural features and environmental resources". [Open Space Recreation and Environment: Goals; page 2-5].

Chapter IV: Issues and Recommendations

- (15) The proposed special use is consistent with the recommendation to "Ensure proposals don't have an adverse impact on the residential character of the surrounding residential neighborhoods." [Issues and Recommendations, 4.3.6. Land Use - Public and Semi-Public; page 4-5].
- (16) The proposed special use is consistent with the recommendation to "Encourage governmental and non-governmental institutions to work with their constituents, neighbors and the Village to minimize the impact of traffic and parking on surrounding

residential streets and to develop on-site solutions where appropriate" [Issues and Recommendations, 4.3.6. Land Use - Public and Semi-Public; page 4-5].

RESOLUTION

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Winnetka Plan Commission finds that the proposed Special Use Permit application by Saints Faith Hope and Charity is consistent with the Village of Winnetka Comprehensive Plan.

Passed by a vote of eight in favor and none opposed.

Consideration of Special Use Permit Request by Winnetka Public Schools / District 36 for Proposed Modular Classrooms at Crow Island School, 1112 Willow Road

Trisha Kocanda introduced herself to the Commission as the Superintendent of the Public Schools as well as Greg Kurr, the District CFO and Carol Pugh, the project architect. She began by stating that over the past few weeks, they have engaged with the parents and the neighborhood community near Crow Island to share this presentation. Ms. Kocanda stated that she would explain why they are looking at these temporary classrooms, what their long terms plans are for Crow Island and what the temporary classrooms would look like.

Ms. Kocanda stated that they engaged their parents and the neighbors and that they wanted to make sure that they built that shared understanding that they engaged in conversations and gathered that input to inform the school board and the processes along the way. She stated that there is also a slide which represented the feedback that they received from the neighbors and an update that they made to their school board the previous night. Ms. Kocanda informed the Commission that the school board is expected to vote on this at the next school board meeting on March 13, 2016.

Ms. Kocanda informed the Commission that the students at Crow Island currently have access to all of the district's structural programming, their specials, fine arts, physical education, etc. that the Hubbard Woods students benefit from as well. She stated that although the population at Crow Island is approximately 130 more students than Hubbard Woods and Greeley at 385, she stated that the programming is solid and that the children are benefiting from this approach.

Ms. Kocanda then stated that they placed their students into sections or classrooms per the standard guidelines. She also stated that they have the wonderful support of the community at Crow Island, a great teaching staff and a very special building which has historical significance.

Ms. Kocanda stated that with regard to why they are looking for the temporary classroom solution, she informed the Commission that they have four sections of classes per grade level of students and noted that they have over 90 first grade students currently which necessitated a fifth section at that grade level. She then stated that a few decades ago, Crow Island had over 600 students. Ms. Kocanda stated that with regard to what is different in connection with their expectations today primarily related to their commitment to some of their specials and that when they reviewed their curriculum for arts, physical education and Spanish, they recognized that there was a lot of

flexibility from school to school as to how much structural time the students were having at each of those programs. She stated that they decided that those programs are very important to their students and that in the past, when the schools had larger enrollment, they might peel back on some of those specials and referred to the disparity of costs.

Ms. Kocanda also stated that they have a program that is required and titled by the state as a mandated Response to Intervention and that the purpose of that it flipped how they service children a little. She then stated that in a traditional special education model, students would have to keep failing through the system before they received services. Ms. Kocanda stated that the state stated that they have to have a response to intervention model which allowed them to intervene early on behalf of students so that the route to services is not special education and that essentially, there would be less students in special education.

Ms. Kocanda then stated that what this has to do with regard to space is that it required them to service students earlier in smaller group situations which required more space for a small group structural environment. She stated that with regard to specials consistency, to give the Commission a mathematical domino effect, for every section they have of a grade level, it would add 13 30 minute sections of specials a week to the schedule. Ms. Kocanda then stated that with regard to Response to Intervention, she spoke to the principal, Julie Pfeffer, about this and that it amounted to 100 to 125 students who would receive those services.

Ms. Kocanda went on to state that they knew going into the school year that they would have an extra section at first grade and that they made some changes last summer that they felt were adequate changes, such as having the publication office at Crow Island servicing the district moving over to Washburne and a special education district program that they have since moved to Hubbard Woods. She then stated that in going through the school year in November, they recognized that they are servicing students in the hallways for Response to Intervention and that there are eight teachers in a classroom which are servicing some of the small group classes and that they want to expand and make some more room for some of that programming to provide some relief.

Ms. Kocanda stated that for their students at Crow Island today, they want to look at an interim solution. She stated that they also recognize that the district needs time and responsibility to look at longer term solutions to address the space. Ms. Kocanda then stated that one is that there could be a self-correction at Crow Island and that the larger first grade hopefully moved on to the Skokie School. She stated that they can also investigate school boundary shifts and informed the Commission that it takes approximately 10 years to recover from significant events of the school system, one of which is a strike and the other is redistricting. Ms. Kocanda stated that it would take at least a year to look at redistricting and the long term impact on the community. She stated that they could also invest in looking at construction at Crow Island but that they did not forecast another expected growth spurt and that it looked to be declining by approximately 2% per year.

Ms. Kocanda then referred the Commission to the summary slide which indicated that the project would provide immediate relief to look at some temporary classrooms and that the overall enrollment projection does not look to sustain a high level at Crow Island and would allow them to investigate the costs of other long term solutions. She also stated that another factor complicating

the situation is the fact that the school board is considering extending the kindergarten day from a half day which would require additional classroom space. Ms. Kocanda informed the Commission that the kindergarten day study has been ongoing during the school year and that the school board is expected to make a decision in May which would take effect in the 2017-2018 school year. She stated that related to the discussion with regard to phase two of a temporary classroom or that in May, they could have other alternative options where extended day kindergarten may only be offered at Greeley. Ms. Kocanda then stated that Greg Kurr would now discuss the classrooms themselves and the positioning of them.

Greg Kurr began by stating that the thing to point out that they have two governing bodies over this process which included the Commission and the Village, as well as the Illinois State Board of Education and that they have regulations as far as both of those are concerned in going through the process. He then stated that as far as the units themselves, he identified the A and B units in an illustration for the Commission and stated that each unit would house two classrooms. Mr. Kurr stated that if extended day kindergarten went into effect, there would be four classrooms or two units.

Mr. Kurr then stated that as far as the installation of the units, the first is planned to be installed this summer which they have referred to as providing space relief for the school and that once extended day kindergarten is approved in May, they would be looking to put the second unit in the following summer.

Mr. Kurr stated that in connection with some of the amenities of the units, the exterior painting as far as color tone, they discussed that with the community which is one of the outcomes that the Commission would see on a later slide. He also referred to the design of the exterior as to whether it would be slatted or stucco. Mr. Kurr then stated that landscaping is also a topic of concern and that they have engaged the community and hired a landscape architect. He stated that as far as the community is concerned, they may feel a little pressured as they do and that as Ms. Kocanda explained, they began the process in November or December and began reaching out to the community in January and that they would hear during public comment that although it was a little late, they are attempting to catch up in the process.

Mr. Kurr then informed the Commission that the units would be air conditioned which is attractive for the faculty and the students. He then stated that as far as the technology they have in the buildings, they would be part of the units as well. Mr. Kurr added that in the area of security, it is the same and that there would be lighting, security cameras as well as the fact that they would be sprinkled units which is a requirement.

Mr. Kurr then identified the school building on an illustration for the Commission as well as the southwest doorway and the A unit for space relief which would run in a north-south direction and that the B unit would run in an east-west direction. He then referred the Commission to a summary and the fact that they are going through a tandem plan with the Village and the school board and that the timing would be over two summers in a row. Mr. Kurr also referred to the parent and neighbor engagement sessions and identified some of the outcomes from that. He stated that there is a general consensus as far as space needs from both parties. Mr. Kurr also stated that with regard to questions as to how to utilize the classrooms, he stated that while it was

identified that kindergarten being part of the extension program, there is no intent to put kindergarten students in the temporary classrooms.

Mr. Kurr stated that there has also been a third dialog with regard to where to place the units which Carol Pugh would discuss. He then pointed out that with regard to the layout of the property, he identified Willow Road and the open field. Mr. Kurr stated that when they first considered the project, the first location was coming through a road which he identified for the Commission and current asphalted property which would be the most logical and easiest location from a physical standpoint. He then identified the plan for the units at the southwest corner of the property and identified Park District property and the wooded area behind the units. Mr. Kurr noted that this is the furthest location from the property lines and where they have had mobile units in the past. He then stated that the neighboring community has asked them to look at other locations at the northwest corner of the property which is where there is a play area and playground equipment. Mr. Kurr also stated that another alternative would be to locate the units in between the U area he identified for the Commission and that the area progressed down to the basement level and which he described as an arena type area.

Mr. Kurr stated that they have also had commentary from the neighbors as far as where the windows would go and that they would be adding a window to each as well as the color of the material. He then stated that in connection with landscaping, the landscape architect would go through the plan. Mr. Kurr informed the Commission that what that plan deals with is not only around the units themselves but that it also related to the perimeter area and the bermed area around the field.

Mr. Kurr then referred the Commission to a summary of the key dates and timetables and informed the Commission that they have been before the DRB and would be going back before them in March and that the school board would be focusing on March 15 to approve the design and implementation as well as extended day kindergarten. He identified the final target for them from the Village standpoint is to have approval by the Village Council on April 5, 2016.

Carol Pugh introduced herself to the Commission as the architect on the project and that she is assisting the district with regard to the implementation of the units, the logistics and how to get the modular units onto the site. She then referred to the overall site plan and the fact that they looked at several different locations in order to find the least impactful place to put them. Ms. Pugh stated that there have been modular units in the proposed location in the past in the late 1980's.

Ms. Pugh then stated that with regard to the first two alternative locations, they could have put the units out in the front of the building near Willow Road and that no one wants to do that, as well as the fact that the area is in the 100 year flood plain. She stated that another location was off to the northwest side which is Park District property and that they would have to be located on Park District property which would affect the first grade playground and that they would have to remove the playground equipment in order to get the units in. Ms. Pugh then referred the Commission to an illustration of the 100 year flood plain area on the property. She also stated that an issue with the Willow Road location is that you would see the units in this location coming from the west on Willow Road.

Ms. Pugh then stated that on the east side of the building, she identified a sliver of property which is not wide enough to put the units and which would be an obvious solution for the neighbors. She identified the area above that as the kindergarten play area and that they do not want to touch that. Ms. Pugh also stated that another location on the southeast portion is an option but would be imposing to the neighbors and would infringe on police and security of driving by the property in terms of seeing what is going on at the property. She then stated that they felt that the southwest location was the least impactful on the community and the neighbors. Ms. Pugh also identified the exit from the southeast wing and that the reason for the L shape is for the sake of the trees.

A Commission member asked if there is fencing along the western property line.

Ms. Pugh responded that there is fencing on the Park District property and that there is no fencing along the western edge and that it is mostly a tree line.

Ms. Holland asked at what point does the log house come in.

Ms. Pugh identified its location for the Commission.

Mr. Thomas asked if this is a different site plan than was presented to the Park District in January.

Mr. Kurr informed the Commission that the Park District had an initial plan where instead of having the A unit centered on the wall, there were two parallel units, that alternative would have encroached on their property. He stated that when they started going through the process and identifying what would fit between trees as well as to accommodate maximum classroom size, they would have only been able to fit a smaller unit between the trees which would have shortened the classroom size. Mr. Kurr then stated that as far as what the Park District approved, he referred to the location of the units at the property line.

Mr. Thomas then asked since they changed the plan as to what was presented to the Park District, do they no longer need Park District approval since the units would not be located on their property.

Mr. Kurr confirmed that is correct. He stated that they wanted to move along as quickly as they could and that depending on the plan sorting out and the fact that they had the intergovernmental agreement in the works.

Ms. Holland indicated that she assumed that the applicant is aware that Crow Island is not on the National Register of Historic Places and that it is a national landmark which has very stringent requirements out of Washington. She then asked what kind of implication and stated that she realized that they are not changing the building and asked if there had been any conversation with the National Preservation Commission in Washington about a national landmark having two modular units for a long period of time.

Mr. Kurr responded that he has not had direct conversation with them but that they have a preservation committee which has looked at it as far as any conflict. He added that he can look further. Mr. Kurr reiterated that they have had these units in the past on the same location.

Ms. Holland stated that there is a Washington connection and that she hoped that they would make that connection and make sure that irrespective of what happened in the past the fact that this has no impact on this very special structure and what kind of restrictions they may have.

Ms. Pugh stated that the two units would be removed and that when they are removed, there would be no trace of them. She stated that they can inquire further about that issue and get a more expert opinion but stated that they are not talking about changing the structure at all. Ms. Pugh also stated that for historic structures which undergo renovation, there sometimes have to be a temporary structure or things moved out.

Ms. Holland stated that she could not vote on this as a special use unless there was a statement about the temporary time frame.

Ms. Pugh stated that they do have a time frame for the approval specified which is three years and that four years would be the maximum.

Mr. Kurr confirmed that the time period would be three years with an option for a one year extension for the A unit. He reiterated that there is not only the oversight of the Village, but that they have to report to the state as far as their intentions and as far as disposition of the units to avoid the very concern Ms. Holland is expressing.

Ms. Holland then stated that getting in touch with the proper people is important and that this is the one national landmark which although it is an honorific designation, she commented that it is a very important designation for not only the school district, but for Winnetka.

Ms. Pugh agreed that they recognize that as a board and would like to note for the record that they have made significant improvements to Crow Island and that the significance of the building has always figured in to everything they have chosen to the point that they have made decisions to spend more money in some instances in order to preserve the historic character of the building and get renovations which are line. She stated that it is a very important priority of the board.

Ms. Pugh went on to inform the Commission as to why the units are configured the way they are, she stated that they would be setting modular unit A 10 feet off of the Park District property and that the reason for that is to nestle it in between the trees there without taking any trees down. She stated that one of the goals was to get the units as close to the building as possible so that the children do not have far to walk and to save the trees that are there. Ms. Pugh stated that for modular unit B, it would be turned in an east-west fashion in order to maximize the green space of the soccer field just south of that location. She stated that this L configuration would suit their needs the best.

A Commission member asked if there would be any windows on the units.

Ms. Pugh confirmed that is correct and referred the Commission to an illustration. She stated that there would be three windows in each one of the classrooms as well as glass in the door. Ms. Pugh noted that these are premanufactured units and that there is not a whole lot of character to

them and that there are not a lot of options that they have to customize them.

A Commission member stated that it was mentioned that this was the previous location of modular units and asked if there are utilities already in the ground.

Ms. Pugh responded that she believed that they were taken out and that she worked with the district back in the 1980's and that they would have taken the utilities out and not left them in the ground.

A Commission member questioned the connection to the existing school building.

Ms. Pugh stated that they are anticipating putting in a plank which would be a vinyl public walkway which would take the children under cover to that entry. She noted that it would have posts and that it would not be attached to the building and that it would not be enclosed.

Mr. Thomas asked if the plan is to start with unit A and if the school board decided they needed the second unit, to go ahead with that a year or so later.

Ms. Pugh confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Thomas then stated that in getting to unit A, there would be a walkway which would come out of the southwest part of the school and would loop around to come into the front door and he asked why did they not just have them come in the back door.

Ms. Pugh stated that there are doors on the back of the units and that if the staff decided they wanted to take the children in that way, they certainly can. She stated that for the sake of monitoring the students, the assumption is that they would all stay together and come in one door. Ms. Pugh then referred to the walkway to the A unit and that it would then continue on to the B unit.

A Commission member asked if there would be a lot of going in and out of the classrooms between the building and the modular classrooms for the children.

Ms. Kocanda stated that there would be discussions with the staff and that the Spanish and music classes would be outside which was the result of a lot of the feedback from parents and because of the special nature of the classes and to not have classes isolated all day long out there. She also stated that all of the students would rotate through and that they would be out there no longer in either of those classes one half hour. Ms. Kocanda stated that in addition, it would also provide some air conditioning to all of the students since the building does get hot.

Mr. Thomas asked if the school is K-4 and if one of the classrooms would be Spanish and the other would be music.

Ms. Kocanda confirmed that is correct.

A Commission member asked if the kindergarten gets, if a couple of classes have to be in the modular units and clarified that she meant grade level classes.

Ms. Kocanda responded that they would not have to be and that they have plenty to look at if they need to have some of those small group environments outside.

A Commission member then asked if they would be housing a complete class in the modular units if the extended or would they put other special ...

A Commission member then asked if there would be a first grade class in the units.

Ms. Kocanda stated that the only class which was considered at one point was the fourth grade.

It was stated that there are lot of other classes that could go out there and that there are a lot of special classes such as tutoring, etc.

Ms. Pugh went on to state as far as the Commission's concerns with regard to the request, there would be no change to traffic flow or parking or asphalt which is another reason they chose this location since there would be no change to the amount of impervious surface. She also stated that they have a landscaping plan to screen the units the best that they can with the use of large evergreens and Arbor Vitae as well as the use of other seasonal interest plants. Ms. Pugh noted that the berm is already there which is a maintenance issue.

Ms. Kocanda stated that they are working with the neighbors in terms of landscaping and in terms of making decisions which they heard was something loud and clear as an issue to the neighbors.

Ms. Pugh stated that was the end of the presentation and asked if there were any other questions.

A Commission member asked if the units would be monitored in terms of going in and out of the building to the units.

Ms. Kocanda informed the Commission that the students would be escorted out to the units by a teacher or a teacher associate and that if there is a need for a bathroom break, there would be an escort as well.

A Commission member asked if the units would affect drop-off and pickup at all.

Ms. Kocanda stated that they would not.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other questions. No additional questions were raised by the Commission at this time. She then asked for any members of the public who would now like to speak to the request.

Shannon Pope, 311 Glendale, introduced herself to the Commission as a neighbor of Crow Island as well as parent. She commented that it is a great school with world class teachers and that while they love being a neighbor to Crow Island, lately it has gotten a little bit trickier with the trailers making it a bigger burden. Ms. Pope stated that they recognize that there is a need for more space at Crow Island. She stated that while she has a lot of concerns with the plan primarily, the fact

that there are a lot of pieces that are not complete right now. Ms. Pope stated that she is aware that they are going to work together on a landscaping committee but that is not developed yet. She also stated that while there has been investigation into fences and colors, that has not been finalized. Ms. Pope stated that there are a lot of pieces in motion for which she would like to see the actual final collaboration.

Ms. Pope informed the Commission that she has lived across the street for 10 years and that she has watched the trees in front of the berm deteriorate which ultimately get removed and that nothing is replaced. She then stated that five years ago, Crow Island changed the traffic pickup pattern resulting in the redirection of vehicles off of Willow Road to Glendale and that although it as helpful in terms of the Willow Road traffic, it has really lead to a deterioration of the campus with the children all over the lawn waiting for their rides. She suggested that modifications can be made to endure that for the children waiting for their rides along Glendale. Ms. Pope stated that the current situation on Glendale is not great and to add trailers which would be directly visible from her home would make it worse. She then stated that while she is excited to work with the school, she asked that they think of ways to make it better and that there are not at that point tonight and that while they have a lot of meetings scheduled, they do not yet have a plan that everyone is on board with. Ms. Pope also stated that they are concerned with regard to their property values and that selling a home with the trailers across the street would be very difficult.

Ms. Pope then stated that they are concerned with the duration and that four years seemed like a really long time and that they are going to add programs and if they do not have the capacity to currently accommodate the children, it did not make sense to introduce new programs to this facility and that they could use some of the space in the other buildings where the enrollment is lower.

Ms. Pope stated that with regard to the landscaping in general, they have discussed it quite a bit not just in front of the blacktop, but along Glendale to the north of the driveway entrance to the blacktop which is run down. She stated that she is hopeful that they can see some more work on that that the school has for the final plans for the district.

A Commission member asked Ms. Pope what would be her suggestion for a best space solution.

Ms. Pope responded that she understood that they need the trailers but that the best solution would be for her to feel as though she is not looking at the trailers for four years. She also stated that if trees were added and if there was landscaping improvement on Glendale, your focus would not be on the area of the trailers

Judy Klarfeld, 329 Glendale, informed the Commission that she has lived there for 52 years and that she can attest to Ms. Pope's comments. She then stated that last week, she could not get up the street to her driveway after school. Ms. Klarfeld also stated that she has seen things deteriorate in the last several years. She stated that when the shed was built across from her property, it was white and that she questioned whom she believed to be the president of the PTA as to the color and that the school is beige and aqua in color. Ms. Klarfeld reiterated that the landscaping has gone to pot and that the trees are town down with nothing replaced. She then stated that she may be leaving her home in a couple of years and that she understood the problem

with the population rising and that four years is a very long time.

Mr. Thomas stated that he did not have a problem with the proposal and that the business of temporary housing was something he was involved with years ago. He described the proposal as a nice solution for a short term population problem and that he has seen the population of the schools go up and down over the years. Mr. Thomas reiterated that it is a good solution and that he would leave it to the board and the professionals with regard to what they do. He then referred to the miscommunication between the neighbors and the school board on a variety of issues, none of which had to do with alterations on the units. Mr. Thomas stated that there is a problem in the neighborhood which should be addressed. He concluded by stating the special use proposal sounded reasonable and logical.

Mr. Coladarci stated that he agreed with Mr. Thomas' comments and that the use of the temporary classrooms is an appropriate way to deal with the bump in student population and that it has been done fairly often as a temporary solution. He stated that the criticism of the school by the neighbors of not keeping the property up is a valid criticism and that part of the plan here is to make sure that there is a real commitment by the school board and the school to replace trees and come up with a plan that helped. Mr. Coladarci stated that when you go to the property, you can see that no attention has been made to replacing trees and shrubs which would solve the problem of people looking at these modular units and feeling that they are an eyesore. He stated that the use of landscaping might solve a lot of the visual problems.

A Commission member stated that the school board reviewed the request on a preliminary basis last night and that she did not see there would be a problem with the school board being committed to doing landscaping. She stated that Mr. Kurr mentioned that they are working with the same landscape architect on the Saint Faith Hope and Charity project and that they planned to get community input on that. She stated that it is a project that had to happen in a time sensitive way and that in order to allow that community input, they had to have a committee for people to have voices and some choices. She stated that she can state that the administration and the school board have a common vision with regard to the landscaping which needed to be improved and that this represented the opportunity to do it. She then stated that the other issue is that they do not hear about these issues until a change is made. She noted that the school board heard about traffic all the time and that they deal with it the best that they can.

Ms. Fessler commented that the plan is fine in terms of what they are proposing and that the people who have made their voices known about the landscaping and traffic should continue to do that since it will be presented to the Village Council. She also stated that if the school's population has expanded enough that they are adding these classrooms, traffic would be expanding which would require review and addressing.

A Commission member stated that the placement of the units given the alternative is the best that it can be and that to add landscaping to alleviate some of the concerns and that parking is a separate issue.

A Commission member stated that she agreed with all of the comments made and had nothing to add.

Ms. Holland stated that she would agree that the project is fine given the comments by Ms. Fessler and Mr. Coladarci that the neighbors continue to work with the school board to make whatever changes vis-à-vis landscaping. She also stated that although the applicant did not need an official blessing from Washington, but to make them aware that there would be changes on this site and that there are architectural historians that the Village is very familiar with in Illinois who do this all the time for the Landmark Commission.

A Commission member stated that the application as submitted is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and that they are going through the efforts to landscape the modular units and referred to the parents at Hubbard Woods and how they have embraced it and the job done of the landscaping committee there. She also stated that hopefully, that can take place at Crow Island as well. She added that while it is incumbent on the applicant to install it, it is incumbent on the families of Crow Island to maintain things like flower pots and that their maintenance people have to do other things.

A Commission member stated that she is excited to hear that the district is thinking about all day kindergarten which would boost enrollment and trigger a much bigger discussion in the Village. She stated that some of the other communities have gone to all day kindergarten and have seen a boost in enrollment. She concluded by stating that it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Chairperson Dalman stated that the Commission would now go through the procedure and make a motion for the findings that the application is consistent with the Village of Winnetka Comprehensive Plan. She then asked for a motion.

Mr. Thomas moved to state that the application is consistent with the Village of Winnetka Comprehensive Plan. The motion was seconded.

**Findings of the Winnetka Plan Commission
Consistency of the Winnetka Public Schools /
Crow Island Elementary
Special Use Permit
With the Village of Winnetka Comprehensive Plan**

After considering the application, the Commission makes its findings as follows,

Chapter II - Vision, Goals and Objectives

- (1) The proposed special use is consistent with the Goal to "Preserve and enhance those public assets, public lands, natural resources and architecturally significant structures that create the attractive appearance and peaceful, single-family residential character of the Village." [Community Goals: Village Character and Appearance page 2-1].

- (2) The proposed special use is consistent with the Goal to "Support educational excellence and the enrichment of Winnetka's religious and cultural environment". [Community Goals: Educational and Community Institutions page 2-1].
- (3) The proposed special use is consistent with the Goal to "Limit commercial, institutional and residential development within the Village to minimize the potentially adverse impacts on adjacent residential neighborhoods and to prevent the need for significant increases in infrastructure (streets, parking, utilities, sewers) and other community resources (schools, parks, recreational facilities, etc.)" [Community Goals: Growth Management page 2-2].
- (4) The proposed special use is consistent with the objective to "Ensure that commercial, institutional and residential development is appropriate to the character of and minimizes the adverse impact on its surrounding neighborhood" [Village Character and Appearance: Objective #1; page 2-2].
- (5) The proposed special use is consistent with the objective to "Recognize the critical role of the Village's historic architecture in defining Winnetka's unique character in public, institutional, commercial and residential areas, and encourage its preservation" [Village Character and Appearance: Objective #3; page 2-2].
- (6) The proposed special use is consistent with the objective to "Encourage organizations, schools, religious institutions, businesses, and citizens in their efforts to beautify the Village"; [Village Character and Appearance: Objective #7; page 2-2].
- (7) The proposed special use is consistent with the objective to "Protect residential neighborhoods and homes from the encroachment of incompatible land uses and traffic patterns." [Residential Areas-Single Family Residence Objectives: Objective #3; page 2-3].
- (8) The proposed special use is consistent with the objective to "Maintain the quiet ambience of residential neighborhoods"; [Residential Areas-Single Family Residence Objectives: Objective #5; page 2-3].
- (9) The proposed special use is consistent with the objective to "Use high quality design and materials when constructing public improvements. Enhance the beauty of improvements with appropriate decorative details, artwork, or sculpture"; [Village Character and Appearance: Objective #13; page 2-3].
- (10) The proposed special use is consistent with the objective to "Recognize the critical importance of educational, religious and other community institutions to Village residents"; [Educational and Community Institutions: Objective #1; page 25].

- (11) The proposed special use is consistent with the objective to "Maintain and atmosphere in which diverse cultural, educational and religious organizations may flourish and in which special activities for residents of all ages may be enhanced"; [Educational and Community Institutions: Objective #2; page 2-5].
- (12) The proposed special use is consistent with the objective to "Engage in a public process that balances institutional goals and minimizes any adverse impact to the character of the adjacent residential neighborhood"; [Educational and Community Institutions: Objective #3; page 2-5].
- (13) The proposed special use is consistent with the objective to "Ensure safe and attractive access to educational and community institutions. Pursue improvements that address public safety as well as traffic, congestion and parking"; [Educational and Community Institutions: Objective #5; page 2-5].
- (14) The proposed special use is consistent with the Goal to "Preserve or expand the quantity, quality and distribution of open space and recreational opportunities", and to "protect the Village's natural features and environmental resources". [Open Space Recreation and Environment: Goals page 2-5].

Chapter IV: Issues and Recommendations

- (15) The proposed special use is consistent with the recommendation to "Ensure proposals don't have an adverse impact on the residential character of the surrounding residential neighborhoods." [Issues and Recommendations, 4.3.6. Land Use - Public and Semi-Public; page 4-5].
- (16) The proposed special use is consistent with the recommendation to "Encourage governmental and non-governmental institutions to work with their constituents, neighbors and the Village to minimize the impact of traffic and parking on surrounding residential streets and to develop on-site solutions where appropriate" [Issues and Recommendations, 4.3.6. Land Use - Public and Semi-Public; page 4-5].

RESOLUTION

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Winnetka Plan Commission finds that the proposed Special Use Permit application by Winnetka Public School District / Crow Island Elementary is consistent with the Village of Winnetka Comprehensive Plan.

Passed by a vote of eight in favor and none opposed.

Date: February 24, 2016

Public Comment

Chairperson Dalman asked if there was any additional public comment. No additional public comment was made at this time.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Antionette Johnson

MEMO

SUBJECT: Plan Commission procedures for public hearings
DATE: May 20, 2016
FROM: Brian Norkus, Assistant Director of Community Development

The attached procedural guidelines have been provided by Village Attorney Peter Friedman for consideration and adoption by the Plan Commission. Adoption of the attached rules formalizes existing practices, and allows for distribution as a handout to the public at future meetings.

WINNETKA PLAN COMMISSION (PC) PROCEDURES FOR PUBLIC HEARING

This document explains the procedures that the PC will use to conduct the public hearing on [type of zoning relief]. The purpose of these procedures is to ensure that the applicant and the public have a full and fair opportunity to present their views and questions regarding the proposed development, and to ensure that the PC has the information it needs to make its recommendation to the Village Board regarding the preliminary development plan.

1. **Introduction by the Chairperson.** The Chairperson will begin by officially opening the public hearing. The Chairperson will then announce the name of the petitioner and that the stated intent of the public hearing will be to consider an application for [type of zoning relief]. The Chairperson will explain the procedures for the conduct of the public hearing. An oath shall be administered to all persons intending to speak during the course of the public hearing.
2. **Status of Petition.** Village staff will report the status of the proposed petition and note the materials received.
3. **Petitioner's Presentation.** The petitioner will present the petition for the preliminary development plan with testimony of witnesses and other evidence. The petitioner will be given approximately 1 hour for its presentation, subject to extension that the Chairperson may grant in order to ensure that necessary information is included and presented at the public hearing. In general, the PC will allow the petitioner to make this presentation without interruption, except for those questions allowed by the Chairperson from the PC members that may be immediately necessary to aid the PC or the public in understanding the presentation.
4. **Initial PC Questions.** After the Petitioner's Presentation, the PC members may ask such questions of the petitioner as may be necessary to clarify material presented or the relief requested. It is anticipated that the Petitioner's Presentation and the Initial PC Questions will proceed on the [date] hearing date, at which point the PC will continue the hearing to the PC's [date] meeting date for the commencement of Public Testimony and Comment on the preliminary development plan.
5. **Public Testimony and Comment.** It is anticipated that Public Testimony and Comment will commence on the PC's [date] meeting.

- **Designated Counsel.** It may be that certain residents or groups of residents may have chosen to be represented by counsel ("Designated Counsel"). If this is the case, then the first portion of the public testimony and comment period will be allocated to Designated Counsel. If there are no Designated Counsel, then the proceedings can go directly to the General public comment explained below.

If there are Designated Counsel, then at the start of the Designated Counsel period for testimony and comment, the Chairperson will advise the Designated Counsel of the amount of time permitted for testimony and comment. For this hearing, each Designated Counsel will be given 30 minutes for their individual comments. The Chairperson will ask all Designated Counsel to state their names and addresses and the names and addresses of who they represent. The Chairperson will remind all Designated Counsel to avoid repetition from previous speakers and that all information presented is under oath. The Chairperson will allow each Designated Counsel to speak one time only, unless the Chairperson determines that allowing a Designated Counsel to address the PC again will contribute new testimony or other necessary and relevant evidence.

- **Testimony, Evidence, and Questions.** Designated Counsel may address to the PC their questions, testimony, evidence, and comments about the [proposed project and type of zoning relief] application and the evidence presented by the petitioner and other members

of the public. The Chairperson shall determine how the questions from Designated Counsel shall be addressed. Following the conclusion of all Designated Counsel participation, the Chairperson shall direct the questions from the Designated Counsel to the petitioner in an orderly and consolidated manner for response.

- **General.** At the start of the general period for public testimony and comment, the Chairperson will advise the public of the amount of time permitted for public testimony and comment. For this hearing, each member of the public will be given five minutes for their individual comments. The Chairperson will ask all speakers to state their names and addresses and will remind all speakers to avoid repetition from previous speakers. The Chairperson will also remind the public that all information presented is under oath. The Chairperson will allow each speaker to speak one time only, unless the Chairperson determines that allowing a speaker to address the PC again will contribute new testimony or other evidence.
- **Testimony, Evidence, and Questions.** Members of the public may address to the PC their questions, testimony, evidence, and comments about the preliminary planned residential development application and the evidence presented by the petitioner and other members of the public. The Chairperson shall determine how the questions from the public shall be addressed. Following the conclusion of all public participation, the Chairperson shall direct the questions from the public to the petitioner in an orderly and consolidated manner for response.

6. **Response by the Petitioner.** The Chairperson will allow the petitioner a reasonable time to respond to the public testimony and comments presented.
7. **Questions by the PC.** The PC members may ask such questions of any individual (petitioner and members of the public) as may be necessary to clarify material presented or the relief requested.
8. **PC Discussion and Deliberation.** During the PC's discussion, members of the PC may direct additional questions to the petitioner, witnesses for the petitioner, or members of the public who spoke during the hearing. The Petitioner, witnesses for the petitioner, or members of the public may not address the PC during this portion of the meeting without the consent of the Chairperson.
9. **PC Action.** Based on the discussions, the PC may: (a) require the petitioner, Village staff, and/or the Village Attorney to provide new or additional information and continue the hearing to a date certain; or (b) take action (vote) on the petition and make its recommendation to the Village Board. A vote by the PC will close the public hearing. A majority vote of the PC members present is required in order to take action on the [type of zoning relief]. Under the [applicable zoning code], the PC has the authority to (i) recommend approval of the [type of zoning relief], (ii) recommend approval of the [type of zoning relief] with modifications, or (iii) recommend denial of the [type of zoning relief].

Oath for Public Hearing Participants:

(administered by Chairperson):

“Please stand and raise your right hand –

Do you swear to tell the truth and the whole truth in the testimony you are about to give?

If so, please say “I do”.

Thank you - please be seated.”