Tuesday
June 14, 2016

To: Mr. E. Gene Greable
Winnetka Village President

Mr. Andrew Cripe/Mr. Scott Myers
Mrs. M.Prodromes/Mrs. P. Lamphier
Mrs. Kristin Ziv/Mr. Chris Rintz
Winnetka Village Trustees

Mr. Robert Bahan
Winnetka Village Manager

Mr. Mike Dinofrio
Community Development Mgr
Village of Winnetka

LIMIT HEIGHT & SCOPE OF Winnetka One Project
or GOODBYE Mr. Trandel & Stonegate Partners
NEXT VILLAGE MEETING - Tuesday June 21st @ 7:00 P.M. VILLAGE HALL

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Winnetka;

At the Tuesday April 19th 2016 Village of Winnetka Meeting; Mr. David Humphrey, the Owner of Grand Foods Supermarket Building, displayed a beautiful color smart Tudor (4 Story Framed Building Photo). Such a Building would be a big Asset to East Downtown Winnetka; And a Happy and Moral solution for all the Village.

There is nothing Moral, Fair, or Equitable about Mr. David Trandel building over the four (4) Story Winnetka Building Height Limit or Building Public Parking owned by Stonegate Partners, but paid for by Winnetka Village Residents. Stonegate Partners' grandiose Parking Plans would destroy existing Lincoln Ave. Trees, and also compromise Railroad Safety and the existing Green Bay Trail. LINCOLN AVENUE IS FINE THE WAY IT IS FOR ANY AND ALL STREETSCAPE FAIRS INCLUDING THE CURRENT LAST SUNDAY OF THE MONTH ANTIQUE CAR FAIRS/JAMBOREES.

Mr. Trandel of Stonegate Partners has publicly flattered in the Press the newly elected "non partisan" Village Trustees - Lamphier; Ziv; and Chris Rintz;, While public scolding Hadley School for the Blind, in the press, for doing what over forty (40) other Public and Private Winnetka Residents have done - Filing a Written Objection to the Mega Nature of Winnetka One - Specifically Building Yet Another Public Garage just West of the Hadley School for the Blind, When there already exists twenty-one (21) public parking spaces already under the Current Fell Store on Lincoln Ave.

MR. & MRS. WINNETKA move to WINNETKA to get away from the Hustle & Bustle of Superstructure Buildings & Increased Traffic found in the Cities of Chicago, Evanston, Glenview, and Highland Park. Hope to see everyone at the next Village of Winnetka Meeting June 21st.

[redacted]
Peter E. Geiderman
[redacted]
Winnetka, Illinois 60093-1943
[redacted]

An open letter to the Honorable Winnetka Village Council
By Kaveh Mirani, [redacted] Winnetka

On Winnetka One and Winnetka

For the past few years, an almost two acres, premium part of our village has been sitting idle, going through changes of ownership and a prolonged attempt to secure a Village permit for a new development at the site. As a long term resident of Winnetka I am concerned. As an operator of a restaurant right across the street from the proposed development I have seen the devastating effect of this ghost town on the nearby businesses and how the empty spaces are turning to a sanctuary for drug users at night. I have also had a chance to discuss this project with numerous residents, neighbors and restaurant patrons. Most people know little about the details of the project. Some know a little more but not all the details. Everybody agrees with the following points that (1) the empty site is a disgrace to our Village, (2) our downtown is in a serious need of revitalization and (3) with the skyrocketing property taxes, we need to increase the pool of property taxpayers. There are also concerns that (a) the development is too large and too commercial for the Village, (b) the long expected construction will be an inconvenience to the neighbors and (c) the Village has to spend money upfront towards the project.

There is no doubt that there are some legitimate concerns among our residents and our Village trustees. But I believe that the opposition stems from (1) our natural tendency as Winnetkans to resist change, and (2) the failure of our Village to inform the general public of the pros and cons of this issue in a non partisan fashion. But I am personally of the opinion that the advantages of Winnetka One for the Village far exceed its disadvantages.

An open letter to the Honorable Winnetka Village Council
By Kaveh Mirani, [redacted] Winnetka

Anyone who cares about our Village should be taking a ride through our streets to see the staggering number of closed stores in the commercial district and houses for sale in every corner of our residential areas. The high property taxes (scheduled to go up again by an average of 25% for 2016) have changed the math for people moving to Winnetka because the expected saving on school tuition and other amenities the suburbs offer are eroded by the ever increasing, almost astronomical property taxes. We desperately need to increase the size of our tax contributors. Winnetka One makes this possible. We should overcome the fear of change, that our village will turn to another Northbrook, Rosemont,… if we allow commercial entities like Winnetka One. It is possible to keep the serenity and peaceful nature of our Village without losing track of the economic realities of our community. We need to move on with the times to remain viable. Times have changed and we need to move with it. It is neither wise nor cool to stay behind the curve.

What is the alternative, I have asked in many conversations about the development? Some of us may want a smaller and more modest construction to that offered by Winnetka One. Yet the development of any commercial project must make economic sense and remain profitable for its developer. It is my understanding that Springbank has made several modifications to accommodate the Village's concern, still offering a development worthy of Winnetka. Have they done all they could? I do not have the answer to that but am concerned that, similar to the previous owners of this parcel of land, they may - at some point - find the demands of the Village too prohibitive to meet and give up. What will we do then? Another few years, another developer ….??

Friday July 22, 2016

To: Mr. E. Gene Greable
Winnetka Village President

Mr. A.Cripe/Mr. S. Myers
Mrs. M. Prodromes/Mrs. P. Lamphier
Mrs. K. Ziv/Mr. Chris Rintz
Winnetka Village Trustees

Mr. Mike Dinofrio/Brian Norcross
Community Developmt Mgr & Asst
Village of Winnetka

Mr. Peter Friedman
Village of Winnetka Attorney

Mr. Robert Bahan
Winnetka Village Manager

Mr & Mrs Winnetka
Scott St South to Winnetka Ave
Lake Michigan West to Skokie Lagoons

LIMIT HEIGHT & SCOPE OF WINNETKA ONE (East Elm) PROJECT
Or Find an Alternate Developer in Lieu of Stonegate Partners
NEXT WINNETKA ONE VILLAGE DISCUSSION - Wednesday July 27th @ 7:00 P.M.
WINNETKA VILLAGE HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Winnetka;

At the Tuesday April 19th 2016 Village of Winnetka Meeting; MR. DAVID HUMPHREY, the Owner of GRAND FOODS SUPERMARKET BUILDING, displayed a beautiful color smart Tudor (4 Story Framed/Stucco Building) Photo. Such a Building would be a big Asset to East Downtown Winnetka; And a Happy and Moral solution for the Village of Winnetka.

There is nothing Moral, Fair or Equitable about Mr. David Trandel building over the four (4) Story Winnetka Building Height Limit or Building Public Parking owned by Stonegate Partners, but paid for by Mr. & Mrs. Winnetka Taxpayer. Stonegate Partners' grandiose Parking Plans would destroy existing Lincoln Ave. Trees; Compromise Public Railroad Safety, and the Existing Green Bay Trail. LINCOLN AVENUE IS FINE THE WAY IT IS FOR ANY and ALL STREETSCAPE FAIRS, INCLUDING THE LAST SUNDAY OF THE MONTH ANTIQUE CAR JAMBOREES.

Mr. Trandel of Stonegate Partners in the Press has publicly flattered our newly elected "Non-Partisan" Village Trustees - Lamphier; Ziv; and Chris Rintz;, While publicly scolding HADLEY SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND, in the press, for doing what over forty (40) other Private and Public Winnetka Residents have done - Filing a Written Objection to the Mega Size of Winnetka One - Specifically Building Yet Another Public Garage just West of the HADLEY SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND, When there already exists twenty-one (21) public parking spaces under the Fell Store Structure on Lincoln Ave.

MR. & MRS WINNETKA, with their Children move to WINNETKA to get away from the Hustle & Bustle of Superstructure Buildings & Increased Traffic found in the Cities of Chicago, Evanston, Glenview, and Highland Park.

HOPE TO SEE MR & MRS. WINNETKA AT THE SPECIAL VILLAGE MEETING called by Mr. E. Gene Greable on WEDNESDAY July 27th @ 7:00 P.M. @ WINNETKA VILLAGE HALL 2nd Floor.

[redacted]

Peter E. Gelderman
[redacted].

Encl. Suggestion

A BETTER CHOICE FOR WINNETKA and WINNETKANS

By Peter E. Gelderman

Dear College Educated Winnetka:

There is Historical and Legal precedent for the Village of Winnetka turning out Mr. David Trandel & Stonegate Partners and awarding the Rehabbimg or Rebuilding of the East Winnetka Fell Commercial Property to Reputable Well thought of Organizations.

In July of 1995 A Winnetka Village Council Committee recommended the Development of 360 - 380 Green Bay Road Winnetka by OPTIMA INC. (And Not David Feely).

Therefore in the Interest of Good Government and Good Community Relations, The Winnetka Village President E. Gene Greable, Mr. Peter Friedman, the Village Attorney; Mike Dinofrio/Brian Norcross; And any other Village Trustee deemed capable to seek out respected Alternatives to the Current Developer.

Respected Construction Cos.

1. Terry Graber Pres. CEO
   Power Construction Co. LLC
   Power Construction . net
   (312) 596-6960
2. Mr. Matthew Walsh
   Walsh Group Ltd
   Walsh Group . Com
   (312) 563-5400
3. Mr. J. David Pepper
   Pepper Construction Group
   Pepper Construction . Com
   (312) 266-4700
4. Clayco Inc.
   Mr. Robert G. Clark
   Clay Corp . Com
   (312) 658-0747
5. F.H.Paschen S.N. Nielsen & Assocs
   Mr. James V. Blair
   F.H. Paschen . Com
   (773) 444-3474
6. Mr. Richard A. Blair
   Turner Construction Co.
   Turner Construction . Com
   (312) 327-2770
7. Mr. Allan E. Bulley Jr.
   Bulley & Andrews LLC
   Bulley . Com
   (773) 235-2433
8. James McHugh Constr. Co.
   Mrs. Patricia H. McHugh
   McHugh Construction . Com
   (312) 986-8000

Financial Institutions

1. Mrs. Margaret Gunn Mgr
   Mr. Charles (Chuck) Needham
   Former Branch Mgr-New Business
   Northern Trust Co.
   62 Green Bay Road
   Winnetka, Illinois 60093
   Tel: 1-(847) 441-1221
2. Mr. Wade M. Bundy
   Asst V.P. & Branch Mgr
   Harris Bank
   520 Green Bay Road
   Winnetka, Illinois 60093
   Tel: 1-(847) 441-4814
3. Mr. Mike Kozawick
   Branch Manager
   J.P. Chase Bank
   721 Elm Street
   Winnetka, Illinois 60093
   Tel 1-(847) 501-6513

End of List

George H. Walper, Jr.
[redacted]
Winnetka, IL 60093
[redacted]n

July 26, 2016

Village of Winnetka Trustees
Via Email

Re: One Winnetka and Flooding

I strongly urge you to vote against the revised One Winnetka development project that you will consider on July 27, 2016 and strongly encourage you to only move forward with consideration of a development plan that adheres to all zoning and other regulatory guidelines with no exceptions.

More importantly, you must stay 100% focused on fixing Winnetka's aging infrastructure, as once more evidenced by this weekend's flooding. Five years ago the Village Trustees and staff pledged to solve flooding in Winnetka. Some progress has been made. But, too much money, staff and Trustee time has been spent on studies with no significant implementation plan in sight and damage to may homes once again.

It is clear that the One Winnetka project has divided the Village as evidence by the continued public outcry against the project, that it became the center of the recent Trustee election and the marketing and media campaign undertaken by the developer. The development plan has in fact not created a unified one Winnetka.

The recent flooding will only further divide the Village.

There are no fact based reasons for you to approve this plan. As a Trustee you are charged with acting in the best interests of all Winnetka. You and the Village staff are not responsible to respond and approve the wishes of a developer whose only objective is to ensure a sufficient return on his investment as defined by him. These properties were purchased with a clear understanding and knowledge of the Village regulations and laws that govern the development of the multiple properties he chose to purchase and combine into one development. There has never been a Village vision or plan that called for these properties to be combined into one massive development. All of the developer's comments and rationalization about acting in the interests of Winnetka are stated to rationalize his investment only. The limited flexibility provided for Planned Developments should be used to protect the community by limiting over-sized, unnecessary, and unjustified excessive development, rather than bailing out a developer.

Enough is enough! Devote our staff time, financial resources and your leadership to fix Winnetka's infrastructure.

Thank you,

[redacted]

From:	Robert Bahan
To:	Kathie Scanlan
Cc:	Megan Pierce
Subject:	FW: Resident concerns regarding proposed One Winnetka development
Date:	Tuesday, July 26, 2016 5:11:28 PM

One Winnetka correspondence for tomorrow. Let's add to Mr. Gelderman in the morning.

From: Apatoff, Robert [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, July 26, 2016 4:53 PM
To: Robert Bahan
Cc: Apatoff, Robert
Subject: FW: Resident concerns regarding proposed One Winnetka development

Hi Rob, as I am unable to attend the special Wednesday meeting, would you please give the trustees a copy of my letter prior to the meeting and make sure that it is added to the official meeting record? Thanks very much.

Dear Winnetka Trustees,

I noticed that One Winnetka has asked for a special Wednesday meeting to review their new proposal.

I am writing to voice my clear opposition to the new proposal by One Winnetka. It has become a common tactic by aggressive real estate players; Ask for something really outrageous and then try and wear people down to approve something that is a little less outrageous. We cannot give in to this tactic. We are Winnetka. Not Arlington Heights or even Highland Park.

The town was clear that while most everyone would like some appropriate development in that space, me included, One Winnetka has not satisfactorily answered the many questions that the residents asked of them because, quite candidly, there is no satisfactory answer other than to work within our reasonable, clear building/development guidelines and build something that adds to the town vs. detracts from the town. These variances, ignoring setbacks, etc are just not acceptable as the builder tries to justify the price that he paid for the property.

In addition, it seems common sense that any Trustees that have received financial support from any real estate PACS or were supported by One Winnetka/Trandell in paid advertising in past or recent elections should have to recuse themselves from the Trustee vote on this matter. It would be difficult to be impartial to the very people who spent money to support your campaign.

Thank you very much.
Rob Apatoff
[redacted]

Robert Apatoff
President & Chief Executive Officer
T: 630.724.6100
F: 630.719.6183
E: rapatoff@FTDI.COM

FTD Companies, Inc.
3113 Woodcreek Drive
Downers Grove, IL 60515

From:	Vicki Apatoff
To:	Kathie Scanlan
Subject:	Note for Council re: OneWinnetka meeting tonight 7-27-16
Date:	Wednesday, July 27, 2016 2:40:26 PM
Attachments:	OneWinnetka special meeting 7-27-16.pdf

Hi Kathy-
Hope this finds you well and things are a little calmer since the storm last weekend.

Would you please forward my email below o the Village Council members and Rob Bahan prior to tonight's special meeting on One Winnetka? I would appreciate it being added to the public record. I've also attached it in pdf format if that works better for you. Thank you very much for your help. Vicki

Dear Winnetka Village Council members:

Having followed the OneWinnetka process very closely since its original inception by New Trier Partners, I was extremely surprised to see the latest proposal from StoneStreet Partners, which is to be presented Wednesday night at a special meeting. Especially the items below asking for exceptions to the zoning regulations.

Due to the very late notice and unusual scheduling of a Wednesday, rather than the typical Tuesdays most Council meetings take place, I am unable to attend to speak during public comment, so I would like this email to be included in the formal record, please.

It is no secret that there has been overwhelming objection by Winnetka taxpayers to the size and design of the last iteration of the OneWinnetka proposal.

In addition, residents made it clear that no taxpayer dollars should be required to subsidize private development in the Village without substantial public benefit.

After years of hearing residents who come to meeting after meeting to voice their reasonable objections to the New Trier and Stonestreet proposals, why would the new proposal come back with even more requests for additional height and setback variances?

Is there discussion going on with Stonestreet and the Village that we have not seen during the Council meetings that would lead them to believe this would be acceptable? Otherwise it makes no sense that they would waste even more time, energy and money doubling down on these unreasonable requests.

I think we can all agree that the residents of Winnetka would like to see this eyesore at Elm and Lincoln, (which was created by both New Trier Partners and StoneStreet), to be resolved. But not at the expense of the zoning laws and quality aesthetic considerations that compelled us all to move to this community and want to see enforced. This latest proposal seems to show a complete lack of understanding and disrespect for the concerns and requests of the residents of Winnetka.

I hope that you will vote no on this latest proposal by Stonestreet and ask them to either work within the Village guidelines or move on so that a serious, considerate proposal can be made which will allow this project to finally move forward. Thank

you very much for your consideration.

Vicki Apatoff
[redacted]

As part of the PD approval, the Applicant has also requested approval of three exceptions to the zoning regulations. These include the following:

• Maximum Building Height - 4-stories and 45 ft...
o West (Lincoln Ave.) building – 5-stories, 59 ft. (exclusive of 2'6" parapet – 61'-6")
o East (Elm St.) building – 5-stories, 58 ft.
o Center (Elm St.) building – 4-stories, 48'-10"
• Upper Story Setback – stories at 4th floor and above must be stepped back 10 ft.
o West (Lincoln Ave) building – no stepback provided at 4th and 5th stories
o East (Elm St.) building – no stepback provided at 4th story (stepback provided on 5th story)
• Rear Yard Setback (east property line) – 10 ft.
o No rear yard setback is provided.

From:	Scott
To:	OneWinnetka
Subject:	Comments for the Council regarding the current (7/2016) One Winnetka proposal
Date:	Wednesday, July 27, 2016 12:56:32 PM

To the Village Council

With the apparent reaching of a deal with Conney's Pharmacy, there is no reason for the Village to consider selling or giving any part of Lincoln Avenue to the developer. Before the acquisition of the Conney's property, it might have been argued that the strip of Lincoln was needed to go around Conney's since the 740 Elm building (Phototronics) property did not touch the developer's other parcels even at a point. That need is gone.

As I see it, in Mr. Trandel's letter of July 20 we are being asked to give them 7767 square feet times 5 floors or 38,835 square feet to rent or sell. A very rough calculation using a commercial rental rate of $30 per square foot per year (which is low, I think) would yield $1,165,000 income per year (or some equivalent for sale of condominium units) to Stonestreet. It is not the Village's business to maximize or optimize the commercial value of public property like streets by conversion to private use. I believe Stonestreet should confine their development to property they own now. I also believe they should conform to the zoning requirements of four floors and height limitations which are now more liberal than when the development process began.

With regard to an underground parking garage, I am opposed to that option considering the public reaction I have heard (negative) and the long term maintenance costs of a structure. The limited acceptance of the structure in Hubbard Woods, along with the maintenance expenses, should be instructive. Lincoln Avenue should remain as it is.

In the interest of full disclosure, I am co-owner of Phototronics. We were a tenant of Stonestreet Partners until we moved to our new location in Hubbard Woods. We acquired the business of Phototronics knowing that the building had been sold and that we would have to move. Stonestreet treated us quite decently during the time we rented from them. My comments are totally mine as a resident and have nothing to do with Phototronics.

Scott Dallmeyer

[redacted]
Winnetka

From:	Bradley Smith
To:	OneWinnetka; Brian Norkus; Michael D"Onofrio; Gene Greable; Andrew Cripe; Penfield Lanphier; William Krucks; Chris Rintz; Scott Myers; Kristin Ziv; Richard Sobel
Subject:	Public Comment Concerning One Winnetka
Date:	Wednesday, July 27, 2016 2:50:17 PM
Attachments:	Public Comment Concerning One Winnetka (3).docx

Dear Members of the Winnetka Village Council & Staff,

My name is Bradley Smith and I am working as an intern for Richard Sobel, the son of architect Walter Sobel of the Fell Store on Lincoln Avenue.

Attached you will find a report that details the statistical breakdown of public comment expressed at the various plan commission, design review board, zoning board of appeals, and village council meetings held since March of 2015 that concern One Winnetka. We have found that approximately 71% of the comments either written in or physically presented at these meetings disapprove of the One Winnetka project, despite any revisions that may have occurred over this time period. I encourage you to take a look at this report and to subsequently consider the effect that this project may have on the community, and what other options may be available to pursue.

Thank you very much for your time.

Kindly,
--
Bradley Smith
Northwestern University | 2018
Weinberg College of Arts & Sciences
Mathematics | Art History | Kellogg Certificate in Managerial Analytics

Bradley Smith
[redacted]
July 2016

Public Comment Concerning One Winnetka

This document examines the distribution of opinion voiced concerning the various Plan Commission, Design Review Board, Zoning Board of Appeals, and Village Council meetings pertaining to the One Winnetka project, held between March of 2015 and May of 2016. Overall, the vast majority of public comment concerning this project has remained in opposition of the project. Across all of these meetings, approximately 71% of the comments were negative, as you will find in this report. Most of these opposing opinions were voiced concerning the building's size and its effect on Winnetka's character as a village as a whole, even as developers provided changes to the plan across this time frame. In fact, at the October 21st, 2015 Plan Commission meeting, board member Chris Blum stated that based on the materials present, 97% of the public opposed the plan largely due to these factors. As a result, we encourage the village council to continue to carefully deliberate the effects of this plan. We also encourage the developers to continue to revise their designs based on this feedback—specifically to lower the building height, modify its architectural style, and to incorporate the existing Fell structure into these designs.

This report includes both public comment physically voiced at each commission and feedback sent by mail or email to the council, which was included at the end of each meeting's minutes or on the One Winnetka page at the Village of Winnetka website. Comments expressed through both of these mediums by the same person at the same meeting were not double-counted. Likewise, subjective comments expressed in the questions-only portions of meetings were not included. The table below summarizes these findings. A more detailed analysis of public opinion expressed at the Plan Commission, Design Review Board, Zoning Board of Appeals, and Village Council meetings individually can be found in the following five pages.

Public Comment for Various PC, ZBA, DRB, & VC Meetings

Table 1: Public Comment for various PC, ZBA, DRB, & VC Meetings							
		Number of Comments			Percent of Comments		
#	Date	Dissenting	Neutral	Agreeing	Dissenting	Neutral	Agreeing
1.	3/25/15 PC^	57	3	4	89.1	4.7	6.3
2.	4/08/15 PC	50	2	2	92.6	3.7	3.7
3.	6/24/15 PC	19	7	10	52.8	19.4	27.8
4.	7/22/15 PC	18	7	1	69.2	26.9	3.8
5.	9/30/15 PC	69	3	5	89.6	3.9	6.5
6.	10/21/15 PC	8	2	2	66.7	16.7	16.7
7.	12/14/15 ZBA	28	3	4	80.0	8.6	11.4
8.	1/20/16 DRB	25	1	42	36.8	1.5	61.8
9.	2/8/16 ZBA	10	2	0	83.3	16.7	0.0
10.	2/18/16 DRB	2	1	4	28.6	14.3	57.1
11.	4/5/16 VC	6	2	12	30.0	10.0	60.0
12.	4/19/16 VC	16	2	4	72.7	9.1	18.2
TOTAL*		308	35	90	71.1	8.1	20.8
^: Note that PC stands for Plan Commission, DRB for Design Review Board, & ZBA for Zoning Board of Appeal, VC for Village Council							
*: Note that these totals include comments physically expressed at the meetings and through mail/email							

From these data, we can see that approximately 71.1% of the comments expressed by the general public at all of these meetings were against the proposed One Winnetka plan, about 8.1% were more or less neutral, and 20.8% were in favor of the plan. One must account, however, for the changes in design made by the firm across this time period, particularly in the building's size and height, which parallels a slight decrease in the proportion of dissenting opinion. Nevertheless, a firm majority of the comments made at these meetings by members of the public remain dissenting towards the proposed One Winnetka building plan. A link to a compilation of each meeting's minutes and written comment received can be found here:

http://www.villageofwinnetka.org/departments/community-development/one-winnetka-planned-development/application-materials-received/

Plan Commission Meetings

Looking solely at data from the Plan Commission meetings held within this time frame, we find this:

Table 2: Public Comment for Plan Commission Meetings							
		Number of Comments			Percent of Comments		
#	Date	Dissenting	Neutral	Agreeing	Dissenting	Neutral	Agreeing
1.	3/25/15 PC^	57	3	4	89.1	4.7	6.3
2.	4/08/15 PC	50	2	2	92.6	3.7	3.7
3.	6/24/15 PC	19	7	10	52.8	19.4	27.8
4.	7/22/15 PC	18	7	1	69.2	26.9	3.8
5.	9/30/15 PC	69	3	5	89.6	3.9	6.5
6.	10/21/15 PC	8	2	2	66.7	16.7	16.7
TOTAL*		221	24	24	82.2	8.9	8.9

^: Note that PC stands for Plan Commission

*: Note that these totals include comments physically expressed at the meetings and through mail/email

From these data, we can see that approximately 82.2% of the comments expressed by the general public at these meetings were negative, about 8.9% were more or less neutral, and 8.9% were in favor of the One Winnetka plan.

Design Review Board/Sign of Appeals Meetings

Here I am analyzing the distribution of opinion voiced at the Design Review Board meetings on January 20th, 2016 and on February 18th, 2016. As stated before, I am also including feedback sent by mail or email to the council included at the end of meeting's minutes. This also includes the signatures of a petition to support the preservation and adaptive reuse of the Fell Building. The minutes of these meetings and their written comments can be found here:

- January 20th, 2016: http://www.villageofwinnetka.org/assets/1/20/2016_0121_DRB.pdf
- February 18th, 2016: http://www.villageofwinnetka.org/assets/1/20/DRB_Agenda_2-18-16.pdf

Table 4: Public Comment for Design Review Board Meetings

		Number of Comments			Percent of Comments		
#	**Date^**	**Dissenting**	**Neutral**	**Agreeing**	**Dissenting**	**Neutral**	**Agreeing**
1.	**1/20/16 DRB**	25	1	42	36.8	1.5	61.8
2.	**2/18/16 DRB**	2	1	4	28.6	14.3	57.1
TOTAL*		27	2	46	36.0	2.7	61.3

^: Note that DRB stands for Design Review Board

*: Note that these totals include comments physically expressed at the meetings and through mail/email

Here, we can see that 36% of the participants were against One Winnetka, 2.7% were neutral, and 61.3% were in favor.

Zoning Board of Appeals Meetings

The following data analyzes the distribution of opinion voiced at two Zoning Board of Appeals meetings: one, which was first held on December 14th, 2015, and was then extended to January 11th, 2016, and one of February 8th 2016. Once again, as well as physical comments expressed at the meeting, I am also including opinions voiced through mail or email, included at the end of each meeting's minutes. The minutes can be found here:

- December 14th, 2015: http://www.villageofwinnetka.org/assets/1/20/2015_1214_zba.pdf
- January 11th, 2016: http://www.villageofwinnetka.org/assets/1/20/2016_0111_ZBA.pdf
- February 8th, 2016: http://www.villageofwinnetka.org/assets/1/20/2016_0208_ZBA.pdf

Table 5: Public Comment for Zoning Board of Appeals Meetings

		Number of Comments			Percent of Comments		
#	**Date^**	**Dissenting**	**Neutral**	**Agreeing**	**Dissenting**	**Neutral**	**Agreeing**
1.	**12/14/15-1/11/16 ZBA**	28	3	4	80.0	8.6	11.4
2.	**2/8/16 ZBA**	10	2	0	83.3	16.7	0.0
TOTAL*		38	5	4	80.9	10.6	8.5

^Note that ZBA stands for Zoning Board of Appeals

*: Note that these totals include comments physically expressed at the meetings and through mail/email

Including the thirteen signatures included in a mailed petition against the project, we can see that 80.9% of the views expressed were negative, 10.6% were neutral, and 8.5% were positive.

Village Council Meetings

The following data analyzes the distribution of opinion voiced at the village council meetings pertaining to One Winnetka. This includes the meeting held on April 5th, 2016, which was then extended to April 19th, 2016. Once again, as well as physical comments expressed at the meeting, I am also including opinions voiced through mail or email, included at the end of each meeting's corresponding council agenda packets. These files can be found here:

- April 5th, 2016: http://www.villageofwinnetka.org/assets/1/20/2016_0405_rm1.pdf
- April 19th, 2016: http://www.villageofwinnetka.org/assets/1/20/2016_0419_rm2.pdf
- April 5th, 2016 Agenda Packet: http://www.villageofwinnetka.org/assets/1/20/2016_0405_rm.pdf

Table 6: Public Comment for Village Council Meetings

		Number of Comments			Percent of Comments		
#	**Date^**	**Dissenting**	**Neutral**	**Agreeing**	**Dissenting**	**Neutral**	**Agreeing**
1.	4/5/16 VC	6	2	12	30.0	10.0	60.0
2.	4/19/16 VC	16	2	4	72.7	9.1	18.2
TOTAL*		22	4	16	52.4	9.5	38.1

^: Note that VC stands for Village Council Meeting

*: Note that these totals include comments physically expressed at the meetings and through mail/email

When totaled, 52.4% of the views expressed were negative, 9.5% were neutral, and 38.1% were positive.

Concluding Remarks

We can see that the majority of opinion voiced in person and through writing for these meetings as remained in opposition to the project over the past year. Approximately 71% of the views expressed across all of these meetings have been negative, despite the developer's alterations to the One Winnetka plan.

As a result, we encourage the village council to continue to carefully deliberate over this plan. We likewise encourage the developers to heed this feedback and to consider alternate designs for this plan suggested by many members of the village; these include the reduction in the number of the building's stories, a change in its architectural style, and the adaptive reuse of the currently standing Fell Company Store. We ask the developers and village council members to consider not only the consequences of the One Winnetka plan with regards to the character of Winnetka as a whole, but also with regard to the views of its citizens, clearly expressed in these public forums.

Bradley Smith
bsmith@u.northwestern.edu
July 2016

Public Comment Concerning One Winnetka

This document examines the distribution of opinion voiced concerning the various Plan Commission, Design Review Board, Zoning Board of Appeals, and Village Council meetings pertaining to the One Winnetka project, held between March of 2015 and May of 2016. Overall, the vast majority of public comment concerning this project has remained in opposition of the project. Across all of these meetings, approximately 71% of the comments were negative, as you will find in this report. Most of these opposing opinions were voiced concerning the building's size and its effect on Winnetka's character as a village as a whole, even as developers provided changes to the plan across this time frame. In fact, at the October 21st, 2015 Plan Commission meeting, board member Chris Blum stated that based on the materials present, 97% of the public opposed the plan largely due to these factors. As a result, we encourage the village council to continue to carefully deliberate the effects of this plan. We also encourage the developers to continue to revise their designs based on this feedback—specifically to lower the building height, modify its architectural style, and to incorporate the existing Fell structure into these designs.

This report includes both public comment physically voiced at each commission and feedback sent by mail or email to the council, which was included at the end of each meeting's minutes or on the One Winnetka page at the Village of Winnetka website. Comments expressed through both of these mediums by the same person at the same meeting were not double-counted. Likewise, subjective comments expressed in the questions-only portions of meetings were not included. The table below summarizes these findings. A more detailed analysis of public opinion expressed at the Plan Commission, Design Review Board, Zoning Board of Appeals, and Village Council meetings individually can be found in the following five pages.

Public Comment for Various PC, ZBA, DRB, & VC Meetings

Table 1: Public Comment for various PC, ZBA, DRB, & VC Meetings							
		Number of Comments			Percent of Comments		
#	Date	Dissenting	Neutral	Agreeing	Dissenting	Neutral	Agreeing
1.	3/25/15 PC^	57	3	4	89.1	4.7	6.3
2.	4/08/15 PC	50	2	2	92.6	3.7	3.7
3.	6/24/15 PC	19	7	10	52.8	19.4	27.8
4.	7/22/15 PC	18	7	1	69.2	26.9	3.8
5.	9/30/15 PC	69	3	5	89.6	3.9	6.5
6.	10/21/15 PC	8	2	2	66.7	16.7	16.7
7.	12/14/15 ZBA	28	3	4	80.0	8.6	11.4
8.	1/20/16 DRB	25	1	42	36.8	1.5	61.8
9.	2/8/16 ZBA	10	2	0	83.3	16.7	0.0
10.	2/18/16 DRB	2	1	4	28.6	14.3	57.1
11.	4/5/16 VC	6	2	12	30.0	10.0	60.0
12.	4/19/16 VC	16	2	4	72.7	9.1	18.2
TOTAL*		308	35	90	71.1	8.1	20.8
^: Note that PC stands for Plan Commission, DRB for Design Review Board, & ZBA for Zoning Board of Appeal, VC for Village Council							
*: Note that these totals include comments physically expressed at the meetings and through mail/email							

From these data, we can see that approximately 71.1% of the comments expressed by the general public at all of these meetings were against the proposed One Winnetka plan, about 8.1% were more or less neutral, and 20.8% were in favor of the plan. One must account, however, for the changes in design made by the firm across this time period, particularly in the building's size and height, which parallels a slight decrease in the proportion of dissenting opinion. Nevertheless, a firm majority of the comments made at these meetings by members of the public remain dissenting towards the proposed One Winnetka building plan. A link to a compilation of each meeting's minutes and written comment received can be found here:

http://www.villageofwinnetka.org/departments/community-development/one-winnetka-planned-development/application-materials-received/

Plan Commission Meetings

Looking solely at data from the Plan Commission meetings held within this time frame, we find this:

Table 2: Public Comment for Plan Commission Meetings							
		Number of Comments			Percent of Comments		
#	Date	Dissenting	Neutral	Agreeing	Dissenting	Neutral	Agreeing
1.	3/25/15 PC^	57	3	4	89.1	4.7	6.3
2.	4/08/15 PC	50	2	2	92.6	3.7	3.7
3.	6/24/15 PC	19	7	10	52.8	19.4	27.8
4.	7/22/15 PC	18	7	1	69.2	26.9	3.8
5.	9/30/15 PC	69	3	5	89.6	3.9	6.5
6.	10/21/15 PC	8	2	2	66.7	16.7	16.7
TOTAL*		221	24	24	82.2	8.9	8.9

^: Note that PC stands for Plan Commission

*: Note that these totals include comments physically expressed at the meetings and through mail/email

From these data, we can see that approximately 82.2% of the comments expressed by the general public at these meetings were negative, about 8.9% were more or less neutral, and 8.9% were in favor of the One Winnetka plan.

Design Review Board/Sign of Appeals Meetings

Here I am analyzing the distribution of opinion voiced at the Design Review Board meetings on January 20th, 2016 and on February 18th, 2016. As stated before, I am also including feedback sent by mail or email to the council included at the end of meeting's minutes. This also includes the signatures of a petition to support the preservation and adaptive reuse of the Fell Building. The minutes of these meetings and their written comments can be found here:

- January 20th, 2016: http://www.villageofwinnetka.org/assets/1/20/2016_0121_DRB.pdf
- February 18th, 2016: http://www.villageofwinnetka.org/assets/1/20/DRB_Agenda_2-18-16.pdf

Table 4: Public Comment for Design Review Board Meetings

		Number of Comments			Percent of Comments		
#	**Date^**	**Dissenting**	**Neutral**	**Agreeing**	**Dissenting**	**Neutral**	**Agreeing**
1.	**1/20/16 DRB**	25	1	42	36.8	1.5	61.8
2.	**2/18/16 DRB**	2	1	4	28.6	14.3	57.1
TOTAL*		27	2	46	36.0	2.7	61.3

^: Note that DRB stands for Design Review Board

*: Note that these totals include comments physically expressed at the meetings and through mail/email

Here, we can see that 36% of the participants were against One Winnetka, 2.7% were neutral, and 61.3% were in favor.

Zoning Board of Appeals Meetings

The following data analyzes the distribution of opinion voiced at two Zoning Board of Appeals meetings: one, which was first held on December 14th, 2015, and was then extended to January 11th, 2016, and one of February 8th 2016. Once again, as well as physical comments expressed at the meeting, I am also including opinions voiced through mail or email, included at the end of each meeting's minutes. The minutes can be found here:

- December 14th, 2015: http://www.villageofwinnetka.org/assets/1/20/2015_1214_zba.pdf
- January 11th, 2016: http://www.villageofwinnetka.org/assets/1/20/2016_0111_ZBA.pdf
- February 8th, 2016: http://www.villageofwinnetka.org/assets/1/20/2016_0208_ZBA.pdf

Table 5: Public Comment for Zoning Board of Appeals Meetings

		Number of Comments			Percent of Comments		
#	**Date^**	**Dissenting**	**Neutral**	**Agreeing**	**Dissenting**	**Neutral**	**Agreeing**
1.	**12/14/15-1/11/16 ZBA**	28	3	4	80.0	8.6	11.4
2.	**2/8/16 ZBA**	10	2	0	83.3	16.7	0.0
TOTAL*		38	5	4	80.9	10.6	8.5

^Note that ZBA stands for Zoning Board of Appeals

*: Note that these totals include comments physically expressed at the meetings and through mail/email

Including the thirteen signatures included in a mailed petition against the project, we can see that 80.9% of the views expressed were negative, 10.6% were neutral, and 8.5% were positive.

Village Council Meetings

The following data analyzes the distribution of opinion voiced at the village council meetings pertaining to One Winnetka. This includes the meeting held on April 5th, 2016, which was then extended to April 19th, 2016. Once again, as well as physical comments expressed at the meeting, I am also including opinions voiced through mail or email, included at the end of each meeting's corresponding council agenda packets. These files can be found here:

- April 5th, 2016: http://www.villageofwinnetka.org/assets/1/20/2016_0405_rm1.pdf
- April 19th, 2016: http://www.villageofwinnetka.org/assets/1/20/2016_0419_rm2.pdf
- April 5th, 2016 Agenda Packet: http://www.villageofwinnetka.org/assets/1/20/2016_0405_rm.pdf

Table 6: Public Comment for Village Council Meetings

		Number of Comments			Percent of Comments		
#	**Date^**	**Dissenting**	**Neutral**	**Agreeing**	**Dissenting**	**Neutral**	**Agreeing**
1.	4/5/16 VC	6	2	12	30.0	10.0	60.0
2.	4/19/16 VC	16	2	4	72.7	9.1	18.2
TOTAL*		22	4	16	52.4	9.5	38.1

^: Note that VC stands for Village Council Meeting

*: Note that these totals include comments physically expressed at the meetings and through mail/email

When totaled, 52.4% of the views expressed were negative, 9.5% were neutral, and 38.1% were positive.

Concluding Remarks

We can see that the majority of opinion voiced in person and through writing for these meetings as remained in opposition to the project over the past year. Approximately 71% of the views expressed across all of these meetings have been negative, despite the developer's alterations to the One Winnetka plan.

As a result, we encourage the village council to continue to carefully deliberate over this plan. We likewise encourage the developers to heed this feedback and to consider alternate designs for this plan suggested by many members of the village; these include the reduction in the number of the building's stories, a change in its architectural style, and the adaptive reuse of the currently standing Fell Company Store. We ask the developers and village council members to consider not only the consequences of the One Winnetka plan with regards to the character of Winnetka as a whole, but also with regard to the views of its citizens, clearly expressed in these public forums.

From: [redacted]
To: OneWinnetka; council@winnetka.org
Cc: Brian Norkus; Michael D"Onofrio; ellieandpeter@gmail.com; smithsondm@yahoo.com; editor@pioneerlocal.com; editor@wilmettebeacon.com; boshea@pioneerlocal.com; bkamin@tribune.com
Subject: Fwd: Adaptively Preserving the Fell Company Store Winnetka: To the Village Council and Trustees-RSVP
Date: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 3:43:05 PM

To the Winnetka Village Council,

Here is a statement about the important of adaptive reuse of the valuable Fell store for any proposal. If the proposal tonight includes significant revisions, especially if it does not yet incorporate adaptive reuse, it needs to come again to the Village Council, Plan Commission, Design Review Board, and Zoning Board as a new application for a first round of reviews. Please also note that the Fell Store is eligible for placement on the National Register of Historic Places, and there are significant benefits to adaptively reusing it. .

It appears that the Council may be considering a revised One Winnetka proposal tonight without adequate notice to other interested parties. Because of the sudden nature of this meeting, which could well have been left to the regular council schedule, public comment needs to be reopened, and no vote be taken.. There are significant regulatory and historic value reviews that need to be taken to preserve the Fell Store.

Thank you for your consideration. RS for "Fell's Future"

Walter H. Sobel, FAIA z"l
Walter H. Sobel, FAIA & Associates

To the Winnetka Village Council, President and Trustees, Village Staff, and Neighbors:

This letter highlights the several reasons why the adaptive reuse of the award- winning Fell Store as part of future development fits within the current design provisions. As the "Fell's Future" Presentation by architect Peter Milbratz at the November Design Review Board meeting showed, a design incorporating the adaptive reuse of the Fell Store can accomplish the goals of the Village and development. This design offers architectural, design, sustainability, environmental and economic benefits. We ask the Council to encourage the developer to consider these favorable prospects at tomorrow's meeting.

We ask the Village President and Council Trustees to specifically encourage the Fell Store's adaptive reuse, by asking the developer to work with us and our architect.

Please also consider the following:

1) First, the letter below (and Fell's Future plan) outlines in detail the architectural significance of preserving and adaptively reusing the award-winning and Iconic Fell Building, particularly as a stand alone retail development in the age of malls.
2) It discusses the historic significance of the Fell Family and the Fell Store for the wider community and particularly for the History of Winnetka.
3) It identifies a 20% income tax credit available for adaptively reusing historic properties, as a substantial financial incentive to the developer and development.
3) Combining the tax incentives, with the savings from not demolishing a rock solid building and having to rebuild 2 full floors including parking, could save hundreds of thousands of dollar of development costs, and prevent considerable neighborhood and environmental disruption from unnecessary construction activities in a residential area.
4) Together these could bring major architectural, commercial, and financial benefits to the community and developer much sooner.
5) Our alternative plan, presented to the DRB in November, permits the adaptive reused of Fells by adding a similar number of residential units as in the One Winnetka plan. It can be accomplished within the height and other zoning limitations and design review guidelines for Winnetka. It does not require zoning variances.
6) Because the financial viability of the proposed project has not been demonstrated, the Council needs to ask for economic details. The worst possible outcome would be to permit demolition for a project that does not have long term economic viability. It would not be the first to leave a large hole in the ground and a community. This fate was avoided in the New Trier Partners plan, which had approvals but could not complete the project. The ZBA vote against the project raises similar questions about viability.
7) There has been significant public opposition stated at all Board meetings and reflected in emails and letters to the various Boards and Council that need to be reflected in any decision on One Winnetka.

We therefore ask the Village President, Trustees, staff and neighbors to strongly encourage the development to include the adaptive reuse of the historic Fell Building. Please encourage the developer to meet with us at today's meeting and please respond from the Board in writing to this request. Thank you. Richard Sobel and Peter Milbratz.

Walter H. Sobel, FAIA z'l
Walter H. Sobel, FAIA & Associates

-----Original Message-----
From: Rubano, Anthony <Anthony.Rubano@Illinois.gov>

Sent: Fri, Aug 21, 2015 11:07 am
Subject: RE: Fell Company Store Winnetka

...

It was a pleasure to speak with you on Wednesday about your father's Fell Store…. I encourage you or someone to investigate whether this building is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. .... There are no restrictions placed on the building if listed, but listing makes the building eligible for the 20% income tax credit. There's more info on the NR on our website here: http://www.illinois.gov/ihpa/Preserve/Pages/Places.aspx.
... I can't write a letter that endorses the building's significance. But letters from this office that contain positive determinations of NR eligibility have often been used to assist advocacy efforts. I'm happy write out what you and I talked about regarding the building and its architecture.

The building has a tailored and elegant appearance. It is a sophisticated mixture of brick and concrete. The brick recalls the older commercial buildings in the downtown, while the concrete is a nod to the modern. The building expresses its structure, but that expression doesn't solely define its character. The massive brick panel that once held the Fell sign rests on a concrete beam. That brick panel is held away from the end columns by slit windows that relieve its monumentality. The first floor is pulled to the interior to create a sheltered, recessed colonnade. So that same brick panel is not only pulled from the structure at its ends, it also appears to hover over the transparent first floor. The ground plane under the colonnade is covered in the same brick as the panel above the entrance, and the structural grid is drawn in concrete onto the brick ground plane, which extends the building out towards the pedestrian. The building aligns with the orthogonal grid of the downtown and not to the angle of the railroad, which places the front and south side at an angle to Lincoln. When one travels north on Lincoln, the building presents itself as an object in space, a sculpture to be considered obliquely rather than head on. As it directly addresses the Classically derived Winnetka village hall across the tracks to the west, it's prefers to be understood as a complex 3-dimensional composition and not a flat, symmetrical façade. It is a restrained essay, activated by subtle moves that keep the monumentality in check without sacrificing sophistication. It never overwhelms. It invites.

The building is rooted in American Brutalism and the work of Paul Rudolph, John Johansen, John Carl Warnecke, Ulrich Franzen, and others. The plasticity of the façade and structure, the use of (apparent) roof terraces, the breaking down of the box with staggered silhouettes all place this building squarely among the work of the American Brutalists. But this is a distinctive work of architecture in its own right. So many other key works of American Brutalism are institutional (libraries, governmental, hospitals (like St. Mary of Nazareth Hospital by Perkins & Will of 1975)) or they were commissioned by large corporations (ATT Long Lines by Warnecke, etc.). Fell is a relatively small building commissioned by a small, family-run store for a relatively small downtown.

Yet it is packed with fantastic and expressive elements found in much larger, more monumental (or Monumentalist) buildings. The ends of the concrete pans that support the roof are prominently expressed, like the roof pans at Rudolph's Art and Architecture Building at Yale. The plasticity of the planes, the push and pull of surfaces relieved by slit openings and tall, attenuated columns also suggests the work of Rudolph in the mid-1960s. The Fell Store packs a lot of architecture into a relatively small volume but it holds its own, not only in its downtown location but also among larger, better known works of American Brutalism.

Abe Fell chose to locate it as a standalone building in a downtown rather than on the Edens expressway or as an anchor to a shopping mall. Edens Plaza by Graham Anderson Probst and White was built in 1956 along the Edens, and was a development by Caron's, just as Old Orchard in Skokie of the same year was developed by Marshall Field's. Randhurst by Victor Gruen was built in 1962 in Mt. Prospect. Though the enclosed shopping center and the department-store-as-developer models were well established by the time Fell decided to construct this building, Fell wanted his store to stand alone. According to a 2004 Tribune article (http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2004-02-04/news/0402020273_1_clothing-store-fish-store-highland-park), the Fell Company's de-facto mission was, in the words of Joe Fell, "to take care of people and be part of the community."

Abe Fell served as a village trustee, Rotary Club president and board member of the Winnetka Human Relations Commission, so he was committed to Winnetka as a community. The article explained that Abe bought the Lincoln property outright, "an example of the Fell belief in independence that also has kept the stores out of busy malls, such as Old Orchard shopping center in Skokie and Northbrook Court…. Joe Fell said, 'After all, you can't go to Marshall Field's and talk to Mr. Field, but you can go to Fell's and talk to Mr. Fell.'" So one might argue that Fell's decision to locate the building in a downtown and not on the strip or the Edens is part of the building's overall significance. What other stand-alone department stores are there in the area? The former Field's in Market Square in Lake Forest doesn't count. The building was built for a bank, and the development was itself a shopping mall.

I also mentioned that perhaps this store can be seen in the context of the free-standing postwar department store nationally. Department stores constructed large retail outlets for themselves since the late 19th century (think Marshal Fields, Sears, Schlesinger & Mayer (now Target) on State Street in Chicago). But they often looked like office buildings in their downtown environments. After the War, department stores began looking like something else. From

Victor Gruen's Milliron's in Los Angeles of 1949 to Harris Armstrong's Vandervoort's in Clayton Mo of 1951, to the Lord and Taylors in the Northeast by Raymond Loewy (from Bala-Cynwyd, PA in 1954 to Stamford, CT in 1969), modern department stores became more sculptural and less reliant on regular banks of windows (due to the prevalence of fluorescent lighting) than office buildings. They embraced their sites with complicated massing, asymmetry, occasionally elaborate landscaping. Fells fits right into this typology as well. And I can't think of another free-standing department store (not a part of a mall) in the Chicago metro area.

...Let me know if there's anything else you need.

Anthony Rubano
Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
One Old State Capitol Plaza
Springfield, IL 62701
Phone: 217-782-7459
Email: anthony.rubano@illinois.gov
www.illinois-history.gov

From: Rubano, Anthony
Sent: Wednesday, August 05, 2015 2:54 PM
...
Subject: RE: Fell Company Store Winnetka

It's a great building. Always looked a bit early Paul Rudolph to me. ... Like ...Sarasota High School…

Anthony Rubano
Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
One Old State Capitol Plaza
Springfield, IL 62701
Phone: 217-782-7459
Email: anthony.rubano@illinois.gov
www.illinois-history.gov

From: Kathie Scanlan on behalf of contactus
To: OneWinnetka
Subject: FW: Contact Us Submission (Village of Winnetka Illinois)
Date: Thursday, July 28, 2016 11:56:39 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: Contact Us Form [mailto:noreply@winnetka.org]
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2016 4:32 PM
To: contactus
Subject: Contact Us Submission (Village of Winnetka Illinois)

A new contact us submission has been received:

Concerning: Village Council
Contact Type: Resident
Name: Debbie Guillod
E-mail: Debbie.guillod@gmail.com
E-mail Format: HTML
Address 1: 1301 Forest Glen Dr N
City: Winnetka
State: Illinois
Zip/Postal Code: 60093
Country: United States
Subject: One Winnetka vote
Comment: Thanks to each of you for your service to our community. I am out of town so I wanted to make my voice heard tonight. I am in favor of moving ahead with the One Winnetka project. It has been modified and scaled down as requested and I see no reason for further delaying a vote by our elected Village Trustees. Please vote for the vitality and growth of our community by voting yes to One Winnetka. Thanks again for your continued hard work to move our much loved Village of Winnetka forward. Debbie
Phone: 303-807-5719

Please go to the following URL to review: https://vwntka.ae-admin.com/admin/contact-us/