

**WINNETKA PLAN COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES  
APRIL 8, 2015**

**Members Present:**

Tina Dalman, Chairperson  
Caryn Rosen Adelman  
Jan Bawden  
Jack Coladarci  
John Golan  
Louise Holland  
Matt Hulsizer  
Keta McCarthy  
Scott Myers  
Jeanne Morette  
John Thomas

**Non-voting Members Present:**

Richard Kates

**Members Absent:**

Paul Dunn

**Village Attorney:**

Peter Friedman

**Village Staff:**

Michael D'Onofrio, Director of Community  
Development  
Brian Norkus, Assistant Director of Community  
Development

**Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Dalman at 7:05 p.m.

Chairperson Dalman introduced herself to the Commission and stated that they would open the meeting with the continuation of the public hearing which was continued from the March 25, 2015 meeting.

A roll call of the Commission members present was taken for the record.

Chairperson Dalman stated that the first agenda item is the adoption of the March 25, 2015 meeting minutes. She stated that they were just handed a letter from Frank Petrek of his objections to the drafted minutes. Chairperson Dalman then suggested that the Commission continue the adoption of the minutes to the next meeting in order to review the objections and asked the Commission members for their comments.

Mr. Norkus circulated the objection letter to the Commission for their review.

Chairperson Dalman noted that they would still be within 30 days to adopt the minutes if it is done later. She asked if there was any objection to the continuation of the adoption of the March 25, 2015 meeting minutes. No objection by the Commission was raised at this time.

**Continuation of Case Number 15-10-PD: Preliminary Review of Planned Development Application by Stonestreet Partners and Winnetka Station LLC, for the Properties at (a) 511 Lincoln Avenue; (b) 513-515 Lincoln Avenue, (c) 710-732 Elm Street, (d) 740 Elm Street and (e) a Portion of the Adjacent Lincoln Avenue Right-Of-Way**

Chairperson Dalman stated that she would go over the setting of expectations for the meeting. She noted that they are going to continue and begin with the applicant's presentation which was not completed the last time to the Commission. Chairperson Dalman stated that they would wrap that up that presentation within a reasonable amount of time. She stated that then, there would be an opportunity for the Commission to ask additional questions or to question the applicant. Chairperson Dalman stated that after that, they would take public comment starting with those people who did not speak at the March 25<sup>th</sup> meeting first and then if there are others who previously submitted written comments or spoke previously, they would be welcome to use the public comment period to provide additional comments. She asked that those speaking limit their comments to anything new and that they would continue with the guidelines of five minutes for public comment and asked for those speaking to respect that. Chairperson Dalman stated that the spirit is to make sure that they focused comments and have ample opportunity to hear everyone who came tonight to speak. She added that they appreciated the participation.

Chairperson Dalman went on to state that after the general public comment, the meeting would be open to interested parties who have formal presentations or questions to ask the applicant and the consultants. She indicated that it would depend on how many speak during the public comment portion of the meeting. Chairperson Dalman asked if there are interested parties with more structured questions or comments to let them know now by a show of hands who planned to speak either tonight or at a later meeting. She stated that the presentation would be for those who asked questions on the applicant's team or have materials to present in order to have a sense of time and that she did not want to cut them off. Chairperson Dalman stated that represented an opportunity for very specific questions or concerns. Chairperson Dalman stated that after that, a portion of the meeting would be designated for the applicant to respond and ask questions to those interested parties. She noted that it would not be a trial or cross-examination, but would be to give the applicant the opportunity to ask questions. Chairperson Dalman stated that then, the intent is to have the Village staff go through what the standards of review are or what the Commission is to consider followed by the Commission's deliberation and asking questions of the applicant. Chairperson Dalman stated that represented a roadmap of tonight's meeting.

Chairperson Dalman then asked everyone to withhold their displays of approval or disapproval and that it took time out of the meeting. She stated that with respect to the Commission, they have heard based on the last meeting that the audience had a hard time hearing the Commission members and asked the Commission members to speak into the microphone. Chairperson Dalman noted that submissions and public comments would be posted on the Village's website and that comments which were received today by 5:30 p.m. are being posted. She described it as a wonderful way to see everyone's comments.

Mr. Kates stated that he would like to address an issue and for the other concerns to be heard first.

Mr. Coladarci asked if the Commission would have time to ask questions not at this meeting, but that it would depend on what is set out here for the meeting.

Chairperson Dalman responded that the expectation is for the applicant to get through their presentation and that the time for the Commission to ask immediate questions and concerns would be done after that. She reiterated that the Commission's deliberation would be held at a future time. Chairperson Dalman then asked the applicant to bring their consultants back if the Commission members had additional questions at a later meeting. She asked if there were any other comments. Chairperson Dalman noted that in connection with how late the meeting would go, the agenda indicated 9:30 p.m. and that it is reasonable to shoot for 10:00 or 10:30 p.m. She asked the Commission members if they had any objections. No objections were raised by the Commission at this time.

Mr. Kates stated that he would like to address the point where people are saying that the project is a product of the Village Council which it is absolutely not. He then stated that any proposal of this type would be taken before various boards and the Village Council and that once the facts have been garnered, decisions are made. Mr. Kates reiterated that there is no preapproval and that he spoke for the Village Council and that they welcome public comment.

Chairperson Dalman stated that she agreed with Mr. Kates and that they appreciated the comments which they are reviewing. She also stated that all public comments are taken seriously and reiterated that if there is not enough time for general public comment, for comments and concerns to be submitted in writing. Chairperson Dalman noted that they do read all of them and stated that they are important. She stated that she wanted everyone to know that their voices are being heard. Chairperson Dalman then asked if there were any other matters for the Commission to address. No additional comments were made at this time.

Glenn Udell introduced himself to the Commission as an attorney with Brown Udell Pomerantz & Delrahim, Ltd. representing the applicant. He stated that he would finish and conclude their presentation with minor preparatory comments, followed by George Kisiel of Okrent Associates and David Trandel.

Mr. Udell stated that he would like to clarify two points with respect to the comments made at the prior meeting. He stated that the first point related to the public way strip of land on Lincoln Avenue which is part of the proposed planned development included in the property to be developed. He stated that it is important to point out that it is clear that the developer is not asking the Village to gift land to the developer and that rather, they are proposing that the land be vacated and dedicated to the project and that they would pair fair market value for the land. Mr. Udell reiterated that they never wanted land given to the developer. He then stated that based on the comments, it occurred to them that there may be a misconception.

Mr. Udell stated that with respect to the second point, he referred to the comment that a portion of the plan involved the use of public money in the amount of \$6.5 million to be facilitated by the

Village for the building of a parking garage. He stated that he would like to point out that the developer is not asking the Village to take \$6.5 million to be used for private development for the project and that rather, the money would be used to build the needed public parking facility which would be owned by the Village and from which the Village can earn profit and get money back. Mr. Udell stated that it is desperately needed and stated that most of the parking downtown is occupied by commuters which prevented people from coming into the downtown area to patronize the businesses there. He reiterated that it is not money that the developer is asking the Village to put into the project.

Mr. Udell also stated that with regard to the construction of the garage, the developer offered to be involved in having the garage built and to charge fees, with a portion of the garage measuring 12,000 square feet to be built on land owned by the developer which they are proposing to be gifted to the Village. He noted that the Village would not be paying for it and that they are offering it on the public right-of-way on Lincoln Avenue.

David Trandel stated that he appreciated the time taken to vet and understand the proposal. He stated that he would provide a quick summary and then turn the presentation over to George Kisiel. Mr. Trandel stated that with regard to One Winnetka, a lot of thought was put into the name. He stated that they are trying to bring light to the more pointed issues of the retailers, shop owners and loyal people who have dedicated their lives to businesses in Winnetka. Mr. Trandel then stated that the proposal is geared to help them and enhance the quality of life for its residents. He stated that a lot of lives are touched by the current deficiencies downtown. Mr. Trandel stated that while they all love the Village, there is a third generation of Winnetkans and others who want the best for their families and lifestyles and that they need to think 50 to 100 years ahead. He then stated that the team has been blessed in that they have found a team of professionals who have done work worldwide and who have solved far more complicated issues than this. Mr. Trandel stated that the whole plan is about addressing very specific needs and that they all seek certain amenities and expectations in connection with money spent on homes and in businesses. He also stated that the issues have to be solved and addressed and that they would create a complexity and mass which allowed for the burden to not fall on the Village.

Mr. Trandel then stated that when you look at the housing stock, it served as a disservice to the longtime residents who do not have many choices if want to simplify their lives. He stated that they either go to neighboring communities or to the city. Mr. Trandel stated that they want to create some venue which allowed people to maintain their quality of life and keep close to their families. He also stated that it related to a sense of identity, pride and place. Mr. Trandel then referred to safety and stated that the wonderful part of the Bennett plan related to the sunken railroad which he described as the unintended consequences of a divided downtown. He also stated that they lack a sense of place and gathering for art and book fairs and that it would bring a civic pride to the community. Mr. Trandel then stated that with regard to retail, everyone wanted to get into Winnetka and that they have been cautious. He stated that they need to be excited by the fact that there are restaurants and health care provider opportunities which touched on a lot of the notions all in the complexity of addressing all facets of the population.

Mr. Trandel stated that finally, they are proposing to have 225 additive parking spaces. He stated that from a safety perspective and practical standpoint, they would end up with 225 parking spaces

which would enhance the vibrancy of downtown. He indicated that where it started is the core of the issue and the whole discussion. Mr. Trandel also stated that with regard to money, the municipality is strained on all sides and that they need to find a way to hit it head on and not be dependent on third parties who do not care what Winnetka looked like. He stated that the point of the plan is to provide over \$1 million of additive income to the Village. Mr. Trandel informed the Commission that he has set up a website and asked everyone to visit it and provide comment. He identified the website address as [www.onewinetka.com](http://www.onewinetka.com) and then stated that they would like to invite everyone next week to an informal one-on-one meeting to meet the team and ask specific questions. Mr. Trandel added that it is not a take it or leave it approach and that they want to find a way which is not meant to be divisive.

George Kisiel introduced himself to the Commission as the president of Okrent Associates and stated that at the last meeting, they were halfway through their presentation and that the zoning issues and Commission criteria are the items which were left to be presented. He referred the Commission to the PowerPoint presentation and began by stating that they are talking about the development of 120 rental units and that the project would contain 45,000 square feet of retail space along with 533 parking spaces and a public plaza. Mr. Kisiel described it as a transit-oriented development which would be mixed use and have moderate density.

Mr. Kisiel indicated that there are different kinds of transit centers and that they all have different kinds of criteria as to how well they would function. He then referred to how regional centers, urban centers, suburban centers and town centers which is what they are talking about here in Winnetka. Mr. Kisiel stated that they want to make sure that they are working in the context of using the right idea of scale and the right idea of what density is. He stated that downtown Winnetka really fits the town center model which is served by commuter rail and regional transit and that it looked for moderate density, mixed retail use.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that for this particular type of transit center, the recommended density within a half mile radius is 3,000 to 7,000 dwelling units which he commented is the critical number to provide vibrancy and the amount of synergy that is needed to have a vibrant downtown community. Mr. Kisiel then stated that the downtown Winnetka density within a half mile radius of the train station is approximately 1,350 dwelling units, which is short of the minimum critical number. He noted that the proposed density for the development is 120 dwelling units per acre which amounted to approximately 85 dwelling units per acre.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that what that meant is 80 dwelling units per acre would be the equivalent to a low rise multi-family development. He stated that with regard to the impact on downtown within that ¼ mile radius represented an increase of approximately 5.7 dwelling units per acre to 8.7 dwelling units per acre and added that although it would be shy of what the goals are, it represented a move in the right direction.

Mr. Kisiel stated that he would like to refresh the Commission with regard to the development proposal itself. He noted that it would have a 7 story volume along Lincoln Avenue, a 6 story volume to the east adjacent to the Elm Street parking lot and that the rest of the site would be either two stories or open space. Mr. Kisiel then stated that 44% of the site represented the taller volumes and that with regard to the inside volumes, the 7<sup>th</sup> floor on the east side is residential and

that it would step down to the fourth floor which is all residential and that there would be a mix of second story commercial space with the rest being residential and amenity space.

Mr. Kisiel referred to the misconception that there would be two levels of retail which is not the case here. He noted that on the ground floor, the majority of the space would be commercial with the rest being circulation and functional space for the residents. Mr. Kisiel stated that it is important to note that they are proposing 120 dwelling units at this time. He added that with respect to GFA, it is needed to hit their financial milestones. Mr. Kisiel noted that the residential portion of the tower measured 122,000 square feet and referred to 120 dwelling units. He informed the Commission that they want the maximum amount of flexibility and that the units would be larger and that having fewer units would change the density a little. Mr. Kisiel also stated that with the parking ratios, it would be more in line with the requirements.

Mr. Kisiel referred the Commission to the ground level and site circulation. He stated that in connection with Lincoln Avenue, there is not going to be a loss and that they planned to connect Oak and Elm Street and continue to the north. Mr. Kisiel informed the Commission that there would be three general categories of users on the site which he identified as residents, commuters and retail patrons and employees. Mr. Kisiel noted that the residents would enter off of Lincoln Avenue and would continue into the garage and go down. He then stated that the commuters would descend from the ramp off of Lincoln Avenue and that there would be some retail traffic. Mr. Kisiel also stated that in connection with the retail patrons and employees, it would be off of Lincoln Avenue and that they would drive through to the east and into East Elm parking or enter off of Elm Street. He noted that the site circulation is clear and added that there would be two curb cuts on the site which would not interfere with pedestrian activity.

Mr. Kisiel went on to state that with respect to the traffic analysis and circulation, he informed the Commission that KLOA did a traffic study. He informed the Commission that it looked at the capacity of the surrounding street grade using a function of the intersections. Mr. Kisiel noted that there were six intersections studied adjacent to the property and that they were rated from A-F. He then identified the prior condition of all of the intersections and access points for the Commission as a Function A or B level of service which he described as well-functioning. Mr. Kisiel then stated that with the addition of the project, all of the intersections would still function at an A or B level with minimal traffic impact. He also stated that there would be very little to no impact perceived on the surrounding traffic and intersections. Mr. Kisiel informed the Commission that Javier Milan can answer any questions the Commission had in that regard.

Mr. Kisiel informed the Commission that KLOA also studied parking. He described parking as a big part of the development and that it represented a big opportunity for Winnetka in that the development would allow that to happen. Mr. Kisiel then stated that with regard to the parking inventory, there are 33 commuter parking spaces on Lincoln Avenue, 30 retail parking spaces on Lincoln Avenue and 24 parking spaces on Elm Street. He also stated that with regard to the existing amount of parking spaces, there are currently 149 parking spaces with 116 parking spaces for retail and 32 parking spaces for commuter parking. Mr. Kisiel noted that the two levels below grade would be dedicated to parking and vertical circulation. He then stated that with regard to the west, there would be a parking garage with a two story deck below the plaza. Mr. Kisiel noted that the 33 commuter parking spaces would be relocated here along with 23 retail parking spaces.

He stated that the project would add 111 commuter parking spaces and 30 retail parking spaces.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that in connection with the east reconfiguration of the lot, there would be the relocation of 62 retail parking spaces and the addition of 35 retail spaces. He stated that it would also add 35 retail parking spaces and four parking spaces on the street. Mr. Kisiel noted that with respect to the structure below One Winnetka, there would be the addition of 45 retail parking spaces and that the rest of the 159 parking spaces would be for the residences. He then stated that in connection with the impact of the addition of three parking areas, there is a total of 149 existing parking spaces and that there would be a total of 374 parking spaces after the development resulting in a net gain of 225 parking spaces which he described as a significant change with regard to the difficulties with parking in the vicinity.

Mr. Kisiel went on to state that with respect to context, he referred the Commission to an aerial view of the property facing west. He noted that the area of development is outlined in yellow. Mr. Kisiel suggested that the Commission notice first the size and scale of the downtown area surrounding it and the adjacent land uses south, west and north, all of which represent commercial development. Mr. Kisiel also stated that any residences are located to the east and northeast and referred to the degree of separation of the site from other structures. He also stated that there is nothing within 40 feet of the property. Mr. Kisiel then stated that there is 80 feet of separation with Elm and the East Elm parking deck and 175 feet of separation by them and the school. He then referred to the tree cover and indicated that there is a mature tree area canopy at 40 feet and 60 feet. Mr. Kisiel also stated that the proposed building sits at the height of the existing canopy and would provide a visual buffer to the residences to the east and northeast.

Mr. Kisiel stated that with respect to the texture and character downtown, he identified a collection of smaller buildings for the Commission. He referred to the streetscape along Lincoln Avenue and Elm Street and identified the sense of containment along the streets by the smaller scale buildings with two and three story buildings. Mr. Kisiel stated that to understand the context and the site, it would be markedly different from the rest of the texture. He stated that they are talking about a site which would have a very large residential structure on it and that it would be one of the taller buildings in downtown Winnetka. Mr. Kisiel also stated that the site is a large site and that the development needed to respond to the differences in scale and context within which it sits.

Mr. Kisiel stated that with respect to downtown, the construction period of time ranged from the 1890 to the 1920's period and that the style of architecture contained a mix of styles and different building vocabulary vernacular. He indicated that it is reflected in the styles represented downtown. Mr. Kisiel then referred to the survey that they did which identified significant representations of different styles which they concentrated in downtown Winnetka. He noted that Tudor Revival is concentrated in a few places downtown which he identified for the Commission. Mr. Kisiel also stated that there are Georgian and Federal Revival styles and the mostly larger public buildings, as well as eclectic styles. He noted that the buildings he identified in red in the illustration represent the majority of the buildings which did not adhere to a particular architectural style and indicated that they are utilitarian in nature. Mr. Kisiel then stated that the Tudor portion amounted to 27% to 28% of the building frontage downtown. He referred to the thought of the appropriateness for Tudor and indicated that the perception is different than the reality of the amount downtown.

Mr. Kisiel stated that in connection with context, he referred to the presence of the large expanse of open space between the Village Hall and the open space. He then stated that the Bennett plan conceived the central square and the need to create something as a commercial block of lasting importance. Mr. Kisiel referred to the large expanse which is part of what separated the area into the two halves of downtown. He described the project as an opportunity to have a unifying effect.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that with regard to the zoning exceptions and Commission criteria for review, they are asking for a building height where the maximum is four stories and 45 feet with the proposed development being 7 stories and 83 feet. He stated that with regard to the rear yard setback, the requirement is for 10 feet to the east and that they are asking for 0. Mr. Kisiel stated that with regard to the setback story on the upper level, the setback would be none although they would provide a mansard roof which would accomplish the same idea as an upper level setback.

Mr. Kisiel went on to state that with respect to the residential parking standard, 174 parking spaces are required and that they would be providing 159 parking spaces based on 120 dwelling units maximum flexibility proposal. He indicated that there would likely be fewer units and that they would then come closer to satisfying that particular standard. Mr. Kisiel added that with regard to commercial parking, 92 parking spaces are required and that 45 parking spaces would be provided.

Mr. Kisiel stated that in connection with building height, they are proposing 7 stories and 83 feet. He then referred to the fact that the criteria for building height is repeated for most of the other exception criteria here and that once they get through the building height criteria which he commented is the most critical, the rest would go fairly quickly. Mr. Kisiel then stated that the criteria stated that the height limit may be modified by taking into consideration several things such as other buildings in the vicinity, the proposal's consistency with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan, the accommodation of parking and open space requirements and compatibility with adjoining properties.

Mr. Kisiel stated that in connection with buildings in the vicinity, immediately to the south are some of the larger buildings in downtown Winnetka in terms of footprint and height. He stated that with regard to the configuration of building volumes on the site, they very carefully considered and organized the development to minimize the impact on adjacent structures. Mr. Kisiel reiterated that 44% of the development would exceed two stories. He stated that the configuration also respected the existing 711 Oak building by maintaining an open courtyard adjacent to it and the corner to corner relationship. Mr. Kisiel then stated that the two story commercial component on Elm would respect the scale of the street-related retail on the north side of the street. He stated that although there is a differentiation and change in height between the three and four story buildings and the seven story building, it is not uncommon throughout downtown Winnetka.

Mr. Kisiel stated that the next point related to the Comprehensive Plan objectives and stated that the most relevant portion of the Comprehensive Plan which related to building height would be the Village character and appearance section. He informed the Commission that section stated that "to ensure that commercial, institutional and residential development is appropriate to the character of and minimizes the adverse impact on its surrounding neighborhood." Mr. Kisiel

stated that they addressed several of these aspects at both this and in the prior presentation and testimony. He stated that the density would be appropriate for this site and location for the reasons they stated earlier in that it is a transit accessed site and the need for increased density in the central business district is evident. Mr. Kisiel also stated that the size of the structure, while larger than adjacent buildings, is not incompatible in terms of scale and height.

Mr. Kisiel went on to state that with respect to the style, the eclectic style would be appropriate given the nature of the downtown area itself and of the period in which it grew. He stated that the Beaux-Art style is something which harkened to that period of time and that it is a form of eclecticism and is a different style of Tudor, Georgian, etc. and that it followed the same type of style being applied to modern development. Mr. Kisiel then stated that the building would be well separated and well screened and referred to the distance from adjacent structures. He stated that they also talked about the care in the arrangement of the building volumes which would mitigate impact. Mr. Kisiel stated that they talked about shadow, wind, etc. and the fact that there would be no negative impact and that the development would be compatible with the character of the surrounding development.

Mr. Kisiel went on to state that in connection with parking and open space, that represented another consideration with regard to allowing the additional height. He indicated that they have talked about parking being provided on the site and the addition of public open space immediately west on Lincoln Avenue. Mr. Kisiel referred to the evidence of a high degree of texture and air in the design of all of the spaces. He added that the provision of additional parking goes to that criteria for approving additional height.

Mr. Kisiel then referred to the compatibility of the development with adjoining properties. He identified the view in an illustration when you walk around the building at street level which he indicated was missing from the prior presentation. Mr. Kisiel also identified the view from the bridge on Elm to the east. He indicated that while you see the structure as larger, when you look at how the mass is broken down and similar configurations of the base, middle and top of the development, the difference in height would be less striking and illustrated that from the street view that the building would not overwhelm or overshadow. He stated that the illustration also showed what the scale comparison is from the ground level.

Mr. Kisiel then identified the corner of Elm and Arbor Vitae and referred to the compatibility of the scale of the two story portion of the structure and that it would be similar with the three and four story commercial development on the north side of Elm. He also identified the Maple Street view and the impact of the size of the building and points east. Mr. Kisiel noted that there is a 20 foot drop in the grade from the site to the park immediately to the east and that it gives a different perspective when looking uphill. He indicated that every object in the foreground tended to obscure more and that a modeling of the tree cover showed that there is very little visual impact to the residential neighborhood to the east.

Mr. Kisiel then referred the Commission to a view of the flag from the Village Green and that you see the same type of issue. He identified the cornice line of the top of the eastern portion of the proposed development which appeared to be at approximately the same height of the roofs on Maple. Mr. Kisiel then stated that in terms of compatibility with adjoining properties, they cannot

argue that the development is larger and stated however, they do not believe that it is incompatible given the changes in stepping that there are throughout the downtown area and other scale of buildings in the vicinity.

Mr. Kisiel stated that with respect to the fourth story upper level setback, there is a 10 foot requirement. He noted that the same criteria applied and that the evidence presented stated that with regard to the upper level setback and the use of the mansard roof, the impacts are minimal and that the compatibility in terms of scale due to the care and the detailing of the elevation took care of this issue.

Mr. Kisiel stated that in connection with the rear yard setback, 10 feet is required on the east and that nothing would be provided and that it related to the same criteria. He stated that the crux of the matter and that it has been shown that there is a technical need for relief and that the fact of the matter is that the structured parking for the East Elm lot would provide 175 feet of separation from the nearest non-residential structure. Mr. Kisiel stated that the crux of the setback requirements are to provide light and air and in the situation with the 175 feet of separation justified relief from this standard.

Mr. Kisiel stated that in connection with residential parking, 174 parking spaces are required and that 159 parking spaces would be provided, which they previously talked about in terms of the number of dwelling units and the fact that the number of dwelling units may be reduced. He indicated that Javier Milan can discuss the details with regard to the residential parking component. Mr. Kisiel noted that they surveyed the area with respect to renters and found that within a ¼ mile of the site, he referred to the typical ownership of vehicle ratio which he identified as 1.05 parking spaces per dwelling units. He stated that they would be providing 1.33 parking spaces per dwelling units and that while it is short of the requirement, it would be adequate in connection with the market dictated. Mr. Kisiel also stated that they have shown that there would be a surplus of parking spaces for other uses accommodated on the site. He stated that the provision of these attributes would help in connection with the downtown traffic concerns and also with regard to the deficit in parking existing for commercial uses.

Mr. Kisiel stated that with respect to commercial parking relief, 92 parking spaces are required and that 45 parking spaces would be provided on the One Winnetka property. He referred the Commission to the prior illustration and reiterated that there would a net gain of 225 public spaces which justified relief from the standard.

Mr. Kisiel went on to state that with respect to the Commission's criteria, there are nine standards of criteria that the Commission is to consider when evaluating projects. He stated that the first standard is to ensure that the development would be appropriate to the character of and minimize adverse impact on its surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Kisiel stated that prior testimony has shown that there would be no negative impact on the surrounding neighborhood particularly with regard to the residential neighborhood from which it is separated and buffered well from and that it would be compatible with commercial development which is adjacent to it and that it is appropriate in terms of its character and style.

Mr. Kisiel stated that the second criteria is to limit development within the Village to minimize the

potentially adverse impacts on residential neighborhoods and to prevent the need for significant increases in such infrastructure such as streets, parking, utilities, sewers and other community resources such as schools, parks and recreational facilities. He stated that they have already talked about the fact that the proposed development is well separated and well screened from any adjacent residential development. Mr. Kisiel stated that with respect to increases in the need for infrastructure such as streets and parking, they have shown that the parking program would provide additional parking beyond what is required for the development on site. He then stated that in connection with streets, they have shown that there is little or no impact on the street grid surrounding the subject property due to its development.

Mr. Kisiel stated that with respect to utilities and sewers, Pat Dimmer of the engineering firm is here to answer any questions and stated that he would touch on a couple of points. He referred to the existing sanitary sewer adjacent to the property which handled the current and prior development load and that it is sized such that it can handle the proposed development on the site. Mr. Kisiel informed the Commission that there would be the reconstruction of the water main and that currently, there is a 6 inch water main which connected two larger mains on Maple and Lincoln Avenue. He then stated that because of the configuration of the garage below Lincoln Avenue, one of those water mains would need to be relocated as a 16 inch main which would provide and maintain the connection while increasing the capacity along Lincoln Avenue and which he also described as an improvement.

Mr. Kisiel stated that with respect to other community resources such as schools, parks and recreational facilities, the Tracey Cross Market Report as well as the financial memorandum prepared by Ted Mandigo & Associates looked at what the likely occupants of the proposed development are and found that there would be little to no impact on existing schools, parks and recreational facilities. He informed the Commission that what they are conceiving here is for empty nesters to move into the downtown area and into the building in order to continue their life in Winnetka.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that the third criteria is to ensure that the development minimized the impact on residential neighborhoods including the impact on pedestrian character, onsite parking, traffic patterns, congestion, open space, storm water management and Village infrastructure. He indicated that most of these points have been touched on before. Mr. Kisiel noted that they would be providing additional open space in the form of a civic plaza and that there would be no real issue with traffic patterns.

Mr. Kisiel stated that the storm water management issue is one that is very near and dear to the residents of Winnetka. He then stated that with regard to the current situation, the site is not managed at all and that all of the storm runoff went directly into the sewers and that there is no detention capability. Mr. Kisiel stated that the site would be engineered to retain water on the site and to release it at a rate that is acceptable to water management best practices as well as with regard to any ordinances that exist in connection with storm water management. He stated that there is over an acre foot worth of water of detention planned for the site which would contain 325,000 gallons of water and that its release would be at a rate which would not burden the existing storm water system.

Mr. Kisiel stated that the fourth criteria is to provide for a wide range of office, service, retail and commercial land uses in the development with existing business districts in the corridor which is exactly what this proposal would do.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that the fifth criteria is to promote a strong community identity and opportunities to interact on building a healthy commercial tax base. Mr. Kisiel then stated that part of the whole concept of One Winnetka is to provide a structure and a plaza which would unify the two sides of the community. He commented that it is very strong in its desire to do that and that they felt that it accomplished that criteria very well. Mr. Kisiel then stated that in connection with providing opportunities to interact, the creation of a civic plaza did exactly that. He also stated that with regard to a healthy commercial tax base, Mr. Trandel noted earlier that there would be a net gain to the Village in terms of taxes, fees and revenue which would be discussed in more detail after his presentation is completed.

Mr. Kisiel stated that the sixth criteria is to provide a broad range of goods and services so that Winnetka residents can satisfy most of their ordinary shopping requirements in the Village and so that non-residents would come to the Village for specialty goods and services. He identified this as one of the key components of the development which is the retail component which would satisfy this criteria and stated that it would provide additional opportunities for retailing in a more modern and marketable configuration over what currently existed in downtown Winnetka.

Mr. Kisiel stated that the seventh criteria is to maintain the essential quality, viability and attractiveness of Winnetka's business districts while encouraging new economic development which is consistent with the character of the Village and the individual business districts. He stated that they believe that the development fits all of the criteria and that it certainly encouraged economic development with the addition of new residences downtown and that it would help create a more vibrant and active downtown, provide opportunities for the Village to attract other residents from other communities as well as bolstering the business district.

Mr. Kisiel stated that the eighth criteria is to encourage the provision of onsite parking at the rear of buildings with alley access via alleyways, private driveways to reduce the demand for on-street parking. He stated that they have already shown the addition of 225 parking spaces for commercial users which satisfied this criteria and reiterated that all of the parking spaces are located either below grade or in structured parking.

Mr. Kisiel stated that the final criteria is to ensure that the new development did not decrease the public parking supply, particularly on-street parking which supported retail use. He stated that what they have shown earlier supported this criteria.

Mr. Kisiel stated that in conclusion, granting relief would allow numerous benefits. He also stated that the project is consistent with the criteria for zoning exceptions and that it is consistent with regard to Comprehensive Plan and the current initiatives and therefore, is consistent with the Commission's criteria.

Chairperson Dalman asked if that completed the applicant's presentation. She indicated that she wanted to make sure that there is an opportunity for the applicant to have made its complete

presentation so that the public comment would reflect everything which was presented.

Mr. Trandel stated that he would like to recap points with respect to the public parking improvements, the creation of the Lincoln Avenue plaza and gathering space, the Elm Street streetscape enhancements, the water main replacement and the storm water detention enhancements. He then referred to the financial impact. Mr. Trandel informed the Commission that there would be a public/private partnership between their \$90 million in private money and that they are suggesting that Winnetka pay its fair share in order to own the assets in perpetuity. He then stated that with regard to the plaza, he noted that the Lincoln Avenue right-of-way and the east parking lot would remain under Village ownership. Mr. Trandel referred to the portion of the building which would be owned by the developer on Village property and the portion of the commuter garage which would be owned by the Village on One Winnetka property.

Mr. Trandel identified the striped lines in the illustration for the Commission as the 7,700 square feet they are proposing to acquire at the surface level from the Village and that underneath, they would deed two stories back to the Village.

Mr. Trandel noted that the Village would pay for the plaza finishes, landscaping and streetscape work on Lincoln Avenue and Elm Street as well as the new water main on Elm Street. He also stated that the developer would take responsibility for the design and construction of all improvements. Mr. Trandel noted that there would be a net gain in revenue for the Village.

Mr. Trandel then stated that in connection with sales tax revenue, the Village portion would be \$155,063 per year. He identified the real estate tax revenue which would go to Winnetka as \$618,315 per year. Mr. Trandel informed the Commission that the utility and communication tax would be \$47,518 per year. He then identified the user fee, license fee and permit fee revenue for the Commission. Mr. Trandel stated that with regard to the financial impact, the budget as a Village would be \$58 million per year. He informed the Commission that they dug deep into the budget in order to improve the aging infrastructure.

Mr. Trandel stated that the total net gain in revenue for the Village would be \$1 million annually. He stated that the project would bring renewed vigor and new vibrancy to downtown Winnetka, as well as fill the current housing void which has existed for a long time for Winnetka residents. Mr. Trandel also stated that the project would provide a sense of place and would enhance the community identity. He then stated that it would provide economic benefits to the Village and its residents. He concluded by stating that they appreciated the time and vigorous different opinions which have been expressed and that they look forward to working with the Village.

Chairperson Dalman asked Mr. Trandel if there were additional slides which were not part of their original application which were presented today.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct.

Chairperson Dalman stated that they wanted to make sure that they get copies for the Commission and for it to be uploaded on the Village's website.

Mr. Coladarci stated that they would also like the PowerPoint presentation and summaries.

Mr. Trandel agreed that would be fine.

Chairperson Dalman then stated that they would make sure that it is available to the public. She then stated that she would open the meeting to the Commission's discussion and questions.

Ms. McCarthy stated that she would like to comment that with regard to the presentation, she saw the benefit for Winnetka in terms of revitalization. She then stated that obviously, with this many people in attendance at the meeting, there is a real concern in connection with the exceptions being requested. Ms. McCarthy stated that the main ones related to height and density although they have been addressed, as well as the setbacks. She stated that she would like to make the point that the Village Engineer wrote with regard to Lincoln Avenue that the modification on Lincoln Avenue although it would remain a two way street, to say that there are concerns with that. Ms. McCarthy then stated that it appeared that the street seemed narrowed and that there could be a safety concern with regard to traffic impact.

Ms. Holland stated that they talked about transit-oriented development. She then referred to a *Chicago Tribune* article in connection with transit apartments finding footing. Ms. Holland stated that it was listed in Chicago with larger streets and intersections and that of nine transit-gear apartment projects, only one was built. She stated that they are talking about Chicago with one building which has 29 units, etc. in Chicago which has no transit-gear apartment projects and that this project has 120 units. Ms. Holland indicated that it can be accommodated in Chicago but that the Village is smaller.

Chairperson Dalman asked that the audience withhold any demonstration of approval or disapproval.

Ms. Bawden thanked the applicant in doing a problem solution exercise. She then stated that she did not find problems with the articulation and solutions which she was curious about. Ms. Bawden stated that for instance, she referred to the demand for rental units in town and asked what the demand is and if there was a study indicating that there is a huge waiting list. She stated that second, she referred to the underground parking demand. Ms. Bawden stated that she got the sense back when the post office site was to be developed, people were adverse to underground parking. She stated that third, with regard to the civic plaza, no one brought up that they understand that they is a need for that place and that she did not understand if they needed another gathering place since on the other side of the development is the Village Green which is used as gathering space. Ms. Bawden commented that the civic plaza would suck the oxygen out of that. She then stated that she would provide more comments later.

Mr. Thomas thanked the applicant for clarifying their comments. He stated that there was talk about the need for places for older people to move into and informed the Commission that six of his peers sold their homes and had no trouble finding places to buy. Mr. Thomas stated that they found apartments easily in town and that there are enough available. He then stated that with regard to occupancy, he referred to the extraordinarily lengthy meetings of the Commission years ago with regard to residential occupancy downtown and that the focus of the discussion was in

connection with affordable housing. Mr. Thomas stated that while there did not seem to be a dearth of available rental places, there is no lack of them either.

Mr. Thomas then stated that he was puzzled about Lincoln Avenue staying a street and stated that it would be a mess if there is a snow storm. He also stated that if they were to build a 7 story building, would the fire department and police be equipped to handle emergencies at the top of the building. Mr. Thomas stated that density was also mentioned which he commented helped him a lot. He stated that 120 units would be radically disturbing or would take the density out of whack and added good luck to the applicant in renting them. Mr. Thomas concluded by stating that they are seeing a substantial number vacancies and that with regard to adding retail, the applicant should sign up tenants with long term leases.

Ms. Adelman thanked the applicant for their presentation and clarifications. She stated that they talked about the tree canopy and height of the canopy which would be the same as that in the 7 story rendering. Ms. Adelman then stated that she is not sure that they can count on the canopy to stay based on what they have been experiencing and that more clarification is needed on that.

Mr. Coladarci stated that he is pleased that they are proposing development for land that needed it. He then stated that with respect to what he is concerned with, there was a letter posted today on proposed business developments on the website which stated that two major businesses could sell this development to, the first one being a drug store and the second being a specialty grocery store as well as that part of the plan is for a health club. Mr. Coladarci stated that would have a significant impact on businesses in the Village now. He added that he is most concerned with the health club's effect on the Community House whose budget is on the back of the fitness center and that it could lead to all sorts of problems for them with this development including a health club.

Mr. Coladarci stated that his other questions are also concerns with the economics of a convenience/drug store in the area surrounding Conney's. He indicated that something is missing here in terms of the planning process which is why do they want to say a drug store surrounded by Conney's and if the applicant talked to anyone with regard to the effect of the development on the Community House with a health club there. Mr. Coladarci stated that the Community House is supported by donations and is an important part of the Village, along with Tudor. He reiterated that while he liked the idea of developing the area, there is a lot of indication in the program of a lack of sensitivity to a lot of different factors in the Village. Mr. Coladarci then stated that while he understood the idea and would advocate for a program, the impact on the Village would be huge in this case. He concluded by stating that while is not against development, there is a lack of sensitivity in a lot of different places and oversight on the effects in many different places.

Ms. Morette commented that she thought that the presentation was excellent.

Mr. Golan referred to the discussion of politics in connection with Conney's and One Winnetka and the smaller footprint of Conney's.

Mr. Kates stated that he is concerned with regard to the idea of the Village putting \$6.57 million toward parking and referred to the net gain of 225 parking spaces. He stated that it seemed to indicate that a stream of income to take care of the Village investment in the presentation stated

that it estimated income streams by the development to defray the Village's contribution in approximately 23 years which he indicated differed significantly from the presentation. Mr. Kates noted that the Village has large expenditures such as storm water and that if the contribution is not coming from the Village, would that diminish the amount of parking on the site and the effect it would have on the applicant's plans. He added that he did not know if the applicant could count on that contribution.

Mr. Hulsizer stated that he had no comments at this time.

Mr. Myers stated that he has questions and referred to Mr. Udell's comment which he interpreted as building parking for the Village is not critical to the development. He asked if they were to say no to underground parking, how would that affect the development.

Mr. Trandel informed the Commission that there would be a 24 year payback on parking revenue from the commuter users, not from tax impact. He stated that the tax impact studies are clear. Mr. Trandel then stated that if there is no parking, the development would be what it needed to be. He referred to the fact that they live in a vacuum which he commented is a concern. Mr. Trandel stated that the shop owners and workers have a hard time parking which is the real issue. He also stated that it stemmed out of the opportunity since they would be in the ground to [in terms of constructing the development] to create something in the design which would allow people to park and take the train as well as to get permit parking off of the surface lots.

Mr. Myers stated what if they were to separate out the evaluation of parking and that they can decide as a Village if they want underground parking. He then stated that if they were to say no to underground parking, did that change the economics of the development.

Mr. Trandel responded that it would change the economics of retail and that they would not be able to attract class retail if customers cannot park. He described it as a tradeoff. Mr. Trandel also referred to whether it needed to be two levels and reiterated that since they would be in the ground, they can solve the problem. He suggested that they work together toward finding the right number. Mr. Trandel stated that with regard to the Lincoln Avenue idea, he commented that it is not a beautiful road. He then referred to the temporary fix for the North Shore from 1961. Mr. Trandel also stated that in connection with the plaza, there would be the net loss of 10 feet in terms of width and that Lincoln Avenue safety and tightness is not the issue. He reiterated that during the day, it would be a two lane road and that it represented the ability to transform the personality of the area to host events.

Mr. Kates stated that the problem is that their own book says that there would be a 23 year payback and that it is not just commuter parking revenues.

Mr. Trandel stated that the impact study commissioned stated numbers which can be refuted. He then stated that if \$1 million in net revenue is added, it is not 24 years.

Mr. Myers stated that with regard to the style of the building, the point was made that there is a lot of eclectic architecture in the area. He then stated that putting in a Beaux-Art building of this size would dominate and overwhelm. Mr. Myers referred to the applicant's argument that it would

not make that much of an impact. He asked the applicant why are they tied to Beaux-Art architecture and that they would be bringing in a new building which would have very different architecture.

Lucien Lagrange commented that it is not that different. He then stated that on a smaller scale, it represented Revival Classical architecture. Mr. Lagrange referred to 2550 Lake Shore Drive which contained 200 units and that he had a dinner there with a doctor who said he loved living there. He commented that meant good taste. Mr. Lagrange stated that there was also a woman who lived in the building who stated that it changed her life and made it better. He stated that he is convinced that this would be a building that people would want to live in and that it would have style. Mr. Lagrange also stated that it fits in Chicago on the same scale.

Mr. Lagrange then stated that with regard to style, while there are beautiful buildings here, this project would have incredible quality and design and would have an impact on the architecture of Winnetka. He reiterated that he is convinced that they are doing what is right and are responding to the lifestyle and quality of life to have a building that people want to live in. Mr. Lagrange added that it goes beyond architectural lifestyle and related to where people want to be.

Mr. Coladarci stated that Mr. Lagrange's comments refer to where people want to live. He asked Mr. Lagrange how would he answer for the people in the Village who do not want to look at an 8 story building and stated that Mr. Lagrange's comments relate to those who want to buy or live there and asked what would he say to those people.

Mr. Lagrange commented that is a good question. He referred to all of the famous architecture in Chicago and asked where do they live. Mr. Lagrange responded that they all live in classical homes and that it reflected where people live. He reiterated that he is convinced and that he has done it many times. Mr. Lagrange informed the Commission that the feedback from the people who live there is that they love it.

Mr. Coladarci stated that the question related to those who do not live there and have to look at it. He stated that the fuss related to the size and how it looked.

Mr. Lagrange stated that represented two different issues. He referred to the architectural style and that the building would be a nice landmark. Mr. Lagrange added that it would also bring value to the unit.

Mr. Myers asked Mr. Kisiel who talked about typical transit-oriented density of 3,000 to 4,500 dwelling units per acre.

Mr. Kisiel responded that related to the amount of housing units within a half mile of the train station.

Mr. Myers asked the applicant for examples of where density existed on the North Shore or in other areas. He stated that they wanted to know what it looked and felt like.

Mr. Kisiel responded that he had no site specific examples. He informed the Commission that the

prototype of the development is a mixture of two and three stories and a fourth, fifth and sixth story. Mr. Kisiel then stated that if you looked hard, you can find specific examples.

Chairperson Dalman stated that she appreciated the applicant providing additional information with regard to the impact on height. She stated that they still have questions on it and the architecture. Chairperson Dalman then stated that for the audience and those who were not here at the last meeting, the application would also be presented to the ZBA and the DRB and that there is ample time to talk about the architecture of the building. She stated that they would take into consideration the consistency of the project in the community and in connection with the surrounding properties. Chairperson Dalman indicated that it would be helpful to understand the alternative analysis for the site in terms of what if Conney's came in and that they understand that they are the holdout. She stated that they would consider items such as reducing the impact of six stories on the Elm Street parking lot, etc. and that they have the ultimate issue overall which related to height and that it would help them understand some of the considerations.

Chairperson Dalman stated that she believed that the applicant put a lot of thought into this and suggested that they also address the thought of limiting access for the Lincoln Avenue residents only and employees and retail access on Elm from Elm. She stated that would reduce the impact of a shared access point. Chairperson Dalman then commented that the fire department question was a good question and noted that new buildings are required to be fully sprinklered. She also stated that the condominium vs. apartment question is a hot topic. Chairperson Dalman stated that they would consider anything which looked at the concern of the long term vibrancy of the project, especially with Sacks in Highland Park struggling. She commented that any construction downtown represented a leap of faith and suggested that the applicant address the condominium vs. apartment issue at some point. Chairperson Dalman stated that lastly, she wondered with regard to the propensity of people to use underground parking for retail. She stated that there would be more information and asked the Commission if they had any other comments.

Mr. Kates stated that according to the presentation, the Village would be asked to pay for landscaping, streetscape and the new water main.

Mr. Thomas referred to the fitness center affecting the Community House and also stated that the North Shore Senior Center would also be affected and is used heavily in Winnetka. He indicated that he was surprised to see a fitness center as part of the proposal and described it as insensitive.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other comments from the Commission. No additional comments were made by the Commission at this time. She then stated that they would take general public comment. Chairperson Dalman stated that they are asking only for those who did not speak at the March 25<sup>th</sup> meeting to speak first and that then, they would continue with general public comment. She also stated that for those interested parties who have a more formal presentation in a structured format, there would be ample time for them to do that. Chairperson Dalman then swore in those that would be speaking on the case.

Richard Sobel informed the Commission that his father designed the Fell store. He referred to the statement which was passed out last time. Mr. Sobel described the Fell store as one of many stores that was done for Fell and that it has long been a profitable approach. He stated that many

people think of it as the Fell site and that the Fell store is part of the community. Mr. Sobel then stated that with regard to advertising for the Fell store and other uses, he suggested that they look for alternative uses for the building which was called the iconic Fell building. He stated that it is important to note that it is an award winning building and described it as a class piece of architecture.

Mr. Sobel stated that second, he described it as a solid building and that it is a building which was to be built on. He then referred to New Trier Partners and the development asking for what his father envisioned years ago.

Mr. Sobel stated that third, the preservation, adaption, reuse and creative incorporation of this building can save millions in demolition costs. He indicated that the best way to build things is to use existing buildings when they can. Mr. Sobel also informed the Commission that his uncle was an engineer who built bridges and described the building as solid. He then stated that in terms of economics, ecological architecture and greenery, this building embodied it. Mr. Sobel also described it as a model for the future. He informed the Commission that he would be happy to work with the developers for this sort of development.

Mr. Sobel also referred to whether the economics of the building fit within the existing neighborhood, criteria and concerns of those in Winnetka. He then encouraged the Village boards and the Commission to develop and encourage the review of planning for this site considering the economic, environmental, architectural and preservation benefits of reusing the Fell building. Mr. Sobel also asked the Commission not to permit any consideration of the demolition of parts of the building until a full plan has been considered for the preservation and reuse and that there be a full historic preservation report on the building. He informed the Commission that his father is quite a distinct architect and that building preservation is very important. Mr. Sobel concluded by stating that he hoped to incorporate those concepts into the thinking and record and also to look at the letters submitted by Landmarks Illinois, etc. with regard to the importance of the building which he stated added to the community. He also referred to an article in *The Pioneer Press*.

Chairperson Dalman asked Mr. Sobel to submit the information on the historic nature of the building to Mr. Norkus.

Jim Marron stated that he and his wife, Barbara, live at 711 Oak, Unit 402, and are in close proximity to the project. He stated that they are not against development and that they think that the feel of the building and surrounding buildings deserved to be addressed. Mr. Marron then stated that his concerns relate to overdevelopment and commented that One Winnetka is an exercise in overdevelopment. He referred to the commonality which runs through the feeling expressed tonight and at the last meeting.

Mr. Marron then urged that there be significant modification to the project. He stated that he believed that the proposal would have an enduring, negative impact on those neighborhoods near Elm Street and the business district. Mr. Marron also stated that the height, mass and scale of the project is in disproportion to nearby structures. He also stated that while the Beaux-Art style has a stand-alone elegance, the lack complementary would not enhance existing structures. Mr.

Marron then stated that he is concerned with the increased population, density, traffic patterns and that there are problems and issues that no one can predict.

Mr. Marron then referred to the April 2<sup>nd</sup> issue with the current headline being “One Big Decision Imposed over the Architectural Structure of the Building.” He stated that the real challenge is not one big decision, but that it is all of the little challenges and decisions that go into the making of a big decision and that the devil is in the details. Mr. Marron commented that the presentation has been helpful and informative and that it has raised a lot more questions than answers.

Mr. Marron stated that his concerns also related to why there would be rentals. He stated that values are reflected in home ownership. Mr. Marron also referred to the impact on public safety, police, fire protection and the demand on those services, as well as service deliveries on Elm. Mr. Marron indicated that the applicant talked about the public plaza. He noted that the Village Green is located a block away and that it represented the central identity of the Village. Mr. Marron questioned how it would be maintained and managed and that if it is on private property, how is it public.

Mr. Marron then stated that change is never easy and that the outcomes are seldom predictable. He concluded by stating that the project would be a massive change and that it would likely bring destruction to the fabric of the community whose commitment to progress is more incremental than titanic.

Midge Powell informed the Commission that she has lived in the Village all of her life and that she has been a realtor in the Village for 30 years. She then stated that she has worked for hundreds of families and that people who are looking do not want come to the Village for fancy restaurants or fancy retail, but that they come to the Village for the wonderful schools and charm. Ms. Powell stated that the Village is unique and desirable and that they should not change it.

Janice Eager, 956 Greenwood, stated that she is concerned with regard to underground parking and the drainage effect on surrounding properties. She informed the Commission that she has lived in the Village for 46 years and that when a new home was built next door to her with a deeper basement, they experienced a lot more water problems. Ms. Eager referred to the big size of the project and stated that they need to consider that.

Darren Kaleta, 611 Lincoln Avenue, asked the Commission to look at the independent study on traffic. He stated that they would have a hard time with that many vehicles being added. Mr. Kaleta stated that when he moved to the Village, it was small. He then stated that with regard to the comments heard, it struck him that it is a desirable Village. Mr. Kaleta also stated that property value are back up and that it was said that retailers want to come to the Village. He suggested the terms be set so that there would be no need to step up and no need for 7 stories. Mr. Kaleta added that the waited two months to be denied an 18 inch variation for a dormer and commented that the result turned out better when the design was redone. He stated that the time taken forced them to reconsider.

Mead Montgomery, 945 Old Green Bay Road, stated that he was keen on the space getting developed. He indicated that there is a very rundown central business area with a large number of

vacancies. Mr. Montgomery also stated that retailers are not beating to get in. He then stated that good redevelopment would be terrific and that he is concerned with the scale. Mr. Montgomery referred to the financial and economic aspects of the project and that if everything worked, that would be fine, but what if it did not work. He then referred to the major real estate recession and stated that part of the process is to get a sensitivity analysis in terms of what if 50% of the space is rented and whether it would work for the Village economically. Mr. Montgomery stated that there should be good downside protection.

Jen McQuet, 528 Maple, informed the Commission that she would be at ground zero in terms of the shade of the building passed onto the properties and the Village Green. She then stated that she did not buy her home to have six stories and people peering into her backyard. Ms. McQuet informed the Commission that the School for the Blind is her neighbor and that they have been a respectful neighbor. She then stated that this building which would also be on a hill would be on the biggest hill in Winnetka.

Ms. McQuet then stated that in connection with traffic, no one mentioned the numbers of children who come down the street. She stated that people do not stop at the corner and commented that traffic is bad there. Ms. McQuet stated that she loved her home and the location and that this is not something she bought into. She informed the Commission that she would support the project if it was smaller or if there was some affordable housing, but that they have no clue about what the rental units would be charging. Ms. McQuet also stated that with regard to the parking situation, people park in front of her driveway when they are late for the train and that in cutting parking for that many more units, it would be worse. She concluded by stating that she hoped something lovely happened.

Barbara Aquilino, 546 Elm, stated that she has lived in the Village for 35 years and that she was a former Village Trustee and the first chairperson of the BCDC and Chamber of Commerce. She indicated that she is familiar with retailers and the issues as well as parking issues. Ms. Aquilino also stated that she is familiar with the building Mr. Lagrange spoke about and commented that it is a beautiful building. She described it as comparing apples to oranges and that the units were \$1 million. Ms. Aquilino then stated that for 120 units, while she did not know the cost, it would not be the same. She concluded by stating that she would love to see the site redeveloped, but that it should be smaller and that 7 stories is way too high.

Peter Milbratz introduced himself to the Commission as an acquaintance of Walter Sobel. He also stated that he was involved in reviewing construction and design projects of this type. Mr. Milbratz stated that he would like to underscore Mr. Sobel's points and commented that the Fell building has been a wonderful and nicely designed part of the landscape for a long time. He also stated that it is a substantial building and that it was made on which to add vertically in anticipation of further development in that area. Mr. Milbratz informed the Commission that it would be a substantial building to remove and that by not removing it, there would also be less impact on environmental problems. He concluded by stating that [to save the building] would be cheaper and quicker and that it deserved consideration.

Don Faloon, 799 Foxdale, informed the Commission that he has lived in the Village for 30 years. He stated that when you look at the diverse architecture of Winnetka, there are many buildings

which he commented were well done. Mr. Faloon stated that the proposed development would be assured to be of extremely high quality and that the elegant work of the architect is always case. He referred to the vacancy for more than a decade or 20 years and commented that a development of this type was thoughtfully composed. Mr. Faloon suggested that there be dialog had among the interested parties to enhance the value of downtown and create greater economic activity downtown. He also stated that when they have major projects in the community, it enhances them. Mr. Faloon concluded by stating that it would be a great thing for Winnetka and that it would be composed of high quality.

Nan Greenough, 500 Maple, informed the Commission that she spent 7 years on the Commission and wrote the Comprehensive Plan, as well as serving 4 years on the Village Council voting on special use applications and that now, they are hearing a planned development application. She stated that she felt that the Commission has the charge to think globally as well as specifically with regard to the project. Ms. Greenough then stated that with regard to the nine criteria for the Commission to consider, she cannot imagine that they could approve an application like this level with the number of exceptions or density being requested. She also stated that they should address what happens to Conney's if Walmart were to move in next door and that it is something that they have to think about.

Ms. Greenough then stated that with regard to the Community House, she thanked Mr. Coladarci for his comments in connection with the fitness center. She informed the Commission that 40% of the operating revenues are from the fitness center and that there are no tax benefits or revenues in that it is a private organization. Ms. Greenough then stated that although it is based on the services it provided, they also get donations. She stated that if there is a 20,000 square foot fitness center in the proposed development, what would happen to the Community House. Ms. Greenough indicated that she cannot see necessarily the features of the project being additive to the community if it is likely to drive away what is already there which is local and good. She concluded by stating that she is against the proposed development.

Rhonda Miller, 460 Green Bay Road, stated that change is not necessarily progress and that they should keep that in mind. Ms. Miller stated that she is interested in the business aspect and that she would like to know who they are doing business with. She indicated that it is important to have the individual names of the partners involved in the project. Ms. Miller also stated that they are seeing some examples of past projects and architectural past projects which represented a good indication of what they can expect.

Ms. Miller then stated that they should consider the type of people who would be renting or owning the residences. She stated that the applicant is speculating that it could be rented to older people and that there should be no worry about the schools. Ms. Miller stated that realistically, there may be families living there which would affect the schools. She then stated that in connection with underground parking, in the past, there have been other places where the experience of underground parking represented a red flag or omen and that there are situations where assaults happen there. Ms. Miller concluding by stating that she would like for the Commission to consider the shop owners and that they would be interested and eager and that it is important to know that the residents are the customers.

Bob Spencer, 355 Myrtle, informed the Commission that he has lived in the Village for 21 years. He referred to the developer's assertion to provide a solution for one of the three main objectives in the proposal which is to providing housing alternatives for older people. Mr. Spencer questioned if there is a legitimate market research that they do have a solution here. He indicated that he did not think they all have enough options and that he cannot find it here. Mr. Spencer then stated that the project would meet that need although the scope, size and configuration could change the appearance of the Village and he encouraged the Commission to explore that with the developer whether that could change. He also stated that he is curious with regard to the traffic and the additional parking spaces. Mr. Spencer stated that they should ask whether there were standards on naming the project. He also stated that in connection with proposals and studies, he is seriously concerned as to how to integrate the three distinct business districts and commented that the project name represented an antithesis to that. Mr. Spencer concluded by stating that he is concerned about the architecture of the community as that in the community.

Bob Fragen, 1230 Lindenwood, stated that he had concerns with regard to the proposed parking structure. He indicated that they were not told about whether the places would be free or if there would be a paid time limit that the Village would permit. Mr. Fragen also stated that he had the same concerns with regard to the safety of an underground parking facility open to the public.

Mark Jacobs, 736 Elm, and his partner Ashad Gazi, introduced themselves to the Commission. He stated that they have been in business since 1937 and that they have many issues in connection with the height, density and design as well as the fact that there is no adequate parking with the project. Mr. Jacobs also stated that there would be safety issues and referred to the danger of traffic flow. He then stated that the issues involving narrowing Lincoln Avenue would be devastating to them.

Mr. Gazi stated that with regard to the benefits to Winnetka, it was said that they looked at the amount of rental space available now and that the project would be adding to the amount of commercial rentals and that the revenues that the developers projected for restaurants, stores, etc. are inflated. Mr. Gazi stated that the project would impact a business like a convenience store and that with regard to the West Elm stores, he referred to the convenience store impact with regard to the traffic. He informed the Commission that on Lincoln Avenue, parking is good for Conney's along with that on Elm.

Mr. Gazi then stated that with regard to public events, he referred to the Village Green car show in the summer on Lincoln Avenue and Elm. He also referred to the parade, sidewalk sale, arts festivals, concerts and the wine event which use that space and the Village Green. Mr. Gazi concluded by stating that they have been there long enough to see traffic patterns and flow and that the project would have a huge impact in terms of increased traffic in the neighborhood and that it is difficult to walk around.

Mr. Jacobs added that the applicant should share the survey they created with the Village.

Sue Galler, 650 Sheridan Road, stated that she has lived in the Village for 20 years and that her father was set against density and size. She then stated that while it would great for development, it went way beyond what would be useful and helpful to the residents. Ms. Galler also stated that

as a woman, she took the train late at night and that she would not go underground at night alone. She added that she did not like underground parking in other communities and that she liked to park on the street which she commented is the beauty of Winnetka in that it is safe and that you can see. Ms. Galler also referred to the objection of the homeowners on Maple and that people have lived there and that from their backyards, they would be looking at a huge building. She indicated that she would be furious if she lived there. She concluded by stating that with regard to the apartments, it is her thinking that if someone is downsizing, they would not go to a one bedroom apartment and that would not appeal to most of the people who live in Winnetka.

George Walper, 870 Prospect, stated that he and his wife have lived in Winnetka for 27 years and that his wife grew up in Winnetka along with their daughter. He referred to the opportunity to lead projects which made significant changes and that change started and respected the culture of 100 years to begin with. Mr. Walper commented that what he found here was an enormous amount of rhetoric. He then referred to the answer to Mr. Myers' questions were all about money. Mr. Walper then stated that in connection with the series of properties which were bought, it sounded like in order to make it work financially, it would have to be developed at significant levels and with significant variations against zoning. He stated that they should look at all of the requirements. Mr. Walper commented that the project did not respect the culture of the community and that it is all about a return on investment.

Mr. Walper then stated that with regard to Conney's, there are two gentleman who are proudly fighting this. He again referred to respecting the community and that there is marketing rhetoric. Mr. Walper also stated that with regard to underground parking, there would be no street level parking on Lincoln Avenue and asked how would people how park in front of Conney's or Little Ricky's. He commented that the project felt like a lot of spin and return on investment. He concluded by stating that it is the responsibility of the Commission to show no zoning variations and that the multiple parcels should be developed within the zoning requirements and that the applicant should be respectful of the Village.

Sally Sprowl, 1185 Elm, informed the Commission that she grew up here along with her family. She stated that she has seen a lot of changes over the years in the community. Ms. Sprowl also stated that she served on the Commission and is aware that the corridor with Green Bay Road and train tracks is a multi-family area. She then stated that she had no problem with some apartments in the community and commented that it would be would be good to have a mix although she did not know if there should be 120 units or their configuration or the costs of the apartments.

Ms. Sprowl referred to the applicant's statement that older people would be living there. She commented that good points were made philosophically and that they have heard that 33 parking spaces on Lincoln Avenue would be eradicated. Ms. Sprowl informed the Commission that she has background with downtown areas in comparable communities and was the Director of the Chamber of Commercial in Glencoe. She indicated that there is no substitute for on-street parking. Ms. Sprowl then stated that while in the aggregate, there would be more parking spaces, they would not be doing business or a new business in development which did not favor on-street parking. She also stated that they have heard "pie in the sky" terms of the money which would accrue to the Village and the 1% sales tax and stated that it would take \$15 million in revenue to come up with \$155,000 and whether they thought that was realistic. Ms. Sprowl stated that they

do not know if there would be stores which filled the space or would be successful. She commented that she loved that the Village can get that kind of revenue but that they cannot count on it. Ms. Sprowl commented that she appreciated the fact that Chicago is known for its architecture as they look at the building, height, bulk and density and that the project would be a very urban building and that this is a suburb.

Jack Coladarci informed the Commission that he worked at Conney's and that there was no mention of the construction taking place with the building and the effect on local businesses. He noted that Conney's would be right in the middle and would have construction all around it which he commented would not be good for business. Jack stated that would make it harder for people to get their medicine. He also stated that while they could make more deliveries, their delivery drivers park on Lincoln Avenue. Jack informed the Commission that during the construction near Café Roma across the street, there is a jackhammer sound. He concluded by stating that they like quiet in the Village and that the construction would be detrimental to businesses downtown and that there would be damage while construction is going on.

Chairperson Dalman again asked for only those to speak who did not attend the previous meeting.

Vicki Hofstetter informed the Commission that she has a business 550 Lincoln Avenue and that she lived in Northfield and would live in this building. She then stated that based on the comments made, she is definitely in the minority. Ms. Hofstetter stated that she also voiced the same concerns with regard to Conney's. She also stated that she is concerned with regard to the Community House and that she respected the Fell legacy.

Ms. Hofstetter informed the Commission that she is a struggling retailer in Winnetka and that she could have opened her store in Lake Forest or Hinsdale where there is a great customer base established but that she chose Winnetka. She noted that she has been in the community for 47 years and that she loved the community and dreamed of living here. Ms. Hofstetter stated that she was turned by testimony and understood the comments made, but stated that they should also respect her feelings. She then referred to an article and stated that while she did not know about One Winnetka, she saw the article and could not believe that people were opposed to the development. Ms. Hofstetter described it as beautiful and sorely needed. She referred to the dying retailers in East Elm and that they needed the shot in the arm the development would give the entire Village.

Ms. Hofstetter then stated that construction would hurt businesses for a while. She also stated that when a new retailer opened, it would hurt her even more. Ms. Hofstetter stated that while she is willing to sacrifice sales and may lose sales, to have something is more important to her and to have more vibrancy and amenities which would come from the development. She added that any new retail would enhance and not compete with her business.

Ms. Hofstetter also stated that with regard to traffic and parking, it would be a win-win for retailers. She informed the Commission that for her store, people would circle 12 times to get a parking space and that parking is difficult on Mondays. Ms. Hofstetter then stated that she and her husband left their home which they had for 30 years since they cannot do stairs and that they need an apartment which would be handicap accessible. She stated that as an alternative, the

divorce rate is high and that there are many men say in the Village who want to be close to their children and would need the apartments, as well as others.

Ms. Hofstetter then stated that with regard to her age group, it would be a benefit financially to have an apartment. She informed the Commission that they looked everywhere and that there is little available in Winnetka. Ms. Hofstetter also stated that people in her age group want to downsize and stay in town and not have to move to Chicago and that she would have jumped at the chance to live on Lincoln Avenue or Elm. She described the project as elegant and tasteful and that it is what Winnetka needed and what she needed. Ms. Hofstetter added that anyone who knew her knows that she is a traditionalist and hated teardowns. She concluded by stating that on Sheridan Road, there is every style of architecture imaginable and questioned why would it be so different to have variety on Elm.

Nancy Fox, 1036 Elm, informed the Commission that she has lived in Winnetka since 1969 and stated that when she saw the photograph, she could not believe that Winnetka would come to this. She noted that the renderings show the building when you stand on Maple and that when you look up, you cannot see it. Ms. Fox stated that to her and Ms. Sprowl, they live down on Elm and would be looking up. She concluded by stating that proportion-wise with regard to the sun and sky line, it would feel like second empire French and would make it feel like it would be in her head forever.

Patti Skirving, 605 Lincoln Avenue, introduced herself to the Commission as a realtor with Coldwell Banker and stated that she walked the streets every day to work. She indicated that she is one of the few people here who came without bias and that she wanted to be persuaded to be in favor of the project. Ms. Skirving stated that she has clients on a waiting list who do not want to go out west and want to stay in Winnetka. She informed the Commission that she raised her family here and stated that the list of clients want her to call if the project is approved.

Ms. Skirving then stated that she is not convinced and that she is heartbroken. She then stated that she is in full support of the fact that they need something to revitalize downtown and that they see stores closed every day. Ms. Skirving stated that they need vitality. She then stated that you see growth in Wilmette which she described as interesting and noted that her clients come from the city and want Wilmette because their downtown is vibrant.

Ms. Skirving also stated that she is absolutely in support of Conney's and the Community House. She then stated that in connection with competition with realtors, it is not necessarily negative. Ms. Skirving added that she cannot support the proposed height, density and zoning. She stated that it is all about negotiation and compromising. She commented that she loved the statement made with regard to taking some of the height off at the ends and adding more in the middle. Ms. Skirving concluded by stating that compromise can be reached in connection with condominiums and apartments and that the project should not have the proposed height or density.

Jeff Schmidt informed the Commission that he and wife have lived in the Village for 31 years at 550 Cedar. He then stated that given the proximity of the development to the Village Green which he indicated is a critical legacy and resource to the Village, he referred to the higher degree of care needed in providing exceptions. Mr. Schmidt stated that those are requirements and not

tweaks. He also stated that a 100% variation on height would set a precedent. He referred to the effects to other retailers and the others where drawbacks were mentioned.

Mr. Schmidt then stated that years ago, a developer wanted to tear down a home on the Village Green with three homes in the footprint and that they fought that with the Commission's vision and fortitude and turned the proposal down. He then stated that the home on the site was renovated and a new home built. Mr. Schmidt described it as being an unmitigated disaster if they were to give exceptions to the developer which would change the visual appearance of the Village Green. He concluded by stating that there also risk associated with the exceptions required and that a high degree care should be taken before the exceptions are allowed.

Sherry Felty informed the Commission that she lived in Winnetka and worked downtown. She questioned who they were trying to attract as well as what businesses. Ms. Felty stated that what you see in Winnetka architecture is a commitment to quality. She then commented that while it is a beautiful building, she did not see a relationship to Winnetka in the building. Ms. Felty also stated that you do not see the materials in other buildings here.

Ms. Felty then stated that in Paris, it was built with a 30 foot streetscape. She stated that it is not a Paris building because it did not have streetscape and questioned where did it belong. Ms. Felty stated that they could drop it on any corner in any other town with the same predictions of success they are hearing. She indicated that it did not belong in Winnetka and that it did not relate to the history of what they have and what they have built.

Ms. Felty also stated that she is concerned with the streetscape and that you would see a flat front which she described as not welcoming. She also stated that you would not see outward seating restaurants and commented that the over-reliance on the plaza is an unsound idea as well as the over-reliance on underground parking which she commented would not be successful.

Ms. Felty then stated that you did not see a place where people would be riding and parking bicycles and walking families. She referred to the birds-eye view which she commented is intriguing and that on the street front, there would be no egress for the interior courtyard and that she did not know it was there. Ms. Felty commented that she would love to see the property adjacent to Conney's to offer seating and communion. She also stated that you see the space for the 711 Oak residents to sit, walk and be part of the sidewalk of the community. Ms. Felty concluded by commenting that while she loved the variety of massings above the street and would not alter that, the materials do not seem to belong in Winnetka.

Elise Covey, 1503 Edgewood Lane, informed the Commission that she has lived in the Village for 50 years. She suggested that they definitely check things with the fire department and other Village services and how the project would impact in terms of additional costs for the Village. Ms. Covey informed the Commission that she was involved in the worst fire in Winnetka and that they should be careful with regard to new construction and the number of fires in town. She also noted that the North Shore Railroad ran up the bike trail and not Lincoln Avenue. Ms. Covey then stated that the density was way out of proportion and that she was concerned about Conney's which she commented has been a wonderful pharmacy for more than 50 years. She concluded by stating that while they do need something in the area, it should be scaled down and be more

Winnetka-type rather than Paris.

Ashley Vollmer, 377 Walnut, thanked the applicant for the presentation and described it as helpful. She then stated that they need a lot more discussion with regard to the larger scale plan for the business districts they have in Winnetka. Ms. Vollmer described the project as a slippery slope and stated that once one side of the street is approved, what would happen when the other side wanted to do the same thing.

Ms. Vollmer informed the Commission that she worked for a long time in retail and described retail as a challenged arena with online shopping. She then stated that with respect to the types of retail that the developer would bring in like the fitness center, she referred to Evanston and stated that a large portion of retail was turned over to the service industry and that it is struggling. Ms. Vollmer referred to a big mass retailer and whether it could withstand a small location and she also referred to \$15 million generated for that area and commented that it was incredibly wasted with regard to population patterns in the area.

Ms. Vollmer also stated that there would be a huge impact on preschools and that with regard to the level of traffic, they use the Village Green and streets frequently which she stated were not taken into account. She also referred to the idea of the tree canopy and stated she moved to the Village from Chicago. Ms. Vollmer stated that the tallest things you see are the trees. She then referred to intangible property and real property value and described the trees and schools as hallmarks of Winnetka.

Ms. Vollmer then stated that she agreed that the area needed revitalization, but that it should not be remade from the ground up. She indicated that it required larger, wholesale participation and is about the three business districts and what type of viable retail operations can come in to support it and not require residential density to support it. Ms. Vollmer commented that the Community House is an amazing attribute to the community and that she also shopped at Conney's. She referred to the reasons why people move to the Village and stated that you do not see a large scale, 7 story building which would support restaurants going into Wilmette or Glencoe. Ms. Vollmer noted that Winnetka has the second highest property values on the North Shore which is a reason it is encapsulated. She concluded by stating that overdevelopment is not the right answer.

Craig Smith, 552 Hawthorne, informed the Commission that he is against the scale and density of the development. He also stated that he did not believe the developer's explanations on the tree canopy and that the building would be twice the height of the tree canopy. Mr. Smith described the building as urban in terms of its scale and density and that there is no need to urbanize the town. He suggested that they remember why they are here.

Thomas Rajkovich, 306 Forest, introduced himself to the Commission as an architect by profession and architectural educator at the University of Notre Dame. He also stated that he served as a professor at the University of Illinois, the School of the Art Institute, etc. and that he has an office in Evanston where he lived for a long time before moving to Winnetka. He stated that he liked density and described it as word which is often mistreated because it often had negative connotations. Mr. Rajkovich stated that a good town would have differing density characteristics which are worth contemplating.

Mr. Rajkovich stated that one of the reasons they moved to Winnetka is because Evanston went through a number of transit-oriented developments which proved when done the wrong way can harm an urban setting rather than be good for it. He noted that he also submitted written comments. Mr. Rajkovich then stated that in connection with Bennett, Daniel Burnham was Bennett's partner on the plan for Chicago and that they trained in Paris and built a home for himself in Lake Forest. He stated that Bennett made highly differentiated plans for Winnetka in terms of scale and aspects of density which vary between the city and Village setting. Mr. Rajkovich described the Bennett plan in Chicago as a durable plan which thought far enough in the future to accommodate development and that Bennett thought likewise here.

Mr. Rajkovich then stated that of the things which is characteristic of all of Bennett's planning work is that for public buildings and buildings that have shared collective importance to a community such as a house of worship or Village Hall, etc., those towering elements which create the skyline of the Village and beneficially serve the community if they are institutions of shared importance. He stated that they collectively benefit from their presence and they enjoy them.

Mr. Rajkovich stated that a number of comments made this evening related to a variety of issues which have been addressed sufficiently and the issue which came up over and over again related to scale. He stated that there is a reason why these perspectives, if you look at them, he referred to the points on the top of the window lines where it seemed to run horizontally on the illustration would be above the heads of the second floor windows which he described as the eye-line or horizon line perspective. Mr. Rajkovich stated that these drawings were done at the height of the second story floor window and since the presence of the buildings on the other side of the street were omitted from the illustration, you cannot see how big those buildings would have been in order to make the comparison to the height of the proposed building. He stated that this was done in order to make the building appear smaller than it actually is. Mr. Rajkovich also stated that the vehicles appear to look like carpenter ants which was done so that the building would be made to appear smaller than it would actually feel in reality.

Mr. Rajkovich then stated that he did not have the concern that others raised with regard to the architectural style or character of the building if it is executed properly. He stated that he found the height of the building to be problematic and offered the following analogy to make his point. Mr. Rajkovich suggested that they imagine a culture or civilization where everyone in the Village ranged in height from 4 foot 10 inches to 6 feet 1 or 2 inches. He then stated that since the proposed building would be three times that height, to imagine someone in that Village being 15 feet tall. Mr. Rajkovich stated that no one in that Village would assume that person was part of the family and that person would stand out in a freakish version in terms of scale. He also stated that it would not matter what kind of clothing or costume that person wore in that Village, that person would never really fit in.

Mr. Rajkovich stated that while they live in a Village where they value diversity and that they shun the unusual, there are reasons why Venice or Paris had height limitations and that the only elements which exceeded those height limits were monuments of shared importance. He stated that in connection with the fundamentals of this notion of filling out the site out of residential blocks, he would submit that a third residential block would not be a bad thing if the height collectively

could come down and that although that would result in additional density, there would not be the skyline problem of the shadowing issues and other issues that people are describing.

Rob White, 434 Berkeley, commented that the development would be out of place. He noted that what Bennett also had which is important in his plan is the lagoon and yacht harbor. Mr. White stated that this would be more institutional or like a hospital. He then stated that if the architects got the design memo for Winnetka, it would be English Tudor and asked the applicant if they could do that.

Mr. Lagrange responded that they could not.

Chairperson Dalman confirmed that the Commission would register his comment as to why the development could not be English Tudor.

Wes Bauman, 455 Sunset, informed the Commission that he has lived in the Village for 34 years. He then stated that with regard to history, another Winnetka institution, New Trier, proposed a really big and obnoxious plan and that the voters voted it down. Mr. Bauman stated that the developer came back later and that the neighbors applauded the revised plan which brought down the façade to fit in more with the neighbors. He indicated that it is his hope that the development would do something similar.

Crispin Hales, 1000 Sheridan road, stated that in 34 years, he has seen a lot a changes. He then commented that he was sad about the few who are in favor of small business and good service. Mr. Hales then referred to the hardware store which was lost. He indicated that he is not a fan of big stores in the Village. Mr. Hales then stated that when he moved to the Village, he referred to if he could have bought a Chicago home between Northwestern and the lake. He then stated that he found a home in the Village that he loved because of the Village-type environment. Mr. Hales concluded by stating that the project would be totally out of proportion and would set a precedent by making the Village have a different kind of theme.

Juanita Nicholson, 554 Arbor Vitae, informed the Commission that her home is the closet to the building. She stated that there are a lot of reasons for people to object to the project which she agreed with. Ms. Nicholson then stated that it would not look like Winnetka. She commented that she felt bad that the developer spent two years and \$14 million and did not get a sense of the Village. Ms. Nicholson then stated that the last meeting, she walked home and encouraged those to walk toward Arbor Vitae and imagine seeing a building towering on the right. She added that the drawings giving the perspective did not show the impact standing on the street.

Chairperson Dalman stated that this would wrap up the public comment portion of this meeting and noted that they would continue the public hearing to April 22, 2014 which is the Commission's regular meeting date at 7:30 p.m. She indicated that she appreciated that the applicant said that they would hold an open house.

Mr. Trandel informed the Commission that the open house would be on April 15, 2015 at 7:30 p.m. at Mariani's Restaurant on Elm Street. He then encouraged members of the public to attend and stated that it would provide the opportunity to have good feedback to the applicant.

Chairperson Dalman thanked the applicant for making themselves available to meet with the residents and stated that the information would also be put on the website. She described it as quite unusual of the applicant.

Chairperson Dalman then stated that completed the public comment portion of the hearing and reiterated that the hearing would be continuing. She stated that next, they would hear from interested parties who intend on making a more formal presentation and for questioning. Chairperson Dalman then asked for a show of hands of anyone in the room who is an interested party. She indicated that the Commission would start that with that portion at the next meeting with their opportunity and that then the applicant could respond if they chose. Chairperson Dalman added that if there is enough time, the Village staff would make their presentation and refocus as to what the criteria would be for the Commission to consider.

Mr. Myers asked if Steve Saunders could attend that meeting.

Chairperson Dalman stated that they could see if that is possible. She then stated that next, there would be the Commission's questions and their deliberation and that the matter may be continued to the May regularly scheduled meeting. Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other comments. No additional comments were made by the Commission at this time.

**Public Comment**

No additional public comments were made at this time.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Antionette Johnson