

Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes and Resolution

1. November 16, 2015 Meeting
2. December 14, 2015 Meeting
3. January 11, 2016 Meeting
4. January 11, 2016 Zoning Board of Appeals Resolution

**WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
NOVEMBER 16, 2015
EXCERPT OF MINUTES**

Zoning Board Members Present: Joni Johnson, Chairperson
Chris Blum
Mary Hickey
Thomas Kehoe
Kathleen Kumer
Carl Lane
Mark Naumann

Zoning Board Members Absent: None

Village Staff: Michael D’Onofrio, Director of Community
Development
Ann Klaassen, Planning Assistant

Village Attorney: Karl Camillucci

Agenda Items:

Case No. 15-10-PD: 511 Lincoln Avenue, 513-515 Lincoln Avenue,
710-732 Elm Street, 740 Elm Street and a Portion of
the Adjacent Lincoln Avenue Right-Of-Way
Stonestreet Partners and Winnetka Station LLC
Planned Development

511 Lincoln Avenue, 513-515 Lincoln Avenue, 710-732 Elm Street, 740 Elm Street and a Portion of the Adjacent Lincoln Avenue Right-of-Way, Case No. 15-10-Park District, Stonestreet Partners and Winnetka Station LLC - Planned Development

Chairperson Johnson stated that she would start with a roadmap. She then stated that after that, Mr. D’Onofrio would summarize the planned development process and the Board’s role in it. Chairperson Johnson stated that the Village Staff provided copies of the special use standards to the public here tonight that the ZBA will use to evaluate the proposal. These are the same special use standards used by the ZBA to evaluate playground and park developments, school building projects, and certain commercial developments. She stated that after Mr. D’Onofrio made his presentation, the applicant would make their presentation and that the Board would have the opportunity to question the applicant. Chairperson Johnson stated given the complexity of the application, the probable need for additional information, and the importance of providing ample opportunity for public comment, the ZBA will not deliberate and vote on the application at tonight’s meeting.

Chairperson Johnson stated after the ZBA questions the applicant, members of the public will have an opportunity to make comments. They should approach the podium, stated their name and address, and limit their comments to 5 minutes.

Chairperson Johnson then pointed out that the Board was provided minutes from the Plan Commission meetings as well as comments which were submitted on the Village's website. She stated that there is an opportunity to continue to submit comments on the website with regard to the application and that there would be a sign in sheet for interested parties to receive notice of upcoming meetings.

Chairperson Johnson noted that some members of the current ZBA, including herself, were on the Board when New Trier Partners presented its application for final approval of their planned development for the Fell site in 2011. The ZBA recommended that the Village Council approve the final plans. The applicant did not complete the final approval process. She indicated that there is the hope to end tonight's meeting at 10:00 p.m. and noted that the case would be continued to the December 14, 2015 meeting. Chairperson Johnson then stated Mr. D'Onofrio would first provide his presentation followed by those who would be sworn in who planned to speak on this case.

Mr. D'Onofrio stated that he would keep his comments to a minimum and describe the planned development process. He stated that there were a few Board members who were involved with the previous planned development in 2011. Mr. D'Onofrio noted that he would not go into the components of the One Winnetka plan and that he would let the developer do that.

Mr. D'Onofrio stated that with regard to the planned development regulations, a copy was provided and is also included in the agenda packet. He noted that the intent of the planned development ordinance, which was approved and adopted in 2005, was to allow for a greater degree of zoning flexibility for developments on sites which measure 10,000 square feet or more. Mr. D'Onofrio also noted that a planned development is a type of special use and that it utilized the same process of a special use.

Mr. D'Onofrio stated that as described in the purpose statement in Section 17.58, a planned development as a special use procedure departs from the strict application of specific zoning requirements in the district where the development is located. He stated that in an effort to progress development and the redevelopment of land, in this case, with regard to the commercial districts, it is done by encouraging more creative and imaginative design than is possible under the zoning regulations that apply in those districts. Mr. D'Onofrio stated that the understanding is that development on a 10,000 square foot lot did not fit within the bulk standards of the underlying zoning district. He stated that there is also the acknowledgment that it will be unique and that they want regulations which would not stifle that creativity. Mr. D'Onofrio also noted that the development may not meet all of the criteria in the underlying zoning district.

Mr. D'Onofrio then stated that along with the purpose statement, the ordinance also spelled out the intent behind the planned development which included five factors. He stated that the five factors are: (1) to permit a creative approach to development and redevelopment, (2) to achieve a more desirable physical environment by allowing flexibility in building design and site layout, (3) to

allow a more efficient use of land, resulting in a more economic network of utilities, streets and other facilities, (4) to allow the facilitation of a development pattern that is in harmony with the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan and the purpose of the zoning districts and (5) to allow the relaxation of other applicable substantive requirements.

Mr. D'Onofrio stated that with regard to how the planned development process worked, he referred to the Board which considered final approval of the previous NTP planned development in general which is a two-step process. He noted that first, there is preliminary approval and then the final approval process. Mr. D'Onofrio stated that currently, the application is in the preliminary approval process which includes review by the Board, the Plan Commission and the DRB. He then stated that upon completion of the advisory bodies' review, the application is presented to the Village Council for consideration of preliminary approval.

Mr. D'Onofrio noted that if the Village Council decided to grant preliminary approval, within 18 months, the applicant has to initiate the final approval process which he described as more perfunctory in nature. He stated that preliminary approval hashed out the details and that final approval is triggered by the completion, review and approval of engineering site plans. Mr. D'Onofrio stated that then, it is reviewed again by the Plan Commission, the Board and the DRB and then it would go back to the Village Council for final approval.

Mr. D'Onofrio noted that in the agenda packet, quite a bit of information was provided, such as describing the responsibilities of each of the three advisory bodies. He noted that the ordinance clearly identified the role of each body. Mr. D'Onofrio informed the Board that the Plan Commission reviewed the plan over seven meetings and that they recommended approval of the planned development. He stated that their role is to determine whether the planned development as a whole is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. D'Onofrio also stated that all of the minutes from the Plan Commission meetings and the resolution were forwarded to the Board and that there was a vote of eight in favor and two against the recommendation in favor of the planned development along with a number of conditions on the approval, all of which are found on page nos. 9 and 10 of the agenda packet. He added that it was also included in the final minutes of the last Plan Commission meeting.

Mr. D'Onofrio stated that the second body to review the application is the DRB and that they are scheduled to consider the application on Thursday. He informed the Board that the DRB is to provide comment and recommendations as to whether the building design, landscape plan and other exterior aspects of the development are in conformity with the Village's adopted design guidelines.

Mr. D'Onofrio informed the Board that their role is to determine whether the development is consistent with the special use standards. He then stated that to determine this, the Board is to address six findings. Mr. D'Onofrio identified the six findings as follows: (1) to determine whether the development will not endanger or be detrimental to the public health, safety, comfort, morals or general welfare and that it would complement and supplement the community given the nature of the businesses; (2) that the special use will not either substantially diminish or impair property values in the immediate vicinity, or be substantially injurious to the use and enjoyment of land in the immediate vicinity for uses permitted by right in that zoning district, (3) impede the

normal and orderly development and improvement of other property in the immediate vicinity for uses permitted by right in the zoning district, (4) that adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress in a manner which minimizes pedestrian and vehicular traffic congestion in the public ways, (5) that adequate parking, utilities, access roads, drainage and other facilities necessary for the operation of the special use either exist or will be provided and (6) that the special use in all other respects conforms to the applicable zoning regulations and other applicable Village ordinances and codes. He added that the request is similar to the earlier application in connection with the cell tower.

Mr. D'Onofrio stated that he would now discuss the general comments about zoning and the subject site. He noted that the property is located in the C-2 retail overlay district which is the commercial district. Mr. D'Onofrio then stated that being in the overlay district, the first 50 feet on the first floor is regulated differently than the general commercial district. He stated that he would like to mention that because people think that a number of variations are being requested with the project. Mr. D'Onofrio stated that in the application, planned development allows for exceptions to regulations which differ from a variation which he described as a distinction with a difference. He informed the Board that those exceptions were reviewed and recommendations were made by the Plan Commission and not the Board. Mr. D'Onofrio stated that with regard to those exceptions requested, three of them are identified on page 9 of the agenda report. He informed the Board that the three exceptions relate to building height of 5½ stories and 70 feet in height which is the highest point of the building, while the underlying regulation allowed four stories and 45 feet. Mr. D'Onofrio stated that the second exception related to an upper story setback on the east side of the building where the applicant is proposing a 0 foot setback and that the code required a 10 foot setback at the 4th floor level and above. He stated that the third exception related to the rear yard setback and that the applicant is proposing no setback and that a 10 foot setback is required. Mr. D'Onofrio then asked the Board if they had any questions.

Ms. Hickey questioned the exceptions recommended and approved by the Plan Commission. She then stated that in the agenda packet on page 9, she asked if the Board is not to include exceptions and if they are not to address them.

Mr. D'Onofrio responded that with regard to the specific exceptions, the Board has no authority to recommend or deny. He stated that the Board is to look at the project as a whole and determine whether they would be in favor or against it with their concerns being based on what is being proposed. Mr. D'Onofrio added that any opposition to an exception is under the purview of the Plan Commission and that any approval or denial would be done by the Village Council.

Mr. Naumann asked with regard to the maximum building height standard, is there any precedent in the community.

Mr. D'Onofrio stated that he would have to get back to the Board on that one and that he did not recall. He noted that there has been no building similar to the proposal.

Ms. Kumer asked what is currently the tallest building.

Mr. D'Onofrio responded that he would have to get back to the Board on that as well and that there

were studies done and that he did not have that data in front of him.

Chairperson Johnson asked if there were any other questions for Mr. D'Onofrio. No additional questions were raised by the Board at this time. She then noted that in the applicant's submission, there was no formal discussion of the six special use standards. Chairperson Johnson indicated that she did not know if that would be part of the applicant's oral presentation or if there is something in writing that the applicant wanted to present to the Board and that the typical application responds to the six standards in the materials. She then swore in those that would be speaking on this case.

Glenn Udell of Brown, Udell, Pomerantz & Delrahim was not sworn in and stated that he would not be giving testimony and identified himself as the attorney for the applicant.

Mr. Camillucci asked Mr. Udell if he had any objection to being sworn in.

Mr. Udell responded that he did not.

Chairperson Johnson then swore in Mr. Udell.

Mr. Udell began by informing the Board that he is the attorney representing Stonestreet Partners and One Winnetka which is the applicant. He noted that his sole purpose is to introduce the speakers and that he would briefly inform the Board what the speakers intended to speak about. Mr. Udell identified David Trandel as a representative of the applicant who would give an introductory statement with regard to the project and the project vision. He stated that George Kisiel is an urban planner and land planner who would provide the Board with an overview of the project. Mr. Udell stated that Mr. Kisiel would also go through the six standards in connection with how they tie to the project and which they can put in writing after the meeting. He then stated that the project architect, Lucien LaGrange, would explain the project design architecture and answer any questions. Mr. Udell stated that lastly, Mr. Kisiel would provide a summary conclusion and then the applicant would answer any questions the Board has.

David Trandel stated that he would be speaking on behalf of the 20 professionals working on the project. He informed the Board that he would go through the special nuances and stated that it is important that they understand what they are trying to accomplish with the building, as well as how it started, why they are here today trying to solve behind the information bites of information which are rolling through the community.

Mr. Trandel began by stating that with regard to background, he referred to the familiarity with some of the professionals involved on the project and that he is honored to have the brainchild of the design and idea of Lucien Lagrange to try to create something that they can all be proud of. He noted that Mr. Lagrange is known throughout the world for his tremendous residential design from a value perspective and that they should think 5, 10 or 20 years from now and know that his projects are overwhelmingly in the top 20% of the market in terms of value.

Mr. Trandel stated that when they came into the project in 2011, they had taken a more organic approach and that they should forget what was done before them. He stated that the question is

how can they use that moment in time to address some of the issues and referred to the fact that there are residents of Winnetka on the team. Mr. Trandel stated that when he was asked to step in and take a look at what was out there and the proposal, he informed the Board that he spent time previously with Mr. D'Onofrio and Mr. Norkus in designing his home and noted that he lives directly 4½ blocks east of the site. He stated that to suggest that anyone who knows the nuances of being downstream from the project, he referred to the issues confronting the east side of town. Mr. Trandel also referred to the lack of vibrancy and stated that the project would also address parking which he described as an enormous issue east of the tracks, as well as water detention and retention. He then reminded everyone that when the Village was laid out over 100 years ago, water retention was not in the vernacular.

Mr. Trandel stated that in connection with a lot of what they have tried to do, he stated that he would go through the various parties and embrace where they came from. He added that no one was here when the Village started and that they inherited the canvas in terms of what to do for modern life without losing its charm. Mr. Trandel described the process as very thoughtful and that they would continue to work through the issues as they come up.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that they also brought in Daniel Weinbach of Daniel Weinbach & Partners. He then identified Mr. Lagrange's projects as the Waldorf Astoria, the 208 S. LaSalle renovation and 10 E. Delaware which he indicated has the best performing Gold Coast award last year. Mr. Trandel also stated that he and Mr. Lagrange have had a long history of working together and that Mr. Lagrange's portfolio contained the greatest residential assets in the world. He then stated that Daniel Weinbach is a world renowned landscape architect and that what they are talking about is highly relevant with regard to the way it crosses which is beyond the building itself.

Mr. Trandel noted that there are seven different buildings in the project on a very large site. He then stated that in terms of perspective, it is almost twice the size of the last planned development presented by NTP. Mr. Trandel then stated that if you were to include the public area and plaza, it would be three times the size. He also stated that they would get into the massing, shadowing etc. and introduced Eriksson Engineering Associates as the civil engineering firm.

Mr. Trandel stated that with regard to traffic, health and safety are big issues as well as water. He informed the Board that they engaged KLOA who are experts in the field on the traffic safety side and that Erickson Engineering is on the civil and engineering side. Mr. Trandel identified George Kisiel as the consultant on planning and zoning and noted that he is also highly renowned and very astute. He stated that with regard to marketing analysis, he stated that while the project has been a labor of love, it has to cross the finish line. Mr. Trandel stated that they want to make sure to get funded and paid and that they hired Tracy Cross & Associates who he described as highly aggressive, great and well regarded and that they would see if what they are proposing can be achieved.

He noted that it related specifically to the residential offering. Mr. Trandel also stated that they engaged TR Mandigo as the tax impact consultants and that the firm is to consider the impact to both the schools and the tax coffers.

Mr. Trandel then referred the Board to the rendering. He stated that there had been an amalgamation of a lot of different ideas and that their first proposal was put forth several meetings ago which he described as mildly different. Mr. Trandel stated that in connection with the evolution of the project, it can go from more vertical on the edges and that they pushed the masses inside aesthetically and to keep the architectural integrity. He noted that the core of the project starts with parking and solving for the serious void of parking on the east side and downtown. He also stated that the project would create hard space which would become a public focal point. Mr. Trandel then described the Village Green as incredible. He added that when it rained, it created a different issue and commented that gathering place is important.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that the number of residential units was reduced down from 120 to 71 luxury rental units comprised of three different buildings. He stated that underneath them would be a dedicated residential parking garage serving the residents. Mr. Trandel noted that they are proposing 40,000 square feet of retail space which he indicated is not significantly bigger than what they would be replacing. He then stated that part of the education is to understand what draws a retailer such as a fresh market restaurant and that retailers have special expectations and needs. Mr. Trandel stated that it started first with the space and volume ceilings, with most ceiling heights in Winnetka being small. He noted that volume is important to a restaurant which would be a dominant retailer from their perspective. Mr. Trandel also stated that there is an inherent need for parking and informed the Board that through every study which was commissioned, it stated that parking is severely lacking to attract any major retailer. He stated that from a practical standpoint, as a resident, it started with parking and that they built from there.

Mr. Trandel referred to a specific moment in time and that they assembled a world class team on behalf of friends and neighbors and that their peers are well renowned on a global scale. He stated that they wanted to bring the best people forth to address the things they need to solve for. Mr. Trandel informed the Board that it is not a get rich quick idea or that they would come to Winnetka and leave and that as a resident, he is the aggregator. He indicated that there has to be a lot of give and take and that while there are a lot of things they could do by right, you would end up with more and stated that they are not trying to disrespect the 45 foot height requirement. Mr. Trandel then stated that in terms of the reality and within the box afforded to them, there are opportunities and that framing the project in the proper context is critical. He added that the code was not written for a 65,000 square foot site and that the property is located in a very unique spot. Mr. Trandel informed the Board that Mr. Kisiel would talk about the aspects relating to Lincoln and the railroad tracks. He also referred to the light and air to 711 Oak and Arbor Vitae and the streetscape being consistent with what existed on Elm which he indicated required creativity. Mr. Trandel noted that by right, they would end up with a box which he stated would be highly inefficient and that it has to work for the benefit of Winnetka.

Mr. Trandel stated that the project benefits include public improvements and that part of the project addressed parking and that there would be over 300 parking places added downtown which he commented is sorely needed. He also stated that it would be over the amount required and that Lincoln is part of the solution and not the problem. Mr. Trandel then stated that they would be creating a deck for the commuters who would be able to walk directly to the platform which he described as brilliant. He noted that all of the commuter parking would all be down into the garage with 188 commuter spaces which is more than there are now. Mr. Trandel indicated that it

is their hope to attract Indian Hill and Hubbard Woods and to make downtown a focal point.

Mr. Trandel stated that the next huge benefit is aesthetics. He stated that if you were to travel the world and Europe and see how it survived, it is because of public gathering places. Mr. Trandel stated that the public place can change its personality by the hour and that it could have a different personality in the morning and in the evening. He stated that they wanted to find a way to keep more people and for it to be a magnet for others on the North Shore and that the public plaza is a very important aspect, specifically how it related to the railroad tracks and that he wanted to clear up any misunderstanding in that regard.

Mr. Trandel stated that with regard to talk about the project as a developer, he referred to going beyond the time, energy and resources and informed the Board that they are committing a lot of dollars which is not the driving force here. He stated that there is a need to make it pencil and that the key is to be focused on doing what they can which is a part of the reason for the creativity of the architecture in order to make sure it is interesting enough to drive rents and for people to want to call it home. Mr. Trandel stated that they felt that they would be making a significant contribution by picking up half of the cost of the Village garage on the west and 100% on the east side. He then stated that from a participation standpoint, there are critical aspects to make up in retail as well as it being critical to solve the parking issues.

Mr. Trandel went on to state that dollar wise, in terms of being specific to the project, as it is designed, they would be adding \$1 million in added dollars to the Village. He stated that presumably, there would be renewed vigor and activity in an area which would significantly enhance activity in all of downtown. Mr. Trandel then stated that from a land value perspective, he referred to the revitalization of the downtown business district and that as a homeowner, it is important to all of them to focus on schools. He also stated that downtown is an important aspect and referred to civic pride. Mr. Trandel stated that people want to move to Winnetka from other parts of the world and described it as a special place. He concluded by stating that the underlying theme of the project would be the enhancement of downtown. Mr. Trandel then introduced George Kisiel.

George Kisiel of Okrent Kisiel Associates stated that his firm is an urban planning and consulting firm based in Chicago with over 30 years of experience. He informed the Board that he would provide a brief background and history of Winnetka planning heritage and how the project fits into that context. Mr. Kisiel also stated that he would be discussing the nuts and bolts of the project and that he would address the public benefits, zoning and the Board's evaluation of the criteria for the project.

Mr. Kisiel began by stating that the Village was platted in 1850 and experienced rapid growth between 1890 and 1920. He stated that in connection with the Village's planning movement, the Plan Commission was formed in 1915 and that they hired Edward Bennett to help create a plan for Winnetka. Mr. Kisiel stated that the key aspects of the plan included a grade separated rail system and the creation of separate civic space. He then referred to the influence of the work from Paris. Mr. Kisiel informed the Board that Bennett envisioned a central area focused around the train station and the Village Hall to the west which was proposed to be a cultural center and on to the east commercial block. He stated that the plan talked about block faces rather than a large piece

of open space.

Mr. Kisiel stated that in connection with the development context, he stated that things have changed since 1920 and referred to the boom of the 1920's which brought Winnetka to nearly full buildout. He also referred to auto ownership and the change in retail development which impacted traditional downtown centers. Mr. Kisiel also referred to revitalization through transit-oriented development and the impact of e-retailing and internet sales which impact downtown. He noted that the East Elm retail district has a vacancy rate of 38% which he indicated is inflated by the subject property. Mr. Kisiel then stated that there are issues with retail development and in terms of what can be done.

Mr. Kisiel went on to state that every 20 years, the Comprehensive Plan is updated and that the current plan was drafted in 1999. He stated that it anticipated the things which are addressed in the One Winnetka project. Mr. Kisiel then referred to the need for parking in the East Elm district. He stated that it recognizes the issues with the types of buildings and existing development on the site.

Mr. Kisiel noted that in 2006, a parking study was undertaken which identified a significant parking deficit specifically in East Elm. He stated that the Village engaged ULI to study the commercial district and that resulted in findings relating to place making and civic space. Mr. Kisiel also stated that in 2015, a resident survey was done with a 45% response rate and for which 77% viewed the business district revitalization as a high priority.

Mr. Kisiel stated that the project looked to complete Bennett's vision around the train station and respond to community preferences. He also stated that the proposal is consistent with current planning efforts and that it responded to the current Comprehensive Plan as well as reaffirmed the traditional role of Winnetka's downtown.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that Lucien Lagrange for 2½ years worked on the same project with Mr. Trandel and is behind the vision. He noted that the team all worked together and that they did a very important building in Chicago. Mr. Kisiel described it as an incredible and amazing project.

Mr. Kisiel referred the Board to the first illustration which identified downtown Winnetka and showed the side that they are dealing with. He also identified the exposed concrete under the development and stated that when compared to the three corners, it is asking for something to be done. Mr. Kisiel noted that the Village is cut in half by the railroad tracks and that the project would bring all of this part of the Village together which he indicated is missing.

Mr. Kisiel then referred to an illustration of the massing and arrangement on the site which he described as a large site measuring more than an acre. He indicated that it would be hard to find a site that big in Chicago and that this is a very significant site. Mr. Kisiel also stated that they have been very sensitive to the context which is why it took a long time and that they went through a lot of different schemes.

Mr. Kisiel referred to the context at the street level on Elm and Lincoln and stated that the project responded to the context. He noted that with regard to what they did on that side, there is a retail

street and a base of uninterrupted retail. Mr. Kisiel informed the Board that they anticipate a restaurant use on that side and the fact that there would also be two midrise buildings measuring four stories on top of retail. He stated that they want to address the open space of 6½ acres and to anchor that big open space and the area significantly facing the Village Hall. Mr. Kisiel then stated that the second building would be facing east with a setback of 10 feet and the 5th floor which would be set back 20 feet. He indicated that in doing that, there would be 76 feet of wide, large space. Mr. Kisiel stated that on the other side, there would be 200 feet which he described as very open also with a retail base and which allowed them to be able to create the open space and motor court. He noted that they would be taking traffic off of the street and that the street would be purely retail. Mr. Kisiel identified the area going to parking and the drop off. He also stated that pedestrians can walk and identified the entry to the residences. Mr. Kisiel stated that the two buildings would be part of one project with different addresses.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that to create that, there would be a setback 24 feet to the driveway to the drop-off. He identified the area between 711 Oak with the 24 foot setback. Mr. Kisiel also identified the existing parking structure and informed the Board that they put the setback there and made it wider. He also stated that on the second floor above retail, they planned to create a secluded private plaza for the residents.

Mr. Kisiel indicated that the most important façade would be facing the open space and the Village Hall. He noted that Bennett anticipated a taller building at the center of the block facing the Village Hall which is what they did. Mr. Kisiel stated that the penthouse at the top would break down the façade with two wings with emphasis on the entry to the residences. He indicated that you would be able to come from the train and enter directly from the plaza. Mr. Kisiel also identified the acute corner angle and referred to an illustration of what they have today which is parking and asphalt. He stated that the plan is to have a Lincoln Avenue public plaza. He noted that there would be two levels of parking under Lincoln. Mr. Kisiel added that it would be open to traffic on Lincoln but that when it functioned like a flea market, etc., it would be perfect for that use. He stated that the landscaping would respect that and reiterated that there would be a plaza with parking underneath.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that they planned to move the existing parking and wall of Elm and Lincoln. He asked the Board to remember that they would be using another 25 feet which is owned by the Village to go to the property line of the tracks. Mr. Kisiel indicated that they would not be losing that much on Lincoln.

Mr. Kisiel referred the Board to an illustration of Elm Street which he described as the most important aspect. He informed the Board that they made changes to the proposal based on community comment. Mr. Kisiel then stated that with regard to the two midrise buildings to the corner which he identified, he stated that in between, there would be townhomes on top of retail which is three stories. He noted that each one has different architecture. Mr. Kisiel then stated that the building on the east subdivision is vertical and that its massing was diminished. Mr. Kisiel identified the current condition with eclectic architecture with retail on ground. He then stated that in the end, looking west, there would not be much difference between both sides of the street. Mr. Kisiel stated that there could be a sidewalk bistro opening to the sidewalk. Mr. Kisiel also stated that there would be new lighting which now is not friendly and that there would be

lighting on the building as well. He added that you would be able to access the bank on the other side of the tracks and the bridge.

Mr. Kisiel then went on to discuss the architecture and materials. He referred the Board to an illustration and stated that the base is retail which is about the size of base size retail. Mr. Kisiel also stated that the scale of retail would be the same as Lincoln and Elm now and that it would be very compatible. He stated that above, there would be brick on two floors and that the fourth floor would be limestone and then a mansard roof which they want in order to make the building horizontal. Mr. Kisiel stated that the building would then turn the corner with the tower and that they wanted to soften the edge. He noted that the angle is very sharp between those two streets. Mr. Kisiel added that they did not want more than 40% windows and that the building would be in scale with other residences in Winnetka.

Mr. Kisiel stated that he would now discuss the project history and evolution. He stated that he would also identify the building program on each floor as well as the public benefits versus zoning relief. Mr. Kisiel stated that he would follow that with a discussion of the special use criteria and how the project complied.

Mr. Kisiel informed the Board that they started out in February or March 2015 with the proposal on an illustration which he identified for the Board. He indicated that the project has the same setback and open space to the nearest adjacent residential neighbors. Mr. Kisiel stated that the two buildings to the east and west were seven stories and 83 feet which were reduced to six stories with a two story base connecting them. Mr. Kisiel then stated that in June, the floor area dropped to 172,640 square feet and that they maintained the setback and open space adjacent to the residential neighbors.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that the proposal you see here contained the western building at five stories with a one story penthouse on the eastern side at five stories. He also stated that with regard to the upper level setback, there would be three story townhomes over retail and a one story connector for the commercial and residential development. Mr. Kisiel stated that he would like to point out the challenge with regard to the large site in responding to the context and to break up the size of what is developed. He noted that it is a 1.4 acre site for downtown and that they created four different structures and pieces to be assembled on the site. Mr. Kisiel then stated that the taller structures on the east and west address open space and other commercial development. He added that the Elm Street elevation would complement the scale of the retail street.

Mr. Kisiel stated that in summary, the building was reduced in height to five stories and the penthouse at 59 feet from seven stories and 83 feet which is 2.5% of the FAR of the project. He also stated that they reduced the density from 120 units to 71 units and that the FAR was reduced to 172,000 from 205,000. Mr. Kisiel then stated that they reduced the retail component from 45,000 square feet to 40,000 square feet.

Mr. Kisiel stated that he would now go over the floor plans for each floor. He stated that on the upper level, there would be a 6th story penthouse which he identified in an illustration for the Board. Mr. Kisiel stated that on the 4th and 5th floors, there would be residential development and that on the third floor, it represented the upper level townhomes. He also stated that on the second

floor, there would be small commercial development on the southern part of the western building. Mr. Kisiel then identified ground floor retail and circulation and access to the residences.

Mr. Kisiel stated that in terms of site circulation, he identified the view of the garage below. He noted that Lincoln would remain open with two lanes of traffic at 12 feet each and parallel parking on either side. Mr. Kisiel noted that the residents would enter off of Lincoln at the drop-off and enter the garage. He also stated that the commuters would enter the garage from the west off of Lincoln and that commercial traffic would enter off of Elm to the commercial lot to the east.

Mr. Kisiel then identified the existing parking inventory. He informed the Board that currently, there are 33 commuter spaces on Lincoln and 116 retail spaces. Mr. Kisiel also stated that there are 30 retail spaces on Lincoln and 62 retail spaces in the east lot which amounted to 149 spaces available to the public. He then stated that one of the issues raised related to the dearth of commuter parking and their use of retail parking spaces and identified parking as one of the main public benefits of the project.

Mr. Kisiel referred the Board to an illustration of the lower level parking deck and stated that they would be replacing 33 commuter spaces along Lincoln which would be removed and relocated and that they would be adding 111 commuter spaces as well as 33 spaces for retail. He stated that underneath One Winnetka, there would be 116 spaces for the residents which complied with the standard, as well as an additional 11 required spaces for retail. Mr. Kisiel stated that with regard to the east lot relocation, it would require 53 retail spaces as well as to eliminate curb cuts on Lincoln. He stated that in summary, with regard to the existing inventory of 149 public spaces, with the addition of the project, there will be 298 public spaces which resulted in a net gain of 149 public spaces. Mr. Kisiel added that on lower level two, there would be commuter and retail parking along with storm water management for the site located onsite.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that in summary, he would describe the public benefits and zoning relief being requested. He stated that in connection with public benefits, they are proposing public parking facilities, streetscape and public open space, storm water management and a water distribution system, all of which would be done with a significant contribution from the developer. Mr. Kisiel noted that the cost of the east lot containing 116 parking spaces would be borne by the developer. He also stated that in satisfying the parking requirement for the development on the site, it would be done in a manner by making the parking spaces available to the public 24 hours a day. Mr. Kisiel then stated that with regard to the commuter retail garage to the west, there would be 194 parking spaces of which 50 would be paid for by the developer and 144 to be borne by the Village. He added that all of the soft costs such as construction management, etc. would be paid by the developer. Mr. Kisiel also stated that the east lot total cost of \$4 million is to be borne by the developer and that \$2.37 million of the total cost for the west lot would be borne by the developer.

Mr. Kisiel stated that he would now discuss streetscape and open space. He informed the Board that one benefit of the development is the consolidation of scattered development on the site. Mr. Kisiel noted that currently, there are four 4 curb cuts and that the project would consolidate the curb cuts into two places. Mr. Kisiel stated that there is concern about the curb cuts with the area of high pedestrian activity and that the project would minimize the conflicts by consolidating and

locating them at each entry which would have the least amount of pedestrian intrusion.

Mr. Kisiel stated that when construction is finished, the streetscape on the south side of Elm would be upgraded with landscaping and lighting at a cost to the Village but with the soft costs borne by the applicant. He noted that there would be approximately 15% of soft costs. Mr. Kisiel also stated that with regard to the public plaza, there would be the same type of contribution and that the Village would pay for the construction costs and that the developer would pay the soft costs.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that with regard to water main improvement, the developer would pay for 100%. He stated that the Village would contribute toward the construction costs and that the developer would pay 15% which represented the soft costs. Mr. Kisiel stated that all of the upgrades are needed public improvements and would be subsidized by the developer through the process.

Mr. Kisiel informed the Board that with regard to the total construction cost of \$11,675,000, the developer would be paying 46.5% or \$5,430,000 and that the Village would pay 53.5% or \$6,245,000. Mr. Kisiel referred to the fact that the developer would be paying \$7,180,000 or 53.5% and the Village would be paying \$6,245,000 or 46.5% and that when you factor in that the developer would be paying 100% of the soft costs, the developer would be paying more than half for the public improvements. Mr. Kisiel described it as a significant contribution and that the improvements with regard to parking, etc. are needed and the demand for which was memorialized in studies, testimony and evidence.

Mr. Kisiel stated that he would now discuss the zoning exceptions. He identified three exceptions being requested in connection with the project which include building height, 4th story/upper level setback and rear yard setback. Mr. Kisiel stated that with regard to height, the proposal has a 6th story component which would measure 70 feet in height and that the requirement is for four stories and a height of 45 feet. He also stated that with regard to the 4th floor/upper level setback, there is a requirement of a 10 foot setback and that there would be a 12 foot setback provided on the east side only, together with a mansard roof. Mr. Kisiel stated that with regard to the rear yard setback requirement, 10 feet is required on the east side and that there would be a 0 foot setback provided on the east side. Mr. Kisiel stated that it would help reduce the apparent size of the building to the single family residence neighborhood to the east. He also stated that the use of mansard roofs would be similar to an upper level setback and would have the effect of reducing the height of the building.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that with regard to the rear yard setback requirement of 10 feet on the east side, he stated that there would be none on that side of the property. He referred to the 24 foot area of space on that side of the development and the motor court which would be adjacent to the residential development to the south.

Mr. Kisiel informed the Board that from their perspective, they are asking for additional height and a switch of parking setback. He then stated that in order to get an idea of what that means, he stated that you have to think about what the ordinance expected in terms of bulk and density. Mr. Kisiel noted that it can be handled by either one of two different ways, one of which is by a mathematical ratio. He stated that the second alternative related to the perspective of the building

envelope through setback and building height and that Winnetka uses the second strategy.

Mr. Kisiel noted that the ordinance defined the setback on one side and up to three stories for full height along with an upper level setback of 10 feet. He stated that you would get an idea of what the ordinance is asking for in terms of the maximum bulk which can be built on the site. Mr. Kisiel then stated that when you do the math, it resulted in a 10 foot rear yard setback and 100% lot coverage which amounted to 54,850 gross square feet in terms of an as of right development. He stated with regard to the residential upper floors, he referred to the use of a double loaded corridor around the perimeter of the site and that there would be a 70 foot double loaded corridor on the second and third floors of the building with the 4th floor being smaller because of the setback. Mr. Kisiel stated that would have an anticipated total floor area of 185,500 gross square feet based on that building envelope and the requirements of mixed commercial use.

Mr. Kisiel then identified an illustration of what the development would look like at 185,500 gross square feet. He then referred to the exercise of locating the open space where architecturally they feel it would be best used. Mr. Kisiel noted that there would be no setback adjacent to the closest residential neighbor. He also stated that in terms of the floor plan configuration, the corners would represent a problem with regard to the layout of the residential units as well as having a limited amount of open space.

Mr. Kisiel referred the Board to an illustration of the proposal which would measure 172,640 gross square feet. He noted that it would have a larger setback and open space of 4 times as much at grade as is prescribed by the grade. Mr. Kisiel also stated that they have taken one story of additional height and placed it on the east and west ends of the property with a small 6th floor protrusion which he indicated would help break up that elevation. He then stated that there would be three stories and a setback along Elm which they felt is a better solution. Mr. Kisiel stated that in terms of the same building program allowed by the zoning requirements, the development does a lot more for the community when they offset the single extra story of height and the cost sharing benefits and community gain, which he described as a good tradeoff.

Mr. Kisiel went on to discuss the Board's approval criteria which are the special use criteria. He stated that special uses are allowed to take into consideration land uses which are not compatible with other uses in particular zoning districts. Mr. Kisiel identified an example as a school because of the drop-off and pick-up which are typically special uses. He also stated that it is the same as with police stations, fire stations, etc. He then stated that in the context of planned development, they are looking at more uses permitted inside of the zoning district and looking at the evaluation of whether the size of the particular improvements can cause negative impacts on surrounding development. Mr. Kisiel also stated that with regard to public health, safety, comfort and welfare, the proposed development would complement and supplement the community given the nature of the business. He then referred to the response of ground floor commercial space and upper story residential areas which would be complementary to the existing context.

Mr. Kisiel stated that they also talked about the need for additional parking downtown and referred to the project's facilities and the fact that it subsidizes it which he stated solved that criteria. He then referred to any negative impact on the public health, comfort, safety and welfare of the Village and the fact that they are talking about the effect on the street network and circulation.

Mr. Kisiel informed the Board that KLOA performed studies in connection with the traffic situation which analyzed the intersections and entry points. He noted that there would be an "A" level of service which represented a 10 second wait. Mr. Kisiel also stated that in connection with the existing condition, all of the intersections functioned at a service level of A or B. He stated that in connection with the after scenario which he described as conservative in terms of additional traffic, the intersections would function at a service level of A or B which he described as extremely low traffic and wait times at intersections. Mr. Kisiel also stated that in terms of the adverse impact on the public health, comfort and safety, they would not be adding too much traffic that the network cannot handle. He added that they also talked about reducing pedestrian and vehicular conflicts by reducing the amount of curb cuts.

Mr. Kisiel stated that with regard to the second criteria, it addresses property value in the vicinity as well as its use and enjoyment. He stated that the second criteria is that the planned development would not either substantially diminish or impair the property values in the immediate vicinity or be substantially injurious to the use and enjoyment of land in the immediate vicinity for uses permitted by right in that zoning district. Mr. Kisiel indicated that nothing about the uses or densities would cause a negative impact and that the new development in this area would have a positive impact on the property values where there was none before. He also stated that there would be vitality and feet on the ground which would likely be positive for the surrounding properties as well as for the commercial uses which would have greater foot traffic and result in a more vibrant downtown.

Mr. Kisiel stated that with regard to the third criteria, he stated that the planned development would not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of other property in the immediate vicinity for uses permitted by right in the zoning district. He informed the Board that provision did not apply that well and that it was designed to handle development in an area where there is no development. Mr. Kisiel then referred to the infill site and the fact that it is surrounded by fully developed property. He also stated that there would be no affection on the ability to improve those projects or add traffic that would prohibit development at the highest intensive use. Mr. Kisiel added that there would be no negative impact with regard to the proposal.

Mr. Kisiel stated that the fourth criteria is that adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress in a manner which minimized pedestrian and vehicular traffic congestion in the public and private ways. He indicated that was covered in prior testimony by the KLOA study and the rearrangement of the site and access points. Mr. Kisiel then stated that it would not be an issue with regard to the proposed development and that it was well designed and analyzed by top experts in the field.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that with regard to the fifth criteria, it stated that adequate parking, utilities, access roads, drainage and other facilities necessary for the operation of the special use either exist or will be provided. He noted that the situation where parking is concerned has been covered in good detail. Mr. Kisiel also stated that they would be providing adequate parking for the uses on the site above and beyond the amount required and referred to the 149 parking facility to handle the existing parking deficit. He then stated that in connection with utilities, there would be an improvement because of the construction of the garage as well as the replacement of the water main upgrade with regard to the water supply in the area. Mr. Kisiel also stated that with regard to

access roads and drainage, the current property was developed before the storm water management rules were in effect and that the proposal would be developed with MWRD specifications and that a vast majority of the storm management would be located on site or adjacent to the site.

Mr. Kisiel stated that the sixth criteria stated that the planned development in all other respects conforms to the applicable zoning regulations and other application of Village ordinances and codes. He noted that but for the three exceptions recommended by the Plan Commission, it is their hope that the Board considered the exceptions which were recommended as appropriate given the context of the planned development and given the spirit of the creative solutions to the problem. Mr. Kisiel concluded by stating that the proposal did a good job of that.

Mr. Trandel stated that he would now provide closing remarks. He then stated that in conclusion, they are hopeful that although their presentation was brief, that the Board got an understanding of the thoughtfulness and depth they went to in order to address all of the things which have come about from a project of this scope. Mr. Trandel also stated that their objective is not to disrupt, but to construct the project and create something that they can all be proud of going forward. He then asked the Board if they had any questions.

Chairperson Johnson also asked the Board if they had any questions and asked that for tonight's discussion, to focus on those questions that the developer might need to provide more information on at the next meeting. She also stated that there would be public comment. Chairperson Johnson reiterated that they should focus questions on where more information is needed.

Ms. Kumer stated that she appreciated the efforts made by Stonestreet to revitalize the downtown Winnetka area and referred to the fact that the site has been vacant for a long period time. She then stated that she had a number of questions and that she would focus on parking and the Village's contribution. Ms. Kumer then asked how will commuters get to the garage or if they will have to walk up the bridge and down again to get to the garage.

Mr. Trandel referred the Board to the illustration of underground garage parking which would be located underneath Lincoln and that you would come in off of Oak and into the garage. He also stated that they have access to 15 feet between the structure and the bike path which he stated is closer to 20 feet. Mr. Trandel then stated that you would park and walk directly on to the platform to get to the train to Chicago. He added that if you are going to Kenosha, you would come up the vestibule and that they would provide elevator access to go across. Mr. Trandel informed the Board that is Metra property and that they have met with them. He noted that they would be doing work all on Winnetka property and that which is owned by Winnetka. Mr. Trandel then referred to walking off 22 feet from the fence and added that there would be beautiful landscaping.

Mr. Trandel then referred to the unintended consequence of having two campuses. He stated that by moving this and creating hardscape in the plaza area, he referred to the separate disconnection between the two campuses. Mr. Trandel also stated that you would still do drop off similar to what is done now and that they would be creating two central focal access points. He indicated that there are a lot of ways to price the zones in order to maximize dollars. Mr. Trandel then identified the elevator vestibule where you would walk in and take the elevator to both levels of parking. He reiterated that the primary objective is to get the vehicles off of the street which are

clogging retail and putting them into a defined area which would be safe, secured and covered.

Ms. Kumer referred to coming from the city on the opposite side and asked if either way, you would have to walk up the stairs.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct or that you could take the elevators. He then stated that from a business perspective, the objective is for it to be attractive to retailers on the east side as well as to be very compelling to restauranters.

Ms. Kumer then asked if the other elevator on the bridge did not connect to the garage.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct because of security details that have to be worked out. He noted that one benefit of underground parking is that the complete western exposure would stay open. Mr. Trandel then referred to the south side of the Chicago River which he described as very pedestrian friendly and beautiful. He also stated that bicycles would be able to come through here with a few access points and that it would end up being a big energy point for the Village to attract people from all over.

Ms. Kumer asked with regard to parking, reference was made to the parking study on page 21 which was done in 2006. She asked if they have verified that the numbers would still hold water since that was done over 9 years ago. Ms. Kumer then stated that as a train commuter, she took the 7:30 a.m. train and that there is always available space parking wise at that point. She then asked if in creating 133 new parking spaces, whether that contemplated such aspects as the Community House parking.

Mr. Trandel stated that there is a personality in downtown Winnetka with a number of different means. He then stated that for an office on Lincoln, at 10:00, there are no parking spaces available. Mr. Trandel then referred to the gradual suffocation of parking outside of the retail locations and that for retailers, people do drive-bys looking for parking spots. He also stated that with regard to a practical answer, beyond any study which was updated to be consistent with today, they talked to retailers that they are trying to attract. Mr. Trandel stated that the market would tell them what is viable and that if customers cannot park, retailers would not come. He then stated that without proper structure, what is more important is adequate parking.

Mr. Trandel then stated that with regard to the parking study and the ULI study, while it was generic, it represented a good view of what the issues were. He stated that if you are looking for things to really enhance lifestyle choices, parking would start first which he stated is why they approached the project the way they did. He identified it as the 800 pound gorilla and that when you have to get people to pay for it, it is not exciting and would be even less if they were to solve parking issues through other options such as structured parking with no land. Mr. Trandel noted that the land is not here to accommodate today's lifestyle as well as the fact that the buildings which are 70 and 80 years old were built when there was no e-commerce, Amazon, carry out, etc. He then described downtown as antiquated and that while it is charming, it is not functional in terms of young professionals and family life or retirees and that when you cannot park, you do not get conveniences. Mr. Trandel stated that the question is how do they modulate today's lifestyle while keeping a balance of the areas of charm.

Ms. Kumer stated that the issues are more on the retail side as opposed to the commuter side.

Mr. Trandel commented that is a great point. He then stated that train ridership is steady in Winnetka and the North Shore and that long term, there is a lot of competition for commuters. Mr. Trandel also stated that in connection with virtual offices, there are less people going downtown. He then stated that when trying to attract whatever that market is, they want vehicles downtown and not in Indian Hill. Mr. Trandel stated that they want to create a central focal point to attract people and those outside of Winnetka. He added that it would be the only structured covered garage [on the North Shore] and that although Highland Park has one, they are not a competitor.

Ms. Kumer stated that in terms of the financials, she referred to a document which showed the costs with regard to the options for parking. She indicated that she did not see all of the costs, soft and hard, pursuant to the proposal. Ms. Kumer also stated that it is not clear at all in the numbers for the Village and line item costs. She also stated that at the end of the proposal, there is another document dated May 27th which talked about design revisions and that she would like to see one page which provided that information.

Mr. Trandel responded that they would provide that information and that there were revisions after May. He then stated that with regard to the slide Mr. Kisiel provided, what was presented is all in terms of 53% of the costs to the developer and 47% for all parking as it related to the garage on Lincoln with a 65% cost to the Village and 35% to the developer.

Ms. Kumer indicated that it would be helpful to have that information broken down now. She then referred to the studies done with regard to the target market of the older demographic and young professionals and asked if they thought that empty nesters would sell their homes and move in here. Ms. Kumer described it as a stretch to go from homeowner to renter.

Mr. Trandel referred to those who love taking care of their homes and stated that at some point, simplification takes hold. He then stated that in terms of context, they are talking about a scheme of five townhomes and 19 units on the eastern side and 44 units on the west side. Mr. Trandel stated that educated guesses are based on market studies and that there would be larger and less units. He then stated that anecdotally, for the 19 units, they were given names of people who were interested in living there and that they are all Winnetka and Kenilworth residents. Mr. Trandel stated that for those who want to move into a smaller home or townhome, they cannot find that in Winnetka and that there are no choices. He then stated that there is tons of empirical evidence with regard to the boom of home ownership and that from an empty nester side, it would simplify it for them if they were able to stay in the community and social circles which he described as important and that they have roots here.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that there are 4,500 households in Winnetka and that they would be adding 70. He then referred to Tracy Cross & Associates and the study which was laid out. Mr. Trandel also stated that most of the units would be larger. He also referred to the people who move to the Gold Coast and that they want to try to keep those people close. Mr. Trandel also stated that with regard to young professionals, they are blessed with the demographics as a community and that the average person in Winnetka can afford "X". He added that they have also

been blessed with a constituency to keep that edge and that they have addressed the questions and things that they would be looking for in terms of restaurants, etc. and that along with a balance of retail commensurate with quality, style and cost, he described it as top shelf stuff. Mr. Trandel then stated that there has to be some sanity to the economics and described the project as a labor of love.

Chairperson Johnson stated that they want to provide time for public comment and asked the other Board members if they had any questions. She indicated that she is not sure if the applicant would be able to provide all the answers tonight and reiterated that they should focus their questions on the areas where they might need the developer to provide more information. Chairperson Johnson then stated that after the Board's questions, there would be the opportunity for public comment.

Mr. Kehoe stated that he had no comments for now.

Mr. Blum referred to detail and to have dimensions on things. He also stated that with regard to the views from all elevations, it is hard to get a perspective from the ground, especially looking directly south on Elm. Mr. Blum also referred to the tree in front of Conney's as well as the ingress and egress west and the underground lot. He then asked for dimensions on the entry and exit to the lots. Mr. Blum noted that the elevator is not shown in the rendering and asked if Metra would be taking it away.

Mr. Trandel responded that they are not touching Metra.

Mr. Blum then stated that with regard to parking, he asked if they had a concept of the amount of time it would take to go in and out of the garage. He also stated that in connection with restaurants as a target tenant, he referred to the consideration of a wider setback for a sidewalk café. Mr. Blum stated that with regard to parking, there were a couple of statements made with regard to commuters taking retail parking spaces. He noted that most of them have one hour time limits and that for where that would be happening, he described that as great.

Mr. Blum then stated that with regard to transit-oriented development and parking, he asked how did they synthesize whether it would be a car or a pedestrian-oriented Village. He stated that although parking would be beneficial to retailers and foot traffic for tenants, he stated that he would like to know if they evaluated the parking situation in a vacuum and that they do not know what the Village would do, which made it hard for the Board to consider that now. Mr. Blum also asked what is the public benefit for commuters if the Village did not do it and if parking underground would be something on the table no matter what happened. He asked that on the flip side, what would be built without commuter parking. He concluded by stating that while it would be beneficial for retail, it represented a steep price for the Village.

Ms. Hickey stated that she would like to request more information on the bike path and how it would work with commuters crossing over and the possibility of bike riders, walkers and joggers using the path simultaneously. She then stated that to clarify, she asked if the terrace garden on level two would only be for the residents.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct.

Ms. Hickey then asked if the townhomes on Elm would have some Tudor elements.

Mr. Trandel responded that the goal is for them to have five themes from in the Village. He also stated that the building would stay in tune with downtown and would also reference all of these different styles which include Georgian, Revival, etc., as well as different styles of Tudor.

Ms. Hickey also asked if there would be detailed drawings.

Mr. Trandel stated that is more within the DRB's purview.

Ms. Hickey stated that they have identified that there are retail vacancies in the Village. She stated that she is wondering if they can provide or have a better sense on the types of retailers they would be attempting to attract.

Mr. Trandel responded that they have been engaged in discussions and have hired experts.

Ms. Hickey stated that to clarify, she asked if Lincoln would be open to traffic.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct and that it would have two-way traffic. He indicated that they can do the civic center in a lot of ways and that if the Village has a fair or other type of gathering, they can close off the outer ends of Lincoln and have hard space which he commented would be more aesthetic.

Ms. Hickey then stated that she would echo Ms. Kumer's comments regarding commuter parking and the availability of on-street parking, making it relatively simple for the train commuters. Ms. Hickey indicated that for her husband who is a train commuter, would not like to be detained from having to find a space underground.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that they know exactly how many people would park per train schedule and stated that there are five peaks in the morning and five peaks in the evening. He also stated that they can provide the traffic study combined with Metra input. Mr. Trandel also stated that it is spread out over a two hour and 20 minute period.

Mr. Lane stated that in connection with 200 parking spaces, the traffic study showed usage at certain times of the day which are key for the area. He asked for more information as to why they need 200 spots and what necessitated that substantial increase. Mr. Lane then stated that most people agree that they need more parking.

Mr. Trandel stated that along with the Community House, he described parking as suffocated.

Mr. Lane also stated that he is concerned with regard to the use of the garage. He stated that anecdotally, if it is not the expectation of people parking in the garage to get into the elevator, etc. and that experience with the garage indicated that it would not be used. Mr. Lane asked for a better explanation of the people who are going to use the garage when they have had the same

experience with the current garage which is not used.

Mr. Trandel stated that the Village controls the garage.

Mr. Lane asked that they look at the study which was done when parking was evaluated for Hubbard Woods.

Chairperson Johnson stated she believed many retail customers would not want to park underground and would prefer to walk a further distance above ground to their destination. She then asked for studies addressing the willingness of retail customers to park underground in a suburban setting and stated that if customers are reluctant to park underground, they would not be solving the problem. Chairperson Johnson added that the only underground parking is in Highland Park and Evanston and that in connection with Highland Park, she is not sure how much it is used.

Mr. Kehoe noted that there is one in Wilmette.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that the parking under Lincoln would be dedicated for commuters and that the retail lot would be on the east side. He also stated that for restaurants with valet parking, etc., they would get overflow parking in the commuter parking lot.

Chairperson Johnson noted that in numerous places in their application materials, and in Mr. D'Onofrio's agenda report, it states that the underground parking is intended for both commuters and retail customers.

Mr. Lane asked if the other lot would have two levels.

Mr. Trandel stated that it would be similar to Hubbard Woods with scissored parking.

Mr. Lane stated that they need information to help with understanding the need of the garage and the parking spaces in terms of the success of the project trend, part of which is being close to Metra. He also stated that they would like information on other suburban projects which have been successful and why. Mr. Lane added that in connection with the financials section, first with regard to fire, police and schools, they talk about the average and then apply 10% to 15% as an incremental factor and that they would like to understand the basis for that. He stated that the average cost for a student is \$20,000 but that they are only allowing for 15% of that. Mr. Lane stated that would cut the average from 72 to 38. He then stated that while the numbers did not make sense, if the applicant has a basis for them, it would be helpful. Mr. Lane also asked for a more user friendly one page summary on cost. He then stated that they have identified as \$30,000 the cost for a parking space and questioned whether scissored parking would more cost than underground parking.

Mr. Naumann stated that he would be brief and asked with regard to the exceptions, assuming that if there is a reduction in the proposed number of stories of the project, would that impact the financial viability of the project.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct in a couple of different ways. He stated that at the end of the day, the project is an economic endeavor and that while they are trying to be generous in terms of contribution to the Village, everything has a cost. Mr. Trandel informed the Board that in the original plan, all of the costs were put on the table. He stated that for the Village to have less of a burden, the better it would be. Mr. Trandel then stated that from a developer's perspective, the cheapest aspect is air and that for the project to be economically viable and to create an architecturally interesting project, he referred to the shifting of massing out and to open space. He then stated that if they are going to have height, this is the ideal place for it.

Mr. Trandel also stated that there would be a dramatic impact financially which is where things start unwinding. He indicated that if they did not solve the parking problem, it would be a detriment. Mr. Trandel referred to business owners who have signed long term leases and referred to taking the general tenor of retailers around town. Mr. Trandel stated that it is incumbent on them to solve the issue and show that they are willing to and desire a solution to attract people and renew leases. He also stated that they have to show that they are considerate to those who are running businesses every day.

Mr. Trandel noted that they are taking a capital risk in terms of money, time and resources. He then stated that at the end of the day, the project would be a beautiful asset whether they get their money back in 4 years or 11 years and that they want to do it the right way. Mr. Trandel also stated that they have shown in the submittal what could be done by right which would be a less interesting building. He added that none of the proposal is take it or leave it and that they have been respectful to the neighbors with regard to coming up with something. Mr. Trandel informed the Board that the project has a very significant cost and that they own a lot of property which is not producing income and that they need to get to a resolution.

Mr. Naumann stated that they have reduced the number of units to 40% already from the initial plan. He then asked what about square footage. Mr. Naumann also commented that it would be great to have visuals on traffic flow and parking going in and out.

Mr. Trandel suggested planning pedestrian traffic and how to mark crosswalks. He indicated that they would take a fresh look at all of that.

Chairperson Johnson stated that she had questions relating to the proposed underground lot for commuters and the public. She then referred to the entrance to the lot on the west side on Lincoln and that it is 140 feet from Oak. Chairperson Johnson stated that she did not know if there would be a canopy or how the walls would look from the east side. She also questioned the landscaping around it. Chairperson Johnson then stated that for the above ground part of the underground parking structure, there are no drawings and that she would like to see more detail. She also asked if it would only be controlled by a stop sign. Chairperson Johnson stated that she would like drawings showing traffic coming east on Oak, west on Oak, turning onto Lincoln and going into the lot.

Mr. Trandel stated that was brought up in the report on that specific issue. He then stated that Javier Milan can shed light and provide a report for the Board.

Chairperson Johnson asked whether there were comparable suburban underground parking ramps

on the surface of a street. She stated that she has not seen anything similar to the structure proposed in the middle of a narrow suburban street with all traffic feeding into it with no median. Chairperson Johnson also asked that they provide examples of other suburbs like Winnetka with an underground parking entrance on the street with traffic on the other part of the street. She indicated that she thought it would not be workable or safe.

Mr. Trandel referred to lower Wacker Drive.

Chairperson Johnson also stated that there are no stop lights here. She also asked if they considered having the entrance on the north side.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct and that the result is due to traffic studies.

Chairperson Johnson asked for Mr. Milan to provide information on traffic from the north.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that it is 92 feet wide and that there is plenty of room.

Chairperson Johnson asked for the applicant to provide drawings to show what the structure would look like and how vehicles would access it.

Ms. Hickey also asked for a drawing of the plaza and where it is in relation to the garage.

Mr. Trandel agreed that would be fine. He then stated that the Board would have to walk it to understand. Mr. Trandel also stated that lines were put on the street now and that they can do a field trip to walk the space.

Chairperson Johnson stated that on page 3, it appeared that there are only two lanes of traffic on Lincoln when there are really four. She then stated that Mr. Milan is not here to answer that question.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that there are two lanes of traffic.

Chairperson Johnson then referred to a letter submitted by an architect with regard to an accurate photomontage to depict the views from the street level. She stated that she found something on the website which is not in the packet and asked if it was computer generated.

Mr. Kisiel informed the Board that they are digital renderings.

Chairperson Johnson asked for the applicant to provide renderings which showed the buildings on the north side of Elm. She also stated that you do not see the average height of the buildings on the north side of Elm.

Mr. Trandel stated that they can get that information.

Chairperson Johnson then asked how many units would have lake views other than the penthouses.

Mr. Trandel responded that as currently designed, there would be five.

Mr. Lagrange stated that there would be seven with two [penthouses] on the top two floors. He indicated that whether there would be 7, 5 or 9 depended on the market in addition to the penthouses.

Chairperson Johnson stated that with regard to the foldouts of the site's geometric plan and on other pages, it says that the scale is that 1 inch equaled 20 feet and also that 1 inch equaled 40 feet and suggested that the applicant look into that. She identified them as C2-01 and 02, which seemed to contain a discrepancy in terms of scale.

Mr. Kisiel informed the Board that is the graphic scale and that the 24 x 36 inch drawings were reduced for the packet.

Chairperson Johnson asked how many storefronts would there be.

Mr. Trandel responded that he did not know for sure and that they designed 9 bays.

Chairperson Johnson asked for a range to be presented at the next meeting and asked if there would be any big box stores.

Mr. Trandel stated that there would not. He informed the Board that when they first acquired the site, they terminated the Petco discussions. Mr. Trandel also stated that they would not be bringing in any competitive business or national chains to local retailers. He indicated that there has been interest from wineries and various prolific restaurateurs. Mr. Trandel added that it would be mostly retailers and boutiques.

Chairperson Johnson then stated that she is concerned with the number and how large they will be. She also asked if there would be entry from the inside.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that it would all have street level entry.

Chairperson Johnson stated that now, the Board would take public comment. She stated that there would be another meeting on December 14, 2015 with public comment. Chairperson Johnson then asked the audience to limit their comments to five minutes.

Juanita Nicholson, 554 Arbor Vitae, stated that it was suggested that there be a model.

Chairperson Johnson stated that the applicant would not invest in that and that there may be changes. She indicated that it may be done for the Village Council.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct. He then offered to have one-on-one meetings with the development team to walk them through all of the scale.

Chairperson Johnson stated that they asked for that from the street level which should be brought to the next meeting.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that there would be renderings for sure.

Chairperson Johnson asked if there were any other comments.

David Smithson stated that he is not yet a resident of Winnetka and that he is considering moving to the Village from Glenview. He informed the Board that his family has strong ties to the Village which go back 50 years. Mr. Smithson also stated that his father had a furniture and antique store in Hubbard Woods and that he and his siblings went to New Trier. He then stated that he is concerned with what happens in the Village because the Village represented the North Shore in a terrific way.

Mr. Smithson stated that he would keep his comments brief and stated that first, he is hopeful that there would be some consideration by the Village and the residents that there is an alternative to the proposal that does not require the destruction of a 50 year old award winning building which is the Fell store that they know well. He stated that there are already good plans for the adaptive reuse of the site and that the building was designed in terms of over engineering to accommodate two floors of residential units. Mr. Smithson then stated that utilizing the building instead of demolishing it would have a substantial decrease in the construction cost and impact on the environment and would preserve what will be designated a nationally registered building.

Mr. Smithson then stated that his second comment is to the residents and that they have an opportunity to have an impact as to what goes on in the Village. He noted that he has been involved in politics for many years dealing with the Village and that there is a place and time to make a difference with local politics where they have a voice to be heard. Mr. Smithson stated that with regard to whatever is done with the project, he asked the audience to please make themselves heard and that they do not have to take responses from the Village government. He also stated that they have a right and an obligation to question the leaders of the Village and that there is an opportunity throughout this process to affect the future of the Village.

Ms. Nicholson asked for the traffic pattern on Elm. She indicated that it seemed that vehicular traffic would enter on Lincoln and that the commercial area would enter on Elm and that she wondered what the traffic flow would be. Ms. Nicholson also asked if trucks on Elm would turn around and go back out on Elm. She then stated that she would relay her other comments at the next meeting.

Chairperson Johnson noted that the recommendation from the Plan Commission is that the commercial traffic be relocated to Lincoln which would have an impact on 711 Oak. She indicated that she did not know if the developer would consider that before the Village Council meeting.

Este Brashears asked for the applicant to go back to the illustration which showed the structure from the west. She informed the Board that she lives at 711 Oak and that she has lived in Winnetka for a long time. Ms. Brashears stated that she had an important question and stated that in all of the photographs; it indicated the proposed building relatively as high as proposed. She stated that the illustration downgraded the size of this building and upgrades the size of 711 Oak. Ms. Brashears noted that their building is well within the legal constraints and that it is 43 feet high

and four stories while the proposed building would be 70 feet high. She then questioned how high are the buildings on Elm and stated that they are at a maximum 45 feet. Ms. Brashears asked what is this monstrous building doing next to their building which is 43 feet high of housing and which has four floors.

Ms. Brashears also stated that in connection to the entry to the back parking lot, it is not far where all of the delivery trucks would enter. She then stated that she appreciated the Board and knowing the intricacies of the monstrous project and the impact it would have on the Village. Ms. Brashears concluded by attesting to the fact that every single person in the building is curious about the scope of the project.

Chairperson Johnson confirmed that the Board has seen the letters and that more can be submitted. She stated that at the next meeting, there would be an opportunity for more comments.

Richard Sobel informed the Board that his father is the architect for the Fell store which he stated won an award for the building which is future oriented and that he designed it to be built upon and have two stories of residential space on the Lincoln and Elm sides. He stated that the future was what he was interested in. Mr. Sobel then stated that it is his hope that the Board could encourage the developer and staff to think about incorporating the design which would accomplish the goal of the plan of saving his father's building. He also stated that adapting the reuse of the Fell building would accomplish a great deal of the goals. Mr. Sobel then stated that he submitted a letter to the Plan Commission and the Board. He stated that it can be accomplished in the same footprint.

Mr. Sobel then stated that he would like to note one of the criteria's response to the community. He stated that if you look at the comments, you would know that a vast majority or 90% are critical of the development and that the major issue of critique is the height. Mr. Sobel stated that the issue of the zoning ordinance requirement for four stories has people quite concerned about it.

Mr. Sobel stated that the exceptions were recommended for approval and that most of the people who came to the Plan Commission meetings had exactly the same issue to come before the Board. He then stated that he hoped that the Board would consider that issue and the vast majority of the people questioning that and the design. Mr. Sobel also stated that he has not seen in the standards before tonight the first criteria with regard to the detriment to the public health, safety, comfort, morals and welfare and referred to the benefits of adaptive reuse. He informed the Board that the engineering on the Fell building was done by his uncle, Burt Sobel. Mr. Sobel stated that there would be a major environmental impact and that it would be expensive to tear down and build another building in its place. He added that cost can be used for other development and have a great benefit. Mr. Sobel then stated that if the building is placed on the National Register, the developer would be eligible for a 20% income tax credit.

Mr. Sobel stated that they have the design with the same footprint as the current building with 70 units in reusing the Fell building on Lincoln and Elm and that it would be a benefit architecturally and environmentally to Winnetka. He then thanked the Board and asked that the applicant consider the adaptive reuse of the building which would benefit the community.

Eleanor Prince of Kenilworth informed the Board that she drove past the building for 45 years and

that she is concerned with regard to a number of issues. She stated that the applicant did not show the up and down ramps side by side. Ms. Prince stated that she understood that it is a 1½ acre site and referred to the nine Winnetka homes on the side. She then stated that the applicant is asking for a variation on the east side. Ms. Prince also stated that with regard to the west side, it is not set back but set out. She stated that in that area on the west side of the building, the applicant wants to build another 39 feet up from there.

Ms. Prince then referred to the west wall of Phototronics which she indicated is within 2 feet of the property line. She described the building as a massive structure and stated that the Board has no jurisdiction over the buildout on the west end. Ms. Prince then referred to an agreement between the city and the applicant. She also referred to having 70 feet next to 43 feet in terms of height and the fact that 95% of people are not in favor of the project because of its size.

Ms. Prince then asked what can be done. She stated that she realized that they need a good quality structure, but questioned whether they need 40,000 square feet of retail with a 25% vacancy rate in the Village. Ms. Prince then referred to 24 feet of a two way street over the bluff down to the tracks and that half would be paid for by the Village. She then stated that they would be building out over the bluff and to have space for the plaza. Ms. Prince concluded by suggesting that there be less parking on the lower floors and to have 50 apartments and 10,000 square feet of retail space.

Melinda Jakovic (sp?) informed the Board that she works for Coldwell Banker and that she planned to live in the building. She referred to the big talk and stated that there has been very positive talk in the real estate community and referred to those who are excited and calling with positive comments. Ms. Jakovic noted that she is not associated with the project. She then informed the Board that Fran Brody is saying it is the best thing happening on the North Shore. Ms. Jakovic stated that all the Board is hearing are negative comments and described it as sad. She added that the people who want to live here are not the naysayers.

Chairperson Johnson indicated that there were some positive letters on the website. She also stated that anyone can speak and that they would like to hear everyone's comments.

Jan Bawden, 129 DeWindt, informed the Board that she would read from her prepared notes. She informed the Board that she has served two terms on the Plan Commission and that she voted against the project. Ms. Bawden stated that it was not because she did not like it or think that East Elm needed a do over, but because the project on this site is bad urban planning.

Ms. Bawden then questioned how did they get here. She then stated that Winnetka has a Comprehensive Plan, the zoning ordinance and planned development ordinance within the zoning ordinance to make sure that not only private citizens who buy land with a dreamer idea would create something which would fit in the neighborhood. Ms. Bawden stated that she walked through Winnetka to the proposed site in the evening to visualize the project without the noise of a typical day in the neighborhood. She also stated that she wanted to experience the project and concentrate and give it a fair reading.

Ms. Bawden stated that she stopped by Fell and referred to the studies done and the beautiful

drawings of the project. She stated that in terms of a tripled height of what is there now to 59 feet, she felt very small. Ms. Bawden also referred to the shadow of the building visualized while having lunch. She described it as noisy, complicated and big. She then informed the Board that she sat in front of Connie's at four stories and referred to the shadow from across the street. Ms. Bawden stated that she was not smiling or feeling like the people shown in the renderings.

Ms. Bawden went on to state that they need to find a place for the project and if not here, then where. She stated that if Winnetka was a metropolis or if this was in response to an RFP for the Village Hall or some other significant structure, One Winnetka would have a chance at magnificence. Ms. Bawden stated that the project's scale and density would suck the life out of downtown Winnetka. She noted that the Plan Commission discussed the matter long and hard and referred to revising the zoning ordinance in terms of height and stated that is why height is so significant. Ms. Bawden also stated that Evanston and others and some communities love height. She stated that is why Winnetka is so different. Ms. Bawden stated that the streets on East Elm are not boulevards and that the residents are comfortable with the current scale and that they frequent space when they feel comfortable.

Ms. Bawden also stated that she brought up a request for photographs which are in scale. She informed the Board that she took photographs for the Plan Commission and that the photographs were taken with people in front of them so that you can see the impact on human scale.

Mr. D'Onofrio stated that he would take the photographs and distribute them.

Louise Holland, 545 Oak, informed the Board that she is the person standing in the photographs and that she was the other negative Plan Commission vote. She then stated that all Winnetkans agree upon the desire to see the 1.6 acre site at the corner of Elm and Lincoln developed. Ms. Holland also stated that they all wish to see a sensitive project which would take into account the size and scale of the structure as well as the size and scale of existing buildings. She stated that they are being asked to approve three exceptions for One Winnetka. Ms. Holland indicated that the largest and most onerous exception is to allow a height of 70 feet for a building fronting on Lincoln. She stated that they are being told that this exception is only for five stories, not four. Ms. Holland also stated that they were told that there would be a green roof at the Plan Commission meeting which would provide a beautiful view for the adjacent buildings. She indicated that did not equate to five stories as the number found in the zoning ordinance which stated 45 feet height. Ms. Holland then stated that 70 feet is almost 50% more than the ordinance allowed. Ms. Holland also stated that green roofs at 70 feet would only be visible to pilots who would have the benefit of that view.

Ms. Holland then suggested that the Board not be deaf to the concerns of a majority of Winnetka residents. She stated that they all want a vibrant east Winnetka, parking and a structure that enjoys architectural symmetry and which would complement adjacent buildings. Ms. Holland concluded by asking the Board to vote and send a message to the Village Council and that 70 feet did not belong in the Village.

Chairperson Johnson asked if there were any other comments.

Mr. Sobel informed the Board that there are people who left the meeting. He asked if there would be public comment at the next meeting.

Chairperson Johnson reiterated that there would be public comment at the next meeting. She asked if there were any other questions from the audience. No additional questions were raised by the audience at this time. Chairperson Johnson then asked the Board if they had any questions. No additional questions were raised by the Board at this time. She then asked Mr. D'Onofrio if the painted lines on Lincoln outlining the western edge of the proposed development site could be re-painted.

Mr. D'Onofrio stated that it would be done again and that they would let everyone know when it is done.

It was stated that they have provided the big picture requests for information and asked if there would be more time for questions.

Chairperson Johnson confirmed that is correct.

Ms. Nicholson asked how would they know when the lines were painted.

Mr. Trandel responded that they would post it on the website.

Chairperson Johnson asked Mr. D'Onofrio for an estimate of when it would be done which should be before the December 14th meeting.

Mr. D'Onofrio confirmed that it would get done before Thanksgiving, depending on the weather.

Chairperson Johnson referred to whether Javier Millan would be in attendance at the next meeting. She also stated that staff took notes, outlining the additional information that the applicant is to provide. Chairperson Johnson noted that the public hearing portion of the meeting would be open for the next meeting and that interested parties would be allowed to cross examine the applicant at the next meeting. She then asked for a motion to continue the meeting to December 14, 2015.

A motion was made by Mr. Lane and seconded by Ms. Hickey to continue the meeting to December 14, 2015. A vote was taken and the motion was unanimously passed, 7 to 0.

AYES: Blum, Hickey, Johnson, Kehoe, Kumer, Lane, Naumann
NAYS: None

**WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
DECEMBER 14, 2015
EXCERPT OF MINUTES**

Zoning Board Members Present: Joni Johnson, Chairperson
Chris Blum
Mary Hickey
Thomas Kehoe
Kathleen Kumer
Carl Lane
Mark Naumann

Zoning Board Members Absent: None

Village Staff: Michael D’Onofrio, Director of Community
Development
Ann Klaassen, Planning Assistant

Village Attorney: Karl Camillucci

Agenda Items: ***

Case No. 15-10-PD: **Continued from the November 16, 2015 Meeting**
511 Lincoln Avenue, 513-515 Lincoln Avenue,
710-732 Elm Street, 740 Elm Street and a Portion of
the Adjacent Lincoln Avenue Right-of-Way
Stonestreet Partners and Winnetka Station LLC
Planned Development

511 Lincoln Avenue, 513-515 Lincoln Avenue, 710-732 Elm Street, 740 Elm Street and a Portion of the Adjacent Lincoln Avenue Right-of-Way, Case No. 15-10-PD, Stonestreet Partners and Winnetka Station LLC - Planned Development

Mr. D’Onofrio noted that the case was continued from the November 16, 2015 meeting.

Chairperson Johnson stated that they would proceed like they did before. She then stated that there would be a presentation by the developer and noted that they have read the newly submitted materials. Chairperson Johnson asked the applicant to focus on the changes to the plan and the parking issues addressed in a recent submission. She then stated that there would be questions from the Board followed by public comment. Chairperson Johnson also stated that if there are interested parties who wanted to cross-examine the applicant, they would be able to do that. She then stated that they would then go back to the Board for discussion and deliberation on the matter. Chairperson Johnson noted that the Board had many questions at the previous meeting that required more information and that now, there would be more questions from the Board in addition to those from the last presentation. She then swore in those that would be speaking on this matter.

George Kisiel of Okrent Kisiel Associates introduced himself as the planning and zoning consultant for the One Winnetka project. He informed the Board that he would run through some of the design responses since the last meeting. Mr. Kisiel then stated that Javier Millan would speak and clarify issues with regard to traffic and parking.

Mr. Kisiel began by stating that the original One Winnetka proposal was somewhat larger than the last one. He informed the Board that they started out with seven stories and 83 feet with two stories on the west, six stories on the east and two stories along Elm. Mr. Kisiel then stated that the last proposal before the Board reduced the gross square footage to 17,200 square feet while maintaining setback and open spaces and reducing the height on the east by one floor and on the west by two floors and adding townhomes above the retail portion for a total of three floors.

Mr. Kisiel stated that since then, they have made another reduction in the GFA to 162,000 square feet while maintaining the same open space. He informed the Board that they have reduced the east building by one floor so that now, it would be four floors and 45 feet and added an upper level to the townhomes and maintained the required upper level setback along Elm. Mr. Kisiel stated that what they have done is further reduced the height on the east to four stories and 45 feet and further reduced the GFA to 162,000 square feet.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that with regard to how the floor plans would be configured, he identified the sixth floor penthouse in an illustration for the Board and the fifth floor which would contain no residential development above the roof other than on the west side of the property. He then identified the townhomes on the fourth floor and the eastern building with apartments. Mr. Kisiel also identified the third floor in an illustration and noted that the rest of the building down to the ground floor would remain the same as in the prior proposal. He stated that in summary, they have approximately 118,000 square feet of residential floor area and 43,000 square feet of commercial area which resulted in 162,000 square feet in GFA.

Javier Millan introduced himself to the Board as a senior consultant with KLOA who would speak about traffic and parking study. He then referred the Board to an illustration of the traffic flow diagram for underground parking for the commuter lot and identified the entrance and exit to the other portion of parking. Mr. Millan stated that there would be two access driveways, one of which is off Elm and the other access on Lincoln which meant that you can enter underground parking from either Lincoln or Elm and the same with exiting. He also identified the access driveway which would be one lane in and one lane out with stop sign control.

Mr. Millan then stated that there were some specific questions and comments with regard to parking in the area. He stated that as part of the study which was conducted, they did a parking survey of the East Elm district which was conducted on May 22, 2014 from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. and made some key findings. Mr. Millan informed the Board that the Metra parking lot is 88% occupied and that the Lincoln and Oak commuter spaces are 100% occupied. He then stated that the Green Bay Road commuter spaces parking spaces are 92% occupied and that the availability of on-street parking for retail along Lincoln and Elm, Green Bay Road and the Zone A parking spaces in the Lincoln Avenue parking lot reached above 85% occupancy during the 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. hours. Mr. Millan stated that they looked up what they did by comparison which was very similar to a study commissioned by the Village of which he was not aware of until not too long ago. He

noted that the data was very similar to their findings.

Mr. Millan stated that there are industry standards to consider for a parking area whether it is for on-street or off street parking which identified 85% as fully occupied. He stated that the reason why is that when there is an 85% or higher capacity, that meant that there is less readily available parking which leads to two things. Mr. Millan stated that meant that people would start driving around the area to find the “golden spot” which created movements which are not needed and result in driving away customers who could not park right in front of their destination. Mr. Millan stated that additional commuter and retail parking is needed.

Mr. Millan also stated that there was comment made with regard to people being willing to park underground. He informed the Board that is more of a marketing type question and that there is no concrete data on that. Mr. Millan did state, however, that after searching and searching, they found articles and referred to the members of ULI who showed a project in Portland, Oregon which decided to create underground parking because the public complained that there was no parking. He then stated that it was done and that once it was done, although the results are anecdotal, the results indicated that even when people cannot find a spot in front of their destination, they know that there is readily available parking underground and that it is successful. Mr. Millan also stated that the other benefit is that they would be hiding parking and create the vibrancy of a pedestrian-centered development as opposed to vehicles blocking stores.

Mr. Millan stated that there was also the question as to the benefit of providing additional commuter parking. He noted that the survey stated that parking is at capacity. Mr. Millan also stated that parking which is covered is more attractive to commuters and that there would be clean vehicles with covered parking as opposed to if they were located on a surface lot since a covered lot would protect them from the elements. He added that it would be attractive for commuters to use it and that it would free up on-street parking which would be more suited for retailers.

Mr. Millan then stated that there was a question with regard to the reconciliation of the transit-oriented development concept with the claim for the additional need concept. He noted that transit-oriented development is a two part concept in that it liked to have developments in close proximity to trains or buses and that you see a lower trip generation because there is no need to drive to work. Mr. Millan stated that by the same token, there would also be a reduction in parking for those who live close by since there is no need to own vehicles and that they can rely on public transportation. He also stated that in connection with the census data for Winnetka, automobile ownership for those located within 1.4 miles of train and rental units is 1.05 vehicles per unit. Mr. Millan noted that the development could have peak parking at 75 units for residential development and that the developer decided to meet the ordinance requirement of 116 spaces for the residents. He referred to the need for additional parking for retail and commuters but that they would be meeting the code for new residential development and that the developer would be ensuring that they would be containing the demand within the site and not put any additional demand on existing parking. Mr. Millan concluded that he hoped that he covered the questions raised at the last meeting and asked if there were any other questions.

Chairperson Johnson also asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Kehoe referred to the parking lot at the Community House which was one time considered and asked if it could have been two story or underground parking.

Chairperson Johnson stated that the Village Council talked about that.

Mr. D'Onofrio stated that over the past number of years, one alternative was to provide structured parking at the Community House and that they never got to the plans for the concept.

Chairperson Johnson asked if there were any other comments.

Mr. Blum stated that for the first time, he realized that you would enter and exit the lot from the current alleyway. He stated that the illustration indicated that there would be one lane in each direction and asked which direction each lane would go and how would it be controlled.

Mr. Millan referred the Board to an illustration and stated that the driver would be on the right side. He then demonstrated drop-off and pick-up and how traffic would circulate on the illustration. Mr. Millan also stated that the movements would be stop sign controlled. He added that if there are sight line issues, they would put in a concave mirror in order to allow you to be able to see. Mr. Millan indicated that there are many ways to treat the issues such as with signage. He then stated that in his experience with these types of garages, a concave mirror would help most people see what is coming.

Mr. Blum referred to Elm and the ramp going up and confusion with the green and red arrows.

Mr. Millan identified the direction of the arrows for the Board in an illustration.

Mr. Kisiel informed the Board that with regard to the East Elm lot circulation, it would be at grade at the intersection at Elm and that the entrance is 5 feet below the entrance at Lincoln. He stated that for this stretch, there would be a ramp going up to grade on that side. Mr. Kisiel then stated that if you were to go left, there would be the option of going down underneath a portion of the Elm lot which he identified for the Board. He described it as a scissor type situation in that area.

Mr. Blum responded that was helpful. He then questioned if there would be enough room to execute a three point turn if there are no spaces. Mr. Blum also referred to the loss of setback in an area which he identified and stated that in connection with the 4th floor being taken off on the east side, the next level up is gone and that there would still need to be a setback on the 4th level which was referred to at the Plan Commission meeting. He asked the applicant to address the change.

Mr. Kisiel noted that the intent of the setback produced on the street side would give the illusion of a three story building. He noted that the east side is not adjacent to the street and that previously, they provided five floors and that it would now be four to make up for the loss of that area. Mr. Kisiel reiterated that there would be no setback on Elm on the east portion of the property which was what they had previously.

Mr. Lane asked Mr. Kisiel what is the box in the illustration after the motor court.

Mr. Kisiel identified it as the loading area.

Mr. Lane stated that he thought it was closer to Elm.

Mr. Kisiel stated that only on Elm would be the trash pickup and that the other loading area was relocated off of Lincoln central to the site which is where the box is.

Mr. Lane then asked how traffic would go in with retail trucks there.

Mr. Kisiel stated that there would be a limited time and that it would be scheduled so that it would not conflict with the peak hours of operation of the site. He indicated that they do have control of the site in connection with the tenants which they would build in with a use agreement.

Mr. Lane asked what is the peak time that the residents come and go.

Mr. Millan responded that while there would be traffic all day long, he identified the peak hours as 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. He also stated that delivery would normally be avoided during those times and that deliveries can be scheduled to not interfere with peak times.

Chairperson Johnson stated that the request would be appearing before the DRB on Thursday and that it appears that the applicant moved where the loading zone will be which is what the agenda said. She then identified its location from the materials.

David Trandel informed the Board that the illustration showed how it was moved from an earlier configuration with loading off of Elm. He then stated that they listened to the north neighbors and reconfigured it to have loading off of Lincoln.

Mr. Kisiel then identified the access for the Board.

Chairperson Johnson asked if trucks would be prohibited from entering off that area at all.

Mr. Trandel responded that would be the Village's call.

Chairperson Johnson questioned whether it was submitted to the DRB at the November meeting.

Mr. Lane then asked what the broader reason was for it as opposed to the comments which were received.

Mr. Trandel indicated that he did not know if there were broader reasons. He stated that they were faced with 25 questions and that there was a lot of discussion with the neighbors on Elm and the businesses. Mr. Trandel stated that for practical reasons, it would be less intrusive to have it on Lincoln.

Mr. Lane asked if it was an enclosed area before.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that it would still be enclosed. He also stated that on the street, it is 24 feet. Mr. Trandel noted that with a truck stopped now on Elm, it would be easier to navigate. He added that there are no alleys on Elm to load and unload now.

Mr. Blum asked if there would be a turnaround or if the trucks would have to back out.

Mr. Trandel responded that they would be able to do a full circulation off of Lincoln and exit on Elm. He confirmed that they would not go through the garage.

Mr. Kisiel stated that to clarify, in general, what is great about how the site is laid out is its flexibility. He then identified a secondary internal roadway to connect Elm and Lincoln for the Board and stated that there would be the ability for a truck to turn and that it would not be a difficult maneuver. Mr. Kisiel also stated that to mitigate any negative impact is why there is an enclosed trash and loading bay and that trucks would be able to pull in next to the loading bay. He noted that they struggled to satisfy all of the neighbors on all sides and that loading is a fact of retail and residential development. Mr. Kisiel reiterated that the site has flexibility and the ability to handle that.

Mr. Trandel noted that now, trucks stop on Lincoln with traffic going around them as well as on Elm.

Mr. Lane referred to them parked on the access road before you get to the garage where they would be blocking one lane of traffic to the parking garage if they are sitting there.

Lucien Lagrange stated that he would explain and identified where trucks would come in for the Board. He also identified the two bay loading dock for two trucks and noted that the dock would be located behind doors. Mr. Lagrange stated that the trucks would back up into the bay and then drive out.

Mr. Lane stated that is contrary to what the Board was just told.

Mr. Trandel stated that the illustration was an old rendering.

Mr. Lagrange stated that for a project with retail and residences, garbage pickup would be private and that they will have a management system with contracts and compactors.

Mr. Trandel stated that Mr. Lane made a good point. He then stated that if there is an opportunity to use interior first floor space as a bay that would be desirable. Mr. Trandel then stated that management through scheduling is the first choice and that they can design around it for the back end with a "T."

Mr. Lane stated that the Board needed to know what the plan will be so that they can make a decision as opposed to something that the applicant is still thinking about. He also stated that ingress and egress is what the Board is to consider. Mr. Lane then stated that if the bay is located inside, that would be completely different than parking outside.

Chairperson Johnson stated that the problem besides the inconvenience for the residents is also if the trucks have difficulty in maneuvering on Lincoln and Elm.

Mr. Trandel indicated that a lot of it is management and reiterated that the street is 24 feet wide. He also stated that if trucks park illegally, they can manage that as part of the process.

Mr. Lagrange agreed that traffic on a private road can be managed.

Mr. Trandel then stated that the issue with other retail for example is an 18,000 square foot center and a terrific back driveway. He informed the Board that there would be dedicated loading all behind. Mr. Trandel referred to a situation where truck drivers who want to block 12 parking spaces and put a ramp out and deliver materials which he stated was done for three weeks and that they went to the business owners and fined them.

Chairperson Johnson stated that she lives on the east side of Winnetka and drives on Lincoln several times a day and that delivery trucks for Little Ricky's blocked traffic.

Mr. Trandel stated that the benefit here is that there would be loading off of Elm and Lincoln and on the private way. He added that they have an alternative.

Ms. Hickey stated that she had a question with regard to the widths of the parking deck with two lanes of traffic and parking spaces.

Mr. Millan informed the Board that a typical width for two way traffic is 24 feet. He stated that they could go with an amount which is less at 22 feet and that ideally, the amount is 24 feet and that the plan is for 24 feet.

Ms. Hickey then asked how long the parking spaces are.

Mr. Millan referred to 18 feet with some communities asking for 18½ feet. He confirmed that it would have to meet the code.

Ms. Hickey asked what the total width of the upper deck is.

Mr. Millan stated that it would 18 feet plus 18 feet plus 24 feet for a total of 60 feet.

Chairperson Johnson questioned whether they are planning to have parking as required in the motor court.

Mr. Trandel agreed that is their intent and that they planned to have four spaces in the motor court.

Chairperson Johnson asked if they eliminated one parking space, noting that the original plan was for five spaces.

Mr. D'Onofrio informed the Board that the applicant did not have to designate where the spaces have to be.

Mr. Trandel noted that they have more than captured the spaces elsewhere.

Mr. Lane asked if there is room for four spaces there.

Mr. Trandel responded that there would be parking on one side only.

Mr. Lane then stated that he saw three on one side and two on the other.

Mr. Trandel stated that with regard to how the motor court would be parked, the general thought there was geared toward the professional services off of Lincoln and that it was designed for drop-off and also for ease of drop-off for the elderly or those needing assistance to the services on the second floor.

Mr. Lane asked if there is space to have five parking spaces regardless of what they are used for.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that it is a big space sized at 32,000 square feet.

Mr. Lane then stated that in connection with the fountain in the middle, then to the wall is 22 feet on both sides. He then stated that if that is normal for road width, how with 22 feet they expected two vehicles to go and for two cars to park which he indicated is not feasible.

Mr. Kisiel referred the Board to a diagram and stated that it is misleading in that there would be one way circulation inside of the motor court. He then stated that the two green areas show in and out traffic which would all be going in the same direction.

Mr. Lagrange informed the Board that the Waldorf did exactly the same thing with their motor court. He also stated that there are the same size vehicles as well as many big limos and that there is a lot of space. Mr. Lagrange stated that from experience, he stated that is what they would do here. He also stated that in connection with more than five vehicles and 10 minutes in terms of drop-off and pickup, that is why they are confident about it.

Mr. Trandel added that if they have a doorman, they can handle it.

Mr. Naumann asked the applicant to briefly address the pedestrian access points and the covered parts of the garage and to identify them.

Mr. Trandel referred the Board to an illustration to identify those areas. He informed the Board that they held an open house on Saturday which he described as illustrative and helpful in terms of understanding how Lincoln would shift 22 to 25 feet to the west and how they would square off Lincoln and Elm and make it a much safer intersection. Mr. Trandel also identified the entry point for the stairs and the elevator up and down, the grade and the area of the bike path up to the plaza level. He noted that they would still have the Metra overrun catwalk. Mr. Trandel also identified another area as the east lot stairwell off of Elm which you would take down and up. He then identified the residential garage with 122 spaces and noted that since the building size was reduced, the amount of parking spaces would go down. Mr. Trandel confirmed that the access would be similar and identified the private access for the residents. He informed the Board that

the only public access points would be off of the east lot on the northeast corner and the northwest corner of the commuter garage. Mr. Trandel noted that they call it the retail/commuter garage which is commuter parking with a retail overflow component and which would contain 194 spaces. He indicated that they envision that it would be filled with commuters during the day and would be used by restaurants and retail in the evening.

Chairperson Johnson stated that the applicant repeatedly in the presentation referred to the garage as retail/commuter.

Mr. Trandel stated that the Village can call it what they want to and that they are saying that it would be a multi-use garage. He then stated that there are times when it would be more relevant to be used as a commuter garage rather than a retail garage.

Chairperson Johnson also asked why retail users at night would need to use the underground garage when they could use surface parking.

Mr. Trandel reiterated that they need retail parking in the evening which would use the commuter garage.

Mr. Naumann asked about alternatives. He stated that the applicant has talked about evening use and asked what safety devices they considered. Mr. Naumann then referred to the two limited access points to the garage and asked if they thought about how it would be managed to make the garage more attractive to a nighttime user.

Mr. Trandel responded that one natural benefit is that there would be open exposure on the west side to allow natural light on the first and second floors. He then stated that beyond that, they planned to coordinate with the police department and the drivers there. Mr. Trandel stated that now, a good example would be the lot behind the old Fell building which he described as awful and added that they have been lucky that there have been no bad instances. He stated that it comes down partly to education and part to proper lighting. Mr. Trandel also stated that with regard to LED lighting, there are a lot of ways to activate it and that motion sensors would be helpful.

Chairperson Johnson stated that she had questions in connection with the underground lot. She stated that they asked at the last meeting whether there was a similar suburban underground parking structure with the ramp on-street.

Mr. Millan stated that he cannot provide a specific example.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that it was done in Arlington Heights. He then referred the Board to an illustration of an example in Evanston and confirmed that is not what the parking lot would look like. Mr. Trandel also referred the Board to an illustration of a parking lot in Lake Forest.

Chairperson Johnson stated that those are not the same.

Mr. Blum stated that in Evanston, they both turn on the side in which you are driving. He stated that from Lincoln, it would be crossing traffic and asked the applicant where there is a situation like that.

Mr. Trandel responded that he is not sure in terms of relevance and stated that with regard to the parking lot, there is a lot more area on Lincoln than in these examples.

Mr. Blum asked if there would be a turning lane.

Mr. Trandel responded that they could have one and that there are a lot of ways to manage it.

Chairperson Johnson stated that the radius is an 11 degree radius coming south on Lincoln and asked what the radius of the sharp turn is.

Mr. Millan responded that it would be a 90 degree turn making that right turn. He then identified the entrance and two-way traffic on the illustration for the Board.

Chairperson Johnson noted that the drawings provided did not extend to the Lincoln/Oak intersection. She also stated that it is not shown on the illustration.

Mr. Millan stated that with regard to the concerns, if traffic south on Lincoln is cued past the access driveway, would they have to wait to make the turn to go in is Chairperson Johnson's question. He informed the Board that the analysis with the simulations and observations show that traffic would never cue at that level going to the access driveway and that the only blocks they would have are at an intersection. Mr. Millan reiterated that there would be no cue of traffic to or beyond the proposed access driveway.

Chairperson Johnson asked what the retaining wall and guard rail would look like.

Mr. Lane questioned whether it would be significant at grade level.

Mr. Trandel responded that it would not and stated that the walls would be more of fencing so that people would not walk onto the ramp. He also stated that it would be one story down. Mr. Trandel stated that it may be 11% grade and that the Village ordinance is 14%.

Chairperson Johnson asked what the height limitation for the truck clearance is and if there would be a sign.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct and that there would be warning before in terms of the height limitation which they can hang from the roof which he indicated is the most effective way. He noted that it is shown at 7 feet 6 inches and that taller SUVs measure 6 feet 11 inches.

Chairperson Johnson then asked if the applicant considered creating an entry ramp from Lincoln onto the site and having a separate ramp to the commuter/retail garage.

Mr. Trandel indicated that would open a Pandora's Box. He informed the Board that it was their

first idea and that it seemed the most logical. Mr. Trandel stated that it was done this way to manage privacy and safety.

Chairperson Johnson stated that there is no stop sign now on either side of Oak. She stated that Steve Saunders said that they might need a signal.

Mr. Millan stated that the report from Mr. Saunders stated to explore the potential for an all way stop sign to control Oak and Lincoln. He then stated that with regard to the volumes, there is no need for a stop sign or an all way stop sign for control.

Chairperson Johnson asked if there was a stop sign, where would it be.

Mr. Millan responded that it would be for outbound traffic from the ramp. He noted that they would not be stopping the Lincoln flow of traffic and that it would be like it is today.

Ms. Kumer questioned whether it is shown on the drawing.

Mr. Millan stated that as the ramp goes up, there would be a stop sign and a stop bar.

Chairperson Johnson asked will others see it.

Mr. Trandel stated that there would be landscaping in the area and referred to the entrance point at the sidewalk of Lincoln which he described as way to the west. He noted that the stop sign would be for those coming out of the ramp and reiterated that Lincoln traffic would not be stopping.

Ms. Kumer stated that there is no sidewalk depicted there with the landscape patch and asked if that is gone.

Mr. Trandel stated that in the plaza, there is one big sidewalk and a new sidewalk which he identified for the Board and where the three trees are. He informed the Board that vehicles can turn north onto Lincoln from the garage. Mr. Trandel then stated that during the day now, he described it as the Wild West with a big wide street.

Chairperson Johnson asked where the signage would go showing that there is a ramp to parking.

Mr. Trandel presumed that there would be warning signs for vehicles in and out south on Lincoln and the same going north.

Chairperson Johnson then asked how far the guardrail would extend on Lincoln.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that it is marked off now to the existing sidewalk and that they would still have a wider street than Elm for example. He stated that there is a lot of room.

Chairperson Johnson stated that at the November meeting and the DRB meeting, Mr. Trandel said he hoped commuters currently using the Hubbard Woods and Indian Hill stations and those outside of Winnetka would use the parking structure.

Mr. Trandel stated that part of the goal is to get the commuter vehicles on Maple for example. He stated that they would be creating a centralized place for commuter parking to take the vehicles from Zones A and B.

Chairperson Johnson asked if they considered the impact additional commuters from Indian Hill and Hubbard Woods and neighboring towns would have on traffic generated on the proposed site.

Mr. Millan confirmed that it was considered in the study. He noted that they applied the ratio to come up with trip generation assuming that all of the spaces are spaces used. Mr. Millan also stated that they assumed that it would be full.

Mr. Trandel stated that as an added benefit, they envision a bike rental or an exchange off of the bike path by the garage where people would be able to rent or park their own bike.

Chairperson Johnson asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Lane stated that with regard to the parking lot, the financial analysis used a \$600 per year amount to come up with recovery by the Village. He asked where the \$600 figure came from.

Mr. Trandel responded that the Mandigo report showed that based on sales and property tax; there would be a 24 year recovery period.

Mr. D'Onofrio informed the Board that they charge \$200 for residential and \$440 for non-residential commuter parking.

Mr. Trandel stated that they deferred to the June report. He referred to the break-even point beyond what people would pay which includes shopping and retail sales.

Mr. Lane then stated that with regard to the financial analysis, he referred to the value placed on Village land of 7,767 square feet and the \$279 per square foot valuation number and asked what the basis for the \$279 figure is.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that it included comparables which were in the report a long time ago. He then referred to what was paid for Phototronics and the former Baird & Warner spot.

Mr. Lane asked if they included what was offered for the pharmacy property.

Mr. Trandel responded that they did not.

Mr. Lane stated that they would be getting the corner which he described as necessary space and that they cannot build retail without the corner space. He also referred to whether it was offered and turned down and that it could be higher.

Mr. Trandel stated that at some point, it makes sense and that sometimes, it does not. He also stated that it related to FAR.

Mr. Lane reiterated that the corner spot is key for retail. He then stated that if you do not have the pharmacy location, the Village land is creating the corner spot.

Mr. Trandel stated that they also have Phototronics which is on the corner.

Mr. Lane then stated that they do not have Conney's and that it is a disjointed location.

Mr. Trandel then stated that they would be delivering 360 parking spaces for the Village at \$15,000 per spot.

Mr. Lane stated that he thought that it was \$30,000.

Mr. Trandel referred to retail on the east lot and stated that it is their money. He then stated that it benefits the shops and the Village and that they are adding 63 parking spaces.

Mr. Lane stated that the additional 63 parking spaces created value for the developer's retail. He then stated that with analysis of the Rich and Associates study, he referred to using different factors to come up with the parking demand. Mr. Lane asked if they looked at those to determine if the amount needed would be higher or different than what was calculated.

Mr. Trandel responded that they went into it with a fresh set of eyes and that it was better to do it unfettered. He indicated that it would be similar in terms of parking demands, weaknesses and shortfall.

Mr. Lane asked if the factors used were different.

Mr. Trandel stated that for projects which are way over-parked, they would build more than for residents that used it.

Chairperson Johnson stated that the applicant is seeking to purchase the Village right-of-way on Lincoln. She then stated that with regard to the plaza overhang on the west side, she asked if they planned to take part of the bluff and extend the street over it.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct and informed the Board that they taped off only the building and that the Village asset is on Village land. He indicated that they would only be paying for part of the plaza and that the collective cost is a 50/50 venture.

Mr. Blum stated with regard to the tradeoffs with the Village, if the project is approved, they would be going to Lincoln but that the Village would not build parking and asked what the benefit to the Village is.

Mr. Trandel stated that for the Village, it represented an interesting opportunity to do a long term solve for the parking challenges at half the market rate it would cost to build.

Mr. Blum asked if the proposal, regardless of whether the parking lot is built, would take extra space on Lincoln and the right-of-way.

Mr. Trandel urged the Board to look at the moment in time. He then referred to the defector result of the North Shore line closing and that it was abandoned 45 years ago. Mr. Trandel stated that it is being asked for and that they will pay for it.

Mr. Lane referred to paying for the land and that the financial analysis did not say that. He indicated that it says that it related to the value of the vacated land. Mr. Lane stated that is a key issue to him in connection with the devaluation of land.

Mr. Trandel agreed with Mr. Lane's comments and stated that they would pay market value.

Mr. Naumann stated that there is a need for retail parking. He referred to the study and to come back with plans and the fact that the important constituency is the business owner. Mr. Naumann asked what their feedback was.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that they spent a lot of time with the Chamber of Commerce and the business council and found that there is a resounding need to solve the parking problem. He stated that they need activity and pedestrian walkways and not just people driving through the Village. Mr. Trandel then stated that when you do not have parking, there is no place to catch people and that the project represented an opportunity to capture those people. He described it as hard and that when you cannot find parking, people do not stop.

Mr. Naumann then asked if there was engagement with the commuters.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct and stated that with regard to the idea of opportunity, he stated that there are interesting things the Village can do to lure people to the area. He described it as unique and that they have been gifted with a unique set of circumstances. Mr. Trandel then referred to the great visionaries from 70 years ago and the thought about safety in terms of lowering the tracks. He also referred to the unintended consequences which created two campuses and that the project represented a unique opportunity to finish off what was started and create something. Mr. Trandel added that there would be activation and a focal point to bring people to town that would park, work and come back and meet families in the middle of town. He stated that the other benefit would be removing the commuter vehicles from street level which block up retail parking.

Chairperson Johnson stated that to clarify, would the current commuter designated parking spaces except for Lincoln be maintained for commuters.

Mr. Trandel described it as a demand issue. He then referred to shrinking the vehicles in half which would result in more vehicles on the street. Mr. Trandel stated that they planned to create a harbor for all of the vehicles.

Chairperson Johnson asked what would be the use of the station parking lot if it is no longer used by commuters.

Mr. Trandel stated that there would be more retail opportunities in the station itself.

Chairperson Johnson asked if the lot would be a substitute for all commuter parking.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct. He also stated that given the choice, the commuters would take sheltered parking.

Mr. Naumann asked Mr. D'Onofrio that it was stated that there are safety issues and whether they would talk through the process for Winnetka to go through to vet out all of the safety issues. He also stated that the issues went beyond the Board's purview.

Mr. D'Onofrio stated that is one of the big components required that upon preliminary approval, the applicant would be required to submit detailed engineering plans and that part of that is traffic control which is reviewed by the engineer as well as the locations of stop signs and whether they are needed or not. He noted that the appropriate professionals would be looking at those safety issues.

Chairperson Johnson stated that with regard to the overhang, she asked if part of the bluff would be eliminated.

Mr. Trandel noted that the Village owned up to 5 feet of the bike path and that they would be going within 20 feet of the bike path and that it would cantilever over the bluff 5 feet. He stated that the bluff would be reduced by 2/3 and that there is tape out there to illustrate it.

Ms. Kumer asked if they planned to eliminate part of the bridge.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct and that with regard to the division between the two sides, they planned to bring the two sides together. He then stated that the Board members would need to walk it.

Mr. Kehoe referred to the right-of-way use terminal requesting surface and air rights to 7,600 feet. He indicated that it did not sound like they would be purchasing a fee interest in the property.

Mr. Trandel stated that it would be deeded back underground. He also stated that if they built the garage, the Village would own what is underneath and their own air rights above.

Mr. Kehoe stated that \$279 per square feet is not applicable.

Mr. Trandel stated that he understood and that the Village needs the garage.

Chairperson Johnson then referred to the size and density of the project. She stated that with regard to the New Trier Partners (NTP) proposal for the site, the Village Council provided preliminary approval for the Fell property and that the developer's plans subsequently lapsed. Chairperson Johnson noted that proposal did not include the Baird & Warner property or Phototronics.

Mr. Trandel agreed that is correct.

Chairperson Johnson then asked why there is a need for a bigger site. She stated that the NTP proposal was for .8 acres and this project would be double that at 1.6 acres.

Mr. Trandel stated that the simple answer is economics. He also stated that time is not a developer's friend and that in connection with the original development, the developer basis gets high. Mr. Trandel also stated that if the project was financially doable, it would have gotten done. He then stated that the other issue is that when they looked at the project, they started with the ills confronted by the Village that they could solve for. He indicated that they took a pragmatic approach which is why they are spending time and getting Village feedback and focusing on cures that they can solve while disrupting the world in terms of construction in order to come out with a commuter and retail solution.

Chairperson Johnson stated that with regard to the 13 parking spaces which would be retained on Lincoln, she asked if they would be parallel or angled parking.

Mr. Kisiel referred the Board to an illustration with a combination of parallel parking on the east side and 90 degree parking on the west side.

Mr. Trandel indicated that it is angled parking by 711 Oak.

Ms. Kumer asked if it is commuter or retail.

Mr. Trandel stated that 711 Oak wanted them to be public spaces.

Chairperson Johnson asked Mr. D'Onofrio what the area of the post office site is and referred to 1.6 acres.

Mr. Blum stated that they talked about the contextual aspect and stated that Elm would be broken up into smaller scale buildings and asked why not on Lincoln.

Mr. Trandel responded that there are no buildings on Lincoln. He also stated that it related to the architectural elements being taller and that it dovetails head and shoulders with the Village Hall. Mr. Trandel then stated that there is over 6 acres of land between Lincoln and the railroad tracks, Station Park and Green Bay Road before you would get to the building.

Mr. Blum stated that the bulk was rearranged significantly and that they need a higher height on the outside to make more open space. He then stated that in connection with a four story box, no one wanted that. Mr. Blum then stated that the Board asked for street level renderings.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that they have them.

Mr. Blum then stated that the perceived height for a man on the street did not change. He also stated that you cannot see what is in the middle of the building from the street scale. Mr. Blum stated that it would be more injurious from the street to see a 7 or 6 story tower versus the mass inside.

Mr. Trandel noted that there is other open space on Lincoln. He stated that to look at Elm, it is offered in package heights which were asked for across the street. Mr. Trandel indicated that he was surprised to see how tall the building was which houses the Neapolitan which stood at 42 feet.

Chairperson Johnson stated that those are single buildings which vary in height, width, and in other ways.

Mr. Trandel then stated that some of those buildings would be here in 20 years and that some would not. He stated that the point is that they dealt with the hand as it relates to configuration and that they tried to be respectful and responsive which lead to terrific commentary. Mr. Trandel described the proposal as a way better idea than it was a year ago and that they would continue to improve on that.

Mr. Trandel then stated that the massing opportunity was to create something neat as opposed to what could be done by right. He stated that if they built one building by right one at a time without planned development, it would not be financially viable and would not solve the parking problems. Mr. Trandel described the beauty of planned development as being able to take a step back and see how can they, within the framework of the guidelines, encapsulate and embrace the Village ideas and have features which would still create what they think is an exciting project. He also stated that the market would dictate the number of units which was reduced down from 100. Mr. Trandel then referred to selling off a number of the townhomes.

Chairperson Johnson asked if there would be three story townhomes.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct and that they would be for sale. He then stated that square footage is square footage and that they can combine three units for a buyer. Mr. Trandel also stated that in connection with the market, 711 Oak has 38 units and that it is their guess that there would be approximately 40 or 45 in total with twice the area. He reiterated that they could combine units into bigger units and that with regard to the market; they want to work with people on the unit.

Chairperson Johnson stated that with regard to the elimination of a story on the east building, she asked if the units on the east façade of the west building would have a better view of the lake.

Mr. Trandel responded that there would be 4,000 at 6 and 12,000. He agreed that their view would be enhanced.

Chairperson Johnson then asked if the penthouse would measure 4,400 square feet.

Mr. Trandel stated that it could be whatever a purchaser wanted to buy. He stated that part of it would help to offset the cost of the garage.

Ms. Kumer asked if there would no longer be rentals.

Mr. Trandel stated that two years ago, condominium talk was not in the cards and that the world evolved. He stated that they wanted to make sure that the proposal is what they can deliver on and

that it would be premature to say it would all be condominiums.

Chairperson Johnson referred to The Galleria on Lincoln which is fairly new and contained high-end expensive condominiums and that there was a provision for no restaurants on the ground floor, which led to problems leasing the space. She then stated that in connection with condominiums, there are issues with regard to restrictions for restaurants.

Mr. Trandel stated that is why they planned to have grease traps and that buildings in the city have first floor restaurants. He indicated that it can be done and that it would be expensive.

Mr. Lane stated that in connection with employee parking, he asked how many are there and if there would be 6.

Mr. Trandel stated that in terms of what they envision, the employees now park in the east lot. He stated that with regard to what they could do, they could bring them into the residential area.

Mr. Lane asked how they came up with 6. He then stated that with regard to the financial analysis, the study stated that they would create revenues driven by 165 employees and that the numbers did not coincide and that it is a big variance.

Mr. Trandel responded that most studies do not think about employees. He noted that they do not want employees using front retail space and that most retailers on the east side ask that their employees park by the Hadley School. Mr. Trandel stated that what they would do if they had extra parking under the building is to offer it to employees. He also stated that it came in at 6 because that is the number they had.

Mr. Lane stated that it seemed that they would need more. He referred to the zoning requirements on how much parking is needed.

Mr. Trandel agreed with Mr. Lane's comments.

Mr. Blum referred to diminished property values and planned development. He stated that with regard to the Conney's building, he asked how does this horseshoe cutting off access to that property in terms of impact and future development.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that they were unable to reach an agreement with Conney's and referred to impairing the long term value of the space. He indicated that there has been good dialog with them and that Mr. Blum raised a good point.

Chairperson Johnson stated that the Board can ask more questions later and asked if there were any interested parties. No interested parties came forward at this time. Chairperson Johnson then stated that the Board would take public comment and asked that comments be limited to three minutes.

Mr. Gelderman introduced himself to the Board and stated that he has lived in the Village for 25 years and inherited the property from his father, Gregory Gelderman, who was an attorney. He

stated that he did not find that there are any difficulties. Mr. Gelderman informed the Board that he comes to Winnetka two to three times a day and that he had no difficulty parking. He then referred to reducing the size of Lincoln from Elm to Oak and more traffic east and west on Elm. Mr. Gelderman stated that it would suck the life out of the Village. He also stated that with 24,500 people, it is a much smaller size. Mr. Gelderman then referred to a developer who did projects in Evanston and Arlington Heights and that this is a much smaller village. Mr. Gelderman also referred to the impact on the Green Bay trail and that there could be serious injuries. He also stated that there was talk with the Interstate Commerce Commission with regard to the bluff Harold Ickes constructed. Mr. Gelderman concluded that they would be going too far with the project and that it did not belong in a village the size of Winnetka.

David Smithson stated that he hoped that they take a close look at the entrance to the garage, which was discussed; off of Lincoln and that it seemed like a hairpin turn. He also stated that he is very concerned with vehicles being able to make the full 180 degree turn if someone is coming out of the garage. Mr. Smithson stated that with all of the talk, he commented that it is still a beautiful project and that it was planned by terrific experts. He stated that it would be to the Board to decide whether it is appropriate for the Village and that it didn't seem so to him. Mr. Smithson stated that it comes down to housing for a couple hundred people and described restaurants as a risky business. He questioned whether they should change the character of Winnetka for that.

Mr. Smithson also commented that it is a shame that the Fell building is not being used which he described as a classic building with mid-century architecture and which was way over-engineered when it was built with the future in mind as an adaptive reuse to put two floors of condominiums above it. He also stated that there was an entire plaza developed with the future in mind. Mr. Smithson concluded by stating that there can be revitalization of downtown in that section without changing the character of the Village and that he hoped that the Board thought about that.

Joyce Bishop stated that she has lived in Winnetka off and on for 50 years and that she is proud to say she is from Winnetka. She stated that she has a personal interest in the project and that she lives where Lincoln hits Oak in the condominiums. Ms. Bishop stated that from her kitchen door, she would be looking at the building and that her view would be affected and that she is deeply concerned. She then stated there are other people in the 12 units of condominiums. She then stated that she asked about the catwalk and that is a very traveled area for fire engines. Ms. Bishop then stated that with regard to the ramp, she asked if it would be going down and up.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct and reiterated it would be a two way ramp.

Ms. Bishop then stated that she is having a hard time figuring this out. She concluded by stating that she thought that all of the new construction would be in the area on the east side of Lincoln but not the west side of Lincoln.

Don Smith stated that he has lived in the Village for 38 years and that he is not in favor of the variations for the One Winnetka project which he described as too large for the Village. He then stated that by passing variations of this magnitude, it would set a precedent for future projects. Mr. Smith also stated that zoning laws were created to maintain a set of standards among the Village. He concluded by stating that if the variations are passed, it would discredit the founding fathers to

maintain a set of standards and that they should keep Winnetka as a village and not allow it to become a city.

Gerald Brown, 711 Oak, stated that it was represented even with the ramp up and down on Lincoln, there would still be two ways and allow fire engines up and down on Lincoln. He stated that the ramp would be two lanes and with two way traffic and parking on Lincoln and asked for clarification on that.

Richard Sobel stated that his father is the architect of the Fell store. He also stated that he looked for the minutes from the previous meeting and that they have not appeared yet. Mr. Sobel stated that at the last DRB meeting, Peter Milbratz put together a visual of the adaptive reuse of the Fell building to accomplish the goals of the developer. He stated that the Fell building was designed to allow additional residential space to be built on top. Mr. Sobel stated that he shared the goals of the project in a way which would be commensurate with current, past and future Winnetka. He stated that the adaptive reuse contained a number of design functions and which can be done within the existing zoning ordinance in terms of height and to accomplish the goals of any residential units. Mr. Sobel also stated that there is already commercial space available.

Mr. Sobel then stated that there would be great financial benefits of the development not to tear down an over-engineered building and great savings and not having to build up. He also stated that if the building gets on the National Register, there would be a 20% income tax credit to the developer. Mr. Sobel described it as a win-win within the existing parameters and great savings. He then stated that he has asked various Boards to encourage looking at the alternative design and to incorporate part within the three existing buildings to accomplish the same goals.

Mr. Sobel also stated that he would like to raise the issue which no one mentioned before which is affordable housing. He described the project as containing high end housing and that there could be internal subdivision so that there is a diversion of units. Mr. Sobel concluded by asking the Board to encourage the developer to preserve the Fell building at a great advantage.

Chairperson Johnson swore in Eleanor Prince.

Eleanor Prince of Kenilworth informed the Board that she is in the Village all the time. She stated that when discussions began months ago, she referred to height being a matter. She stated that she thought about it carefully and that all three commercial districts were revised and that they are looking at what makes it an integral, harmonious commercial district. Ms. Prince stated that she noticed that there is a great deal of harmony in all three districts even though there is a difference of architectural styles and heights. She stated that someone a long time ago considered what makes a harmonious district and that it comes down to zoning and design. Ms. Prince then stated that there is a lot of open space around each business district and that the open spaces keep it as a suburban landscape.

Ms. Prince stated that the One Winnetka development would be a very tall development which is 39.5% higher than the neighbor and New Trier High School. She also referred to the huge amount of bulk and height. Ms. Prince then stated that considering what was done over the past 100 years and looking forward, she described it as a beautiful spot to live and shop and that you see

the facades as you go down the street. She stated that the project would go 70 feet up and that it would be 80 feet across at the top of the hill which would not leave them with any open space, only in the center. Ms. Prince asked the Board to observe the setbacks and not give the applicant an extension to the east and that they are getting a lot on the west, as well as to not give additional height. She concluded by stating that three and four story apartment buildings are harmonious and have a lot of open space.

Peter Tryor, 711 Oak, informed the Board that when he bought his home, he looked at zoning in the sense of what is in the neighborhood and what could happen in the neighborhood. He stated that if it was said to the neighbors there would be a change, he questioned who would stand for it. Mr. Tryor described their 39 people who are unit owners as condensed.

Mr. Tryor then stated that with regard to the quality of life, they would be bringing trucks in at 15 feet away and referred to the noise they will hear. He indicated that he found it amazing that they were told now how important it is for the business community. Mr. Tryor noted that people do not move to Winnetka for the business community and described the Village's client as the homeowner and that they depend on the Village to protect them. He also stated that the developer once said that zoning is not a contract, but a right. Mr. Tryor stated that it is a promise. He also stated that when he bought his home, there was a certain amount of faith in terms of what was going on and urged the Board to keep the faith with them. Mr. Tryor stated that they all want something better but not something terrible. He concluded by stating that they want something good and that they should help them get it.

Denny Niles thanked the Board for doing their job. He informed the Board that he has lived in the Village for 45 years with his wife and worked here for 45 years. Mr. Niles stated that they are seeing the future as a disaster and that they are not looking far enough ahead. He referred to the amount of vacancies here and described it as a tragedy. Mr. Niles informed the Board that he is in the real estate business and that he looked at \$5 million homes with a couple from San Francisco and after walking downtown they asked him if the Village is going bankrupt. He stated that he loved Winnetka. He then described Wilmette as having life. He stated that they see what goes on here every day so he is in favor to get something to get them moving so that they have a future for the grandchildren. Mr. Niles also referred to the deterioration of the values of all of the homes which could happen in the near future and suggested that they think long and hard and how it would affect families. He stated that for five days, he walked all over Winnetka and described it as a beautiful place to be and that there is only one Winnetka which is why they live here. Mr. Niles concluded by commenting that they take a hard look on working with this to make it work for all of them and in the future, for it to make more sense and be something for which they can be proud of.

Penny Lanphier, 250 Birch, stated that she would like clarification with regard to the actual height at the peak of the mansard façade. She stated that as you look at the documents, it appeared as though the actual roof height behind the façade so that the top the apparent roof height may actually be different. Ms. Lanphier then stated that she completely agreed with Mr. Blum's comments with regard to the way the space is configured which she described as lovely and that all of the open space is to the inside and that the apparent bulk to the person on the street would be a four and five story building throughout. She indicated that it is important to consider the building

front from that standpoint.

Ms. Lanphier then commented that it is great that the building height was reduced to four stories on the east side. She also stated that it is important to continue to retain the setback if possible which would also fit with the demand for terrace space, as well as to lessen the impact on the east side and that with the rise of the hill, they need to be mindful of the impact on the Village Green. Ms. Lanphier then stated that it is difficult to assess the size of the parking garage without having a more up to date independent study by the Village of the entire Elm Street downtown area. She stated that it is important to look forward in terms of what will the downtown parking demand be before they come to any conclusion as to whether doing the garage makes sense in the proposed configuration and size.

Ms. Lanphier indicated that she was surprised that there was not more conversation in connection with on-street parking. She also stated that while it is great to move the commuter spaces to a convenient location which is not on the street, all of the planning documents talk about retaining or adding to on-street parking because it is important to retailers which she commented is the most important thing for the success of retailers which is to have easy access to on-street parking.

Ms. Lanphier then stated that with regard to the public plaza, she did not see why parking on-street cannot be multi-purpose. She stated that in general, the Elm side enhances the Village and that the reason why they are successful is that they feel like a village in terms of pedestrians and human scale. Ms. Lanphier then stated that anything they can do to enhance that rather than having a more urban and large looming presence which would not enhance the Village's character. She concluded by stating that she would like clarification with regard to the mansard roof height.

Jan Bawden, 129 DeWindt, informed the Board that she is the resident who submitted the photographs in the packet. She stated that she would like to walk the Board through a couple of the photographs on Attachment D. Ms. Bawden then stated that the reason she submitted the photographs was to try to bring a human scale to the entire project. She stated that everyone sees the gorgeous drawings and that she would love something like that being built period but that when she looked at the human scale which has been established in Winnetka, she stated that there is such a disconnect.

Ms. Bawden then identified the first photograph on Attachment D which did not contain any people which was taken from across the street near Phototronics in order to show the Village canopy. She then identified the second photograph which contained Louise Holland in front of Phototronics in order to show the scale which is established there. Ms. Bawden then identified the third photograph with Ms. Holland across the street from the development in front of Neapolitan. She indicated that what is interesting is that you get to see the human scale and Ms. Holland's relationship to the 18 foot frontage and her relationship to the vehicles.

Ms. Bawden then stated that the next photograph is of the 1720 Central Street station in Evanston which she described as an example of a 4½ story building which they are talking about would be on the east side which she commented is still a large façade. She stated that even at 4½ stories, it is a relatively large façade. Ms. Bawden also identified Barnes and Noble which is also approximately 4½ stories in Evanston which she indicated is the closest building they could find to

represent what would take place on that corner with a round building at 4½ stories with Ms. Holland in front of it. She commented that would be a much more appropriate human scale to what would be happening on the southeast corner of the project.

Ms. Bawden informed the Board that the next two photographs are the closest buildings they could find at 60 feet to show would be happening on the Lincoln frontage with Ms. Holland in the photograph. She stated that the last photograph is of 1818 Maple which showed the human scale for what is being proposed for the corner of the site.

Gwen Trindl stated that she has listened to much of what is going on in terms of comment and the project being talked about and the work which is ahead of them to create something which is a new approach to the business district. She stated that they need and have always had a brand and that Winnetka is a place that people knew because it is a charming village. Ms. Trindl indicated that she realized that this is not the Board's purview and that the Board has constraints in terms of what their job is. She stated that it is essential that they look at the building and say one thing and ask themselves do they really want to change the character and vision of Winnetka. Ms. Trindl commented that it is a great building and that it would be great for Evanston. She stated that this is not going to be the only building that would be proposed as a planned development and that this is the first one which would set the standard. Ms. Trindl concluded by stating that she is very impressed with the Board and questioned whether they wanted to change the character of the Village.

Barbara Hull, 711 Oak, informed the Board that a good deal of what she had prepared to say has been touched upon by the Board and members of the audience. She then stated that she has four points which seriously concerned her with regard to the project, the first of which is that the project design alters the width and configuration and the obstruction of the traffic flow on Lincoln. Ms. Hull also stated that it would impact the East Elm lot and significantly impact the traffic flow of the East Elm business district.

Ms. Hull then stated that the current plan would introduce multiple stop and yield signs which would turn Lincoln into a massively congested traffic pattern and have increased density and narrow road widths with multiple converging driveways which she stated would compromise vehicle and pedestrian safety. She also stated that the convergence pattern of driveways would make Lincoln and Oak bottlenecks. Ms. Hull then stated that the East Elm lot would no longer be solely a parking lot and would now serve a dual purpose and be the primary ingress and egress for the lobby entrance. She stated that in the current proposal, it would be the One Winnetka driveway and delivery lane between Lincoln and Elm. Ms. Hull stated that this increased ingress and egress of commercial residential delivery patterns on the East Elm parking lot would be a serious safety concern for individuals and in addition would affect the Hadley School.

Ms. Hull stated that the new position of the delivery entrance would only be a driveway's width from the bedrooms of eight residential condominiums at 711 Oak. She informed the Board that the refuse pickup began at 6:00 a.m. on the Elm Street lot and that deliveries will be made at all hours. Ms. Hull also stated that the increased noise would be loud and intrusive and that the added light pollution would be exceedingly invasive with the removal of the existing trees and no buffering screen being shown on the plans.

Ms. Hull then stated that neither the new nor the former traffic flow plan showed any allowance for a sidewalk or protective curb along the south facing the side of the west and the east towers which she indicated is a safety concern to all residents and visitors to the area. She also stated that in order to access the lobby from Lincoln or Elm, pedestrians would be required to walk the roadway along the side to the west and east towers which she indicated is an unnecessary safety risk.

Ms. Hull stated that the complete and consolidated detailed measurements are absent in the current proposal and its clear interpretation of the developer's plan almost impossible to drive. She stated that for example, the apron to the entry corridor to the motor court is shown as 28 feet and that apron and driveway widths allowances are about the same. Ms. Hull stated that there is no indication of the width of the driveway and whether or not it has been changed from the earlier dimension of 19½ feet.

Chairperson Johnson asked Ms. Hull to wrap up her comments.

Ms. Hull then stated that the proposed height of the One Winnetka plan with the most current revisions significantly exceeded the minimum height of 45 feet for a planned development which she stated remained a concern. She stated that while the residents have been pleased to see adjustments to the current plans, a further reduction would be helpful. Ms. Hull concluded by stating that it would also be helpful to have the current plan clarify the dimensions of the property's roads and driveways that are the most dependent upon and which would be creating congestion for the area.

Chairperson Johnson asked if there were any other comments. No additional comments were made at this time. She then stated that the Board would take a ten minute break.

When the meeting resumed, Ms. Lanphier asked the applicant for an answer to the question with regard to top of the mansard façade or if it was the actual deck of the roof itself.

Jeffrey Birch, a head designer with the architect, informed the Board that with regard to the way in which the roof would work, he referred the Board to an illustration and stated that the height is indicated at 62 feet 10 inches on the west tower, 45 feet on the east tower and 70 feet for the penthouse. He also stated that the roof deck would actually rest approximately 3 feet below that height in order to hide utilities and other unsightly items that may occur on the roof.

Chairperson Johnson later swore in Mr. Birch.

Chairperson Johnson then referred to page nos. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 and asked if someone would discuss the aerial views.

Mr. Trandel referred the Board to an illustration of how Elm relates to the current buildings which was brought up at the last meeting and identified Neapolitan as one of the buildings Ms. Bawden referenced which is 42 feet. He also stated that the terrace is 35 feet with the roof to 45 feet. Mr. Trandel stated that contextually, it is hard to dispute. Mr. Trandel then stated that in the center are townhomes above the retail space and that they added an additional floor which would be setback off of Elm in accordance with the code. He stated that it related to the questions raised with

regard to getting real dimension and texture in terms of the streets.

Mr. Trandel then referred the Board to another illustration and identified the Arbor Vitae friends and to north and identified what the area looked like today with one way traffic going south. He also stated that it showed the effect of the development and the landscaping in front of the wall covering the scissored garage.

Chairperson Johnson stated that the Board can either continue with their questions or start the discussion. She noted that if they vote tonight, the Village attorney would have to draft findings for a vote in January. Chairperson Johnson then stated that instead of voting tonight, they can continue the discussion at the January meeting and give Mr. Camillucci direction to draft findings to present at the February meeting. Chairperson Johnson noted that all of the Board members are present. She described the procedure as different than what they would normally do and referred to the complexity of the planned development project. Chairperson Johnson referred to the lag between giving direction to the Village Attorney and the final vote. She then asked the Board for a sense of whether they wanted to ask more questions or if they were ready to call the matter in for discussion. Chairperson Johnson also asked the Board members to express their opinion as to whether they would be for or against the request tonight. She referred to whether there should be more questioning and described the request as a complex project and that the Plan Commission had seven meetings while this is the Board's second meeting.

Ms. Hickey stated that she would like to talk more about retail. She then referred to three restaurants in addition to the square footage the applicant is talking about. Ms. Hickey also stated that some retailers may combine spaces and indicated that it seemed like retail is the big driver for parking.

Mr. Trandel stated that it is important and that there would be 50 or 60 residents. He indicated that it is more about retail affecting them as opposed to what happened in the units. Mr. Trandel then stated that in total, roughly 35% of the square footage is retail. He stated that the assumption is to address the parking needs which is the first thing for a retailer. Mr. Trandel reiterated that they would have more than the standard which he described as perfunctory.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that they envisioned more specialty shops such as bakeries and florists and conventional amenities which have not been in the Village for many reasons. He also stated that there have been a number of discussions with regard to restaurant concepts such as sports bars and that there has been a lot of interest. Mr. Trandel stated that the huge resource is the demographic base and that given the choice, people would chose convenience over spending money.

Mr. Trandel also stated that there would be high end restaurants. He stated that on a search committee on the west coast, he referred to brands in San Francisco with a local market and organic fare. Mr. Trandel informed the Board that there are interested wineries which centers around parking. He then stated that as you get into people who have more than one store, he referred to the scale where you make the product and distribute it in smaller spots which he commented is more savvy and that people would spend more money. Mr. Trandel stated that they have lived with the property for three years and that it has been raised repeatedly about parking and

having Class A investment grade retail space. He then stated that the other advantage is because of the newness and build-out for a restaurant and that retrofitting an old building for a restaurant would be difficult. Mr. Trandel concluded that they would attract a lot of restaurants who want to be on the North Shore.

Ms. Hickey then stated that there are restaurants closing here.

Mr. Trandel referred to McDonald's, Burger King, Taco Bell and food strips because of food court malls. He then stated that when it comes to pallet, people want a choice. Mr. Trandel referred to the death knell stand along restaurants and that it would not work. He stated that this would become truly a destination and that they need a critical mass of choices to attract people. Mr. Trandel added that if they had five more restaurants, it would be the best thing to happen to the restaurants.

Ms. Hickey stated that with regard to the florists around, she questioned whether they would vacate their space to come here. She then referred to the bakery which they lost years ago. Ms. Hickey asked if they were approaching other Winnetka businesses.

Mr. Trandel responded that they were not and that there are enough options out there. He indicated that some landlords are not the most ideal. Mr. Trandel then stated that the bigger issue is that they realize being committed for family owned shops. He informed the Board that there has been interest from CVS and Walgreens. Mr. Trandel also stated that they made a pledge as citizens that if there is an existing business here, they would not bring in businesses to compete with those existing businesses. He noted that they stopped the Petco discussions when they purchased the property. Mr. Trandel stated that as an objective, he referred to what Glencoe did with Writer's Theater and that they have spaces for that in town where they are directing their attention.

Ms. Hickey then asked how this would work in terms of whether they have a manager finding retailers and how long would the developer stay involved in the leases.

Mr. Trandel responded that they hired SRS Real Estate which has been very good at representing developers and that most retailers do not have the time to look at a plan and say that it would be ready in three years. He described it as more art than science. Mr. Trandel noted that the objective and partners in the project are generally local residents. He also stated that they were fortunate enough to sell more units off and hold and manage the retail portion. Mr. Trandel added that the leases would be minimum 5 year leases which are typical with 10 year leases with a 10 year option.

Chairperson Johnson stated that she attended the November DRB meeting and that the word "desolate" was used in describing the area. She asked the applicant if they meant the Fell building or the East Elm district in general.

Mr. Trandel responded that they were talking about their property.

Chairperson Johnson stated that they also referred to East Elm as being dated, chopped up and

hodgepodge.

Mr. Trandel stated that is being kind. He indicated that they were not referring to the other buildings in East Elm. Mr. Trandel indicated that there are a couple of buildings across the street which they attempted to mimic. He reiterated that some buildings would not be there in 10 years and that Neapolitan is moving. Mr. Trandel stated that they have talked to the businesses and that it is about the space with the big issues being the retail stock which he described as dated and old. He added that they need a jolt on the retail side to raise all of the ships.

Ms. Hickey referred to page 8 which related to public benefits and what was submitted to the Plan Commission or Village on August 26, 2015 as a breakdown of the developer contribution. She asked if it was possible to break it out.

Chairperson Johnson stated that the Board is not supposed to focus on the financial aspects of the project.

Mr. Trandel referred to a summary in the illustration and commented that it is a good question. He indicated that there are four ways to do it, one of which is to buy land. Mr. Trandel also stated that or either they could come up with a partnership with the Village owning assets which are parking and how to go about finding a partnership which provides enough contribution for what the Village would own one day and what it would cost the developer. He stated that since the area would be under construction, he referred to the huge economics if they were to do the garage at the same time and place. Mr. Trandel identified the offered contribution as 53.5% and the overall cost is 194 spaces in the commuter garage and 116 spaces on the east lot. He then stated that of that total expenditure of \$13.5 million including the plaza, he referred to the contribution though cash and soft costs significant to the development. Mr. Trandel concluded that the Village would end up with a new plaza and parking for 330 vehicles for \$6.2 million which he described as a steal.

Ms. Klaassen informed the Board that the PowerPoint would be on the website.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that they are not asking for money from the Village and that the question is that if the Village wants the garage, how do they go about collectively paying for it. He reiterated that there would be a benefit by having parking spots for retail.

Ms. Kumer asked does this factor buying land.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct and stated that it would be \$1.7 million in cash.

Ms. Kumer then asked if it included the building and the bluff.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct. He also stated that there has been some good discussion should there be other mediums and referred to if it is addressed in a timely way. Mr. Trandel also stated that since it is 22 feet down to grade, they might as well do two levels.

Mr. Naumann stated that with regard to the Village Council looking at this piece, as a resident, he

asked what the biggest risks to potentially overrunning construction costs are.

Mr. Trandel responded that the riskiest part of the entire project is when they go into the ground. He then stated that as a benefit, the first thing to do is the garage and that they would get the maximum pricing guaranteeing in a contract which is good in intricate spots like this. Mr. Trandel also stated that they would do a good job of staging in order to create as little disruption as possible. He informed the Board that there would be a signed deal with the Village and that cost overruns would be on their nickel for which they would go back to the contractor.

Ms. Kumer questioned whether permits would be required which would put the project in peril like the railroad.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that early on, they talked to Union Pacific. He agreed that is correct if they were to go into Union Pacific land but that since they are only dealing with Winnetka land, it would be ok. Mr. Trandel also stated that the other issue is that if construction for the parking garage is within 25 feet of the middle of the tracks, they would get flaggers, etc. which is a reason they would be further back than right up to the property line.

Mr. Blum commented that Wilmette and Glencoe are doing great and questioned what happened there. He stated that they have not had massive redevelopment and questioned what spurred that.

Mr. Trandel referred to the unintended consequences of putting the railroad tracks below and that all of the land is used up. He noted that Wilmette has parking lot after parking lot. Mr. Trandel also stated that Lake Forest is able to keep building and that they have more parking along the tracks to the north which is not landlocked. Mr. Trandel then stated that with regard to Kenilworth, businesses have gone there and that they did not have the density to reinvigorate what was their downtown. He indicated that it boils down to the fact that every answer involves a structured garage. Mr. Trandel then stated that the post office site considered structured parking years ago and the land by the Community Center. He described the project as a smooth solution which would be out of site and highly practical for commuters. Mr. Trandel added that it is an elegant solution.

Mr. Blum stated that while he understood, he did not understand the residential need.

Mr. Trandel responded that the residences are geared to the response of what people are looking for. He stated that there are not a lot of alternatives for people to raise families and stay in town without a home. Mr. Trandel then referred to the quick townhome sales on Hibbard and Winnetka.

Ms. Hickey asked Mr. Trandel when they conducted the open houses, what was the interest.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that they have the names of 44 people who wanted to buy. He referred to the people who raise families on the North Shore and who wanted to stay. Mr. Trandel added that Mr. Lagrange designs great homes, not apartments and that these are homes that people will buy.

Ms. Hickey then referred to the Lake Forest development of Westminster.

Mr. Trandel commented that is a lifestyle thing.

Chairperson Johnson asked Mr. Lagrange what he meant by his comment at the DRB meeting that he wanted the building to “touch the sky.”

Mr. Lagrange stated that the building has to sit on the ground and that is why it is more classical. He then stated that to reach the top that is an expression of the presentation of the architecture. Mr. Lagrange also stated that the building would not be chopped off and that it does reach and touch the sky although it would stop in a graceful way. He then stated that you have the roof which is how it would stop and that they would create a home with different materials on the roof.

Mr. Lagrange then stated that in Chicago, the best hotel is the Blackstone which he described as the best example of architecture in Chicago and that it has a beautiful roof. He stated that given that this would be a four and five story building, it would do the same. Mr. Lagrange stated that visually, your eyes stop looking at the roof. He added that they are not doing a classical, but a modern building. Mr. Lagrange also stated that with regard to context, it may be different architecturally and that on Elm, there is the use of different styles. He noted that the windows would be bigger than what would be done in a classical building in that they would come down to the floor. Mr. Lagrange also stated that there would be a lot of details that you would see inside and that they designed the homes for a lifestyle. He described it as a place where you come home and that it would not be an apartment. Mr. Lagrange added that it also is not Parisian but that it will be a building of style and represent where people want to live.

Chairperson Johnson asked if there were any questions.

Ms. Kumer asked the applicant if they considered a height change on the west side and if they considered a setback on the west side. She indicated that appeared to be where people’s heartache is.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that the building is smaller than when they started. He stated that they have had a number of meetings and that the most heartburn was on the east side closest to the neighbors.

Ms. Kumer commented that it is quite an imposing façade especially with the photographs of the person standing there.

Mr. Trandel stated that with regard to the difference between those examples, every floor is different and that those were photographs of monolithic buildings. He also stated that there is not one noted architect on the submitted buildings. Mr. Trandel stated that in connection with the context and texture of Mr. Lagrange’s structures, they do not feel large. He stated that at the end of the day, the cheapest asset you have to pay for the parking garage is air. Mr. Trandel indicated that in order to get it to pencil, he stated that he can provide the Board with the pro forma. He stated that all of the people involved realized that they have to do it right. Mr. Trandel noted that the added height is keeping the building a lot less dense when compared to what can be done by

right versus the amount of land they own and that it could be 40,000 square feet more of residential than what was pulled out of the plan.

Ms. Kumer stated that they are not selling a box. She then referred to what was done on the east side to alleviate the concern and commented that the west side appeared bulky.

Mr. Trandel responded that it did not look bulky. He then stated that when compared to 711 Oak which went straight across and is not contextual in terms of movement; it would not look bulky or boring. Mr. Trandel also stated that from a height perspective, it would not be 70 feet all the way across and referred to 4,000 feet on the center. He then stated that New Trier is taller than this and that there are backyards on four sides. Mr. Trandel stated that in terms of bulk, that building would be getting bigger and bulkier and that this is their downtown. He added that with regard to Lincoln, this is the front yard and that it goes over five to six acres of open space and the railroad tracks. Mr. Trandel also stated that for the people who drive by it and those on the train, they would comment "wow."

Chairperson Johnson questioned if part of the reason they want that corner taller and more massive looking is because they want the building to be a landmark.

Mr. Trandel responded that they are set on the course to do something special. He also stated that being noticed is not always bad.

Mr. Lagrange stated that in connection with the architecture, it represented an issue of scale and that the building would very much be in human scale. He stated that with regard to the ground floor, all of it is in the detail and indicated that what brings human scale is the detail. Mr. Lagrange informed the Board that he designed 65 E. Goethe which has a mansard roof. He then stated that an older woman told him that she loved what Mr. Lagrange does in that it makes her feel good by walking by the Goethe building. Mr. Lagrange also informed the Board that another woman told him that her life was made better living there which is what they want to do here. He added that they would provide a high quality lifestyle which is what the architecture will do.

Chairperson Johnson then stated that the Board would close the public hearing portion of the meeting and begin deliberations. She reiterated that they cannot do a final vote and that the Village Attorney would draft findings which are consistent with where a majority of the Board comes down. Chairperson Johnson asked the Board how they would like to proceed in terms of whether to continue the matter until January and do deliberations then have the Village Attorney draft findings of fact to adopt at the February meeting or whether the Board would prefer to do all of that tonight.

Ms. Hickey proposed that they all walk through the site together on a tour.

Chairperson Johnson stated that they cannot do that pursuant to the Open Meetings Act.

Mr. Camillucci also stated that there are notice and hearing issues involved in doing that. He then stated that is not to say that it cannot be done but that it imposed challenges.

Mr. Blum stated that they have gotten to the point where they know what the project is and that in connection with specific questions, they can bring them up and if not, do a preliminary test.

Chairperson Johnson asked how many Board members are not ready and asked for an indication of how they are leaning.

Mr. Lane stated that for some issues, they might have an opinion on where changes can be made. He suggested that they go through it and if that is the case, if the applicant is willing to make a change to make the Board be more favorable, they should be given the opportunity to do it as the Board has done in other zoning cases. Mr. Lane stated that there are things that they have issues with and that they would not be solved by his being quiet.

Chairperson Johnson asked if there were any other comments. She reiterated that even though there would be a vote tonight, unlike in other cases, the Board needed to direct the Village Attorney to draft findings of fact either in favor or against. Chairperson Johnson then stated that there has been a lot of deliberation and that some Board members may change their position based on other members' analysis.

Mr. Camillucci stated that it would be helpful for the purpose of drafting the proposed findings of fact and recommendation to the Village Council to have some deliberations first to help inform what is drafted for consideration. He then stated that after the Board has deliberated and reached a point where the Board knew the direction in which they are leaning in terms of making a recommendation to either approve or disapprove to the Village Council, at that point, they can then direct the Village Attorney to prepare findings of fact in support of that recommendation for the Board's consideration at a subsequent meeting. Mr. Camillucci stated that would give the Board an opportunity to consider and prepare and that the document would reflect that and that the Board can propose changes and that the Board would have an opportunity to do that. He then stated that eventually, they would get to the point where there is a document that reflected what the recommendation would be and that would be what the Board would vote on as a formal recommendation to the Village Council.

Chairperson Johnson suggested that the Board deliberate and see if they are ready to vote at the conclusion of the deliberations.

Ms. Kumer asked how late they would go.

Chairperson Johnson estimated 20 minutes for now.

Mr. Camillucci stated that if it would take a long time, the Board did not have to do that tonight and that they can continue the hearing and deliberation at a subsequent meeting.

Ms. Kumer then stated that since there is new information, she is interested to hear what the others have to say. She also referred to some material which was not updated which made it hard such as the loading zone.

Mr. Blum stated that there are specific factors to be looked at, the first of which he described as

broad relating to public health and safety. He stated that the Board is looking at a planned development application and not a special use application. Mr. Blum then referred to the standard relating to whether the special use would endanger or be detrimental to the public health, safety, comfort, morals and general welfare and stated that the development is not something that would complement and supplement the community. He also stated that there are significant safety issues which were discussed and the general welfare and that they are looking at open space issues and how the project would relate to the site, the area and how its use affected the business districts.

Mr. Blum reiterated that the development would not be complementary to the community and that they are in a situation where this has doubled the size from the previous development request. He added that the applicant is also asking for public land. Mr. Blum then stated that all of the negative aspects would be pushed to the fringe of the development. He questioned why can it not fit into the massive envelope as is. Mr. Blum added that they all have issues with safety and street flow and that he did not see the request as being a supplement to the general welfare for the community.

Ms. Hickey stated that she agreed with Mr. Blum's comments. She also stated that she is concerned about what kind of retail is being recruited – Mr. Trandel said that negotiations with PetCo had not materialized, generating and keeping retail business to fill this very large space, in addition to poaching existing Winnetka retailers, thus creating vacancies in other areas of Winnetka. Ms. Hickey then stated that she was thrown with regard to the bluff and that they need to look at the engineering of sheering of the bluff which has been part of the transportation system for a long time.

Ms. Hickey also stated that she is worried about traffic flow. She stated that there would be convergent driveways and the school issue. Ms. Hickey noted that between 3:00 and 4:30 p.m., there are children cruising down Elm and that she is worried about safety with the delivery and garbage trucks entering and departing. In addition she is concerned with the ingress and egress to the commuter lot ramp on Lincoln Avenue. It does not appear that this traffic plan has been finalized. Narrowing Lincoln or putting in a left hand turn lane (coming from the south on Lincoln) seems as if it would increase traffic congestion, especially if someone is exiting and turning left (going south on Lincoln). She then stated that she agreed with Mr. Blum's comment that the building would be very inward and creates a lack of public space even though a public plaza has been proposed. Ms. Hickey added that Winnetka has the Village Green which she described as the civic point in the Village as a gathering point. She indicated that the paved area proposed on Lincoln, which is currently Village property, may or may not enhance public gatherings. Ms. Hickey noted that the street is already closed for the antique car show which appears to be a big draw and this is done without a formal public plaza. She concluded by informing the Board that she is very pro-development and that while the property has to be developed, she is worried about whether it would supplement and complement the community and will change the character of Winnetka with respect to scale, scope, mass and height. The project as proposed, even with the revisions presented, is not in context with existing store fronts on Lincoln and Elm.

Mr. Naumann stated that he did not see these as issues. He stated that with regard to public health, etc., he did not see those as issues but that he saw the safety issue. Mr. Naumann stated

that for commuters and getting off the train and pulling off at the same time in different directions. Mr. Naumann also stated that there would be two lanes, but that there would be organized traffic flow and that the flow potential is organized better.

Mr. Naumann then stated that in connection with the comfort factor, he described a lot of it as subjective. He stated that his personal feeling is that it is what they are looking for in town. Mr. Naumann noted that a large portion of the community wanted development and a large portion values what they have in town for a long time. Mr. Naumann indicated that there is no right or wrong answer.

Mr. Naumann also stated that with regard to the first standard, the overriding issue is safety. He noted that there would be other bodies looking at this factor. Mr. Naumann then stated that while he is comfortable with other bodies looking at the issue, they should get to a place where everyone would come out ahead. He concluded by stating that he is also pro-development but that valued what they may offer the community.

Chairperson Johnson stated though there would be other bodies looking at the request, the Board is to look at it as is with no assurance that any specific thing would change for the better or worse. She informed the Board that some members of the Plan Commission said that this Board and the DRB would be looking at the request and seemed to think that made their decision easier. Chairperson Johnson then stated that to the extent the Board has concerns, this is the time to bring it to everyone's attention.

Mr. Blum stated that there is subjectivity in here and that there have been other instances where the Board did a subjective thing. He then referred to the request for fencing at the ball park and the issue of whether they would want to have that at the gateway entrance to the Village.

Mr. Lane stated that he agreed with Mr. Naumann and that the safety issue jumps out. He then stated that clearly, there are people who like and do not like the development and that the ones the Board hears are the ones who come here to talk. Mr. Lane commented that the traffic study was well done and that he is comfortable with the assumptions and that they discussed going in and out of the commuter garage which he described as important. He also stated that with regard to the biggest safety issue in that area, it was discussed.

Mr. Lane then stated that the other component that they also touched upon and which he commented can be managed and addressed are commuters walking across the bike path and safety. He stated that if they were to put signage up that would alleviate that issue and that he is comfortable on the safety side. He concluded by stating that things can be done to deal with the safety issues.

Mr. Kehoe stated that the standard relating to not endangering or being detrimental to the health, comfort, morals, welfare and safety is a pretty high bar to clear. He then stated that he is satisfied with regard to what he heard today and that the safety concerns can be mitigated with signage and normal traffic control. Mr. Kehoe stated that it should be within the context of the purpose and intent of the ordinance which is to permit a creative approach to the development and redevelopment of land that is devoted to multifamily and commercial uses and come up with and

encourage more creative and imaginative design for developments under the zoning ordinance.

Ms. Kumer stated that she agreed with regard to safety being an issue but being able to mitigate the factors toward risk. She stated that the overall, overarching thing that she looked at is whether the development would complement and supplement the community and that it is hard to say. Ms. Kumer stated that the development could change the character of Winnetka and that it is a big building. She then stated that as a train commuter, she referred to traffic and the encouragement of other commuters to come and park where she parked and that it did not sound great to her. Ms. Kumer concluded that it would be hard to predict how it would affect the character of Winnetka and that she is on the fence.

Chairperson Johnson stated that she would like to point out that the paradigm of something that will endanger the public health, safety, comfort, morals and general welfare, such as factories creating noxious fumes, cannot be built in Winnetka even with a special use. She stated that the Board should not even focus on the factory paradigm. What they are looking at is a really large site and there are a lot of ways in which to develop it. Chairperson Johnson stated that they talked about what can be done as of right and that there is nothing that they can do as of right since it is a planned development and that any commercial site would have to go before the DRB whether it is a planned development or not.

Chairperson Johnson then stated that there are lots of other things that the applicant could have done with the site and that while there are financial imperatives, there are other things that they could have done which would complement the commercial district other than thinking that everything in the commercial district would be torn down in the future. She stated that is her fear that they have the post office site which is the same size and that it is crying out to be developed. Chairperson Johnson then questioned what would they say when that site came before them in terms of what type of building it would be and whether it needs to be contextual.

Chairperson Johnson also stated that at the DRB's November meeting, the four members present stated that they thought the Beaux-Arts design and scale are not in context and that the development seemed like an island unto itself. She noted that the DRB contained architects and other professionals who work in this area all the time. Chairperson Johnson stated that she did not think that it is going to complement the East Elm District. She also commented that it is good that the developer lowered the east building but that still left the west building which is going to loom over the neighborhood and be a landmark beacon. Chairperson Johnson then stated that if they did need a landmark, it should be a civic building. The Village is not a city and that commercial landmarks belong in urban settings.

Chairperson Johnson stated that the Village has a lot of character and that there are many older buildings which hopefully will be brought up to whatever standard that Mr. Trandel and others thought they needed to be. She added that many look nice now. Chairperson Johnson also stated that with regard to existing development, she did not think that there are a lot of "disgraceful" retail spaces. She noted there are no vacancies on the north side of East Elm and that there are two vacancies on Lincoln north of Elm and some vacancies in Hubbard Woods, including the Antique Emporium which she described as very large as well as Panera.

Chairperson Johnson stated that even if the applicant could come up with ways to address the safety issues coming in and out of the underground parking garage, it is going to require a signalized stop light and that to have that in an area which has not even had a stop sign on Oak for many years is going to change the character and not complement the neighborhood. A stop light would also be unsightly. She then stated that if they were to put the underground access to parking on the site itself, safety would be significantly improved.

Chairperson Johnson went on to say that there are dozens of letters in the record and referred to the Hadley School and the impact on their students walking on Elm. She then stated that the trucks would be entering there and stated that the Hadley School is an established use which has been there since 1958. Chairperson Johnson concluded by stating that the first standard has not been met in her opinion.

Chairperson Johnson then referred to the second standard which stated that the special use would not be substantially injurious to the use and enjoyment of other properties in the immediate vicinity which are permitted by right in the district or substantially diminish or impair property values in the immediate vicinity.

Mr. Camillucci stated that ultimately, the Board is going to make its decision based on all of the findings. He then stated that a lot of the evidence in the record and a lot of their comments are going to address multiple factors. Mr. Camillucci indicated that it would be useful for the Board to structure their conversation going through the factors and that it is not necessary at this stage of deliberation to address each of them and that they should talk about the types of things that concern them and the things that they like.

Mr. Lane stated that he would like to do it this way.

Mr. Blum stated that at the end of the day, he referred to the process and which way do they go at it first. He stated that they are all going to talk about something on all of the factors and that it would not be that three factors are bad and two are good and that it is not a mathematical equation. Mr. Blum then stated that he did agree that there needed to be structure and that this is the type of conversation that needed structure. He went on to state that with regard to the Hadley School, it is a huge issue. Mr. Blum also referred to the diminishment of property values and the use and the Hadley School. Mr. Blum noted that they have heard testimony from the 711 Oak neighbors and that it would not benefit them. He then stated that on the other side of the street, he referred to the Arbor Vitae neighbors and stated that he asked about the building where Conney's is and that the applicant stated that the development would impair them and that there is a lot of evidence to say that this standard is not met.

Ms. Hickey stated that she agreed with Mr. Blum's and Mr. Lane's comments on how to proceed in discussing each standard individually.

Mr. Naumann stated that he also agreed with Mr. Blum and that it depended on the constituency in terms of the benefits. He then referred to the neighbors who expressed their concerns. Mr. Naumann also stated that he saw the need for critical mass having multiple restaurants to draw people. He stated that it would not be clear cut and that the residents who are close by would be

impacted negatively and that the business owners would benefit from the critical mass. Mr. Naumann concluded by stating that this one is less clear.

Mr. Lane stated that with regard to this standard, when looking at a typical one, this one is a narrow analysis in terms of diminishing property values and referred to a broader planned development. He also stated that upon his initial review of the materials, in connection with the value attributed to the land being vacated or sold by the Village, he questioned whether that is the Board's job or the Village Council's job. Mr. Lane stated that his view in general is that it could diminish property values if the Village is not reimbursed for the value of the property.

Mr. Lane then stated that the second point with regard to diminishing property values related to parking. He stated that there is a lot of parking here and that adequate parking is not the issue. Mr. Lane also stated that the payback on parking did not make sense and that with regard to recovery, there is no basis for the \$600 monthly revenue per space and that the payback period for the Village is likely much longer than the analysis shows. He added that in connection with the study done in 2006, they came up with a price of \$17,000 for a parking spot when it was being considered and that it was not done. Mr. Lane stated that while it may be a stretch, he felt that these are factors that could impact property value.

Mr. Naumann referred to the area down the street and the impact of landlords owning property. He then identified having more competition which would drive up the values of property as a question mark. Mr. Naumann added that in general, downtown and other homeowners could benefit.

Mr. Lane stated that a successful development would help the commercial properties around it. He stated that they would be looking at it as the Village's investment.

Chairperson Johnson stated that they have not discussed how the residential properties would be impacted.

Ms. Hickey stated that residents/occupants of 711 Oak, Arbor Vitae and Hadley School had presented their views on the potential for diminished property values.

Chairperson Johnson then referred to letters from the owners on Maple filing formal objections.

Mr. Kehoe stated that of all the criteria, this is the one that lends the most to activity. He stated that the appraisers are to give their professional opinions in connection with the development and the effect on property. Mr. Kehoe then referred to comparable sales in 711 Oak and the effect of the development on lease and sale prices. He stated that did not mean that they would diminish in value and that he would think that the commercial areas would increase because of foot traffic. Mr. Kehoe then stated that he is at a loss to understand why they have not done a better job.

Ms. Kumer described it as a mixed bag and that there did not seem to be any positivity from the neighbors residential-wise. She agreed that they need vibrancy downtown. Ms. Kumer then stated that with regard to critical mass, she is guilty of going to Wilmette where there are more restaurants and choices. She added that from a business standpoint, it would be positive.

Mr. Blum stated that he agreed with Ms. Kumer that they need critical mass and that the commercial area needed revitalization. He stated that the question at the end of the day is what an appropriate balance on that is. Mr. Blum then stated that while they need vibrancy there, that did not mean that this is the specific plan which is the best way to do it.

Ms. Kumer stated that there could be the use of this plan with modifications.

Chairperson Johnson informed the Board that there have been approximately 25 filed formal objections in the materials submitted. She also stated that the Maple homeowners are concerned about their property rights on the west side with the west building having views into their backyards. She referred to the fact that the applicant lowered the height of the east building but that means the units on the East façade of the west building will now have enhanced views toward the east that might impact the privacy of the Maple Street homeowners.

Chairperson Johnson then stated that in connection with the Arbor Vitae owners, no one wants to look at vacant space which is not kept up, but that the view from Arbor Vitae is not shielded by trees for nine months out of the year. She noted that the 711 Oak objections are included in the record. Chairperson Johnson also referred to the Oak Lane development right at the "T" intersection. Residents in those townhouses will be looking straight at the entrance to the underground parking ramp and the stop signs, and perhaps stop lights, controlling it. Chairperson Johnson reiterated that if there was underground parking access on the site itself as opposed it being on the street that would help. She also referred to Conney's and the other business owners who submitted letters. Chairperson Johnson then stated that the Village Green is already there for community gatherings. She stated that the current strategic planning process might reduce or eliminate the retail overlay district. Chairperson Johnson then stated that the development's retail spaces might then be leased by service uses which are not generally vibrant or contribute to sales tax revenue.

Chairperson Johnson then stated that the third standard related to whether the special use would not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of other property in the immediate vicinity for uses permitted by right in the zoning district.

Mr. Blum stated that this is the same issue with Conney's and that the development would be taking over Lincoln public space for private development at a loss of the development of other areas.

Ms. Hickey stated that it would set a precedent for future developments such as the post office site.

Ms. Kumer stated that it would be hard to say since there are no other buildings that would vary from the zoning ordinance regulations for other planned developments.

Chairperson Johnson identified the only other two sites like that as the post office site and Grand Foods. She noted that the post office is on a short term lease.

Mr. Blum then referred to the street closing.

Mr. Camillucci informed the Board that there has been no precedent legally approving or that it would not bind the Village to approve one or disapprove another.

Chairperson Johnson asked if there were any other comments with regard to standard no. 3.

Mr. Lane stated that he had no issue with the taking of multiple properties that need to be developed and the applicant doing it itself. He stated that it would not have an impact on how others develop their property.

Mr. Naumann stated that he had no concern.

Chairperson Johnson stated that the fourth standard related to whether adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress in a manner which minimizes pedestrian and vehicular traffic congestion in the public ways.

Mr. Blum stated that a lot has been covered already for the various areas where they see potential issues. He stated that in connection with the traffic, the commuter/retail lot and the traffic flow pattern in general, the concerns are down. Mr. Blum also stated that they are still ambiguous in connection with the severe congestion issues there. He then stated that with regard to pedestrians, there are a few ways in and out of the development. Mr. Blum added that there would be a huge increase in density with the amount of people and sidewalks which would be the same size and that he did not feel that they are scaled. He concluded by stating that he felt that some of the issues can be mitigated.

Ms. Hickey stated that she would echo Mr. Blum's comments and reiterate that in connection with the loading dock and garbage pickup issue, while deliveries can be scheduled, there would be the potential disruption of traffic. She stated that she also felt that the entry and exit into the commuter lot could be problematic. Ms. Hickey added that she appreciated that they talked about signage and signaling.

Mr. Naumann stated that they have talked about the size of the space and that it is large. He indicated that while there are limitations, there are tradeoffs. Mr. Naumann stated that while congestion would increase, there would be a more organized traffic flow. He also stated that he is confident that the Village would make sure that the safety issues are addressed in terms of pedestrians or vehicles and that he is more comfortable than at the last meeting. Mr. Naumann concluded by stating that there are some downsides.

Mr. Lane stated that in connection with the loading dock issue, if it was located inside, that would be a good solution. He then referred to the multiple trucks there and the ingress and egress underground which he commented would not work. Mr. Lane stated that it has been his experience in other retail locations where there are trucks holding up streets which bothered the residents and that it is clear that this is an issue that needs to be resolved and that it is a solvable problem.

Mr. Lane then stated that with regard to the sidewalks on Lincoln next to the building, they are only designated to be 8 feet and he commented that it is pretty narrow and that they are currently

12 feet. He stated that with retail, they would want outdoor seating and that pedestrians and traffic cannot use them. Mr. Lane indicated that the rendering showed pedestrians in parking spots and reiterated that the sidewalk on Lincoln is too narrow. He also referred to photographs of the parking lot entrances with big signs which state "Enter Here" and that the rendering did not have that. Mr. Lane concluded by stating that they need something like that to make sure that people know where to go in and out and commented that while it would not look good, they need it.

Mr. Blum referred to a dead end in the ramp which would require a three point turn with someone behind.

Mr. Kehoe noted that the number of curb cuts was reduced which contributed more toward safety and better pedestrian traffic. He also stated that the traffic study that was done addressed a lot of the issues and that the issues can be corrected with signage.

Ms. Kumer stated that she had nothing to add.

Chairperson Johnson stated that if it required signage or a signal, it would have a negative effect on the neighbors. She stated that while some problems would be solved, other problems would be created. She also agreed that the reduced number of curb cuts is good, but on balance she is more concerned about the safety problems of coming in and out of the underground lot.

Chairperson Johnson stated that the next standard related to whether adequate parking, utilities, access roads, drainage and other facilities necessary for the operation of the special use either exist or will be provided.

Mr. Blum stated that parking was hit heavily and that they have a number which is required by code. He then stated that employee parking represented an interesting question. Mr. Blum stated that they have focused on other facilities and utilities which ties into noise and air pollution such as the loading dock. He indicated that if it is out in the open, it would affect the surrounding people.

Ms. Hickey stated that she would defer comment and that they have not discussed the utility issue in detail and that she is not prepared to answer.

Mr. Naumann stated that with the information, they have talked mainly in connection with parking and access roads, utilities, drainage, etc. and that he is comfortable with those factors.

Ms. Hickey stated that she agreed with Mr. Blum's comment that parking has met the code in terms of the number of parking spaces.

Mr. Lane stated that they touched on upgrading the sewer systems and that there is evidence in the record. He then stated that with regard to parking, they have mentioned the issue with employee parking. Mr. Lane referred to planned development and that it is the standard to check and make sure that it would comply with the zoning requirements or that the applicant would be providing an adequate amount of parking. He stated that commuter parking is clear enough.

Mr. Lane then stated that on the employee side or generally for retail, there is misallocated parking. He stated that what is picked up by the Village as a responsibility is benefiting the developer. Mr. Lane also stated that the data on the parking study and the number of employees parking suggest that there is more parking than is necessary and is the responsibility of the developer. He indicated this is his comment in connection with overarching benefits, in moving 17 parking spaces to the garage, people who are parking to shop want to park at street level and that moving parking underground would have a negative impact on the retail locations. Mr. Lane then stated that there would be a lot more retail parking added which he described as positive.

Mr. Kehoe referred to drainage and the benefits of retaining water and slowly releasing it into the sewer system which would be an upgrade. He indicated that would alleviate the Hadley School drainage issue. Mr. Kehoe then stated that parking is adequate along with utilities.

Ms. Kumer stated that with regard to drainage, she referred to it as one of the costs that the Village would be paying and that putting in a bigger pipe would fall under the Village's contribution for a portion of that.

Chairperson Johnson indicated that any development would need that.

Ms. Kumer then commented that the KLOA study which was done was thorough. She then referred to it being done in May 2014 and that considering the economic downturn in the 2000's, she wondered if it referred to the Rich and Associates study to validate the numbers. Ms. Kumer indicated that certainly, there is an adequate amount of commuter parking and that there may be too much.

Chairperson Johnson stated that she would like to add that short term retail users would not be parking underground. She then referred to the study the applicant referred to from Portland, Oregon and stated that is a city not a village. Chairperson Johnson also stated that she is concerned with the east retail parking lot which would benefit the development but not necessarily retailers on Lincoln. Would customers of retailers on the northern part of Lincoln want to park in the east Elm lot? She wondered whether they could eliminate the underground lot, restrict commuters to the expanded east Elm surface parking lot, and restore the 90 spaces on Lincoln for use exclusively by retail customers. Chairperson Johnson then stated that she agreed with the elimination of commuter parking on Lincoln which is taking up retail parking. She indicated that people are already walking from the Community House to the train station so maybe commuters would be willing to walk from the east Elm surface parking lot.

Chairperson Johnson then referred to the last standard which stated that the special use in all other respects conforms to the applicable zoning regulations and other applicable Village ordinances and codes.

Mr. Blum stated that other Boards would be looking at the request and noted that while it is a planned development, it is important that they realize what they are dealing with. He stated that in the C-2 zoning district, the maximum height is 35 feet and three stories with an upper level setback and that planned development puts the standard at 45 feet and four stories.

Mr. Blum noted that the Plan Commission recommended granting exceptions to that standard and the code itself which says that the standard of 45 feet controls. He stated that this exceeds that controlling standard. Mr. Blum also stated that in connection with the purpose of the zoning ordinance overall, he stated that there is a planned development section and read from that section of the ordinance. He then referred to Chapter 17.04 which he would like to mention for context.

Ms. Hickey added that Section 17.58.030 talked about planned development and referred to Item No. C in connection with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Naumann stated that he had no comment.

Mr. Lane stated that he had no comment.

Mr. Kehoe stated that he had no comment.

Ms. Kumer stated that she had no comment.

Chairperson Johnson stated that she agreed with the provisions which were read from the Introductory Provisions/Objectives of the Zoning Code, specifically paragraphs 4, 5, and 6. She then asked Mr. D'Onofrio about Section 17.40.010(B)(2)(d) of the Zoning Ordinance, which prohibits public parking garages within 200 feet of a church or private school or kindergarten. She questioned if underground parking is considered a public parking garage.

Mr. D'Onofrio stated that he would look into that and that he would assume that it is not a public parking garage. He noted that there are different definitions of a public garage and commented that it would have been nice if that question had been raised earlier.

Chairperson Johnson then asked if there is an issue being 200 feet from the kindergarten on Oak.

Mr. D'Onofrio confirmed that is correct and stated that there was testimony that there is 145 feet to the intersection.

Chairperson Johnson asked the Board members to state where they would come down on balance.

Mr. Blum stated that on balance, he would be against a development of this size and structure of development. He thanked the applicant for their time and stated that while they want to see redevelopment of the area, he is not sure that this is the best plan for Winnetka.

Mr. Naumann also stated that he appreciated the work which was put into it and described it as extensive. He also stated that he could see the passion behind it and appreciated the residents close by and those concerns which were raised. Mr. Naumann stated that at the end of the day, you have to look at the benefits versus the risks and that he is in favor.

Ms. Hickey stated that she was pro-development, and appreciated Stonestreet's extensive and well-presented presentation, but, she thought that this particular project as presented did not fit in with the character of where Winnetka is as a Village. She is looking forward to the findings of the

current downtown village discussion being done by Teska Associates. She then stated that she would be opposed to the special use request.

Mr. Lane stated that he also appreciated the amount of work put into it and time and comments made by the community. He indicated that it is important to hear the views in dealing with something of this nature. Mr. Lane also stated that he would like to see something work here. He then stated that he is less concerned than the other Board members with regard to the impact of mass, the size and design on the Village. He indicated that he sees it as an issue and that he understood it. Mr. Lane added that the photographs have been very helpful.

Mr. Lane then stated that there are a handful of things and that based on the way the request was presented now, he would not be in favor of it. He stated that in terms of the value being diminished of property in the area, he referred to the purchase of the lots and that it is high. Mr. Lane also stated that it related to property values. He then stated that there was an assigned value to the land being vacated by the Village which he commented is potentially too low and would impact property values through taxes, etc.

Mr. Lane stated that with regard to parking, clearly it would be adequate. He indicated that there may be too much commuter parking and referred to the need for 20 or 30 spots and that it is not a 90% increase which meant that they would end up with the parking spots not being used. Mr. Lane stated that with regard to his experience in other areas, although every situation is different, in connection with underground parking, he is more concerned about that. He also stated that he agreed with the comments that parking underground for a winery would have a substantial benefit being outweighed by the fact the people did not like to park underground.

Mr. Lane went on to state that while there would be a mix of parking, if they calculated the numbers in different ways to determine how many are needed, it would be above what is necessary and comes down to parking spots for the applicant's property and retail versus parking spots for the Village and other retailers. He referred to whose responsibility it would be for parking and who the benefit is for.

Mr. Kehoe stated that he supported the benefits and that there is clearly an outweigh to the benefits. He described it as a good project.

Ms. Kumer stated that she is on the fence. She then stated that she appreciated the efforts to adapt what the various Boards' and residents' concerns were, especially in modifying the height. She stated that there are still issues with the commuter parking garage concept. Ms. Kumer then stated that in connection with the Village contribution, that is more for the Village Council's purview. Ms. Kumer also stated that there are bulk and density issues and that she is split down the middle. She then stated that the biggest factor as to whether the building would complement and supplement the community, a few say that it does. Ms. Kumer concluded by stating that outweighs the rest and that she would not be in favor.

Chairperson Johnson stated that she is generally not in favor of the request and that she appreciated the applicant making changes over the course of the hearings. She stated that she found the DRB meeting helpful in that they had very significant concerns with regard to the contextual nature of

the project. Chairperson Johnson then stated that everyone wants to work together and that the applicant needed to make it work financially, but that is not the Board's responsibility. She stated that there would be a significant change in the nature of East Elm and perhaps a domino effect. Chairperson Johnson noted that the Fell building did not fit in with the commercial districts' prevailing architectural styles when it was built in 1968. Chairperson Johnson concluded by stating that despite the fact that there would be wonderful architectural materials and superb high quality design elements by a renowned architect, it needed to be changed to fit in better and that she would not be in support of the project under its present configuration.

Mr. Camillucci stated that based on the discussion of the Board, they have the direction of moving forward to agree to make a motion recommending that the Village Council disapprove the special use for the planned development and if it is adopted, to prepare findings of fact and a resolution for the Board for the next meeting and that there may be additional discussion then. He stated that the Board can then vote on it as a formal recommendation for the Village Council. Mr. Camillucci stated that there needed to be a motion to direct the Village Attorney to prepare findings of fact and a resolution to recommend disapproval of the special use permit.

Mr. Blum stated that based on the testimony and public comment and the Board's comments, he would move to direct the Village Attorney to prepare a resolution recommending the denial of the special use permit for the One Winnetka planned development.

Ms. Hickey seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion was passed, 5 to 2.

AYES: Blum, Hickey, Johnson, Kumer, Lane
NAYS: Kehoe, Naumann

Respectfully submitted,

Antionette Johnson

**WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
JANUARY 11, 2016
EXCERPT OF MINUTES**

Zoning Board Members Present: Joni Johnson, Chairperson
Chris Blum
Mary Hickey
Thomas Kehoe
Carl Lane
Mark Naumann

Zoning Board Members Absent: Kathleen Kumer

Village Staff: Michael D’Onofrio, Director of Community
Development
Ann Klaassen, Planning Assistant

Village Attorney: Karl Camillucci

Agenda Items:

Case No. 15-10-PD: **Continued from the December 14, 2015 Meeting**
511 Lincoln Avenue, 513-515 Lincoln Avenue,
710-732 Elm Street, 740 Elm Street and a Portion of
the Adjacent Lincoln Avenue Right-of-Way
Stonestreet Partners and Winnetka Station LLC
Planned Development

511 Lincoln Avenue, 513-515 Lincoln Avenue, 710-732 Elm Street, 740 Elm Street and a Portion of the Adjacent Lincoln Avenue Right-of-Way, Case No. 15-10-PD, Stonestreet Partners and Winnetka Station LLC - Planned Development

Mr. D’Onofrio stated that this case has been heard at previous meetings and has been continued from the December 14, 2015 meeting.

Chairperson Johnson stated that the Board closed the public hearing portion of One Winnetka at the last meeting. She stated that there have been some letters and materials submitted by the applicant, some of which were in the Board’s agenda packet and some of which were submitted today and which would become part of the record. Chairperson Johnson then stated that the Board can proceed to vote on the resolution or that they could have additional comment. She stated that she could poll the Board members to see if they want to reopen the public hearing portion of the case in which case members of the public and the applicant may address the Board.

Mr. Naumann provided comment as to whether the Board should reopen the public hearing portion of the case.

Mr. Lane stated that he felt that they have had sufficient comment.

Ms. Hickey also provided comment.

Mr. Blum stated that he felt that the Board has heard enough and that he did not think that there needed to be and referred to the Plan Commission. He added that he felt that he had a good handle on that.

Mr. Kehoe stated that he would be opposed based on all of the comments.

Chairperson Johnson then stated that the Board would proceed to vote on the resolution and that all of them should have received a revised resolution. She stated that she would now let the Village Attorney explain why the resolution was revised.

Mr. Camillucci stated that the Board has a draft before them which is a resolution for their consideration and that the Board's direction at the last meeting was to prepare a resolution recommending the denial of the approval. He stated that when they first talked about the process to prepare a resolution, they obviously did not know yet that the Board was going to direct the resolution to recommend the approval or denial recommending that the zoning ordinance requires for approval certain affirmative findings to be made. Mr. Camillucci stated that in the case of recommending denial, those findings did not have to be made and that the way that the resolution is structured, it basically finds that the Board did not make the required findings. He stated that as the basis for those findings, the resolution will incorporate by reference the minutes of the public hearing and the totality of the evidence which has been received by the Board as reflected by those minutes which will be the basis for the resolution.

Mr. Camillucci stated that today, as part of the public hearing as well, the final minutes will not be available for approval until the next Board meeting so that the resolution is structured in a way that will include the provision that says that upon approval of the minutes of the Board, they will be incorporated by reference in the resolution without further action by the Board which is the procedural way of including the minutes. He then asked if there were any questions with regard to the resolution.

Chairperson Johnson stated that she wanted to explain that they now have the November minutes and that the December meeting minutes were not available and should be available within the next 7 to 10 days. She asked Mr. D'Onofrio to circulate the December minutes before the February meeting so that the members can submit via email any corrections to those minutes. She stated that in addition, the portion of this meeting tonight devoted to One Winnetka will be very short and that she would like those draft minutes also circulated so that at the February meeting, the Board will have already submitted all of the changes. Antionette will be able to make all the changes by the time the minutes are approved at the February 8 meeting, and the record can be transmitted to the Village Council within the 30 days required. Chairperson Johnson asked that the Board members attend to them as soon as they get them so that Antionette can make the changes. Chairperson Johnson then asked if there were any questions. No questions were raised by the Board at this time.

Chairperson Johnson stated that the other point that she would like to make is that for a negative resolution, if you are in favor of the resolution recommending denial of the proposed development, you would vote yes and that if you are not in favor of recommending denial of the planned development, you would vote no. She asked if there were any questions before the roll call vote. No questions were raised by the Board at this time.

Chairperson Johnson then asked for a motion to approve the resolution on the planned development.

A motion was made by Mr. Lane and seconded by Mr. Blum to approve the resolution recommending denial of the planned development. A vote was taken and the motion was passed, 4 to 2.

AYES: Blum, Hickey, Johnson, Lane
NAYS: Kehoe, Naumann

Chairperson Johnson confirmed that the motion passed and asked for a quorum check for the next month's meeting on February 8, 2016.

Respectfully submitted,

Antionette Johnson

**WINNETKA ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
RESOLUTION
RECOMMENDING DENIAL OF A PRELIMINARY PLAN FOR A PLANNED DEVELOPMENT
FOR THE ONE WINNETKA PLANNED DEVELOPMENT
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS CASE # 15-10-PD**

**(511-515 LINCOLN AVENUE,
710-740 ELM STREET, AND
PORTION OF ADJACENT LINCOLN AVENUE RIGHT-OF-WAY)**

WHEREAS, Winnetka Station, LLC, owns the property located at 511-515 Lincoln Avenue in the Village, and PSB/Elm Street, LLC, owns the property located at 740 Elm Street in the Village (collectively, the ***“Applicant-Owned Parcels”***); and

WHEREAS, an application for approval of a preliminary plan for a planned development (the ***“Application”***) has been submitted by Stonestreet Partners, LLC (the ***“Applicant”***), for the Applicant-Owned Parcels and an irregularly shaped portion of the adjacent Lincoln Avenue public right-of-way measuring 7,767 square feet (the ***“Adjacent Right-of-Way”***), which the Applicant proposes to purchase from the Village and consolidate into the Applicant-Owned Parcels (collectively, the Applicant-Owned Parcels and the Adjacent Right-of-Way are the ***“Subject Property”***); and

WHEREAS, the Applicant desires to: (i) develop the Subject Property as a mixed-use planned development consisting of a mixed-use building with commercial space on the first and second floor and residential units above; and (ii) construct certain public improvements on Village-owned properties, including construction of new public parking, reconstruction of existing public parking, construction of a public gathering space and plaza, construction of other streetscape improvements, and replacement of a public water main, all as further described in the Plan Documents defined below (collectively, the ***“Proposed Development”***); and

WHEREAS, the Application has been designated as Zoning Board of Appeals Case No. 15-10-PD and consists of a request for approval of a preliminary plan for a planned development on the Subject Property to permit the Proposed Development; and

WHEREAS, a public notice for Case No. 15-10-PD was duly published on October 22, 2015, in the *Winnetka Current* and a public hearing was held on the Application at the Zoning Board of Appeals’ meetings on November 16, 2015, December 14, 2015, and January 11, 2016 (collectively, ***“Public Hearing”***); and

WHEREAS, a sign was properly posted on the Subject Property indicating the time and date of the Public Hearing, and all property owners within 250 feet of the Subject Property were notified of the Public Hearing by United States mail; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Board of Appeals has considered all the evidence presented to it regarding the Application and the Proposed Development, including, but not limited to, the following:

1. The Winnetka Zoning Ordinance, which is codified as Title 17 of the Winnetka Village Code (the ***“Zoning Ordinance”***), including, without limitation, the standards for approval of special use permits and the standards for approval of planned developments set forth in Chapters 17.56 and 17.58 of the Zoning Ordinance, respectively;

- 2. Site plan, floor plans, elevations, preliminary engineering plans, traffic study, perspective drawings, and other documents submitted by the Applicant related to the Application and the Proposed Development and included in the record of the Public Hearing (collectively, the *"Plan Documents"*); and
- 3. All written testimony received and all oral testimony heard at the Public Hearing by the Zoning Board of Appeals concerning the Application and the Proposed Development; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Board of Appeals has determined that the Proposed Development does not satisfy the standards for approval of special use permits and planned developments set forth in Chapters 17.56 and 17.58 of the Zoning Ordinance and desires to recommend that the Village Council disapprove the Application for the Proposed Development;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Village of Winnetka, Illinois, **THAT**:

Section 1. Findings.

A. Standards for Approval of Special Uses. Pursuant to and in accordance with Chapter 17.56 of the Zoning Ordinance, and as further described in the approved minutes of the Public Hearing that will be incorporated into this Resolution in accordance with Section 3 of this Resolution, the Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the Proposed Development, as a whole, does not conform with the standards for approval of special uses set forth in Section 17.56.120 of the Zoning Ordinance, which standards are set forth below:

- (1) The establishment, maintenance and operation of the special use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, comfort, morals or general welfare;
- (2) The special use will not be substantially injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity which are permitted by right in the district or districts of concern, nor substantially diminish or impair property values in the immediate vicinity;
- (3) The establishment of the special use will not impede the normal and orderly development or improvement of other property in the immediate vicinity for uses permitted by right in the district or districts of concern;
- (4) Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress in a manner which minimizes pedestrian and vehicular traffic congestion in the public ways;
- (5) Adequate parking, utilities, access roads, drainage and other facilities necessary to the operation of the special use exist or are to be provided; and
- (6) The special use in all other respects conforms to the applicable regulations of the Zoning Ordinance and other Village ordinances and codes.

B. Standards for Approval of Planned Development. Pursuant to and in accordance with Chapter 17.58 of the Zoning Ordinance, and as further described in the approved minutes of the Public Hearing that will be incorporated into this Resolution in accordance with Section 3 of this Resolution, as a whole, does not conform with the standards for approval of planned developments set forth in Section

17.58.110 of the Zoning Ordinance, which standards are set forth below:

- (1) The proposed planned development will not either endanger or be detrimental to the public health, safety, comfort, morals or general welfare, in that the proposed development will complement and supplement the community given the nature of the business;
- (2) The proposed planned development will not either substantially diminish or impair property values in the immediate vicinity, or be substantially injurious to the use and enjoyment of land in the immediate vicinity for uses permitted by right in that zoning district;
- (3) The proposed planned development will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of other property in the immediate vicinity for uses permitted by right in the zoning district;
- (4) Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress in a manner which minimizes pedestrian and vehicular traffic congestion in the public and private ways;
- (5) Adequate parking, utilities, access roads, drainage and other facilities necessary for the operation of the special use either exist or will be provided; and
- (6) The proposed planned development in all other respects conforms to the applicable zoning regulations and other application of Village ordinances and codes.

Section 2. Recommendation: The Zoning Board of Appeals recommends that the Village Council disapprove the Application for approval of a preliminary plan for a planned development to permit the Proposed Development on the Subject Property.

Section 3. Public Hearing Minutes: After the Zoning Board of Appeals approves the final minutes of the Public Hearing, the approved minutes of the Public hearing shall, without further action by the Zoning Board of Appeals, be incorporated into and made a part of this Resolution as if fully set forth in this Resolution.

Section 4. Transmittal of Resolution to Village Council: The Zoning Board of Appeals authorizes and directs the Village’s Director of Community Development to transmit to the Village Council, within 30 days after the close of the Public Hearing, an executed copy of this Resolution and the approved minutes of the Public Hearing.

Section 5. Effective Date: This Resolution shall be effective from and after its passage and approval in accordance with law.

[SIGNATURE PAGE FOLLOWS]

ADOPTED THIS 11th day of JANUARY, 2016.

AYES: Blum, Hickey, Johnson, Lane

NAYS: Kehoe, Naumann

ABSENT: Kumer

NON-VOTING: None

al
[Redacted Signature]

Joni Johnson, Chair
Winnetka Zoning Board of
Appeal

ATTEST: */ /*

[Redacted Signature]

Director of Community Development