

Design Review Board Meeting Minutes and Findings

1. November 19, 2015 Meeting
2. January 21, 2016 Meeting
3. February 18, 2016 Meeting (to be provided)
4. February 18, 2016 Design Review Board Findings

**Winnetka Design Review Board/Sign Board of Appeals
November 19, 2015**

Members Present:

Bob Dearborn, Acting Chairman
Brooke Kelly
Paul Konstant
Peggy Stanley

Members Absent:

Kirk Albinson
Michael Klaskin
John Swierk

Village Staff:

Brian Norkus, Assistant Director of Community
Development

Call to Order:

Chairman Dearborn called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Chairman Dearborn stated that he would be acting as chairman for the meeting since John Swierk is absent. He then asked if there were any comments or corrections to be made to the October 15, 2015 meeting minutes. No comments were made.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the October 15, 2015 meeting minutes. On a voice vote, the motion was unanimously passed.

Case No. 15-10-PD: Preliminary Review of Planned Development Application by Stonestreet Partners and Winnetka Station LLC, for the properties at (a) 511 Lincoln Avenue, (b) 513-515 Lincoln Avenue, (c) 710-732 Elm Street, (d) 740 Elm Street and (e) a Portion of the Adjacent Lincoln Avenue Right-of-Way

Chairman Dearborn stated that the order of business for tonight's meeting would be for Mr. Norkus to provide a brief overview of the Board's role in this process followed by a presentation by the applicant. He then stated that would be followed by questions from the Board and then public comment, and that they are hoping to conclude the meeting by 10:00 p.m.

Mr. Norkus provided a PowerPoint presentation and described the scope of the Board's review in the context of the overall planned development review process. He stated that the Board is generally accustomed to seeing applications where the Board is the final authority on matters of design applications such as modifications to existing buildings, additions to buildings and even new buildings. Mr. Norkus stated that the Planned Development review process differed somewhat from the typical development review in that it has an extended public review process in which three advisory boards provide a recommendation to the Village Council. He stated that on top of those three boards advising the Village Council, he stated that it is important to point out that the review process is divided into two steps which are preliminary review followed by final review.

Mr. Norkus stated that the application is currently at the preliminary stage, and that the Board may make a recommendation to the Village Council and issue findings as to whether the project is either consistent or inconsistent with the Village's adopted standards. He stated that the Village Council, after considering the recommendations of the three boards, may choose to grant preliminary approval; if preliminary approval is granted the applicant would then return to the same three boards with more detailed plans for subsequent final review.

Mr. Norkus then stated that as previously mentioned, the Design Review Board is one of three bodies making a recommendation to the Village Council. He stated that in addition to this Board, the Plan Commission is to make a recommendation relative to the plan's consistency with the 2020 Comprehensive Plan and the ZBA is to evaluate the request with regard to its consistency with the standards also contained in the zoning ordinance. Mr. Norkus stated that all three Board's recommendations would be presented to the Village Council which has final authority to approve.

Mr. Norkus stated that the procedures set out in the zoning ordinance call for the Design Review Board to evaluate the project in terms of its compliance with the Village's Design Guidelines, which he described as an approximate 80-90 page document which was developed over a period of several months and adopted by the Village in 2001. He noted that the Guidelines are intended to provide a standard to evaluate proposed building alterations and developments in the downtown area as well as for institutional uses such as schools, parks, churches and multiple family residential developments, to ensure that new designs retain a contextual relationship with the Village and the immediate surroundings.

Mr. Norkus informed the Board that the *Design Guidelines* are divided into two main categories which include *Buildings and Architecture*, followed by a somewhat shorter section which addressed standards for the public spaces such as streetscape, parking areas, and the like.

Mr. Norkus stated that with regard to the *Buildings and Architecture* section, it is divided into five smaller sections which include recommendations on *Building Mass, Proportion and Scale, Building Articulation, Building Materials* and then more fine grained details with recommendations on *Service Areas on Secondary Elevations and Parking Structures*.

Mr. Norkus then stated that in connection with the standards, there is rather lengthy language in the guidelines dealing with each of these subjects, but that he would only briefly touch on each of them. He stated that the section on *Building Mass* includes recommendations on appropriate setbacks, height and roof form, and presented an example of one image depicting recommended roof slope.

Mr. Norkus stated that the section on *Proportion and Scale* provides guidance on maintaining an attractive pedestrian scale and a contextual relationship with the surrounding business districts. He also stated that it provided guidance on breaking down the mass of a building through

establishing patterns of horizontal and vertical rhythm, as well as through articulation of the façade through fenestration patterns, changes in building materials and changes in building plane. Mr. Norkus identified the figure as a graphic representation of the recommended hierarchy of public commercial space over the private upper level space through emphasis of the ground floor space with a higher degree of transparency and increased ceiling height compared to residential floors.

Mr. Norkus explained that the section on *Building Articulation* provides more finely grained recommendations on details such as building entries, windows and doors as well as some ancillary elements such as lighting, signage, awnings and mechanical equipment. He stated that section also provided recommendations as to both appropriate and inappropriate building materials.

Mr. Norkus stated that the standards which follow deal with recommendations on pedestrian zone and pedestrian circulation recommendations and provides guidelines on the configuration of the public realm. Mr. Norkus referred to the configuration of sidewalks as well as decorative paving and tree grates and stated that it also provided recommendations on plant material and pedestrian amenities such as benches, lighting, waste containers, bicycle racks, etc. He stated that the guidelines conclude with recommendations for the configuration and design of parking areas, loading zones and landscaping.

Mr. Norkus indicated that the *Design Guidelines* are available on the Village's website for those in the audience who would like to review.

Chairman Dearborn asked the Board if they had any questions. No questions were raised by the Board at this time. He then stated that they would begin with a presentation by the applicant followed by questions from the Board and then public comment.

David Trandel introduced himself to the Board as a part of the development team and stated that he appreciated the opportunity to present the request to the Board. He also stated that there are members of the development team present and that he would provide the Board with background as to how they got here. Mr. Trandel stated that more importantly, he would try to address any questions and try to bring the life what for the last two years has been two-dimensional. He stated that as they start delving into it and getting more granular in terms of the materials and the liveliness that would come with the materials they planned to use, the style and intricacies, they would be able to create something that they would all be proud of.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that he is a resident of Winnetka and that he has two children in the public schools and that he is a frequent user of the business district and the commercial district. He then stated that taking on this project was more about what Winnetka can be and looking forward to the future and respecting the past and history by creating something that embraced that and be contextually relevant and also give lifestyle choices which currently do not exist in the Village. Mr. Trandel stated that they began the project from the need perspective which Mr. Norkus discussed and which related to parking, how they handle parking and traffic flow and how

to create an environment that is conducive for attracting the type of retailers that as a resident are looking forward to seeing and experiencing. He then stated that for many of the retailers, 77% of them want are geared around restaurant choices, lifestyle choices, boutiques and things that can be a convenience factor for today's lifestyle which are driving retailers and driving families' decisions.

Mr. Trandel then stated that one of the beautiful aspects of their plan is to create terrific public spaces which do not exist now. He also stated that although the business district currently has hardscaped areas, they do not have what he would call an inviting sense of a place where you could meet. Mr. Trandel stated that there have been a lot of references to things which are timeless and their architecture, but that with regard to public spaces, whether it is in Europe or other wonderful plazas throughout the world, he stated that those are hardscaped. He stated that the Village Green is home to several community events, but that the Village Green is not part of downtown, and that the proposed public plaza is very exciting with the benefit of it being both beautiful and functional, with its hardscape areas being a place to accommodate festivals and art fairs, etc.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that they would hear from architect Lucien Lagrange and whose pedigree included residential and commercial spaces and is unparalleled in that field. He stated that the Board would also hear from Dan Weinbach who is also a nationally recognized landscape architect. Mr. Trandel then stated that they started the project trying to create something which would be highly functional and that in the process, if they were to pay attention to detail, they would be able to create something which is really beautiful.

Mr. Trandel stated that to put those in perspective, he stated that it is very difficult for the average citizen who is not involved in real estate or design to conceptualize. He stated that they often talk about height, dimensions, width, etc. which he described as esoteric. Mr. Trandel then stated that when professionals look at a plan, they consider the site and context and that as the Board is familiar, it meant trying to find something which would both be respectful to the neighbors and which is also functional.

Mr. Trandel stated that they have a particularly large site and noted that to his knowledge, a site of this size has never been developed in Winnetka. He stated that with it, it creates some wonderful opportunities and that if you were to look at it on in a box or on a piece of paper, it would not thoroughly be understood and that you have to walk and envision the space.

Mr. Trandel stated that as it related to the design, they ended up with three distinct buildings and that while it is a planned development and special use permit because of the overall size of the project, as it related to the actual allowable density, they would be below those numbers which are allowed by right. He then stated that rather than pack in a bunch of units and density and square footage, they tried to create something that could be valuable but make up for what they do not pack in through architectural nuance and context and the types of materials they planned to use.

Mr. Trandel noted that this is a very expensive design and referred to the intricacies, the windows, the insets, etc. and that it would not be a “hit and run” development but that on the contrary, this would be a labor of love and that in order to do this right, they are attempting to create something special. He then stated that when talking about context and the size of the site, he informed the Board that to the south, there are 38 residences at 711 Oak which he indicated may be the most units in any particular development in Winnetka. Mr. Trandel also stated that their lot is half the size of this one.

Mr. Trandel then stated that overall, the lot measured 60,000 square feet and that it would have its own east building with its own architectural nuances, a west building which would have between 30 and 40 units and 20 units on the east building. He stated that in the middle, they planned to focus on creating open space with deference being given to the south neighbors. Mr. Trandel also stated that on the retail side on Elm, they tried to create something unique to pay respect to the history of Winnetka and also bring in different architectural styles through Winnetka. He indicated that you see Tudor, Gothic Revival and Beaux-Art styles and that they would embrace those themes in the design. Mr. Trandel stated that he would introduce Mr. Lagrange who is available to provide additional details. He also informed the Board that Mr. Lagrange created valuable and beautiful residences throughout the world and Chicago. Mr. Trandel stated that he has worked with him on the Waldorf Astoria, the JW Marriott renovation and 10 E. Delaware and that they have a history of working together. He then stated that all told, Mr. Lagrange has done 27 projects in Chicago which bear his design signature. Mr. Trandel informed the Board that they have assembled a team which is a credible backbone team of architects as well as world class engineers, traffic engineers, etc. to create something special.

Lucien Lagrange stated that starting from the beginning which he estimated to be 2½ years ago, he got a call from Mr. Trandel with regard to working on a project in Winnetka and that he said yes right away. He stated that they have all done high quality and successful projects and that he wanted to work with him. Mr. Lagrange then referred the Board to an illustration and indicated that it is important to understand the context. He stated that there is a lot here and that it contained an old one which is one here and two stories. Mr. Lagrange then stated that the site is very underused and that it did not respond to Elm or the large site which measured over an acre in dimension which he described as substantial and the train station. He stated that it is a very important site that they want to bring back up and respond to the context.

Mr. Lagrange stated that the first context is Elm Street, which he described as a beautiful retail street, but which has one side missing. He stated that they are responding to the large open space which is how they started to think about it. Mr. Lagrange then stated that responding to the large open space, they wanted to have a large façade and a large open scale and that proportion was considered. He stated that they broke it down into several components and the major part of the building related to the Bennett plan which anticipated having a large structure right on the axis of the Village Hall. Mr. Lagrange stated that the Lincoln Avenue elevation has two wings flanking a central element, and that the Lincoln Avenue elevation turns the corner to Elm Street in a very

gentle way responding to the acute angle at the corner.

Mr. Lagrange then referred the Board to slides of artistic renderings which he indicated are very much in scale. He stated that they do computer drawings first which show the vision and intentions and that then they generate the renderings. Mr. Lagrange stated that they wanted to show something soft and referred to the roof, the difference in materials and the windows. He stated that they wanted something which says that this is a residential building and not an office or institutional building.

Mr. Lagrange stated that another thing which happened with the façade is the fact that Lincoln is very large and that it has parking on both sides and that above the train tracks, there is 20 feet. He indicated that they thought that was an opportunity to use that side for something else. Mr. Lagrange stated that as you turn, you have Elm which he identified in an illustration and which he stated has a different scale. He stated that at that point, they brought down the scale to respond to Elm with the use of a three story building. Mr. Lagrange stated that now, you would have a building with anchoring on both sides.

Mr. Lagrange then referred the Board to an existing illustration of Elm Street. He also referred the Board to an illustration of the north side of the street and the 25 or 26 foot height which he indicated gave them a clue as to what they should do on the south side of the street. Mr. Lagrange then stated that with regard to the massing, they subdivided the site which he described as very large and reiterated that it amounted to over an acre. He noted that they put a midrise building on Lincoln which would be facing the open space. Mr. Lagrange then stated that on the east side, they moved the building as far as they could on the site facing east and that in between that, they created a large open space, creating an open court facing south, where the residential drop-off and entry would be located, away from the main streets. He then stated that in connection with the east building, since there is quite a bit of terrain going down toward the east, which he estimated to drop 20 feet from Lincoln Avenue to Maple Street. Mr. Lagrange stated that the east building was stepped back, following the existing slope of the site by dropping 10 feet in height at both the 4th and 5th floors.

Mr. Lagrange went on to state that for the traffic for the drop-off, the loading dock and access for parking, they created a setback to create a driveway of approximately 24 feet wide and that all of the traffic will be off of the street. He then referred the Board to an illustration of the site plan with regard to traffic. Mr. Lagrange informed the Board that they reduced the amount of curb cuts on Elm Street from four to two, which he indicated would be sufficient for the traffic.

Mr. Lagrange then stated that for parking, he referred the Board to an entry which he identified from Lincoln. He stated that the amount of traffic on the street would be minimized and that he parking on Elm would be kept the same as it is today.

Mr. Lagrange referred the Board to the drawings which would show what the project would look

like in the end. He informed the Board that the base which is retail would be clad similar to that used on the Village Hall and limestone as shown in the illustration and the samples. Mr. Lagrange also stated that they planned to create an entry which is more formal to the residential spaces as the second entry.

Mr. Lagrange noted that they wanted the building to look very residential which started with the entry. He then referred to the windows and the different size fenestrations which would reflect that with smaller windows in the bedrooms and larger windows in the living rooms as well as balconies and railings in front of the windows which would result in a strong residential character.

Mr. Lagrange informed the Board that there would be a mansard roof on top. He stated that the base would be created so that the building sits down on the ground which he commented is very important. Mr. Lagrange also stated that in order to reinforce the building horizontally, he identified the retail space, the brick and that they would have the same fenestration for retail. He added that they planned to use a band of limestone again and that the building would be sectioned into four buildings. Mr. Lagrange reiterated that the roof would be a beautiful mansard roof.

Mr. Lagrange went on to state that with regard to the Elm Street elevation, the buildings would have a totally different scale. He referred the Board to an illustration and stated that it would terminate at the corner and that they have a round corner. Mr. Lagrange referred to the building setback and step back and the fact that they reduced the massing in this area. He also stated that on the fifth floor roof, they would make it a four story building and a roof and that in between, there would be five townhomes which they can mix together with Tudor architecture. Mr. Lagrange noted that they would keep retail on the ground floor and have townhomes for the two stories on top. He then informed the Board that they recreated Tudor on the street.

Mr. Lagrange then stated that with regard to public parking, he referred to the setback of the wall and that they would have a brick wall, landscaping and trees and that you would not be able to see parking at all. He also identified the entry with the only curb cut on this side.

Mr. Lagrange stated that with regard to the south elevation which is where the traffic would come, he identified the dock, entry and exit to parking and that it would be recessed 60 feet. Mr. Lagrange also identified the entry to the two buildings. He indicated that you can see the backside of the townhomes and that there is one story on top of retail and the entry to the townhomes.

Mr. Lagrange informed the Board that with regard to the east elevation, he referred the Board to a through section which showed parking and the landscaping. He noted that the five townhomes are shown separately as well as the retail shown at the base of the building. Mr. Lagrange stated that retail is necessary to bring life to the retail street. He also stated that they planned to copy what is on the north side.

Mr. Lagrange referred the Board to the townhome details on this façade. He indicated that there

would be a brick base and then some limestone and windows along with wood and a metal roof. Mr. Lagrange noted that the signage would be limited here for retail and that they want to control signage. He then identified another style of different architecture for the townhome and that the same concept would be carried. Mr. Lagrange also stated that the next townhome would have Tudor with different architecture.

Mr. Lagrange then identified the vehicle entry and main entry from Lincoln which he described as more formal. He noted that there would be two light fixtures flanking the entry and decoration on the doors. Mr. Lagrange also stated that the stone work will be subdivided by stone which would be approximately 18 inches high which he commented is a strong human scale and that every 2 feet, there would be a reveal. He indicated that this would create a very formal and richly detail entry. Mr. Lagrange noted that the base would be a grayish granite color and that it would be highly detailed. He then identified the entry for the motor court for the residential entry and the rear of the townhomes. Mr. Lagrange reiterated that they planned to create a plaza for the residents.

Mr. Lagrange referred the Board to the bay window detail on the east and west sides. He then stated that for retail, they want to use black storefronts and single glass so that there is no reflection. Mr. Lagrange indicated that it is important for retail with regard to how it is done. He stated that also, sometimes a retailer may want one or two doors or one or two bays and that the final configuration of entrances and storefronts is still flexible. Mr. Lagrange then stated that there would be a strong cornice and that for the west building, all of the amenities for the building would be for the tenants which include a swimming pool. He also stated that with regard to the brick and fenestration, the windows would represent a 40% opening with the wall being at 60% and which would be well insulated and very efficient. Mr. Lagrange added that they would all be double glazed glass and that all of the windows would be wood frame. He informed the Board that they are very concerned with regard to how to do it from the inside out and that it is very important with regard to what happens inside. Mr. Lagrange then stated that they divided it into four different bands of materials on each floor and that the windows would extend to approximately 20 inches from the floor in order to make it more vertical.

Mr. Lagrange went on to identify the main samples of the materials. He noted that there would be railings on the balconies which would be black. Mr. Lagrange reiterated that the windows would be wood and metal on the outside in order to protect the windows. He noted that the retail windows would be black windows. Mr. Lagrange also informed the Board that the retail windows would be very narrow metal and not heavy and would contain single glass. He then identified the limestone sample for the Board which he indicated is similar to the Village Hall. Mr. Lagrange also stated that in connection with the brick, they wanted something which would be warm and which is more orange than red. He then stated that with regard to the base, it would be a dark grey material which he identified for the Board. Mr. Lagrange stated that the landscape architect designed the gray stone to work well to go on the sidewalk and that the ground floor would be all stone. He reiterated that there would be a metal roof and identified the sample for the

Board. Mr. Lagrange added that they did not want something which is so uniform but with a pattern if possible.

Mr. Lagrange informed the Board that with regard to one important aspect, he referred the Board to the yellow line shown in the illustration and identified the plaza on Lincoln in the rendering. He stated that they are planning to have two levels for the underground garage for commuter and retail parking and that would allow for the plaza planting, paving for functions when closing off traffic and that the rest of the time it would be two-way traffic. Mr. Lagrange noted that it would be landscaped with trees for the plaza. He also stated that for antique car shows, book fairs, etc., they designed the space for that to happen which he described as friendly with trees and landscaping.

Mr. Lagrange then referred the Board to the plaza and drop at the edge of the train. He also identified the embankment at 24 feet going west and stated that they planned to use that space and put a wall and parking east of the wall. Mr. Lagrange noted that there would be a stairway and rail going from the plaza to parking and a pedestrian bridge to the train station. He also stated that there would be trees and planters. Mr. Lagrange then informed the Board that the parking wall would be facing west and that they are planning to do a highly detailed wall. He indicated that the plan is to have vines grow and vegetation at the base. Mr. Lagrange then stated that because of the geometry of the parking, there would have to be a cantilever of 5 feet to the property line of the railroad track. He informed the Board that the 25 feet in that area is to allow for visual site lines. Mr. Lagrange concluded by stating that there would be plantings on the top of the western at the edge of plaza.

Daniel Weinbach of Daniel Weinbach Partners introduced himself as the project's landscape architect with offices located in downtown Chicago. He informed the Board that he has worked with Mr. Trandel and Mr. Lagrange on two projects and that they have done quality work. Mr. Weinbach then stated that they have heard a lot about context already and that he would describe the site plan and site landscaping and hardscape in detail. He referred the Board to an illustration of a series of green roofs and referred to panels of carpet which would be green roofs. Mr. Weinbach then stated that the main element of the site development is the plaza area and identified Elm and at second level, the courtyard space which would be used as an amenity deck for the residential units facing it and commercial on the side. He added that on the first floor, there would be the main driving space and motor court drop-off for the residents.

Mr. Weinbach then identified the plaza on an illustration and stated that with regard to the paving, it would all be pavers. He indicated that there would be a series of different colored pavers in the street itself and that the pavers would be darker. Mr. Weinbach stated that he has samples for the Board's review and identified them being grayish in color and that there would be a very warm color for the street panels. He then stated that the central plaza will be a browner or reddish brown color. Mr. Weinbach stated that with regard to the street trees against the building, he stated that they planned to use hybrid oak trees which are called Regal Prince Oak. Mr. Weinbach stated

that for the main landscape element, he referred to two shade trees which would emerge from a granular material and compacted stone. He then stated that underneath, there would be six trunks coming up from the paving which would allow for the maximum use of the entire space during normal times or during festivals where all of the space would be useful.

Mr. Weinbach went on to state that along the edges, there would be a planter on the inside edge with boxwood and lilac along with other plant materials which he identified for the Board. He stated that the idea is for the area to be a plaza during the day and that it appears to be a street with two gardens on either side and that the festivals would be filled with activity.

Mr. Weinbach then identified the specific materials which would be used in the plaza. He stated that there would be a grayish paver used in the street in a pattern which he identified for the Board. Mr. Weinbach then stated that the central panel would be more brownish-reddish and that it would be the same paver. He also stated that along the building and in the pedestrian areas, it would be a lighter gray used directly against the limestone, crosswalks and surrounding the trees on the west side of the street. Mr. Weinbach then referred the Board to images of specific pavers in an illustration.

Mr. Weinbach stated that at the entrance of the building, there would be granite stone cut and which would extend into the sidewalk and represent the entrance to the building. He also stated that in connection with the granular material, the trees would come through it. Mr. Weinbach described it as a technique used in Europe, the Washington Mall, etc. He then referred the Board to samples of the granular material and the granite.

Mr. Weinbach stated that up a level, he identified the amenity deck and the courtyard space. He also stated that the residential units would be going around on the two sides and that there would be commercial on one side. Mr. Weinbach informed the Board that they planned to do a border of evergreen shrubs with lights embedded. He also stated that they would separate the space from the residential units themselves and that it would be intended for use by the residents. Mr. Weinbach described it as a simple structure and that there would be a couple panels of grass and in the center and an open fire pit. He then stated that at the end, there would be an outdoor kitchen and grills and table and space for outdoor dining. Mr. Weinbach referred the Board to the blocks which are indentations of the alcove spaces for groupings of three, four or six family members to gather there. He added that there would be benches as well. Mr. Weinbach then stated that there would be magnolia trees, ground cover periwinkle and other minor landscaping and perennial flowers.

Mr. Weinbach went on to identify the round entrance to the motor court. He informed the Board that there would be brownish pavers which would reappear in this spot. Mr. Weinbach then stated that the actual drive-around surface for the drop-off to the residences would be at this point. He described it as a fairly active area and stated that in the center, there would be a water feature and

surrounding that would be boxwood with annual flowers. Mr. Weinbach then referred the Board to the fire pit in an illustration which he described as an elegant and simple table-like structure which would become the center focus of the courtyard. He also stated that the fountain in the motor court would be similar to that shown in the illustration and that it would be tiered or layered. Mr. Weinbach referred to the surrounding planting and stated that in the winter, he described it as a strong object which would remain visible.

Mr. Weinbach then stated that with regard to the planting palette, he identified the use of Honey Locust, Regal Prince Oak at 30 feet and Triumph Elms among other landscaping material. He stated that on Elm Street, they planned to replace the existing elms in the same position if they are damaged by construction and that they would be replaced with like trees. Mr. Weinbach stated that they planned to use Japanese Tree Lilacs for the plaza and Saucer Magnolia and spring display flowers. He also stated that there would be a boxwood hedge around the fountain and plaza and that yews would occur in the courtyard space with the amenity deck. Mr. Weinbach stated that they planned to use Gro-low Sumac near the ramp to the garage and periwinkle and a sedum blend on the roof. He indicated they can have a good variety of texture and color interest. He added that there would also be a series of perennial flowers with a shade tolerant mix in the courtyard space which he identified for the Board.

Mr. Weinbach stated that with regard to the landscaping lighting plan, he referred to the suggestion of a strong lighting plan to define the area. He then stated that currently, Lincoln and Elm are lit with very tall industrial looking light fixtures and that there are very few with two on each side of the street. Mr. Weinbach described them as invisible during the day. He informed the Board that they are proposing the use of a series of yellow colored fixtures and a gooseneck figure bell shape LED which would have strictly down light. Mr. Weinbach commented that it has character and that it would go with the classic and contemporary look of the project. He then stated that the other fixtures would be double sided lights and that there would be lighting for the planting areas and the street. Mr. Weinbach stated that with regard to the driveway to the building on the south side, there would be lights directly off of the building. He indicated that it would be a very simple wall light along the wall lining the plaza which would provide definition to the edge of the plaza. Mr. Weinbach added that in connection with the motor court, he stated that the blue color which he identified as small 21 inch bollard lights and stated that they planned to embed them into the plant beds as much as possible. He also stated that on the outside, they will be single sided and that those in the center of the space would have a 360 degree light. Mr. Weinbach then referred to the photometrics of the light fixtures and informed the Board that they would be projecting a uniform distribution of light of 1 to 2 foot candles.

Mr. Trandel then stated that they are hopeful that from Mr. Lagrange's and Mr. Weinbach's descriptions, they were able to get a sense of what the quality and type of material would be as well as a sense of the space they are going after. He indicated that it would be very inviting, safe and that it would create a magnet to attract activity and pedestrians which is what the retailers want and

that active areas tended to be safer. Mr. Trandel concluded by stating that they have not skimmed on material cost and that it is important to note that if it is done right, the project can be the focal point of the Village and be something special. He then asked the Board if they had any questions.

Chairman Dearborn thanked the applicant for their presentation and also asked the Board if they had any questions.

Mr. Konstant asked with regard to the trees in the parkway and courtyard, would they be planted at grade or would they have them in planters.

Mr. Weinbach responded that those would be planted in the soil below grade. He informed the Board that there would be a layer between the street and the ceiling of the parking garage in which it would be sunk into. Mr. Weinbach also stated that they would plant in a wide bed of soil.

Mr. Konstant stated that the illustration is showing a 10 foot floor and asked if they did not need 4 to 5 feet to grow trees.

Mr. Weinbach stated that they will get the right amount of soil and that they want to be able to use the entire space.

Mr. Konstant stated that the guidelines that the Village established are for things like pavers and asked the applicant if they have not looked at it at all. He also referred to the lighting.

Mr. Weinbach confirmed that it was looked at. He then stated that a typical sidewalk is a combination of concrete and pavers on the edge. Mr. Weinbach stated that they are proposing pavers because of their higher quality. He then stated that the same would be done with the street which would not normally contain pavers since it would represent a dual function. Mr. Weinbach added that since it is a planned development, they are not strictly conforming to the guidelines.

Mr. Konstant questioned north versus south lighting on Elm.

Mr. Weinbach stated that they would love to have lights on both sides of the street.

Mr. Trandel stated that they should match.

Chairman Dearborn asked if that is that part of the proposal to match the north and south lighting.

Mr. Trandel stated that in the scheme of the cost of the project, they did not want to presume and if that is the intent, they would be happy.

Mr. Konstant then stated that with regard to LED lighting, he described it as a new thing which has

come a long way. He stated that he had read negative effects in connection with LED lighting and that they are being removed from villages. Mr. Konstant asked the applicant if they were aware of that. He referred to the fact that the light wave such causes a reaction which makes it difficult to sleep when exposed to it.

Mr. Weinbach indicated that he was not aware of that and that all manufacturers are using LED lighting.

Mr. Konstant commented that it is a very handsome building. He stated that the problem is with the relationship to the rest of the Village. Mr. Konstant then stated that with regard to scale of the building at the street, 14 feet is the typical ceiling height at the first floor in town. He stated that while it seemed like a very handsome building being incorporated into Winnetka, he commented that he liked the overall feel and wondered if the guidelines were looked at by the architects when working on the building.

Mr. Trandel stated that with respect to the height and scale of the first floor, the height is driven more by what they feel it would take to attract top shelf retailers. He stated that the building would have 35,000 square feet of retail. Mr. Trandel then described most of the retail in Winnetka as very dated, not conducive and very challenging in that it is chopped up into small spaces.

Mr. Konstant indicated that it looks like the right proportions when comparing first floor to the rest of the building, but stated that he has concern regarding the relationship to the surrounding streetscape and adjacent buildings.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that the floor to ceiling height on the first floor would be 17 feet floor to floor and that they need 4 feet for heating and air conditioning. He also stated that restaurants, and many retailers, would want high ceilings. Mr. Trandel then referred the Board to an illustration of the street and stated that a good comparable at one point to the street level is approximately 13 feet. He also stated that the window heights across the street may be 10 feet and that these would be 13 feet.

Chairman Dearborn referred to the context of the commercial space on Elm Street, and asked for clarification of the height of the proposed buildings relative to what exists across the street to the north.

Mr. Trandel responded that building heights vary across the street, primarily a mix of three-story and two-story buildings, as well as Mirani's at one-story. He also stated that because they are individual buildings, there are not consistent window lines. Mr. Trandel stated that some of the buildings across the street are good and some of them are not, relative to meeting modern tenant demands. He added that with respect to the first floor height issue, it is difficult to create something new which is viable, while matching existing building scale of buildings which are

much older.

Mr. Konstant stated that for the building being tall at the base that it sat at, he commented that it seemed appropriate relative to what's going on above, clarifying that the concern is relative to the existing context such as across the street.

Mr. Trandel stated that when comparing the height of new to existing, some of the buildings on the north side will be there in 50 years and some will not.

Chairman Dearborn asked for clarification regarding the larger, eastern-most building, and it's location relative to what's across the street.

Mr. Trandel noted that Arbor Vitae goes right into it, and is located where the former Baird & Warner office is located now. The design of the building is unique in that the proposed two setback areas are of a different material from the main building. Mr. Trandel informed the Board that it was intended to look like its own building and setback. He described the eastern building's location relative to the main building at Elm and Lincoln, noting that there is a large expanse between with three townhome units stepped back at the upper floor. Mr. Trandel stated that there is a sharp slope along the site as you go west, and that there is the Village Parking lot between the building and Hadley School to the east, then four homes on Maple Street, and the Village Green.

Mr. Trandel stated that they have attempted to address the interests of Arbor Vitae residents, noting that when you come down Arbor Vitae currently you are looking at a lot of nothing. He stated that they planned to create some architectural and landscape elements which would be beneficial for them. Mr. Trandel also stated that they are working on how to do loading so as to not be overly commercial in terms of noise.

Chairman Dearborn commented that the grade line seemed a little odd.

Mr. Trandel stated that the street comes down going east, and that there is a very large slope, maybe 12 feet, going down from the corner of the building at Elm and Lincoln to the east edge of the Village Green.

Chairman Dearborn asked for clarification on the height of the proposed east and west buildings.

Mr. Lagrange informed the Board that the slope from the west corner of the building to the east corner is 4½ feet, and explained that the east building is 62 feet high.

Mr. Trandel informed the portion of the west building has a five story height that measures only 9,000 square feet in area, and is a small portion of the overall building area, approximately 17%. He noted that they tried to push the masses out to the edge both to create open space and to not be

monolithic, compared to stacking 45 feet and looking like a box.

Mr. Trandel also stated that they would create a lot of public benefit and long term solutions to retail parking. He referred to the sense that setback shown for the east building is an important architectural element as it eases the grade, especially for the vantage point from Village Green, as opposed to having 45 feet up which would be by right.

Mr. Trandel stated that on the west side near the railroad is the appropriate place to have the height near the center of the Village. Mr. Trandel then identified the tallest spot on the west building as the architectural element which is the penthouse at six stories, occupying 3,000 square feet. He also stated that they wanted to create movement in terms of height.

Mr. Lagrange stated that they needed the penthouse to break the mass into different parts, and to serve as the axis on the building.

Mr. Trandel then stated that there is 6 acres between Village Hall and the development site, and noted that the increased height at the center of the west building not unlike Village Hall.

Chairman Dearborn asked if the height for the eastern most portion is the same as the westernmost portion and if it is taller because of the slope.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct and stated that it is similar to the Mews which has a similar condition where it is higher when viewed from the west.

Chairman Dearborn then stated that with regard to the pedestrian walkways, in the context of Winnetka, he referred to walking down the street on a sidewalk next to a building that size relative to a building being 25 feet in height across the street. He stated that it is one thing to do it in Chicago and questioned whether it would be imposing.

Mr. Lagrange stated that as you walk on the street, you are aware of what is happening at the street level, and that the detail at the base catches your eye, and that you hardly see above the third and fourth floors. He stated that he has done a 60-story building, and what you see at the sidewalk is the ground floor. Mr. Lagrange added what is across the street and the dimension to between buildings is also important in establishing scale; if there is good retail and good streetscape, that is what you would see.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that in connection with the lighting on the cornice, it would be framing where you would be walking. He also stated that with regard to the landscaping and lighting, he described lighting as a very important piece which would make it inviting.

Chairman Dearborn asked if there were any other questions.

Ms. Stanley stated that she is curious with regard to the resulting width of what Lincoln Avenue would be. She clarified that she is questioning not the plaza portion, but the entry and exit portion.

Mr. Trandel responded that the Elm Street right of way is that of a typical street at 65 feet and that currently, Lincoln Avenue is 93 feet. He noted that the Village also owns the land that is the bank leading down to the bike path and that the bike path is on Metra property. Mr. Trandel stated that the below grade parking garage would be approximately 20 feet away from the Green Bay trail.

Mr. Trandel stated that from a traffic perspective, it is very awkward now and that no one stops at Lincoln and Elm. Mr. Trandel stated that the reason is that they do not have a hard corner. He also stated that in connection with the existing building which he identified for the Board, he described it currently as asymmetrical, stating that they would be bringing the new building out toward the west to line up with the building line established on Lincoln Avenue north of Elm Street.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that the result is that they are moving Lincoln Avenue 22 feet to the west. He stated that the net difference is that the right of way would still be very wide at 80 feet which stated that it would be 13 feet less wide than it is now.

Ms. Stanley asked for clarification on the entrance to the below-grade parking.

Mr. Trandel explained that drivers could access the garage from coming either from Elm Street or Oak Street; drivers coming from Elm Street would come up Lincoln Avenue and turn right, and that drivers coming from Oak Street would be able to come up Lincoln Avenue and then turn left into the entrance.

Ms. Stanley then asked with regard to corner near Phototronics, how wide is that section.

Mr. Trandel responded that it is 80 feet.

Mr. Konstant clarified that the question is regarding the width curb to curb, and whether there would be two-way traffic.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that there would be two-way traffic. He then identified the sidewalk which would be the same size street as Elm and the walkway.

Mr. Lagrange informed the Board that from curb to curb, it would be 24 feet and that there would be two-way traffic. He also stated that there would be parking along the sidewalk area.

Ms. Stanley asked if there would be 7 parking spots on the plaza.

Mr. Lagrange responded that there would be some in front of retail which amounted to 7 spaces which he described as the minimum amount.

Mr. Trandel added that it would be parallel parking on the east side of Lincoln Avenue.

Mr. Konstant asked if there would be parking on the west side of Lincoln Avenue.

Mr. Trandel stated that there would be 7 short-term spaces on Lincoln Avenue, but that they would be adding 60 spaces to the Village-owned lot on the east end of the site for short-term use, doubling the size of that lot.

Mr. Trandel stated that there would now be 188 parking spaces underground. He stated that commuter and employee parking are currently located in a number of different zones, including the Community House lot, as well as on-street parking on Lincoln Avenue and Green Bay Road. Mr. Trandel stated that they are attempting to ease the congestion at peak hours, and that retailers currently suffer due to the need for commuter parking. He then stated that with 188 parking spaces in the garage, it is their hope that it would be filled with permit parking, freeing up other more desirable street parking for retailers. He also stated that the lack of parking downtown rippled out to Indian Hill and Hubbard Woods and that clearing up the congestion here would result in better traffic in Hubbard Woods and Indian Hill.

Mr. Konstant asked what the zoning requirements are for parking for the building.

Mr. Trandel responded that there is one parking requirement for the retail and one for the residential; he stated that they are proposing 123 residential parking spaces beneath the building, which would serve a planned 70 dwelling units, explaining that the number of dwelling units could be less. Mr. Trandel indicated that they would be providing a few extra parking spots than are required under code.

Mr. Trandel stated that commercial parking is also required for the proposed 35,000 square feet of retail, which they are proposing to provide through expansion of the existing Village parking lot to the east, which would be expanded by building a scissored garage which would be half below grade and half above grade. Mr. Trandel stated that 35,000 square feet of retail and 7,000 square feet of second floor office require a certain amount of parking and that they are adding more than that. He stated that in the aggregate, there may end up being extra parking, referring to developments in areas such as on the Gold Coast as being over parked. He then stated that if that is the case here, they would open it up to employees for the retail tenants.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that they are adequate on the amount of parking and that reiterated 123

parking spaces would be for the residents only with 63 parking spaces for retail. He stated that the benefit of that would be to attract the type of restaurants which they are in discussions with, the commuters would be gone by 6:00 or 7:00 p.m. and that on the weekends, it would be empty, allowing for use of commuter parking by restaurant patrons or for special events such as festivals, the Fourth of July, or parades.

Ms. Stanley stated that with regard to the parking garage, when you come through the door, she asked if you would have to cross the Green Bay trail to get to the train tracks.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct and that with regard to the 5 feet for the overhang of the plaza, you would walk 15 to 20 feet before you get to the Green Bay trail. He indicated that it can be managed. Mr. Trandel stated that it would be a concern if the building went right up to the bike trail but explained that there would be 20 feet.

Ms. Stanley also asked if there would be two elevators.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that nothing changes with the station itself, explaining that the two elevators serving each platform of the Metra station would be unaffected. He stated that the below-grade garage would extend 22 feet from the eastern edge of the pedestrian bridge, and would be served by an elevator and stairs from street level to the two levels of parking below.

Mr. Trandel stated that lowering the tracks was a major improvement for the Village but referred to the unintended consequences of lowering tracks being the gulf between east and west Elm. He stated that the project would bring the two sides together, describing it as a neat solution to both the separation between the districts and the parking shortage. He then stated that Winnetka is unlike Lake Forest which has the benefit of an unlimited amount of land by the railroad tracks and the fact that there is nowhere to go here but up, or in this case down.

Mr. Konstant described it as a good solution and that having the parking hidden is a very good solution. He referred to traffic and parking above ground which may be an issue and that there have been people who have obviously studied that.

Mr. Trandel agreed that they have spent a lot time on traffic being studied. He stated that they have to think about when it is being used and that people do not all leave at the same time and that they are sensitive to that. Mr. Trandel also stated that an important detail with regard to parking is that it would be an open area with natural light and that it would have green vines facing west and eliminate the feeling like you are in an underground garage.

Mr. Konstant then referred to the portion which appeared to be cantilevered.

Mr. Trandel identified the correct illustration and confirmed that it is cantilevered and that it would

provide shelter and give texture. He stated that are a lot of interesting opportunities and that all of the landscape to the ground is to get garden clubs, etc. and that it can be energized with bike rentals. Mr. Trandel stated that it would create activity with riding bikes and that in the middle of town, it would be a nice place to energize.

Chairman Dearborn stated that in the context of pavers and the building, a comment was made that in connection with the brick, they wanted to have it be warmer versus the use of red. He commented that the building is commendable as is in terms of detail, but that it would be very different than the surrounding buildings, even with the use of Tudor and other elements. Chairman Dearborn also stated that the use of orange and the other colors would make it more different. He questioned how they came to the decision that it would fit in with the neighboring commercial buildings in the area. Chairman Dearborn also stated that it would make it an island building in itself with so many different elements and asked how it would fit in with the community which is part of the design guidelines.

Mr. Trandel responded that it would be a place to live. He stated that the idea is to look at the materials as warm and inviting. Mr. Trandel noted that a majority of the homes built in the area over the last 20 years are classical in form. He indicated that while across the street, it may be stucco, he described it as hard to create a sense of residential appearance and draw and referred to the difference of the homes versus the apartments across the street which he described as night and day. Mr. Trandel also stated that while context is important, he referred to raising the bar and creating something which did not exist right now.

Chairman Dearborn noted that one of the differences is there is no Design Review Board for residential, and that some new homes are contextual and some are not. Chairman Dearborn stated that as you look at the design guidelines and put it in context of the neighboring buildings, even though it is commendable in many ways, it is also different in so many ways.

Mr. Trandel noted that the 711 Oak as built in the 1970's and asked do they want a building which looked like that now. He then stated that the biggest influence on the proposed building is Village Hall, and that it would be very complementary to that style. Mr. Trandel stated that with regard to influential structures, they also considered the building at 735 Elm Street which was renovated recently. He stated that they looked at the Community House which he commented is awesome and unique. Mr. Trandel then stated that they are attempting to create their own personality and be respectful and added that there is not a ton to play off of in that part of town.

Chairman Dearborn stated that with regard to the coloring, he asked if this is what Mr. Lagrange thought would fit the best in terms of context and the neighborhood.

Mr. Lagrange stated that it is a more complex answer. He informed the Board that they spent a lot of time thinking about it and responding to the context of Winnetka. Mr. Lagrange then stated that Winnetka as a Village is very eclectic and has architecture with many different bricks. He referred to a building on Oak Street which he described as a beautiful building which is very similar to this one. Mr. Lagrange stated that it contained some of the elements that do exist in Winnetka and added that with regard to limestone, there is no question, there is a lot of use of limestone, noting that the Village Hall has limestone.

Mr. Lagrange then stated that the Tudor building on Elm has strong roof, and that they have that here. He indicated that they would bring the same elements, in an eclectic way.

Mr. Konstant asked for clarification on the roof material.

Mr. Trandel clarified that the roof is a metal finished to appear like copper with a patina.

Mr. Lagrange also stated that in connection with the brick, it would have a very modern line and referred to the building on Oak which they looked carefully at in terms of the brick for this building. He agreed that they are different.

Ms. Stanley stated that the problem is that the Board is charged to look at what is consistent with the design guidelines and that she is struggling with the applicant's claim to be different.

Mr. Trandel stated that there are three areas, and that it is hard to generalize because the size of the site is so big. He indicated that there are a number of French provincial styles all over. Mr. Trandel then stated that with regard to Elm Street elevation, they tried to capture various styles. He also stated that with regard to the residences themselves, he noted that the east building would be half the size of 711 Oak and that the west building would be smaller than 711 Oak. Mr. Trandel then stated that both the west and east portions are unique themselves. He also stated that when you have such a large area, you did not want too much of a hodge podge. Mr. Trandel added that the area where they wanted to create interest is Elm since it contained the human element. He reiterated that it is a challenge and that they did not want it to be monolithic.

Mr. Konstant stated that there are guidelines and that this building would be a very strong piece of architecture. He also stated that it would be a lot larger in terms of space and form and that they respect that. Mr. Konstant stated that it is a very big structure and that to him, it would not be a complementary structure. He then stated that if things are done well standing alone, he referred to the context of the design guidelines and that it would be hard to say it works in the community, which he stated is the biggest problem for him. Mr. Konstant added that with regard to the

articulation of Elm, they do not want a Disney-like downtown. He then stated that although there are a lot of good things about the proposal, he would have a hard time supporting it.

Mr. Trandel reiterated that it is a challenge. He stated that if they did what was easy which is to do what would be allowed by right, no one would like that either and commented that what it would look like would be awful. He also stated that it would have to be economically viable and that there are a lot of things that they are trying to solve for, while trying to keep the scale appropriate.

Ms. Stanley stated that she agreed with Mr. Konstant's comments. She indicated that it would help her to have the elevations of the buildings next to it and the heights of the buildings across the street on Elm as well as for 711 Oak which is 43 or 45 feet. Ms. Stanley stated that she would like to look at it in comparison along with the storefronts which she indicated would be helpful.

Mr. Trandel responded that they could do that as it relates to the storefronts and stated that they have the design guidelines and referred to the size of the glass relatively and the 60% rule which is what the market desires.

Ms. Stanley stated that the design guidelines say for the second story to be 20% less than the first story. She then stated that if the first story is 17 feet, then the second story should be 14 and that the ratio is different in the proposal.

Jeffrey Burt stated that the design guidelines dictate the idea is for a 20% reduction from the first floor to the second floor. He then stated that what would be roughly 14 feet would not be conducive to residential or office space.

Ms. Stanley suggested that maybe 17 feet is the problem and that the heights in the design guidelines say 14 feet.

Mr. Konstant stated that they are saying cannot do the building at 14 feet.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct and stated that it has to be designed to be commercially appropriate to the end users. He informed the Board that for a new restaurant, 10-foot finished ceilings are not going to happen, in that no high end restaurant will consider it. Mr. Trandel referred to the design as to what good retailers want also. He also stated that while they respect the design guidelines, it should not be held to too rigidly.

Ms. Kelly stated that with regard to her comments, she agreed with the comments that it no doubt would be a beautiful building and referred to the care and detail in connection with the plaza and parking. She stated that the problem is that they are a Village and not a city. Ms. Kelly then stated that the scale of the building would be overwhelming for the type and size of a community they are. She stated that if it was in Evanston or another larger community, it would be perfectly

appropriate and that, but this Village has a totally different scale. Ms. Kelly also stated that is not to suggest that over time the Village won't see any new buildings, but that the height proposed is of a completely different place.

Mr. Trandel referred to the fact that height of 72 feet would occupy 3,000 square feet of a 6 acre site.

Ms. Kelly stated that the buildings across Elm Street are 24 feet.

Mr. Trandel noted that the buildings on Elm are not all the same, and that there are three story buildings on Elm. He then commented that beauty is in the eye of the beholder and that they respect the opinion of the Board. Mr. Trandel went on to state that they tried to create something from the massing side which would be interesting. He then stated that if they were to go back to the alternative which is by right 45 feet, it would be another 711 Oak.

Ms. Kelly stated that it didn't need to be 40 feet, but it didn't need to be 70 either.

Mr. Trandel noted that the building would not be 70 feet all the way through.

Mr. Trandel stated that they ultimately must get something that can get Village approvals, and which can get financed and built. He noted that the current proposal is not the first iteration submitted, explaining that it has gone through several revisions as requested. Mr. Trandel stated that they could have went with something bigger and felt that economically, the proposal would relieve more of the burden on the building. He informed the Board that they have responded to a lot of commentary to shrink and reduce the building while also attempting to provide improvements to Village assets which the Village would continue to own. Mr. Trandel added that it would not be a wildly profitable venture and that it is highly risky and extremely expensive.

Chairman Dearborn referred to all of the commentary which was made in the context of the design. He stated that the others boards and the Village Council are to deal with other issues in a different context. Chairman Dearborn then stated that what he is hearing that while they like the feel and design, they are to look at the location relative to other properties which is where the rub is. He then stated that at other meetings, the Board will be looking at light fixtures, signage and detail elements. Chairman Dearborn stated that the presentation is scratching the big surface here. He then asked if there were any other comments from the Board. No additional comments were made by the Board at this time. Chairman Dearborn stated that they would now open the meeting to public comment and asked that the comments be brief and kept under five minutes.

Don Falloon informed the Board that he is a 30 year resident. He described the proposal as extraordinary and commended Mr. Trandel in considering taking a risk in the face of the waves of vacancy and the long term vacancy in this location. Mr. Falloon then stated that in order to make

the proposal viable, the design has extraordinary detail and is thoughtful. He described it as a complex situation and that there have been thoughtful and appropriate solutions. Mr. Falloon also stated that he would like to commend Mr. Trandel for commissioning Mr. Lagrange.

Mr. Falloon also stated that it is a neighborhood issue. He then stated that in the 1970's, in Chicago, there have been a couple of premier buildings. Mr. Falloon stated that in the last 40 years, they are all the ones which have enhanced the neighborhood and created the highest values for communities and that 90% or more of those prestigious buildings were designed by Mr. Lagrange. He indicated that Mr. Lagrange would bring the same level of attention here and described it as a tremendous credit to the community and the enhancement of the values of everything around it. Mr. Falloon concluded by stating that it is a great project.

Richard Sobel informed the Board that his father designed the Fell store on the site and thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak. He went on to state that the Fell building is an award winning building and that it has a very distinctive design. Mr. Sobel referred to the letter received from Landmarks Illinois and the AIA with regard to the architecture and nature of the building.

Mr. Sobel stated that the building is called the iconic Fell store and that in terms of the Fell future, it looked at the future of the building and the site. He noted that his father was a futurist looking a century ahead. Mr. Sobel also stated that the building was designed in terms of architecture and engineering and that his uncle Burt Sobel did a future plan for the building which was to build residences above the commercial units.

Mr. Sobel informed the Board that he has spoken at other meetings and that he would like to encourage the Board to create a dialog with the developer, the Board and the Village staff to incorporate a design to accomplish the goals which are more characteristic of the building. He indicated that it would be a terrible disruption to the Village and very expensive to tear it down. Mr. Sobel also stated that developments can be accomplished within zoning requirements and the guidelines of this Board.

Mr. Sobel then referred to the public sentiment with regard to the current design and stated that while people felt that it is attractive, he stated that the question is its context. He noted that most of the comments are negative with regard to the current design and that he proposed to move toward the community design guidelines which look to the future and past in a win-win situation. Mr. Sobel informed the Board that a written letter was given to the Board and to the ZBA.

Mr. Sobel also stated that in terms of the context, the Fell store faces the Village Hall and described them both as different ways of making a classic statement of architecture. He noted that the Fell store is located slightly askew of Lincoln but that it faced the Village Hall. Mr. Sobel then read the Athenian Oath which stated that they are to make the Village more beautiful than the way they found it. He reiterated that his father had an idea to build to the future and encouraged the Board

to create that dialog to have something wonderful.

Chairman Dearborn asked Mr. Sobel if he has asked to meet with the developer.

Mr. Sobel confirmed that he has asked for such a meeting and stated that if the Board encouraged it, it would have more meaning.

Chairman Dearborn asked if there were any other comments.

Peter Milbratz stated that he would speak to the Board with regard to the drawings done by Walter Sobel in the 1960's shown on the slide presentation. He indicated that it is important to note that they are not necessarily proposing an architectural solution, but are merely showing an alternative as to how the building could be massed to continue to incorporate the Fell building with two additional floors as shown on the sketch. Mr. Milbratz identified the Fell building on the right side of the illustration and stated that the drawings planned for two floors of residential space setback from the street. He also stated that it would be a three story building that would be the same height as the building on Oak. Mr. Milbratz also stated that access would not be changed. He then informed the Board that the rest of how the original proposal would be reconfigured to fit the site with the Fell building on the bottom is shown on the illustration. Mr. Milbratz reiterated that while he is not trying to propose an architectural style, he wanted to show alternatives as to how it could be done.

Mr. Milbratz went on to identify a photograph of the Fell building and referred to the white element bulkhead wall in front of the patio area for the two additional floors. He stated that in the next illustration, it showed other significant buildings which are similar in style to the Fell building. Mr. Milbratz then indicated that there could be approximately 70 residential units if it worked out that way. He also referred the Board to the layouts of the residential floors in the floor plans to show how the floors could be designed preliminarily.

Mr. Milbratz reiterated that the building anticipated a project like this and referred to the layout of different apartments by Walter and Abe Fell. He then identified an illustration of the front elevation which he stated that can be made out by the heavy white line with sliding doors open to the patio area and a strip of windows on the top floor. Mr. Milbratz informed the Board that it was laid out in the site plan in five phases of development over the existing buildings on Elm and with a plaza area in the middle similar to the applicant's plan. He then identified underground parking and a raised plaza in the middle.

Chairman Dearborn agreed that they all have some have affection for the Fell building. He then stated to make it clear, they are not the designers of the property and that the Board would encourage conversation like any other conversation. Chairman Dearborn then stated that the proposal would be as the applicant presented.

Mr. Milbratz concluded by stating that his home has a design which was unique to Winnetka.

Chairman Dearborn asked if there were any other comments.

Penny Lanphier, 250 Birch, informed the Board that she did not hear an answer to the question with regard to the area along Elm if the corner line is to start at the corner of Lincoln and Elm. She then stated that as it heads east, the street slopes and referred to the corner line at the easternmost corner of Elm.

Mr. Trandel responded that the angle is approximately 3 feet and that it goes down significantly. He noted that the cornice line would be at 13 feet and 16 feet at the other end.

Ms. Lanphier also asked what would be the width of the sidewalk on Lincoln along the front of the building on the west side and that it is not clear what would be the width of that.

Mr. Trandel responded 14½ feet including the trees.

Mr. Weinbach confirmed that there would be a clear width of 9 feet.

Ms. Lanphier then stated that she is curious with regard to the deletion of on-street diagonal parking. She stated that the design guidelines include maintaining on-street parking. Ms. Lanphier also stated that she understood that parking would be provided to the east side and underneath the development. She then referred to the diagonal parking spaces which serve the corner of Elm and Lincoln and also on the north side of Lincoln for businesses. Ms. Lanphier noted that there would be an impact on the commercial district by removing on-street parking.

Ms. Lanphier also stated that relative to the railroad cut, she commented that the garage being located underneath is an interesting idea. She questioned what it would look like in the winter when the green is gone and that it would be leafless six months out of the year. Ms. Lanphier then referred to the discussion with regard to street width. She stated that she did not know what the standard lane is in the East Elm commercial district and that 24 feet made it appear narrower than others in the area.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that it is now 22 feet and that it would be 24 feet which is wider.

Mr. Burt informed the Board that the drive lanes are 11 feet wide with angled parking.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that it would be 2 feet wider than what is there.

Mr. Burt added that north of Lincoln, it is 22 feet as well.

Ms. Lanphier stated that she would then like to comment with regard to context and stated that in connection with the massing of the building, she appreciated how it was broken up and stated that with regard to the massing on the east directly adjacent to the residential area, the east tower would be right at the edge of the plateau on Elm. She noted that the context is particularly out of sync because of where it sits on the site. Ms. Lanphier indicated that she understood that planned development gave flexibility, but that if there is more massing toward the center of the site, it would have less of an impact. She then stated that from the standpoint of the context of the adjacent residential area, it represented a big mass. Ms. Lanphier asked if the planned development would still have to go all three boards.

Mr. Norkus confirmed that is correct.

Chairman Dearborn asked if there were any other comments.

Joseph Cacciatore, 850 Hill, informed the Board that he has not met the developer but commented that they must be brilliant to have hired Mr. Lagrange. He stated that if they want to predict what will happen to the future of the neighborhood, they should look at what Mr. Lagrange has done in the past and in connection with neighborhood values. Mr. Cacciatore then stated that he did not know what committees were in place when the Eiffel Tower was built or the sculpture in front of the Daley center and described Mr. Lagrange as an unbelievable artist.

Paul Beitler informed the Board that he has been a resident for 35 years as a commercial developer and that he has been in front of boards often. He then stated that it is a very tough place that they are in. He stated that the applicant was handed the guidelines and that he never anticipated this kind of development and that there is a struggle with it rightfully so.

Mr. Beitler then stated that in the absence of more of a definition in dealing with an area outside of the box, that is why planned development was established so that development could be provided with differences. He referred to Henry Ford in 1922 who decided to paint the Model T Ford black and that it lasted five years. Mr. Beitler then stated that in terms of popular demand, people wanted a different color. He stated that as of today, he has not seen Winnetka change much in 35 years and referred to the other pressures they are facing today such as competition. Mr. Beitler also stated that has seen communities which are very vibrant and less vibrant.

Mr. Beitler stated that the fact is that Winnetka is popular and that people want to live here. He also stated that he would like to live in the Village but that he cannot and sold his home and downsized to be closer to his children. Mr. Beitler stated that a development like this would give those in his age group the opportunity to downsize and be in the community and be an active part of the community without forcing them to go to Northfield, Northbrook and Evanston. He indicated that a lot of people are moving to Evanston since it is the only option.

Mr. Beitler went on to state that while the development may be out of character and out of step with the existing community, it also contained architecture that they are not used to seeing. He stated that at the end of the day, it would be wonderful have something which goes where the path would not normally lead but that would be a trail for others to follow. Mr. Beitler stated that it is obvious in terms of the direction they are going. He also stated that he hoped that the ZBA has a different viewpoint.

Mr. Beitler described the development as terrific and stated that the quality would go beyond anything the community would ever see. He stated that if they are left to their own resources and the development did not happen, he questioned what would be there. Mr. Beitler stated that lastly, he described it as a tough project for the developer to bring retail on the ground floor, hide parking underground and convince people to live on top of retail. He suggested that they look at The Glen which represented a very different situation but that it worked. Mr. Beitler concluded by stating that this would work and that they should give the developer an opportunity to revise their plans and come back before a final decision is made to incorporate changes that they have heard.

Chairman Dearborn noted that this is the first meeting of this Board and that there are three members who are not present. He confirmed that there would be additional dialog.

Mr. Beitler also stated that the 2001 guidelines are inconsistent with today's market.

David Smithson informed the Board that he grew up on the North Shore and hopefully would move to the Village shortly. He also informed the Board that his father owned a furniture store in the Village for 20 years and that they have ties to Winnetka. Mr. Smithson stated that they have heard the eloquent comments and that he did not disagree. He described the building as beautiful with no question and that it represented a top design you would find anywhere.

Mr. Smithson informed the Board that he has lived in several parts of the country and that the North Shore is known far and wide among a lot affluent people all over the country. He also stated that he has talked to his colleagues who were impressed when they heard he was from the North Shore which he stated still has a true community feel. Mr. Smithson stated that the lack of pretentiousness is very different than in Beverly Hills and that he lived near there for many years. He reiterated that the project is gorgeous and that what it boiled down to is residential housing apartments for 175 to 300 people together with restaurants which he described as the most risky business there is. Mr. Smithson concluded by stating that for those things, they are talking about changing the character of the town and that it may not be great despite it being a gorgeous building.

Chairman Dearborn asked if there were any other comments from the audience. No additional comments were raised by the audience at this time. He then asked if there were any other

questions from the Board. No additional questions were raised by the Board at this time.

Mr. Norkus noted that the December meeting would be held on December 17, 2015 at 7:30 p.m.

Ms. Stanley made a motion to continue the conversation at the next meeting. Mr. Konstant seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion was unanimously passed.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 10:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Antionette Johnson

Winnetka Design Review Board/Sign Board of Appeals
January 21, 2016
Excerpt of Minutes

Members Present:

John Swierk, Chairman
Kirk Albinson
Bob Dearborn
Brooke Kelly
Michael Klaskin
Peggy Stanley

Members Absent:

Paul Konstant

Village Staff:

Brian Norkus, Assistant Director of Community
Development

* * * *

Case No. 15-10-PD: Preliminary Review of Planned Development Application by Stonestreet Partners and Winnetka Station LLC, for the properties at (a) 511 Lincoln Avenue, (b) 513-515 Lincoln Avenue, (c) 710-732 Elm Street, (d) 740 Elm Street and (e) a Portion of the Adjacent Lincoln Avenue Right-of-Way

Chairman Swierk thanked the applicant for coming back. She asked the applicant to make their presentation brief and that there would then be public input with a time limit of five minutes and that they would stop the meeting at 11:00 p.m.

David Trandel stated that they appreciated the comments received which he described as very constructive from the last meeting. He informed the Board that they made a fair amount of revisions and had a lot of clarifications from questions raised last time. Mr. Trandel then stated that they welcomed the opportunity to clarify and enlighten.

Mr. Trandel began by stating that as a backdrop, from the last discussion, commentary and constructive voices of the community, they have made architectural changes and structural changes relating to height including setbacks. He then stated that the project as it stands is significantly improved. Mr. Trandel stated that in the context of the entire Village, the neighbors and the commercial district, the project would be completely in the context of what you would expect in the business district. He added that they strived to make the project more vibrant and lively.

Mr. Trandel then identified the previous elevation from the first proposal. He stated that there were questions with regard to architectural context and style. Mr. Trandel stated that they wanted to keep within the economic envelope. He informed the Board that they moved some of the density to the middle of the site. Mr. Trandel also stated that you see different architectural styles which are complementary to the various schemes and elements in the Village which he described

as an eclectic and classical Village. He then noted that they went out of their way to listen to the DRB discussion relating to the retail windows and presence and how it related to neighboring retail windows on Elm across the street.

Mr. Trandel referred the Board to an illustration of the original and revised elevations on Elm of the context. He also referred to the 30,000 square foot view, the scale, setback and coloring and stated that they tried to take a strong approach in terms of architectural significance while yielding to the input and concerns raised by the neighbors. Mr. Trandel also referred the Board to an illustration of the terrace setback detail. He then introduced Jeff Burt who worked with Lucien Lagrange on the project.

Jeff Burt introduced himself to the Board as the lead designer on the project and that he grew up in Kenilworth. He then stated that with regard to specifics, modifications were made and that the building would be one story taller and modified as you are walking on Elm. Mr. Burt stated that the building would read as a three story structure with a setback and terrace in connection with as-of-right zoning. He then stated that relative to project 0 on the site, the building would be 45 feet tall. Mr. Burt also stated that the slope is such that it would get a little taller on one end which is why they made it short in order to give it a three story feel. He then stated that you can see the detail which he identified for the Board as well as the slope which he noted is negative 6 feet. Mr. Burt stated that the building would be 41 feet off the ground and that it would be 35 feet tall in an area he identified for the Board.

Mr. Burt also stated that further changes were made on the eastern elevation which he described as the most prominent facing the residences. He referred to the concern that it would be imposing and that they understood that. Mr. Burt noted that they made modifications in height and articulation and that the color was changed from the rest of the building. He indicated that they broke up the façade with projections and setbacks which he also identified for the Board. Mr. Burt then identified the point which is the closest to the adjacent residences at three stories.

Mr. Trandel stated that he wanted to make it clear that throughout the process, there has been a misconception that it would be one big building and the fact is that it is three different structures. He noted that there would be two residential buildings on the east elevation which would all be four story condominiums and that the west building would be luxury rental and in the middle, the first floor would be retail and townhomes. Mr. Trandel stated that they would all be distinct and different and suggested that they discard the term monolithic. He added that they are creating a distinction between each particular address and that it is important to make that clear.

Mr. Burt then referred the Board to a comparison in an illustration of the shorter and additional setbacks on either side. He identified the previous south elevation facing 711 Oak and how it appeared now.

Mr. Burt stated that with regard to the comments and questions from before, they reviewed the

overall design to follow the Village design guidelines and that they heard feedback that they had thrown the book out and started from scratch. He then stated as an architect, you always start from scratch and that they reviewed the design guidelines and are doing most of the things in the design guidelines.

Mr. Burt stated that first with regard to the spirit of the document, he read that the Village of Winnetka seeks to maintain the high quality of its business districts and environment with development which is attractive and consistent with the pedestrian-oriented town center character. He then referred the Board to an accurate rendering of the proposed development and what existed on the north side of Elm. Mr. Burt stated that they found that they are largely in context with the buildings that they would venture to say are more illustrative of the town.

Mr. Burt then stated that with regard to the architecture, there have been objections to the use of French, classical or Beaux-Art architecture. He stated that while in downtown Winnetka, it might be true that a majority of it might be Tudor, there are a lot of classically designed French classical homes in Winnetka. Mr. Burt then stated that the project would be represented by many of Winnetka's finest homes past and present and that they did not come to that conclusion arbitrarily.

Mr. Burt noted that most of the prominent buildings in Winnetka including the Village Hall are classical buildings. He compared it to going to work in the front yard and wearing flannel and jeans. Mr. Burt stated that the project would be presented as if it is wearing a suit. He stated that there would be different styles of architecture, one of which is one more formal and one which is more for a relaxed use. Mr. Burt added that given that parts of the building would face onto large open spaces, they figured you would see it and for it to be dressed well.

Mr. Burt went on to state that they considered the architectural design specifics and the design guidelines. He then identified the overall façade which would be facing the open space and indicated that it would be fairly visible when it is not obstructed by trees. Mr. Burt stated that the design guidelines emphasize that buildings need to have instances of horizontal rhythm done at a number of different scales. He then referred to the materials which would be limestone and brick along with a metal roof. Mr. Burt also stated that it was done with changes in the plane and identified the cornices and rustication for the Board. He then stated that there would be three levels of horizontal banding on the building.

Mr. Burt stated that with regard to vertical rhythm, you can see that not all of the windows would be the same up and down and that some would be Type A and some would be Type B in terms of rhythm. He also stated that the design guidelines spell out the nature of the entries and noted that for the public access, it would be large, open and inviting which was done with almost all glass and awnings along with one residential entrance as the design guidelines specify to be a more integrated façade. Mr. Burt noted that it would be clear that it is a residential entrance. He also stated that in connection with vertical rhythm, they have broken down the façade in terms of articulation and identified various planes and the roof which would be in deference to the scale of

the neighbors. Mr. Burt added that it would slope down and come up to break up the monotonous roof line.

Mr. Burt went on to state that with regard to the details used for visual pleasure, there was emphasis on the care and level of detail which was put into the building. He also stated that the project would bring a quality building to the Village.

Mr. Burt then stated that with regard to the Elm Street elevation, he stated that it would be intimate in terms of scale and that it would enhance what you see on the street. He also stated that it does the same as the larger façade but on a smaller scale. Mr. Burt indicated that there would be different and interesting scales for pedestrians on the street and that it would not seem like one long building. He noted that there would be differences in the materials. Mr. Burt then stated that with regard to the nature of the screening of the parking lot, the Village specifies that it should be consistent with the development and that they have done that with the architecture and accomplished it well. He added that it would be screened with landscaping and that you would be able to see any vehicles in the parking lot.

Mr. Burt then referred the Board to an illustration of the inviting and richly detailed storefronts and townhomes above. He noted that rhythm and elements would all be in use. Mr. Burt informed the Board that they emphasized the fenestration and the creation of shadows and interest in the façade and that it would be seen by pedestrians walking from fairly close by. He also stated that it would enhance and mirror what is on the other side of the street.

Mr. Burt referred the Board to an illustration of the façade facing 711 Oak and identified the motor court and residential entry to the building. He noted that they detailed that appropriately and referred to the garage entry and loading area. Mr. Burt stated that it would be located as far away from the public right-of-way as it can be on the site. He then stated that it is specified in the design guidelines that garage entrances and loading should be located as far away from pedestrians as they can get. Mr. Burt then identified more details of that façade as well as the residential entry and motor court.

Mr. Burt then stated that the façade changed the most in terms of its color and difference in height and that it would be much less monolithic. He stated that they wanted to improve it and that there are five things going on. Mr. Burt first identified one projection which is a flat area of another project and another flat of another project.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that the height of the structure is 4 inches shorter than 711 Oak and yet over 120 to 200 feet was removed from the west side. He stated that the idea was that it was an imposing structure on the four private residences on Maple and that it would be less imposing than 711 Oak.

Mr. Burt also stated that the whole building is articulated with the base, the middle and top as the

design guidelines desire. He then referred the Board to more details of the façade.

Mr. Burt then stated that with regard to materials, he described it as quality where the rubber would meet the road. He stated that in connection with what the Village desired for the business district, he stated that the first list is of the modular brick and rough faced limestone which would not be appropriate for a building of this type. Mr. Burt informed the Board that there would be granite at the base and that the metal roof on the building would be of this quality and the railings. He also stated that with regard to the windows, there would be similar divided light windows as in the samples shown to the Board. Mr. Burt stated that there would be aluminum clad windows which would be wood and that the interior would be low maintenance and attractive. He then stated that in connection with the granite base stone, there would be stone, brick and a metal roof and ornamental railings along the top. He indicated that the design guidelines specify a desire for the upper floors of a mixed use building to be 20% shorter than the bottom floor for retail. Mr. Burt then identified the floor to floor ceiling heights for each of the floors of the building.

Dan Weinbach introduced himself to the Board as the landscape architect for the project. He stated that last time, they went through the basic concept and that he would go through it again. Mr. Weinbach then stated that there were three elements which consist of the streetscape element, the streetscape combined with the plaza, the terrace on the second level for the residential courtyard type space and a green roof on top. Mr. Weinbach then stated that in terms of the streetscape on Elm, they would be continuing and restoring what was there in terms of street trees. He noted that there would be new precast pavers throughout.

Mr. Weinbach stated that on Lincoln, there would be street trees in the front of the building and on the sidewalk. He noted that the two-way street comes through paved with precast pavers and that beyond that is the plaza space and groupings of shade trees with the trees coming from the crushed stone paving surface. Mr. Weinbach stated that the idea is for normal periods of time to have trees with furniture and benches and that during special events, the space would be entirely available for use for events. He added that at all times of the year, there would be an attractive plaza.

Mr. Weinbach stated that on the west edge, the wall would be continued with planting and seating along the wall. He then stated that at the south side entrance, there would be courtyard space and that in the center would be a fountain element with plantings around it. Mr. Weinbach also stated that in the courtyard space is an amenity deck and that there would be two panels of lawn with ornamental trees flanking it and planters with various types of plant material. He added that there would be a fire pit in the center and an outdoor kitchen and additional dining area. Mr. Weinbach indicated that it is intended to be a passive recreational area to encourage the residents to use the outdoor space. He then stated that the roofs of the buildings would be flat with green roofs which are typical sedum thin layer roofs.

Mr. Weinbach then referred to the provisions for outdoor dining along Elm and Lincoln. He stated that there were some questions the last time about the paving materials since they are not

directly following the design guidelines. Mr. Weinbach stated that the design guidelines say that on Elm, there should be pavers along the edge of the parkway area with shade trees and a concrete sidewalk. He informed the Board that they have done that except that they would like to see the use of pavers throughout. Mr. Weinbach stated that they felt that would be a significant upgrade although it varied from the design guidelines. He noted that they would follow around to Lincoln and the street itself would contain pavers of three different colors. He informed the Board that there are samples on the table. Mr. Weinbach added that there would be grays and two shades of reddish brown in the center with different textures.

Mr. Burt stated that what is the most important take away from the slide is at the bottom of open space. He stated that in creating open space, the design guidelines emphasize that there be the creation of gathering points for Village events and activities which is the intent of the plaza. Mr. Burt noted that it can be closed for Village events. He added that there is not a space like this at the moment and not the Village Green.

Mr. Weinbach went on to state that there would be paving surfaces in the center area of the plaza which he identified as a reddish brown color paver. He noted that the sidewalks and crosswalks would be a lighter gray color which would relate directly to the limestone building base. Mr. Weinbach then stated that the driving surfaces would be a rich mixture of colors and referred to the specific color pallet from Unilock. He informed the Board that the granular surface in the photograph is of crushed stone paving with trees emerging from it. Mr. Weinbach added that there would be a precast paver for the courtyard space on the second floor.

Mr. Weinbach then referred the Board to another illustration of the outdoor terrace space, dining space, fire pit, ornamental trees and garden space. He also stated that along the residential units, there would be a strong hedge of evergreen yews to create separation.

Mr. Weinbach stated that they would like to see a very contemporary flavor to these spaces and identified the fire pit and furniture which would have a nice architectural quality. He then referred the Board to an example of the fountain they planned to use in the drive-in courtyard and surrounding plantings. Mr. Weinbach also referred to the plant pallet they are proposing to use. He identified the street trees on Lincoln as Regal Prince Oak which would not go beyond a 15 foot spread. Mr. Weinbach then stated that there would be Triumph Elm trees for Elm and Honey Locust trees for the plaza. He also stated that there would be a few trees in front of the east parking lot which would be dense Japanese Tree Lilacs and that the trees on the plaza would be Saucer Magnolia. Mr. Weinbach added that there would be a series of yew hedges and periwinkle for the upper terraces and a series of shade tolerant perennial flowers.

Mr. Weinbach went on to state that with regard to the lighting plan, he informed the Board that the yellow dots represent the light fixture they are proposing and that there is the frequent use of this fixture. He then referred to the pedestrian scale lights for the parking and street areas and that it is their intent to use a light which would go with the character of the building and which is different

from the typical fixtures found in the Village. Mr. Weinbach noted that the upper terrace would have high bollards and that there would be lower bollards and wall lighting. He stated that a question raised the last time with regard to the light fixture is that since it would vary from Village fixtures, it was intentional and that it would add quality to the character of the street and the building itself.

Mr. Burt stated that for the west parking garage facing the tracks, the design guidelines say that parking is an essential component and a scarce commodity downtown. He noted that they made every effort to save and expand parking and that the linchpin of the project is to solve the downtown parking issue. Mr. Burt stated that the garage would keep in character with the building and the Village Hall.

Mr. Burt then stated that in connection with the bike trail, there were a lot of questions and noted that there is 33 feet from the edge of the trail. He informed the Board that the line of the current slope which he identified for the Board would be changing and that they are abiding by the 5 foot setback at the base at the garage. Mr. Burt indicated that it would overhang a little to give room for landscaping, a seat bench along the edge of the plaza and seasonal planting. He then identified the pedestrian exit from the garage. Mr. Burt also identified the vertical planting system and stated that the design guidelines say to encourage the use of vines which they did. He then referred the Board to an illustration of more plant materials.

Mr. Burt then stated that as to what is the relationship between the north side of Elm and the proposed design on the south side of Elm, he referred the Board to an illustration which he stated told the whole story. He then stated that you see buildings all of which have a similar scale, architecture and detailing with the exception of Mariani's which he described as anomalous in size compared to what is here.

Chairman Swierk asked how accurate is the distance between the buildings.

Mr. Burt responded that it is 100% accurate.

Chairman Swierk questioned whether it is 44 feet curb to curb and that it looked to be 1/3, 1/3 and 1/3.

Mr. Burt informed the Board that face to face, the building is 76 feet.

Mr. Trandel stated that the illustration is similar to looking through the side view mirror of a car and that there is 78 feet from the face of the buildings on each side. He then stated that the Neapolitan is across from the east building and that it is almost 43 feet tall while this height would be 45 feet. Mr. Trandel added that 711 Oak is 45 feet 4 inches.

Ms. Stanley questioned whether it is 45 feet from 0 0 but 51 feet from the sidewalk.

Mr. Burt stated that grade is different.

Ms. Stanley referred to the elevations across the street at the Neapolitan and asked if their 0 0 is at the sidewalk.

Mr. Burt confirmed that is correct.

Ms. Stanley then asked if their 0 0 is their sidewalk at negative 6 ft.

Mr. Burt confirmed that is correct and stated that the Neapolitan gets taller at the hill which he described as an unavoidable site condition. He informed the Board that they took the elevation of the Neapolitan at the shortest point according to zoning code. Mr. Burt then identified an illustration of the sidewalk entrance to the garage and across the street. He added that the sidewalk would be substantially wider at 6 feet and that they would encourage outdoor dining. Mr. Burt then stated that it would be a much better setup for a retailer.

Mr. Burt went on to state that with regard to the review and consideration of the retail height proportions at street level that follow the Village design guidelines, he stated that the design guidelines do not really specify any retail height proportions. He informed the Board that they looked across the street and that what you see is that the retail windows are between 11 and 14 feet while their retail windows would be between 11 and 14 feet as well. Mr. Burt also identified the retail window heights to be 11 to 12 feet on all of the retail openings on Elm.

Mr. Trandel stated that was a point brought up at the last meeting and that some renderings made the windows look larger.

Mr. Burt then referred the Board to an illustration of the recessed nature of the doors which he described as typical in the area. He then referred to the statement that the design, scale and various heights of the proposed development do not meet the criteria of the current design standard. Mr. Burt stated that he wanted to emphasize again a rendering which he showed to the Board which told the whole story and that it was shot with a wide angle lens and that it would represent what your eye would see when walking down the street. He added that height wise, you can see three, four and five stories and the three and 3½ story buildings across the street. Mr. Burt stated that the anomaly in scale is a traditional retail street which has three to four story buildings which he identified for the Board.

Mr. Burt also referred the Board to an illustration of the view north on Lincoln. He identified the 711 Oak roofline and noted that their roofline sloped gently. Mr. Burt also identified the existing heights on the site as well as the heights of surrounding buildings.

Mr. Trandel noted that it is important in that the illustration related to the four homes on Maple.

He then stated that the building is significantly setback and far less imposing than 711 Oak. Mr. Trandel added that the sun came up on the northern hemisphere and that 711 Oak is more imposing and that there is more shadowing and that it is more dominant on Maple than the proposed plan.

Mr. Burt informed the Board that the maximum height is 70 feet which represented a small portion which would be located as far as way from any residential property that they can put on the site. He also referred to the building distances in the illustration and noted that they would be 275 feet away from the nearest home.

Mr. Burt went on to identify the views looking east from 711 Oak which is much closer to the neighbors. He also identified the view looking out of the windows. Mr. Burt indicated that you would not be able to see into the homes but that it is close. He also referred the Board to a view of their building looking east in photographs and that they made sure to take the photographs in the winter and that it would be impossible to see into homes from here. He then referred to the view from the middle of the building and added that the Hadley School blocked homes on either side.

Mr. Trandel referred to the wildly discussed misconception that you would be able to peer into the backyards for the Maple homes which he stated is not true.

Mr. Burt added that if they cannot see you, you cannot see us. He also stated that the trees would block the view.

Mr. Burt then stated with regard to the urban geometry of that particular neighborhood, he stated that when you go down Lincoln in an area which he identified for the Board, it is 76 feet across and that currently, with solid lines, it is 93 feet across which he indicated did a jog in that the Fell property did not follow the line of the street. He described the area as too wide and that people drive too fast and added that narrower streets are slower streets. Mr. Burt then stated that they planned to narrow the drive lane to a reasonable width which would be wider than Elm at 24 feet and noted that the distance between the building and the edge of the plaza is 79 feet which he indicated is approximately the same distance as Lincoln at 76 feet.

Mr. Burt then stated that he would close with the next slide and referred to the first and last sentence of the design guidelines and stated that it was not the intent of the design guidelines to recreate traditional architectural styles but to provide a framework within which good design can flourish in context and enhance the Village character. He informed the Board that the photograph told the whole story in that they all look like they belong to the same family and would work well together.

Mr. Trandel stated that they attempted to be judicious with regard to the time and asked the Board if they had any questions. He noted that this is the 11th or 12th public meeting with regard to the development which he described as an interesting process and which was quite productive. Mr. Trandel stated that they knew going into it that there would be a rather vocal majority no matter

what they proposed as to those who are against it. He stated that everyone who spoke against the request has had an opportunity over the last 10 years to acquire the property, etc. and that the applicant decided to take the task on and put it together in front of three boards and the Village Council unequivocally with an A+ team. He then stated that irrespective of the result, they are grateful to bring in qualified professionals to address the Village and what they are trying to maintain in terms of history and the future and to keep it relevant and that the Village is one of the greatest villages in the country. Mr. Trandel also thanked Mr. Lagrange who he stated has been subjected to a diatribe and that he felt bad and took it to heart.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that they respect the difference of opinions and indicated that beauty is in the eye of the beholder. He then stated that as a Village, you have to get beyond the scope and minutia and have discussion on the bigger issues. Mr. Trandel stated that the project would create significant value for the businesses and residents. He stated that is what happened when you invest \$90 million in an area, it would enhance all of the boats. Mr. Trandel noted that Mr. Lagrange as worked throughout the country and in Chicago and that six of the top 10 buildings were designed by Mr. Lagrange. He added that they are lucky that he came to them.

Mr. Trandel then stated that there is never a perfect solution in life. He informed the Board that as a resident and someone who understands and shops in town, there are fundamental issues that the project was designed to solve from the beginning which started and ended with parking. Mr. Trandel noted that they did not have an agenda to disrupt society and that they want to get something which has enough value with detail, infrastructure and design and to let economically it do what it would need to do. He also stated that they want to create something they are proud of and that their hearts are in it. Mr. Trandel reiterated that they have made changes and that there are a lot of constituencies to appease and that it is not possible to please everyone. He added that no one is saying what is there now or what they are keeping is commercially viable. Mr. Trandel concluded by thanking the Board for their time.

Chairman Swierk asked the audience to limit their comments to five minutes. He also asked that the comments be kept within the scope of the Board's review which are architectural elements, landscaping and public space.

Eleanor Prince of Kenilworth stated that she is affiliated with the League of Women Voters of Northfield and Kenilworth. She then stated that she is concerned with regard to building scale. Ms. Prince stated that the applicant complied with the eastern part of the structure which would be done within the code and that they moved 39 feet further west than Phototronics. She then stated that the building to the west is 70 feet in height and that the code required 45 feet. Ms. Prince also stated that zoning has made the Village beautiful and inviting for the last 100 years. She referred to the western building which would show 6 floors of windows at 70 feet and that 711 Oak is only 43 feet. Ms. Prince noted that the only structure higher than the proposed building is the tower of New Trier High School. She stated that most of the high school is 57 feet and that most of the

tower is five stories and 76 feet. Ms. Prince described the western structure as enormous.

Ms. Prince then informed the Board that she has it on good authority from the Village Council members that dealt with three zoning variations and that this would take over 30 variations. She questioned where is the scale between the Village Hall and 70 feet and commented that there is an enormous difference. Ms. Prince commented that the Board has done great work with The Galleria, 548 Lincoln, the building at Oak and Chestnut which is an apartment building and the Green Bay Road and Winnetka Avenue building, all of which are in balance with other buildings.

Ms. Prince stated that they should think about the fact that this building would be here for 100 years and its relationship to everything else in the Village. She stated that in their hands lies the future of the Village. Ms. Prince informed the Board that she visited friends on long island and that there is a massive building there which she described as out of context. She then stated that she loved beautiful design and that in Paris, height is controlled as well as what they allow in terms of zoning. Ms. Prince commented that the Long Island building is in a tiny town built in the 1920's and that it is not shown in all of the pictures where there are only one, two and three story buildings. She then suggested that the Board think carefully with regard to measure in the minds as to how large the structure would be at the top of the hill. Ms. Prince concluded by stating that she loved the Village, Lake Forest and Glencoe and that while she lived in Kenilworth, she is in in the Village five days a week.

Chairman Swierk asked if there were any other comments.

Penny Lanphere, 250 Birch, asked with regard to the trees and landscaping, for the Lincoln trees on the side of the building and which would be planted on top of the garage, how tall would they get.

Mr. Weinbach responded that there would be a layer of soil between the pavement and the parking structure which would be sufficient to support the trees. He added that they would not be as tall as if they were in the forest and that they mature between 30 and 40 feet.

Ms. Lanphere then stated that she did not understand how the mansard roof form is calculated. She also referred to comments raised by the ZBA and that her concern related to the sidewalk width on the Lincoln side. Ms. Lanphere stated that there would be 10 feet plus the carriageway for the trees on Elm and that the Lincoln sidewalk would be narrower. She noted that wide sidewalks in the commercial district are important and encouraged the developer to put in a wider sidewalk.

Ms. Lanphere also questioned what will the parking deck look like from the Hadley School side. She stated that with regard to the rendering of Elm, it is not of what the deck would look like from the Hadley School. Ms. Lanphere stated that she agreed that the project has been pulled much more in the Village character and that the Elm Street side fit the rhythm and character of the

Village. She then stated that her concern related to the design on Lincoln because the design guidelines suggest that it match institutional buildings rather than commercial buildings. Ms. Lanphere added that it would read as a large institutional building from the street side and that it would not enhance the pedestrian experience and Village feeling. She concluded by referring to the proportion and massing on Lincoln.

Don Faloon, 799 Foxdale, informed the Board that he has lived in the Village for 30 years and is a real estate professional and has had the opportunity to buy and supervise design services for 45 years. He then stated that in connection with the project, the basics have been dealt with and approved by a strong majority of the Plan Commission. Mr. Faloon also stated that in working across the country and internationally, he commented that this design would be very strongly thought of in any community. He added that the interesting and challenging issues have been addressed through very articulated solutions and that the project fits the context. Mr. Faloon then stated that because of the articulation, one spot on the building would be taller and that the building would modulate throughout its course. He described it as a wonderful project in town and that they have had so much trouble with the downtown area. Mr. Faloon also stated that revenues are not generated by this and would be paid by the residents year after year. He concluded by stating that wonderful effort has been made and that it would be a great investment and that they are lucky that the applicant took on the challenge and deserved the enthusiastic support of the boards and the Village Council.

Richard Sobel stated that he is the son of the former architect, Walter Sobel, who designed the Fell building and that he lives in Wilmette. He noted that Peter Milbratz made a presentation a few months ago and that the Fell store has an internationally awarded building design and is described as the iconic Fell store and is a candidate for historic designation. Mr. Sobel stated that the building is designed to be built upon to accomplish the goals of this project. He also described it as a modernist building.

Mr. Sobel then stated that Mr. Milbratz presented a design which could incorporate the goals of the developer and the reflections of the community while maintaining the Fell building on it. He then identified his father's designs and renderings which he stated are appropriate to an award winning building to fit into the design ideas and maintain the character of the Village as building together.

Mr. Sobel informed the Board that he attempted to meet with the developer and that it is his hope to do that. He then stated that he would like to commend Mr. Burt on his presentation and that the goals of the developer can be combined with what his father foresaw for the future of Winnetka. Mr. Sobel then referred to an advertisement in *The Winnetka Talk* which talked about how the ZBA turned down the request and that with regard to the Board's consideration, the Village Council is to make the final decision. He stated that each board is to make its own decision and that in terms of design, he asked if it is possible that the Board can encourage dialog in terms of his father's design.

Mr. Sobel then stated that with regard to the statement that this is the most blighted portion of downtown, he did not think that any portion of downtown is blighted. He also stated that clearly, it is being seen as three buildings and that the Fell building could be built on with residential units. Mr. Sobel also stated that there have been talks about complementing the surrounding buildings in the Village. He noted that the Fell building faced the Village Hall and that they are both classic buildings in their own right. Mr. Sobel added that the Fell building is part of the community and should be retained. He stated that the current design can complement the past design and that they can do both. Mr. Sobel reiterated that it is his hope that the Board can do both to encourage incorporating the Fell building and the Elm buildings and that they would have the best of both worlds which he described as a win-win. He also stated that with regard to the design, there is an opportunity here and hoped that the Board would encourage dialog with the developer to find a way to incorporate the design and look to the future of the Village.

Denny Niles stated that he has lived in the Village for 43 years and has built homes. He stated that he appreciated the Board's time. Mr. Niles then stated that they have seen vacancies in the community and that they see the future which he indicated is going nowhere. He also stated that real estate values will change and that if they did, there would be no downtown. Mr. Niles stated that nothing is happening in the community and described it as a travesty which puzzled him.

Mr. Niles informed the Board that he has talked to approximately 100 people in the community and that everyone is in favor of something being done. He indicated that it is not about brick and size, but about life and putting energy in the community which has gone away. Mr. Niles also stated that people will move out. He informed the Board that his clients come in and end up going to Wilmette. Mr. Niles then stated that he loved Winnetka and that they are so off track and misguided on what is being given to the Village as a landmark in history and the smartest thing they have done. He suggested that they rethink what it means to the community and for generations to come. Mr. Niles then stated that he may want to live in the building and concluded by stating that for the people who have had trouble renting a home, people may think the community is going down.

Mark Madigan, 1250 Lindenwood, stated that he would like to reiterate the comments made. He then stated that with regard to downtown Lake Forest and Lake Forest High School and Deerfield downtown and Highland Park and Hinsdale, they are taking steps and action to make the communities better. Mr. Madison stated that Mr. Niles stated it well and that the Board has a chance and to not kick the can down the road. He then stated that Mr. Trandel and his team are putting capital at risk and that the project represented a great opportunity to bring Winnetka to greatness. Mr. Madison stated that he hoped that the Board would support the project and that the details can be worked out and that overall, it is a great plan and vision. He concluded by stating that he applauded the developer for taking the initiative.

Nick Hirschen (sp?), ___ Woodley Road, informed the Board that he owned storefronts on Green Bay Road. He stated that in terms of letting a design that enhanced the Village character is the Board's criteria, clearly the project would add value downtown and to Winnetka. Mr. Hirschen then stated that the tax base would be growing. He indicated that it takes a long time to get people interested in building and that it cost a lot of money to stay in business.

Mr. Hirschen informed the Board that he has a small rental property. He stated that the project would create economic growth and excitement and add character and vibrancy to the community. Mr. Hirschen then stated that they would be getting world class design and that a design this prominent and exciting would add and help the economic growth of those with storefronts in town. He stated that when you drive down Green Bay Road and count the vacancies, if they were to get growth there, it would add to the character of the community, the economics and tax base which would improve the schools and make it a town which better than it is now and that they would enjoy it more. Mr. Hirschen also stated that he knew that the public servants are respected a great deal and would help make it a better project with their expertise and backgrounds and that it is his hope that they do.

Mr. Hirschen stated that he hoped that they did not miss the opportunity to make the downtown area and commercial area viable. He then stated that they have got to balance the economics with design and that with regard to enhancing the character, if you do not, people would not risk their equity and capital, time and effort to meet the criteria. Mr. Hirschen then encouraged the Board to apply their expertise to the project and help Mr. Trandel and his team make it a better place which would help all of the residents grow and make the community viable and better. He concluded by encouraging the Board to let the project move forward.

Chairman Swierk asked if there were any other comments. No additional comments were made by the audience at this time. He then asked if there were any other comments from the Board. Chairman Swierk stated that he appreciated the petitioner coming back and clarifying the design guidelines and how they were considered.

Mr. Dearborn also thanked the applicant for coming up with suggestions and stated that the project is moving in the right direction. He then stated to make sure that the clarifications from January 18, 2016 are part of the proposal. Mr. Dearborn then referred to information on vehicle flow, delivery, etc.

Mr. Burt confirmed that is correct that it is included as an appendix.

Mr. Dearborn then referred to the rendering and landscaping around 711 Oak and the trees on the north side and stated that he did not see them in the proposal. He asked if there would be landscaping buffering 711 Oak.

Mr. Burt referred the Board to an illustration and stated that their modifications and planned development area stopped at a line which he identified for the Board and that they would not be touching anything east of that. He added that there would be plenty of landscaping between the ramp and the public right-of-way.

Mr. Dearborn asked if the trees are not on their property.

Mr. Burt confirmed that is correct and stated that is not their property.

Mr. Dearborn stated that with regard to the east parking lot and the Hadley School, there is no dimension of the parking lot looking from Elm. He then asked if the lot is elevated.

Mr. Trandel responded that is the benefit of the nature of the slope and that the scissored garage would have an actual height above 0 0 grade and that it would be 3 feet above 0 0. He described it as the perfect topography for a scissored garage.

Mr. Burt then identified the Hadley School and a row of trees and the slope of the grade toward 711 Oak. He informed the Board that the garage would follow the grade.

Mr. Trandel added that the height of the top of the level of the garage above 0 0 is 3 feet and that there would be a wall which covered everything.

Mr. Dearborn then stated that with regard to the west building, if you look at it compared across the street at the northeast corner Elm and Lincoln, there is 35 feet to Café Roma and that this is 62 feet. He stated that the rest of Elm is more in proportion then it is out of whack.

Mr. Burt suggested that the Board focus on an illustration and identified the façade presented to the street and that the smallest façade is present on that street. He described it as the least intrusive way to meet the street. Mr. Burt also stated that the height is set back on that building and that while it is higher than 35 feet, it is approximately 50 feet or 46 feet actually which is the 10 feet where Café Roma started tapering back. He reiterated that the 70 feet only related to 3,500 square feet of 140,000 square feet and that there is much about creating architectural integrity. Mr. Burt added that they do have five acres here and that if they have to have height, the cheapest resource is air. He also stated that it would not create shadows over homes and that this is a great open area to do it. Mr. Burt stated that they can afford the ability to do things like bite off big and subsidizing a great portion of community parking. He added that they have got to get the financials to add up and that there has to be a balance. Mr. Burt stated that there would be tapering and setback so that there is not a looming canyon effect. He informed the Board that with regard to the actual square footage above 45 feet, it amounted to 11% of the overall maximum square footage of the building. Mr. Burt added that there are also more architectural elements so that it would not look flat and monolithic. He then stated that it would be gorgeous when you look at the architectural elements

and that the two would mirror well.

Ms. Stanley commented that she liked what was done to the east building and that it looked and felt better. She then stated that she is troubled by the height of the west building and its mass and scale. Ms. Stanley reiterated that Elm Street is great and much better and that adding stories with a setback worked. She stated that she is struggling with this piece as well as with all of the different bricks and limestone. Ms. Stanley indicated that she knew that it is a choice they made and that they all want to see something happen.

Mr. Trandel stated that unlike 711 Oak, that is pushed forward and that it is big and is completely linear except for the balconies. He noted that they also have inset windows. Mr. Trandel stated that the point is that it is not going to look like one big building.

Ms. Stanley stated that it would still be a large structure even with a mansard roof.

Mr. Trandel noted that it would be smaller than 711 Oak. He stated that they have design guidelines for that reason. Mr. Trandel then stated that when you go through various countries, to look at the villages with three stories and that there is some focal point which drew people. He commented that it is not attractive which is the reason churches have steeples and that they need a draw. Mr. Trandel then referred to the timeless perspective and indicated that it comes down to economics which is not within the Board's purview.

Ms. Stanley stated that she understood the economics and that they have it in the application which spelled out what the Board needed to look at which is the design. She reiterated that she is struggling with the scale in the context of the predominate west building.

Mr. Trandel stated that what Ms. Stanley is suggesting is not a feasible tradeoff. He also stated that they have 180 feet to cover.

Lucien Lagrange stated that the façade is very residential and that it has vertical windows. He also stated that there is no order and that it would not be an institutional building. Mr. Lagrange noted that the bedrooms would have smaller windows and that the larger windows say residential. He also stated that it is achieved by fenestration and that there would be strong horizontal lines and that it would be less tall. Mr. Lagrange then referred to the roof which would be a mansard roof which he described as strong and that it would fade away when you look up. He described it as a nice hat on the top of the building and that it would be a handsome building. Mr. Lagrange then referred to the design guidelines and to think about the context. He added that the building would respond to the two contexts.

Mr. Albinson stated that with regard to the development team, he thanked them for the whole vision and pursuing the project patiently. He then referred to the goal and that they are taking a

positive step in the right direction in terms of redevelopment. Mr. Albinson then stated that he had some concerns. He stated that in consideration of the improvements to the public right-of-way including the street between the building and the Metra tracks, he stated that area of the design should be within the Village design aesthetic. Mr. Albinson referred to it as a marriage between the building and the garage overlooking the tracks. He also stated that there has been a long term Village planning process and comprehensive downtown streetscape plan and that this would look out of place relative to what the Village wants to be. Mr. Albinson also stated that it would set a definite tone to what the Village civic and architectural improvements should be. He then referred to the railing urns and other improvements. Mr. Albinson stated that they would work well as part of the campus, but that he did not agree with imposing that aesthetic on the strong and civic architecture.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that what they pulled out of the dialog in the design guidelines is that it should be contiguous and representative of the style of the building. He agreed that it is owned by the Village and that if they preferred a color of brick and style of ballast on the fence, that is good input.

Mr. Burt confirmed that it is owned by the Village and that the Village would have more input on that part. He then stated that the closest infrastructure is the Elm Street bridge and referred to its last modification over the last 20 yrs. Mr. Burt informed the Board that they looked at what the Village had and the train station which he described as a vaguely classical building. He also stated that the bridge has balustrades and seasonal plantings.

Mr. Albinson stated that it represented an opportunity for the Village to participate and establish that standard. He then referred to the most significant non-building related civic improvement provided. Mr. Albinson stated that he would recommend as part of the recommendation process, is that it should be treated as a separate element for the submittal process.

Mr. Trandel agreed that would be fine.

Mr. Albinson added that they could take some time to come up with something. He then referred to any sort rendering on Elm at the top of the bridge over the tracks looking at the development.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that there is no digital rendering. He noted that they addressed the areas where they were hearing more questions from the Arbor Vitae, Maple and 711 Oak neighbors. Mr. Trandel then stated that they had renderings initially at the top of the bridge, but that it is not contextual to what they have here. He indicated that they can recreate them.

Mr. Burt informed the Board that the Plan Commission saw renderings of that type.

Mr. Albinson indicated that it would helpful for this Board and stated that the design guidelines are

specific to context and scale. He stated that it would be hard to make an evaluation without seeing that rendering. Mr. Albinson then stated that the elevation on Elm is of smaller broken up units and that relative to the surrounding buildings, it appeared ornamental, excessively heavy and unnecessary. He suggested that it could be enhanced by diminishing some of that detail.

Mr. Trandel noted that these are homes. He stated that the question is whether they should sink to the lowest common denominator and that the homes were designed to be unique homes.

Mr. Albinson commented that it appeared busy. He referred to the reaction to some of the precedent and the township building which has some detail but that it does not go too far.

Mr. Burt stated that they would have to agree to disagree. He agreed that these are unique homes and that they have to have a unique character.

Mr. Lagrange informed the Board that if they take off details, they can save money.

Mr. Trandel stated they would not do that.

Mr. Lagrange stated that you see more details which have been lost 20 years ago and that there is an expectation for this type of project and home.

Mr. Trandel referred to the French Institute of the North Shore and the renovated building and what was done recently is far removed from what was there before. He also referred to what @Properties has done which is retail. Mr. Trandel then stated that whether it is work, retail or home, people want something inviting itself.

Mr. Albinson stated that he understood that the goal for the building was with more Tudor elements and that the more he looked at it, the more he felt it is out of place relative to the other work. He stated that they have English and French and applied an English façade on what wants to be a French building. Mr. Albinson encouraged the applicant to be honest with themselves and commented that it feels like a sore thumb. He then referred to the consideration of thoughtful details and elements on the east Elm elevations. Mr. Albinson also stated that in connection with the west building, from what he has heard, context and scale are two significant items giving the project the biggest challenge as they go through the public process. He stated that the Board is responsible for context and scale. Mr. Albinson added that with regard to the west elevation, his reaction is that it is a beautiful building and that it appeared urban, tall and more vehicle-oriented as well as hard, formal and cold. He stated that what people like about Winnetka currently is its context and pedestrian orientation which he described as soft and warm.

Mr. Trandel stated that he appreciated the comments. He noted that they are sitting over six acres of open space. Mr. Trandel then stated that in terms of context, you have to think of what is next

door and that there would be over 30 feet between the building and 711 Oak and that it would be 10 feet higher at those points. He reiterated that if it was the same height, it would not be particularly attractive and would look linear. Mr. Trandel also stated that in connection with context, the building would be reaching over five acres and that it would be in the heart of the commercial district and is quasi-urban. He then stated that if you go up and down Sheridan Road and Indian Hill, the predominate theme and style is 37 feet and classical design and French context. Mr. Trandel stated that they all have their opinions and that people are spending their own money and referred to \$22 million spent on Sheridan Road and that more than once they are seeing it. He indicated that it spoke volumes.

Mr. Trandel also referred to the different sizes of the windows and setbacks and that it is difficult in two dimension to understand and appreciate. He then stated that if you see it in the context of the neighborhood, people who are walking do not look higher than a 25 foot perspective in connection with the first story or two. Mr. Trandel then stated that there are tradeoffs and that if they want something which is relevant, interesting and different than 711 Oak, it needs to be more interesting.

Mr. Albinson encouraged the applicant to consider the context and to not think of the site as much in terms of its relation to 711 Oak as to the Elm and Lincoln buildings.

Mr. Trandel informed the Board that they also have a rendering south back by the North Shore Community Bank.

Mr. Albinson stated that while he understood the 25 foot height view comment, a majority of the community would experience it more from far away like from vehicles.

Mr. Burt informed the Board that they considered that when they designed the building. He stated that when it is presented to a larger area and more people and vehicular traffic, they want the best face forward which is what they tried to do here.

Mr. Albinson commended the applicant on the effort spent on the east elevation in response to a lot of community input and that they have done an excellent job. He then stated that the east elevation represented a challenge and that they want to be as proud of the west elevation and would love for the community and the Board to have the same reaction.

Mr. Burt stated that as designed, this is a much more aesthetically pleasing elevation than the east elevation.

Mr. Trandel stated that they will get the Board more material.

Mr. Albinson then commented that the west elevation appeared monolithic and imposing and how

it relates to the distance from and the amount of programming to fit in the narrow space to the tracks. He also stated that the overhang on the sidewalk is not necessary and is negative. Mr. Albinson added that it appeared relative to a suburban community and that they are trying to put too much programming in a limited amount of space. Mr. Albinson referred to the human and friendly scale to Winnetka and that it felt urban and did not have the same sort of connotation.

Mr. Trandel responded that overall, it is a large site and that they wanted to create different personalities within the site. He then stated that by right, they are significantly below what would be afforded if it is done by right and that the proposed project is far less dense. Mr. Trandel noted that density is an important aspect they would be creating and that business owners do not want to hear quaint but vibrant. He informed the Board that the goal from the onset was to create an environmentally appealing walk around town.

Mr. Trandel described it as challenging today and informed the Board that he lives four blocks from the site. He then stated that there is no focal gravity point in town and noted that the Village Green is grass. Mr. Trandel stated that a hardscape plaza that can change personalities which he described as a cool dynamic. He stated that a building this size fits. Mr. Trandel then referred to going out of their way to make it comply where most lots are 120 feet x 50 feet which is not what they have here. Mr. Trandel stated that they need to accommodate parking and that for a couple hundred of vehicles for retail, they have to accommodate the cost of parking and that the proposal would cover half of the cost. He then stated that the Village would receive a great bang for their buck and asked what is the tradeoff for that. Mr. Trandel stated that you cannot have everything. He also stated that while they are asking for room on height, there is no other place in the Village where it would be preferable for a higher height than this spot. Mr. Trandel then stated that if they want the retail dynamic, they have to be able to park which is where it starts. He added that the most expensive part of the project is underground.

Mr. Lagrange stated that he is disturbed by the criticism about the architecture and what should be Winnetka. He stated that this is a drawing and that you would never see the building this way. Mr. Lagrange stated that it related to perspective and informed the Board that the highest condominium sold in Chicago cost \$1,475 per square foot. He also referred to architecture which is where people want to live and that 41 people want to live here because of the architecture. Mr. Lagrange reiterated that they have had a lot of interest. He then stated that compared to 711 Oak, he questioned should they take down the value. Mr. Lagrange concluded by stating that they are responding to where people want to live.

Mr. Albinson stated that his responsibility as a community member is to address the concerns in connection with scale and the context of the west building which would go a long way toward recommending the project. He also referred to considering the scale, massing and articulation.

Mr. Trandel stated that he did not see that as an issue and that the tradeoff is that as you go lower,

certain things give way. He asked at what point is it to have litter up and down Green Bay Road or to be unique. Mr. Trandel informed the Board that it is not as simple as lopping off a floor and that they would lose the architectural integrity and attractiveness for the people who live there. He referred to the 800 pound gorilla as parking and that until people are able to park, no one is coming.

Mr. Klaskin asked the applicant if they had a sample of the brick.

Mr. Burt confirmed that is correct but that it would not be the red color.

Mr. Klaskin stated that he understood the economics completely. He described Winnetka as having a black hole from the retail perspective and described it as a sad state of affairs. Mr. Klaskin then stated that he appreciated what they are trying to achieve and for the retailers. He stated that the only question is whether the pro forma would work in terms of the economics and that it would help the Board understand the value of added height.

Mr. Trandel stated that if they went to the three studies done for the parking spaces, you could count the number of vehicles for spots needed in town and to build structured parking at \$35,000 per spot, the \$7 million number represented an above grade structure which would not be attractive and that it is more expensive to go underground. He noted that it would be dedicated for commuter parking and would relieve the pressure off the retail spots in the front of shops. Mr. Trandel also stated that they would be adding an additional 126 parking spaces to the east lot and that for 322 parking spaces at a cost of \$10 to \$12 million, it would solve the problem for a 50-50 partnership at \$6 million. He added that there is approximately 3,000 square feet above the height of 45 feet.

Mr. Klaskin stated that he understood the scheme of things and the critical component in making the whole thing function. He then stated that he had nothing else to add and wished the applicant good luck.

Ms. Kelly thanked the applicant and stated that she really listened to the height comments and relationship to the other side of Elm with regard to her comment from the last time which was done. She then stated that the 70 foot height for the west building is the last thing for her. Ms. Kelly also stated that she saw where it is not going to work and that they are not talking about the economics which she described as a different thing. She agreed that they cannot just lop off a floor and have the other things work. Ms. Kelly then stated that doing the other perspectives will help. She also referred to all of the different fenestrations and the mansard roof so that it would not seem to be 70 feet straight up.

Mr. Trandel agreed they would provide the information.

Ms. Kelly concluded by stating that they are getting there and that she is excited.

Mr. Burt noted that the quality of the architecture here is not inexpensive and that the more they can do to subsidize quality that meets the design guidelines, the better. He added that things are intertwined and referred to lesser quality and lower space.

Ms. Kelly stated that they are all applauding this type of architecture and level of detail being introduced in the community. She also stated that it is huge and that they are grateful.

Chairman Swierk asked the applicant if they want to continue to get more data or are they looking for a resolution now.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that they would provide supporting data.

Mr. Albinson and Ms. Stanley stated that for the whole thing, they need to go through it.

Chairman Swierk questioned the schedule for the Village Council.

Mr. Trandel responded that the goal is coming out of here with findings and a vote on the findings and then to go the Village Council in March. He informed the Board that time is money and that seasonally, they want to be completely done before Christmas 2017 which meant that they want to get in the ground in June. Mr. Trandel noted that there is a lot of data there and that they are not looking for a no.

Chairman Swierk suggested that the applicant come back next month. He stated that the biggest work is on the west building.

Mr. Trandel reiterated that the Plan Commission gave them the thumbs up and that there were a lot of questions which needed answers. He then stated that it would be prudent if they get another stab at it is if the Village Council provided preliminary approval, they would still need to come back for final approval. Mr. Trandel stated that they can then take the findings to the Village Council and make modifications based on the findings before the final submittal to the Village Council. He added that they have shown that they are responsive and that unlike most projects, they own the land and are significantly losing \$50,000 a month.

Chairman Swierk stated that the Board can approve the concept and just give to direction to the Village Council.

Ms. Stanley did not agree with Chairman Swierk's suggestion.

Mr. Norkus stated that illustrative of what the Plan Commission had done was making findings

and recommendations and that in a specific examination of the Plan Commission recommendations, they found that certain elements of the plan required further study but recommended specific changes, one of which was the recommendation to relocate the drop-off and pickup of vehicles and trash off of Elm and which was relocated to Lincoln. He stated that the Board can make the same types of conditional comments relative to the design elements that they are troubled by.

Chairman Swierk noted that there are two things that the Board are hung up and that Elm Street is fairly ok. He then referred to the part facing west.

Mr. Dearborn referred to Paul Konstant's email which goes along with Mr. Albinson's comments and contained complementary comments in connection with the east side. He stated that Mr. Konstant wondered if architectural consideration was given to a more neutral pallet along with several other comments including that the west side is too large. Mr. Dearborn then stated that with regard to the a vote, he stated that it would be hard to say yes but for too much detail and too much bulk.

Mr. Albinson stated that he had comments on the colors as well. He then stated that the Board is being asked to provide a resolution on 28 items that they have to go through and asked to provide additional comments at the end.

Mr. Dearborn stated that can be done in February.

Ms. Stanley stated that with regard to the 28 items and having more work done on the west elevation and the 28 items, going through them would not happen tonight.

Mr. Albinson asked if it is possible if revisions can be submitted soon to the Board which he indicated would be helpful.

Mr. Trandel asked if they could do a special meeting in a week or two.

Ms. Stanley stated that they cannot.

Mr. Norkus stated that they are two factors, the first of which is whether the Board members are available as well as the required notice to the neighbors of a special meeting which would need to be done at least 10 days before the scheduled date. He then stated that would be a date three weeks away in order to provide ample notice.

Chairman Swierk stated that the big things included parking and the garage view being addressed along with materials and the façade east and west.

Mr. Albinson stated that he has made his comments and that they need more information.

Mr. Trandel stated that with regard to scale, to look at 711 Oak and its 45 foot monolithic appearance and that they are asking them to do not what they want to do. He noted that the first floor would be retail not like 711 Oak and that they are trying to do 48,000 square feet of retail. Mr. Trandel also stated that there would be medical offices and the like on the second floor. He reiterated that lopping off a floor would not work financially and that killing parking would result in them being no better off than when they started. Mr. Trandel also stated that for 12 foot trees taller and the building, there are six church steeples which are higher. He then referred to the amazing obsession with 3,000 square feet of area at 70 feet and that the flip side is not what they want to end up with. Mr. Trandel also referred to the \$1 million to the Village coffers based on this design and that they are tweaking something pretty delicate.

Mr. Trandel then stated that the world is not static and that it was easier to get financing a year ago than today. He referred to it as a moment in time financially in terms of getting it done. Mr. Trandel also stated that given a choice, 45 feet can be done and they would get out of here. He then referred to the neighbors and friends and stated that at the end of the day, they are good real estate professionals who are not trying jam something in and that they want something they can get done and be proud of as citizens. Mr. Trandel informed the Board that the investor base is predominately Winnetka residents. He then suggested that the Board vote now and they would take their changes. Mr. Trandel added that they can make color tweaks.

Chairman Swierk then asked the Board if they wanted to make a motion.

Mr. Albinson stated that the Board is not in a position to vote and that they need to see more information.

Mr. Trandel responded that they can get it to the Board within a week. He also stated that they can solve the color issue and provide renderings. Mr. Trandel implored the Board to act and that they are throwing themselves on the mercy of the court. He reiterated that they have proven themselves to be responsive.

Mr. Dearborn asked what is the downside of waiting until February and that there can be an answer in February.

Mr. Trandel stated that he would defer to Mr. Norkus.

Chairman Swierk questioned if they only come back if something changes or they want some additional smaller details.

Ms. Kelly questioned whether the general idea is for or against.

Chairman Swierk stated that the applicant is asking for a motion with conditions.

Ms. Kelly agreed that the Board would have opportunities to change smaller details.

Ms. Stanley stated that is not part of the 28 items.

Mr. Trandel stated that the Village design guidelines were not designed for a \$90 million project but for additions onto homes. He then stated that it could go on forever before they solve for the 28 items. Mr. Trandel asked the Board for approval but for [conditions].

Mr. Norkus stated that it is important that back to a couple of months ago since the initial presentation to the Board, at the beginning, a brief explanation was given of the planned development process and that it did differ somewhat from traditional development, mainly in that there is a preliminary review process which is the stage they are in now. He stated that ultimately, after receiving preliminary approval from the Village Council, the applicant would come back to the Board for final approval with the understanding at that stage, there is certainty with the project and that there is a level of detail which has not been seen yet. Mr. Norkus stated that there would be an opportunity to pass on to the Village Council either a favorable recommendation, an unfavorable recommendation or a mix with the understanding that the project would coming back if the Village Council approved it.

Mr. Dearborn stated that the odds of approval after the applicant comes in with additional information would be a lot higher and suggested that they wait until February. He then referred to the relevance of the vote to take and that Mr. Albinson raised good points.

Mr. Albinson stated that in looking at his responsibility as a Board member, he cannot say definitely that the project is consistent with the design guidelines.

Ms. Stanley stated that she agreed with Mr. Albinson's comment.

Chairman Swierk stated that the design guidelines are not expecting a \$90 million project.

Mr. Albinson then stated that it is easy to say that the building too high and that is not what they are saying. He stated that they are saying that they need more information to truly represent the requirements placed on the Board to make that decision.

Ms. Kelly stated that it would not hurt to vote and that the applicant would come back anyway. She then stated that they are spending tons of money every day and that it is not to say that it is a binding vote. Ms. Kelly also stated that they have the right to have another opportunity again with more information and that the Board members should say which way they are leaning.

Mr. Klaskin stated that he would be in favor and based on the explanation. He then stated that if the Board is divided, they owe it to get other perspectives which may be the missing link. Mr. Klaskin added that there are serious question marks that too many Board members have.

Mr. Trandel stated that they have to vote on the findings.

Mr. Norkus stated that the Board may want to consider if there is a majority vote to recommend, to direct the Village staff to draft a resolution disapproving the project and to draft findings to come back to the Board for consideration at the February meeting. He also stated that it would be the same thing if they were to vote to direct the Village staff to draft a positive recommendation with conditions and based on what is articulated in the motion.

Chairman Swierk stated that if the vote is split, then there would be no recommendation.

Mr. Norkus confirmed that there has to be a majority vote.

Mr. Trandel stated that if they wait until February, he asked if they would still instruct the Village staff to create findings and that at the end of March to ratify the findings.

Mr. Norkus stated that they generally get approved in the form of adopted minutes.

Mr. Trandel then asked for the Board to vote to approve the request with conditions and to come back if they do not do them, to change findings or vote.

Chairman Swierk reiterated that the one biggest problem is the tall building. He stated that if the Board says next month that it is too tall, the request would go on to the Village Council. Chairman Swierk stated that the applicant is not going to reduce the height by a floor.

Ms. Stanley commented that they did remarkable work on the backside.

Mr. Trandel reiterated that they pushed the square footage to the middle. He also commented that it is a way better project than it was a year ago. Mr. Trandel added that it is also way below what would be done by right.

Chairman Swierk then stated that they need a motion with conditions to approve the request or continue it.

Ms. Stanley moved to continue the matter to the February meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Albinson. A vote was taken and the motion was unanimously passed.

AYES: Albinson, Dearborn, Kelly, Klaskin, Stanley, Swierk
NAYS: None

* * * *

Findings of the Winnetka Design Review Board

Consistency of the “One Winnetka” Planned Development Application With the Village of Winnetka Design Guidelines

After considering the application, the *Design Review Board* makes its findings as follows,

SECTION ONE - Consistency with Design Guidelines. The proposal is **consistent** with the following policies and objectives contained within the Village Design Guidelines:

Chapter I & II - CONTEXTUAL DESIGN and USES

- (1)
 - (b) The prevalence of the English Tudor style throughout the Village dictates smaller structural bays and massing, limited building heights, variety in roof forms, mix of materials and special attention to detailing and fenestration proportions and patterns.
 - (c) Traditional two-part mixed use structures with retail at grade should incorporate facades which clearly separate the two uses through changes in materials and wall plane as well as changes in fenestration, with large glass storefronts on the street level and punched windows above creating a hierarchy of public versus private spaces.
- (2)
 - (a) In select locations, where large or awkward site geometry suggests, alternatives to the existing mixed-uses may encourage the use of first floor courtyards or pedestrian ways instead of uninterrupted commercial space.

Chapter III - HISTORIC BUILDINGS & ELEMENTS

- (3)
 - (a) Future project designs should reinforce the established character, massing and scale. New developments and alterations are encouraged to incorporate historic building elements and forms from adjacent structures in order to maintain a cohesive district.

Chapter V - BUILDING MASS

- (4) Building setbacks
 - (a) A continuous “streetwall” should be provided along primary commercial thoroughfares. New buildings should align with adjacent buildings along the property line.
 - (b) Setbacks should be provided where appropriate to enhance landscape areas and/or widen restricted sidewalks to provide appropriate width.

- (c) The main façade should be oriented to the primary commercial thoroughfare.
 - (d) Continuous upper level setbacks are not permitted. Small setbacks no greater than one bay width will be considered on upper floors only.
 - (e) Roof gables should be in the same plane as the primary building façade. Eaves should meet and project beyond the primary façade to create horizontal rhythm.
 - (f) Buildings on corner sites should hold the property line at both property lines - slightly rounded or angled building corners are acceptable.
- (6) *Roof form - Roof forms contribute to the massing, scale and proportions of all buildings. Manipulation of the form can help distinguish between residential, commercial and institutional structures.*
- (a) Sloped roof systems should have eave lines that extend to the perimeter of the building eliminating upper story setbacks at the primary elevation.
 - (b) The continuous length of any roof on a primary facade should be limited to 20'0", without a break in plane using dormers, gables or hip roofs.
 - (c) The predominant roof form within the districts is a pitched shingle roof with cross gables, projecting eave line and brackets reflecting the structural bay rhythm of the building. Variations of the gable and roof pitch contribute to the general breakdown of the building mass and contribute to the steady streetwall rhythm. No roof pitch is to be greater than 60 degrees (21:12) or less than 35 degrees (8:12).

Chapter VI - PROPORTION/SCALE

- (7) *Horizontal Rhythm - The breakdown of the building facade into horizontal bands provides human scale and proportion to the facade. The relationship of horizontal banding among buildings can unify the street elevation.*
- (a) The height of the street level elevations (floor to floor) should be 20% greater than the upper floor to floor dimensions.
 - (b) A building base, middle and top should be strongly articulated through materials, details and changes in the plane of the wall.
 - (c) The retail storefront façade should be differentiated from the facade of the upper stories.
 - (d) The street and storefront facade should be horizontal, contiguous and harmonious with the adjacent and facing structures.
 - (e) Storefront systems, awnings, and entrance doors should be selected to be harmonious and similar to the adjacent buildings' scale and proportion.

- (8) Vertical rhythm - *The breakdown of the building facades into vertical bays creates a sense of progression and scale to the streetwall as well as individual buildings. Vertical rhythms break down the length of a building while unifying the floors from grade to eave. Fenestration patterns will emphasize the vertical rhythms.*
- (a) Facades are to be articulated to express a vertical rhythm that is directly related to the structural columns and bays. Structural bays should not exceed 20 feet in width.
 - (b) Structural elements and bays should be architecturally articulated on the facade to add interest, scale, proportion and detail.
 - (c) Structural bays should be recessed and/or projected approximately 6”– 12” to provide a variety of changes of plane, interest in light and shadow and to establish a hierarchy with the architectural elements. Some variation of facade materials from bay to bay is encouraged. No building facade that faces a street or pedestrian open space may have a blank uninterrupted length greater than 20 feet.
- (9) Facade articulation - *Articulation is achieved through the combination of materials, introduction of detailing and changes in plane of the facade.*
- (a) Facade elements should be recessed and/or projected to provide a variety of changes of plane, interest in light and shadow and to establish a hierarchy with the architectural elements.
 - (b) Building facades are to be proportioned to respect human scale and the existing prevalent scale of the Village’s architecture. No building facade that faces a street or pedestrian open space should have a blank uninterrupted length of wall greater than 20 feet.
 - (c) Ground floor /storefronts that face public streets, adjacent development or pedestrian open space should be subdivided using fenestration along no less than 60% of the facade.
- (10) Fenestration - *The pattern of wall penetrations created by window and door openings.*
- (a) Windows should be recessed back from the overall plane of the building facade at the window head and sill to create additional articulation and shadow.
 - (b) Primary facades (facing streets or pedestrian ways) - At least 60% of the first floor facade is to be windows/storefront or entrances. At least 25% but no more than 40% of the upper floors are to be windows or doors.
 - (c) Secondary facades (facing alleys or parking areas) - At least 25% of the first floor facade is to be windows/storefront or entrances. At least 25% of the upper floors are to be windows or doors.

(11) Hierarchy – Prioritization of certain building masses, components, or elements over others.

- (a) The hierarchy of public over private spaces should be conveyed by the facade. Public or retail spaces should be open and inviting through the introduction of storefronts with doors integral to the system.

Chapter VII - ARTICULATION

(12) Entries

- (a) Hierarchy - Public entrances should be evident from the public way and differentiated from the semi-public and private entrances. Public entries should have a large-scale approach and be open and inviting whereas semi-public and private entries are integral to the adjacent building facade and more opaque.
- (b) Location - Public entrances should be located along main thoroughfares and at corners. Private or semi-private entrances should be located either to the side of a single bay building or centrally for a multiple bay building.
- (c) Detail - Typically, private or semi-private entrances should have a predominately solid door and be set in a masonry opening nearly flush to the building facade whereas the public or storefront doorway should be recessed and have an awning to provide protection from the elements. Entrances can be further defined by using subtle streetscape improvements such as pavers. Residential entrances should be clearly identified and dignified.

(13) Window and door fenestration

- (a) Upper floors - Punched single or ganged windows are required at upper floors but not allowed at street level on primary facades in commercial buildings. A combination of ganged and single units within the punched opening is encouraged to provide hierarchy to the facade. It is encouraged that the sill height of upper level windows align with adjacent buildings but should not be higher than 30” above finish floor elevation. Mullion and muntin divisions are required to maintain the scale of the districts and reduce large expanses of glass at the upper floors. Strip windows are not allowed.
- (b) Storefront windows - required in commercial buildings on the primary facade at street level. Storefront windowsill heights cannot exceed 18”.
- (c) Secondary facades are encouraged to provide punched display windows to define the hierarchy of the primary facade over the secondary.

(14) Building lighting

- (a) Exterior building lighting should be carefully designed, contextual with the building and adjacent building design. Building lighting should focus on providing light on building signs and enhancing architectural details on the facade.

(15) Building signage

- (a) Commercial signs should reflect the character of the building style, while expressing each store's individuality. Metal sign and plaque material such as brushed bronze, antique bronze, aluminum, stainless steel and painted cast iron or similarly appearing materials are preferred. The majority of the signs will be mounted within the building's sign band.

(16) Awnings / banners

- (a) Awning scale and proportions are to be appropriate for the building on which they are mounted as well as the adjacent structures. It is highly recommended that awnings be uniform in size, shape (except for arched openings) and color in order to unify multiple storefronts within a single building.

(17) Mechanical equipment

- (a) Mechanical equipment must not be visible from pedestrian view. Roof top equipment should be located either in the center of the roof or in one corner away from the street elevation so as not to be visible. Mechanical equipment at grade should be screened with a fence or wall of the same materials as the building.

(18) Materials

- a. Rough-faced limestone should be limited to accent or base pieces only.
- b. Brick color palette should be restricted to those present in the district but can vary in color from reds to yellows and have varying levels of iron spotting.
- c. English Tudor buildings obtain some of their character from the mix of materials used in the upper floors. Creative use of material combinations is encouraged to break up the massing.
- d. The number of facade colors should be minimized to maintain unified districts – white and cream stucco with reds and browns, emphasizing earth tones and eliminating saturated colors.
- e. Acceptable materials include modular brick, rough-faced or dressed limestone and exterior grade stucco with wood trim. Wood, aluminum or vinyl siding, metals, rough/random lannon stone, concrete block (split face or smooth) and glass block are not acceptable materials.

- f. EIFS may be allowed if the location is limited to the second floor facades or higher and the finish and articulation are acceptable. The finish of the EIFS must resemble exterior grade stucco of the historic English Tudor buildings in the Village.
- g. Roof materials may include clay tile, cement tile & shingles, ceramic tile that simulate natural materials, architectural grade asphalt shingles, wood shingles, slate, real copper.
- h. Entry doors should be wood or aluminum stile and rail with varying degrees of glass. Public entry doors should be fully glazed whereas private and semiprivate entries should be primarily solid panel doors. Entry door hardware is to be exterior grade with weather-resistant finish. Hardware design and finish is to be appropriate with facade articulation, color palette and district character.
- i. Storefront window materials should be either paneled aluminum or brass. Glazing should be clear glass without tint or film.
- j. Window frames should be wood, steel or aluminum. Muntin divisions should be real divided glass or simulated with spacer bars. Color selection should be sympathetic with the overall building color palette and take into account the adjacent building materials within the structure, immediately adjacent structures. Glazing should be clear glass without tint or film.

(19) Service areas, secondary facades, parking structures

- a. Service areas - are to be located off secondary streets or alleys out of public view. If a service area is visible from the public view, the service area is to be treated with screening approximately 6'-8' tall to match adjacent building elevations.
- b. Secondary facades - When a secondary public entrance is located off a parking area or alley, the alley is to be treated as an extension of the public walkway, and the building entrance is to be articulated to differentiate it from private or semi-private entrances.
- c. Parking structures - should be located remotely from primary streets and not be visible from the public way. Structures should provide a safe and pleasant pedestrian entrance and exit. Structures should integrate into the surrounding architectural fabric. Integrated parking structures should provide a seamless and non-evident appearance of parking. Their scale and mass, building materials, details and articulation should be compatible with the standards set forth in these design guidelines. Adequate vehicular and pedestrian access into the structure, ADA compatibility, safety, lighting, and ventilation issues must be addressed.

Chapter VIII - PEDESTRIAN ZONES and PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION

(20) *Sidewalks*

- (a) A minimum 6-foot wide pedestrian clear zone must be maintained, and shall be next to retail store frontages and away from street edges or curb lines. When landscape elements are incorporated into pedestrian zones a paved 18-inch wide carriage walk must be provided.
- (b) Sidewalk materials and patterns to comply with streetscape palette.
- (c) The Village's streetscape elements should be placed in high traffic areas and grouped to provide the greatest public benefit. They should be coordinated and consistent along the street for a minimum of one block. All elements should be high quality.

(21) *Pedestrian zone landscaping*

- (a) Plant materials shall be selected from approved plant palette; encourages a variety of species sizes and types of plants.
- (b) Street trees should be selected from plant palette, and shall coordinate with existing planting patterns. Grouped and linear plantings may be considered as part of an overall site development plan concept. Minimum size of 4" caliper. Street trees should be no closer than 3 feet from face of curb.
- (c) Landscaping should not block views or pedestrian sidewalks at mature size. Sight triangles should be not less than 12'.
- (d) Structural soil & planting soil depth – must comply.
- (e) Raised planters are encouraged where possible and space permits. Movable planters are encouraged where space does not permit raised planters.

(22) *Special streetscape conditions*

- (a) Outdoor sidewalk cafes - encouraged, to help enliven streetscape, with attention providing pedestrian clear zone.
- (b) Corner bump outs – encouraged, to slow traffic, highlight pedestrian crossings, encourage pedestrian gathering.
- (c) Bus stops – where bus stops occur a coordinated sign system should be utilized. New shelter designs should be considered to maintain Village character.

Chapter IX - VEHICULAR ZONE

(23) Parking areas

1. New parking should be located behind, within or underneath structures and buildings. Off street surface parking lots in front of new buildings and along street frontages are prohibited.
2. Access to parking and loading areas must be provided off secondary streets or existing alleys/service drives.
3. If appropriate and feasible on street parking should be provided within the public right of way in front of new buildings.
4. Curb cuts should be minimized and access points should be shared.
5. Shared parking should be provided where possible.

(24) Loading and service areas

- (a) Service areas should be located at side or rear of new developments, access should be provided by mid-block alleys/driveways or from secondary streets.
- (b) Exterior mechanicals, loading/service trash storage should not be visible from public roads; to the extent possible they should be contained within the building.
- (c) If located outside the building elements should be screened with permanent year round material.
- (d) Service / trash areas should be clustered together and shared between businesses where possible.

(25) Parking signage

- (a) All parking areas, public and private should contain appropriate directional and regulatory signs in an uncluttered, clear and concise manner.
- (b) Village owned parking should be signed consistent with the Village's wayfinding program.
- (c) Individual businesses should identify their property address and establishment name(s) with a clear concise sign program located adjacent to service/loading/delivery areas.

(26) Vehicular zone landscape

- (a) Off Street parking perimeter screening should be provided as detailed in Guidelines in order to minimize impact on surrounding landscape.
- (b) Off Street parking internal landscaping should be employed as detailed in Guidelines.

- (c) On Street public parking should be softened by landscape islands or “bumpouts” where possible.
- (d) Parking structures should incorporate a minimum 5-foot landscape setback at the base of structures adjacent to pedestrian areas in the public way, and appropriately planted & vines planted to soften walls. Integral planters should be incorporated into plans to allow for planting of cascading plant material.
- (e) Service and loading areas should be screened from public view using architecturally treated walls or other approved means, blocking view from pedestrians, between 6-8 feet in height.

(27) *Vehicular area lighting*

- (a) Lighting should be provided in private and public parking lots, in an appropriate pedestrian scaled style and in accordance with standards outlined in the Guidelines.

(28) *Special conditions*

- (a) Vehicular use areas such as parking and service areas may encounter or raise special conditions or concerns, including but not limited to, (a) noise abatement, (b) safety / security, (c) maintenance, (d) special adjacent land use. These concerns should be addressed as part of the development review process.

SECTION TWO – Elements inconsistent with Design Guidelines. The proposal is **inconsistent** with the following policies and objectives contained within the Village Design Guidelines:

- (1) *Contextual design* - Projects should reflect an understanding of the immediate site surroundings and Village-wide character. Contextual design reflects existing features including massing, height, setbacks, proportions, scale, roof forms, materials, articulation, lighting, signs and awnings while creating appropriate architectural design.
- (2) *Building height* - Existing building heights are consistent at 2-3 stories within the heart of the commercial district. Buildings of this height are appropriately located within dense pedestrian districts and along Green Bay Road whereas buildings of 1 and 2 stories function well as transitions to single-family residential areas. Based on existing building heights, new buildings should have transitional elements or bays such that the new building height will not vary more than ½-story lower than the immediate adjacent buildings while complying with the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

SECTION THREE – DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION

RESOLUTION

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Winnetka Design Review Board finds that the proposed One Winnetka Planned Development Application IS consistent with the Village of Winnetka Design Guidelines;

Passed by a vote of **4** in favor and **3** opposed.

AYES: Albinson, Klaskin, Kelly, Swierk
NAYS: Dearborn, Konstant, Stanley

DATE: February 18, 2016