

**WINNETKA PLAN COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
JUNE 24, 2015**

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

Non-voting Members Present: Chris Blum

Members Absent: Caryn Rosen Adelman
Jan Bawden
Paul Dunn

Village Attorney: Peter Friedman

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

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Dalman at 7:34 p.m.

Chairperson Dalman took a roll call of the Commission members present and welcomed three new members to the Commission, Chris Blum from the ZBA, Carol Fessler, a Village Trustee and Dana Fattore Crumley, a School Board representative.

Chairperson Dalman stated that for clarification, this is a continuation of the public hearing which opened on March 25, 2015 and that the Commission had subsequent meetings on April 8, April 22 and May 21, 2015 and that the meeting was continued and that they would be continuing the public hearing. She also stated that additional notice was provided of the continuation of the May meeting. Chairperson Dalman stated that she would like to encourage those who wished to receive notice and provide comment to please provide the Village staff with their email addresses in order to continue to keep people informed who are interested in the project and the workings of the Commission concerning future meetings.

Chairperson Dalman then stated that before they start with the agenda items, the first item

represented the adoption of the April 8, 2015 meeting minutes. She asked if there were any comments. No comments were made at this time. Chairperson Dalman then asked for a motion.

A motion was made by several Commission members to approve the Plan Commission meeting minutes from April 8, 2015. The motion was not seconded. A vote was taken and the meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

Chairperson Dalman stated that the next agenda item related to the adoption of the April 22, 2015 meeting minutes. She asked if there were any comments or corrections. No comments or corrections were made at this time. Chairperson Dalman then asked for a motion.

A motion was made by Mr. Thomas and seconded to approve the Plan Commission meeting minutes from April 22, 2015. A vote was taken and the meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

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

Chairperson Dalman stated that the third agenda item is the continuation of the planned development application by Stonestreet Partners and Winnetka Station LLC. She noted that with regard to the earlier continuation of the public hearing which opened on March 25th, before they start, she would like to provide a brief overview of the schedule of how things are to go at this meeting. Chairperson Dalman then stated that because the applicant submitted a revised application which caused the continuation of the last meeting in May in order to give more time for review, they would start with the developer's presentation of the revised application. She indicated that there is no need to go back over the full application and that it would be helpful for the applicant to focus on the elements which were revised or highlighted. Chairperson Dalman stated that then, Mr. Norkus would walk the Commission through the changes in the plan with regard to zoning because the application has been revised and reduced in scale and that it is important with regard to the changes to the zoning review sought by the applicant.

Chairperson Dalman stated that after Mr. Norkus' Village staff review, they are fortunate to have Steve Saunders at the meeting to walk through the memorandum in response to the applicant's comments concerning the engineering concerns. She stated that after Mr. Saunders' presentation, the Commission would have the opportunity to question the applicant and the Village staff so that they have enough time to get to the public comment. Chairperson Dalman indicated that they are not looking for commentary at this point.

Chairperson Dalman then stated that after the Commission finished, they would open the meeting up to public comment as part of the public hearing. She stated that for those who are not new to the process, there are a couple guidelines which have worked fairly well. Chairperson Dalman stated that they would like to ensure that everyone would have the opportunity to comment and asked if there is general comment about the application, to limit the comments to five minutes.

She added that she was told that amount of time is generous.

Chairperson Dalman also asked that for those who appeared at a hearing before and gave comment, she commented that is great and that they enjoy having them here. She stated that they also want to make sure that they give the opportunity to those who have not had a chance to speak, to limit those comments relative to the new and revised elements. Chairperson Dalman then stated that for those who have not spoken before, to share their thoughts with the Commission.

Chairperson Dalman stated that for those who fall into the category of interested parties or those with more of an organized group, speaking for a household, who have plans to question the consultants or the advisors of the applicant, she asked for them to wait until the general comments are done and then the interested parties would have the opportunity to further comment and question. She then stated that they would wrap up the meeting at approximately 10:00 or 10:15 p.m. and asked the Commission members if they had any questions.

No questions were raised by the Commission at this time.

Chairperson Dalman then stated that the applicant can begin their presentation.

A gentleman in the audience stated that he would like to be recognized as a point of order which he described as important.

Chairperson Dalman swore in those that intended to make comments or provide testimony. She then referred to the schedule for the meeting and order and that they would follow the schedule.

He stated that his comments related to the attorney representing the Commission and asked for three minutes.

Chairperson Dalman agreed to his request.

Frank Petrek introduced himself to the Commission and identified his address as 711 Oak, Unit 409 in Winnetka. Mr. Petrek stated that he is submitting to the Commission as Commission Exhibit 1, June 24, 2015, a copy of the contract between the law firm of Holland & Knight and the Village of Winnetka. He stated that the reason this is a point of order is that this has come to his attention since the last meeting.

Mr. Petrek informed the Commission that the Holland & Knight contract which he identified as Exhibit 1 stated specifically that Steve Elrod, a Partner of Holland & Knight, is one of the team who is responsible for the representation of the Village. He then stated that Mr. Elrod represented New Trier Partners (NTP) with respect to the proposed development of the Fell property which is the same property included in this application for consideration. Mr. Petrek stated that NTP has been identified as one of the real parties in interest in the Stonestreet development of the Fell property also known as One Winnetka. He stated that the contract between the Village and Holland & Knight has no written waiver of conflict of interest and Holland & Knight representing the Village and NTP who are adverse parties with regard to the development of the Fell property, the parole evidence rule remains in effect in Illinois and that it bars oral statements regarding

contract formation.

Mr. Petrek stated that in his professional opinion as an attorney who has been practicing in Illinois for 38 years that the representation of the Village by Holland & Knight on all matters related to the development of the Fell property is an apparent conflict and violation of the rules of the Illinois Supreme Court, for example, Illinois Supreme Court Rules 1.7 through 1.10. He then stated that he therefore demanded that Mr. Friedman recuse himself and Holland & Knight from all further representation of the Village of Winnetka with regard to the Fell development, 15-10-Planned Development.

Mr. Friedman responded that he had no reason to recuse himself and that Mr. Petrek's statement of the law is incorrect. He informed the Commission that their involvement with NTP was disclosed from the moment that they applied for this position with all parties who interviewed them, including the Village Council. Mr. Friedman also stated that the engagement with NTP ended when their petition ended before it went to the Village Council for final approval. He stated that they had no representation of NTP with regard to their sale of the property to the current developers and that they have had no involvement since that time. Mr. Friedman then stated that there is no confidential information or any other reason that would impact their ability to represent the Village fully, faithfully and pursuant to all of the Illinois Supreme Court rules. He also stated that there is no apparent conflict of interest or real conflict of interest.

The attorney for Conney's (Zave Gussin) stated that he was unaware that the other attorney was going to raise this point and that he raised the point in a supplemental memorandum which he filed on Monday which supplemented his previous memorandum and reinforced certain aspects, specifically with regard to point 4 in the memorandum which objected to the continued participation of Holland & Knight. He indicated that the other attorney [Mr. Petrek] expressed his objection well and stated that he would like to add one thing which was not mentioned. He stated that notwithstanding that there may have been a technical cessation of the representation of NTP, there is a principal of both entities who is Michael Klein and who was a principal of NTP and a principal of Stonestreet Partners. He stated that provided an additional link between the two which created a conflict of interest and that he would like to mention that additional aspect.

Mr. Friedman responded that he did not know if that is true and that he has never met Mr. Klein, nor did they represent Mr. Klein and that they represented NTP. He also stated that he had no idea whether Mr. Klein is a principal with the developer and even if it is true, it would not create a conflict of interest, either apparent or real. Mr. Friedman stated that currently, his firm is adverse to Mr. Klein in a development which he is doing in Lincolnwood. He stated that there is no relevance with regard to whatever his position is with this developer and his firm's former representation of NTP.

Chairperson Dalman stated that she had a question for the Village staff as a matter of record that Mr. Petrek raised is the fact that NTP is a party in interest to the applicant and that she did not believe that they had received any evidence of that. She then asked if there has been any disclosure of that.

Mr. D'Onofrio responded not that he is aware of.

Chairperson Dalman then stated that she wanted to make sure that the record is corrected. She referred to the fact that those are not the facts that the Commission were presented with.

Mr. Coladarci stated that he requested at an earlier meeting that the partners of One Winnetka be disclosed and that he was jumped on. He then stated that at this point, they do not know who is involved in the development other than David Trandel. Mr. Coladarci stated that he would like to renew his request that the applicant disclose the investors. He stated that the talk with regard to the law does not provide for that. Mr. Coladarci then stated that the project is asking for public land and that the Village has the right to know who is asking for public land. He also stated that it is impossible for the Commission to know if there are any conflicts without knowing who the investors are. Mr. Coladarci added that it is hard to know bias if they do not know who has financial interest and reiterated that he is requesting that information be disclosed.

Chairperson Dalman indicated that while it may be appropriate for the development to request it, it is not something that the Commission can require. She stated that it is important to understand and that they were told that there are many investors invested in the project. Chairperson Dalman suggested that they all take a step back and that if someone is testifying, the Commission should ask for that person to disclose if they have an interest. She then indicated that she is not sure in terms of appearance or with regard to fairness issues to ask for people to make that disclosure. Chairperson Dalman stated that it would be appropriate to open the applicant to go through the revised application. She also stated that in her review, she did not see a request for necessarily a grant of public land and that there are options for public/private participation. Chairperson Dalman then stated that those options are for the Village Council to determine if they should be pursued and added that Mr. Coladarci had a good point.

Mr. Thomas stated that in going back to the original question with regard to conflict of interest, if the Village Council says that it does not exist, the question following that is whether or not there is enough of an appearance that the Commission is to be concerned. He also asked who would make the ruling on that.

Chairperson Dalman responded that it would be the Village Council since they engaged the law firm. She indicated that it would be helpful for the Commission to take testimony and concerns and stated that to her, she is not concerned as a lawyer and that there is not ongoing representation. Chairperson Dalman then stated that they are not in a position to make that decision and asked for the presentation to be made by the applicant.

Glen Udell informed the Commission that he is representing the applicant, Stonestreet Partners, LLC and Winnetka Station LLC. He also stated that they have George Kisiel and David Trandel present who would discuss the critical components of the revised plan.

David Trandel informed the Commission that it is correct in that Michael Klein is not a principal of Stonestreet Partners. He also informed the Commission that when they were approached by the bank to acquire the note and buy the land, Michael Klein and Bob Goldstein were principals of NTP. Mr. Trandel then stated that in the operating agreement, there was a chance for them to recoup the significant losses they endured in the amount of \$3.6 million in the first attempt at the

development and that what was approved was not financeable. He stated that the lenders approached them which is how they got involved. Mr. Trandel stated that they have good relations with both banks and help the banks with the undergoing project. He then stated that in fairness, Mr. Klein has no control or management and to the extent that he can give his investors a chance to get their money back, that is the extent of their involvement.

Mr. Trandel then stated that the proposal represented the fourth iteration and that it is something which is passionate to those who call Winnetka home. He stated that they have spent a lot of time and soul searching on the project, listening to comments including those from Mr. Petrek and the most affected neighbors by the project and specifically the businesses, residents, the school neighbors, 711 Oak, Conney's and all of the business community around the property. Mr. Trandel stated that they attempted to encapsulate the depth of the comments and criticisms received to adjust and present what would be commercially and financially viable.

Mr. Trandel stated that with regard to the part of the process from the first submittal to now, he described the process as improved and thanked everyone for their openness. He then stated that he would outline the significant changes in the PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Trandel stated that they previously submitted a proposal for up to 120 luxury units and that amount has been scaled down to 71 units. He indicated that the demographic would be the same which included empty nesters and young professionals. Mr. Trandel also stated that they mildly scaled down retail and that the focus would be restaurants, with the health and fitness portion being an amenity within the building and not for a commercial endeavor.

Mr. Trandel stated that as they scaled the project down, they were able to reduce one of the levels of underground parking for the residential component and that the parking count reduced by one floor underneath to 478 parking spaces. He stated that most of the things which are most granular and related to how to look at the project from the onset was solving for the shortcomings downtown such as commuter and retail parking and that they have held onto the public plaza.

Mr. Trandel went on to state that with regard to discussing height and density, they have effectively reduced the top portions of the building and did interesting things on the scale on the easternmost portion of the building in order to provide setback relief which would be a much less imposing building on the neighbors east of the property. He informed the Commission that they reduced the height to mostly 59 feet and that there would be a couple of penthouses which would pop up to 70 feet in height which he described as more of an architectural accent to help bookend, similar to the concept like that of the Village Hall. Mr. Trandel then stated that with regard to the scale and the contours of the roof line, they would do a nice job of complementing each other. He noted that they reduced the density by almost 50 units and that the floor area ratio which he described as critical to the economic viability of the project has been discounted by 15% and that they reduced the retail component 10%.

Mr. Trandel then stated that when you look at the property and in terms of a tradeoff in terms of what they can they do by code at 45 feet versus what they would end up with is three structures which include a west building, east building and a middle building. He described it as a big spot and that it is a large area of approximately 53,000 square feet. Mr. Trandel stated that they need to keep in context with what they are dealing with and that they are trying to keep it from being a

monolithic 45 foot building all the way across.

Mr. Trandel stated that when George Kisiel discussed some of the relief they are looking for with regard to height, he stated that from a percentage basis, it is a very low percentage of the residential above what is recommended and that they are attempting to get everyone to understand that there is a lot of open space and that it would be much more friendly to the south neighbors by having this open space and to avoid a cavernous feeling on Elm and maintain the Village appearance.

Mr. Trandel stated that when you look at the project now, he referred to the building on the right and the easternmost portion and that there would be terraces which would look over the Village Green. He noted that the setback would start on the 4th and 5th floors. Mr. Trandel indicated that there is not a ton of square footage there and that it would have a nice architectural feel. He then stated that the westernmost tower is where most of the height was located originally and that it was reduced to 59 feet except for the bump up to the penthouse, which would represent a mild variation of 14 feet for height. Mr. Trandel stated that there would be a terrific setting for the port cochere for the neighbors to the south. He then stated that although the building would be higher in some points, they have held on to the friendly approach to the surroundings.

Mr. Trandel noted that they have listened to all of the comments and the fact that there are all sorts of varying architectural styles. He then stated that while he was surprised at the depth of the discussion with regard to architectural style [from this Commission], they took a great amount of time and spent 1,000's of man hours with qualified and expensive professionals to modify the plan. Mr. Trandel stated that there is a sense of things that you see in great villages in the United States and around the world. He then referred to the eclectic variety of architectural styles which complement that across the street. Mr. Trandel also referred to the three story structure on Elm with real Tudor, Georgian Revival and Beaux-Art and that there is not just one style. He stated that the building would be warm and embrace the Village feel.

Mr. Trandel then stated that in connection with the variations with this proposal over the last plan, they had discussions back and forth with the planning department with regard to the east lot. He informed the Commission that the new plan is proposing to build and pay for a structure which would be a scissored parking lot on the east lot which currently has 62 parking spaces between the Hadley School and the Baird building. Mr. Trandel stated that they would build that for the Village and work with the Village on a long term lease on the retail spaces which are required by code.

Mr. Trandel also stated that they have talked a lot about the commuter lot. He then stated that there has been a lot of misconception. Mr. Trandel noted that there would be no giving of land to them by the Village and that they are not asking for anything for free. He stated that they are saying that if the Village wants certain things, to figure out a way in which to work together and pay for them. Mr. Trandel then stated that the commuter lot would be maintained and would only be one floor down and that there would be one floor of residential parking. He added that the two story underground parking in the amount of 194 spaces would remain intact.

Mr. Trandel stated that they also discussed enhancements to storm retention and flooding and that they would do an enhancement to the water main down Elm. He informed the Commission that

they planned to move the retention and detention off of the east lot and relocate it underneath the building where the second level of underground parking was previously located. Mr. Trandel then stated that the Hadley School has an island when it rains and that there are serious issues and that they would be working with them. He informed the Commission that by pulling that inside and underneath the building, they would be able to manage and the downstream water flow affecting those areas of town.

Mr. Trandel stated that he has worked on a lot of projects in his life and has never had a team who was passionate and responsive to the project and that it is special to all of them. He commented that they have done a terrific job and described it as a labor of love. Mr. Trandel concluded by stating that they have to get through the hoops.

George Kisiel of Okrent Kisiel Associates introduced himself as the planning and zoning consultant on the project and that he would walk through the nuts and bolts of the project and then talk about zoning relief. He indicated that there are three segments to the proposal and stated that on the west, there would be a five story structure at 59 feet with a penthouse and the corner element which would rise to a height of 70 feet. Mr. Kisiel stated that to the east, there would be a five story structure also which would have upper level setbacks on the 4th and 5th floors which would give the building more of a read of a three, four and five story building as it stepped back. He also stated that there would be a three story segment which would front on Elm and that there would be a single story segment which would front to the south with a roof garden.

Mr. Kisiel then referred the Commission to an illustration of the upper floor penthouse which is approximately 4,500 square feet and which is less than a 10th of the site area. He identified the third, fourth and fifth floors which would be dedicated to residential. He indicated that you can see the maisonettes which would front on Elm which he described as two story townhouses above the retail portion. Mr. Kisiel informed the Commission that there would be a bit of retail on the second floor and that the first floor would be primarily retail with the circulation and entry sequence for the residences of the development.

Mr. Kisiel stated that with regard to site circulation, Lincoln would remain open as a through street which would be two way. He stated that with regard to the way in which the site is approached by the residents, there would be an entrance off of Lincoln through the port cochere and down into the parking garage and that the commuters would enter the site and parking garage from the ramp down off of Lincoln. Mr. Kisiel then stated that for the retail users and employee entrance, the primary entrance would be located off of Elm and into the scissored parking area.

Mr. Kisiel stated that with regard to the parking program, he reminded everyone of the existing conditions and that currently, there are 33 commuter spaces along Lincoln, 30 retail spaces along Lincoln which is an area which would be reconfigured by the plan and that there are 24 retail spaces on Elm, along with the 62 space retail lot to the east. He stated that meant that there are an existing 149 spaces available for the public to use on the street and in the parking lot, with 116 spaces available for retail and 33 spaces for commuter purposes.

Mr. Kisiel went on to state that with regard to the proposal and the parking garage to the west which is the commuter lot, they planned to relocate the 33 commuter spaces on Lincoln into this

lot. He also stated that they would be relocating 17 of the 30 spaces existing on Lincoln and that 13 of them would remain on Lincoln. Mr. Kisiel stated that in addition, they would be adding 111 commuter spaces and 33 retail spaces.

Mr. Kisiel stated that with regard to the parking garage which would be located underneath the One Winnetka project, they would be providing 116 spaces for the residential component of the development, as well as 6 spaces and an additional 5 spaces in the port cochere to start to take care of the retail requirement for the site. He stated that with regard to the east lot, they planned to relocate the existing 62 spaces and add 53 spaces which is part of the requirement. Mr. Kisiel then stated that with regard to the reconfiguration of the entry of the lot, they planned to add 4 spaces on Elm.

Mr. Kisiel stated that to summarize with regard to the amount of parking which is available to the public, there are 149 existing spaces and that after the project is developed, there would be 289 spaces available to public. He indicated that there would be a net gain of 149 public parking spaces and that in essence, the project would double the amount of existing parking spaces which are available to the public. Mr. Kisiel noted that this did not include the spaces which are required for the project and that this would be above and beyond that.

Mr. Kisiel informed the Commission that the commuter and retail lot would go down two stories and that because of the reduction of the program, there is no need to provide a second lower level of parking and that the storm water management facilities would be located in that area below grade. He indicated that it would manage not only the runoff from the project, but also the existing runoff from the east lot, all of which would be managed on site.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that with regard to zoning exceptions being requested for the project, there are only three of them which he identified as building height and setbacks. He stated that specifically, in terms of building height, the ordinance has a maximum of 4 stories and 45 feet and that the maximum for this project is 6 stories and 70 feet which accounted for the penthouse and corner element and which he described as a small percentage of the site. Mr. Kisiel stated that a fourth floor upper story setback is a requirement of the ordinance around the perimeter of the site and that anything above the third story is required to be set back 10 feet. He informed the Commission that 12 foot setbacks would be provided on the east side of the property, but nowhere else on the subject property. He noted that mansard roofs would be used throughout and described them as a device which would accomplish a similar type of effect in terms of reducing the perceived height. Mr. Kisiel stated that finally, there is a rear yard setback requirement along the east end of the property of 10 feet and that no setback is being requested on the east side against the east parking lot.

Mr. Kisiel went on to state that with respect to building height, he stated that it is important to note that 90% of the site would be five stories or 59 feet or less. He then stated that there are standards which are considered when zoning exceptions are considered, which include to consider buildings in the vicinity and what is the context. Mr. Kisiel stated that the standards also include the consideration of the goals in the Comprehensive Plan which in this case, related to Village character. He also stated that they have to evaluate the accommodation of parking and open space and that if there is more open space on the site, there may be reasons to grant greater height. Mr.

Kisiel stated that compatibility with adjoining properties is also considered. He noted that these four standards repeat in connection with all of the zoning relief they are asking for.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that with regard to buildings in the vicinity, he referred the Commission to an illustration of a rendering of the building to the west toward the east. He stated that the first thing you notice is the four story 711 Oak building which he identified and referred to the similarity of the perceived cornice line of the building and that the portion of the project which went above the four story height related to the need for exception relief. Mr. Kisiel stated that another thing to consider which they have talked about at length is the prominence of the site and the presence of the open space and the train station. He also referred to creating an essential square which was conceived in the original Comprehensive Plan for Winnetka.

Mr. Kisiel then identified Elm Street and the buildings located there which are on a smaller scale and which are two and three story buildings. He stated that the response from the architect is to mirror that in three story buildings along Elm and to minimizing the amount of elevation occupied by five story buildings in this area which responded to the scale and context.

Mr. Kisiel stated that with regard to the south and east view, the terracing on the eastern portion of the site would help reduce the perception of height adjacent to the single family residential neighborhood to the east. He stated that the response to the south revolved around the placement of open space and setbacks. Mr. Kisiel then stated that there is a 20 foot setback on the south property line for the One Winnetka building and that you can see the port cochere open space in this area along with the reduction in height to one story and the greening of that which acted more as a visual amenity for the 711 Oak building when compared to the prior iteration.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that with respect to the Comprehensive Plan goals and objectives, he stated that they key goal here in terms of how it related to building height has to do with ensuring that the commercial institution and residential development is appropriate to the character of and minimizes the adverse impact on its surroundings. He then stated that the discussion they just had with regard to the buildings in the vicinity and the responses speak to the appropriateness of it with regard to the character in terms of scale. Mr. Kisiel also stated that it also related to it in terms of architectural style.

Mr. Kisiel stated that with respect to the impact on the adjacent neighborhood, he stated that they focused on sensitivity toward the adjacent residential development, particularly to the east in the terrace treatment of the building in reducing its apparent height and to the presence of open space and setback adjacent to 711 Oak. He also stated that similar things can be said with regard to the treatment along Elm with the contextual response of the lower three story buildings in order to minimize the taller facades.

Mr. Kisiel stated that with respect to the Village's character and appearance, he stated that the density and scale is appropriate for the site at this location and prominence and that the eclectic styles are appropriate given the mix of styles that are present in downtown Winnetka. He also stated that it would be well separated and well screened from existing residential development and that the arrangement of the building volumes would mitigate any impact on surrounding development.

Mr. Kisiel went on to state that they spoke about the tradeoff between parking and open space facilities on the site. He stated that the amount of open space and the single and three story portions of the site are what caused the need for additional height in order to meet the appropriate program. Mr. Kisiel also stated that with regard to the upper level setback, he referred to the same set of criteria and that they covered everything. He stated that the terraces and upper level setbacks to the east and the use of mansard roofs spoke to the spirit of what that regulation is.

Mr. Kisiel stated that finally, with regard to the rear yard setback, he noted that 10 feet is required to the east and that 0 would be provided along that frontage. He described it as more of a common sense and practical discussion and that the fact of the matter is that One Winnetka is a corner site and that many ordinances allow an applicant to choose what would be the front yard and the rear yard based on what the applicant felt is appropriate for the development. Mr. Kisiel referred to the narrow street frontage and stated that is what caused the eastern lot line to be the rear yard. He then stated that the presence of the parking lot along the east property line did not require a setback in terms of any kind of impact. Mr. Kisiel noted that the nearest structure to the east is the Hadley School which he stated is non-residential and also that it is located 175 feet away. He then stated that putting an additional 10 feet there did not serve the spirit of the ordinance which is to create separation between and provide relief between two buildings.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that it did make sense to the south where there is an adjacent structure which is location less than 20 feet away from the property line. He informed the Commission that they would be providing an extra 20 foot setback which would create 40 feet of separation and would be more in the spirit of the ordinance in creating separation. Mr. Kisiel stated that they would be doing a better job in terms of what the ordinance intended.

Mr. Kisiel stated that they believed that the relief they are requesting here is modest in that they are talking about one story with a few bump ups and approximately 14 feet with regard to a majority of the site. He stated that the development would be compatible with the context of and minimizes impact of its surroundings and that it met the criteria of the zoning exceptions.

Mr. Trandel stated that he would now go over the public benefits which they are felt are crucial to whatever happened on the site. He stated that with regard to the parking total count, they would be going beyond that with additional, additive parking spots in that area by creating the commuter garage which he indicated is desperately needed since it would free up parking on both sides of tracks as well as push all of the commuter parking vehicles into one lot. Mr. Trandel also stated that it would help retail on both sides of the tracks. He referred to all of the commuter parking zones and indicated that none of them help the retailers and that by getting the commuter vehicles into a dedicated garage structure would do everyone a world of good.

Mr. Trandel then stated that when he walked with his children, he stated that it is not pedestrian friendly in downtown Winnetka since there is the perpetual cycling of vehicles and that it is dangerous for children riding bicycles. He stated that if they were to have relief from all of the congestion as it related to parking, it would create a more pedestrian friendly environment.

Mr. Trandel stated that with regard to the public plaza, he referred to the beautiful grass area on the

Village Green and having a town square with a hard surface would be a tremendous long term benefit.

Mr. Trandel then stated that with regard to storm water detention, he stated that improving the water main and improving the life of the people would be a benefit. He stated that by addressing those needs, they have embraced the comments and constructive concerns with all of the neighbors who would be the most affected by the project and in the process, creating something which they can all be proud of which would let the world know that Winnetka is open for business and would add vibrancy to downtown. Mr. Trandel thanked everyone for their time and effort and stated that they have spent a lot of hours and are grateful and that they are very proud of the proposal. He then asked the Commission if they had any questions.

Chairperson Dalman stated that first, the Village staff would walk through the zoning relief changes, followed by Steve Saunders.

Mr. Norkus stated that with regard to the applicant's presentation, he would provide a brief review in terms of the overview of exceptions required. He then stated that he concurred with the three remaining exceptions, which related to building height exceeding the maximum of four stories and 45 feet, the rear yard of 10 feet and the upper story setback of 10 feet not being provided along the easterly property line and the upper level story setback not being provided at the 4th floor level. Mr. Norkus stated that to clarify, while the setback from the easterly property line had the well intention of benefitting the neighbors to the east, it did not satisfy the intent or the language of the zoning code which required for the 4th story to be set back from the street line for the purposes of providing that benefit in terms of a reduction in scale and that it applied to any portion of the building which is four stories or greater.

Mr. Norkus also stated that he would now address what has changed in the current iteration compared to the previous proposal. He noted that the previously presented plan incorporated exceptions from both the commercial parking requirements of the zoning ordinance as well as the residential parking requirements. Mr. Norkus stated that the residential parking requirements are now met with the current plan due to the reduction in the number of dwelling units to 71 units. He also stated that the number of parking spaces required for the reduced number of residential units is 109 spaces and that the plan is proposing 160 residential parking spaces.

Mr. Norkus then stated that the commercial parking requirements have been achieved both through the described reduction in the amount of commercial leasable square footage as well as a refinement in the commercial area calculation to exclude areas used for storage and the like. He stated that to clarify, the zoning ordinance required parking for tenant spaces which are over 2,500 square feet at a rate of 2 spaces per 1,000 square feet. Mr. Norkus added that it did provide for the exclusion of those areas used for storage, mechanical rooms, etc. He stated that the applicant clarified with the revised plan that their usage would be 32,000 square feet which required 64 parking spaces for the new commercial space. Mr. Norkus stated that what was described as a bit of a departure from the previous plan, the new plan called for the provision of a portion of commercial parking required on the Village east parking lot and that the zoning ordinance allowed for the provision of parking in that fashion in a remote location subject to the provision of adequate easements and long term agreements to ensure the long term continued availability of that parking.

He then asked the Commission if they had any questions.

Chairperson Dalman then stated that Steve Saunders would speak and then open the meeting for the Commission's questions.

Steve Saunders introduced himself to the Commission as the Public Works Director and Village Engineer since 1987 and that he has been the Public Works Director since 1998. He indicated that he had an opportunity to review the initial submittal and revised submittal from the perspective of parking and traffic with regard to any particular utility details and engineering details. He stated that his comments on those with regard to storm water management, the development is required to meet the provisions of the Village's storm water management code but also the MWRD which includes in addition to detention site runoff, for there to be controls and volume controls which would equate to retaining the first inch of water runoff falling on the property as opposed to detaining water.

Mr. Saunders stated that requirement was triggered based on the area of the proposed development. He then stated that there are additional details to be developed as the project goes through final approval such as electrical and structural code approvals. Mr. Saunders also stated that with regard to traffic and parking, there are four broad areas to be considered when developments are reviewed.

Mr. Saunders stated that the first related to parking and that as to the development increases the demand for parking, the increase is to be offset. He informed the Commission that in reviewing the proposal, the Village parking requirement would be satisfied by the development as proposed. Mr. Saunders then stated that with regard to traffic, they are to look at congestion on the public street, safety, pedestrian, vehicular and bicycle traffic, intersections and traffic circulation. He informed the Commission that the applicant's engineer provided an initial memorandum in connection with the traffic study. Mr. Saunders stated that he reviewed that study for the prior proposal and that for some of the questions, the applicant provided a memorandum dated June 4, 2015 which answered those questions.

Mr. Saunders stated that in connection with pedestrian counts, volumes and pedestrian impacts, the applicant pointed out that pedestrian peaks and vehicular peaks tended not to overlap. He also stated that pedestrian volume and vehicular volume with regard to the numbers was not as much of a concern as much as the geometrics which including striping, signage and sight lines, all of which are details which need to be developed.

Mr. Saunders then stated that in connection with the intersections of Elm and Lincoln, Oak and Lincoln and Lincoln and the entire frontage of the development and the property to the south showed schematically all of details to review to make a determination on the impact for vehicular and pedestrian safety and the turning radiuses at those intersections.

Mr. Saunders went on to state that with regard to volume, congestion and delay, they were all analyzed at intersections with the proposed volumes built out into the future to take place as to how the development would function, it would perform at a Level Service A and Level Service B. He noted that it is tied to the level of delay at a particular intersection. Mr. Saunders informed the

Commission that Level Service A is less than 10 seconds at peak time and that Level Service B ranged from 10 to 15 seconds. He also stated that from an engineering perspective, it is an acceptable level of congestion.

Mr. Saunders then stated that there are things that need to be reviewed. He stated that at the time of the initial submittal, the applicant had not pulled together details with regard to accidents. Mr. Saunders stated that they have pulled the details now with regard to how many accidents were related to pedestrians, bicycles and vehicles. He referred to the request in connection with the intersections immediately adjacent to the development, particularly the details of those accidents to be analyzed to see if conditions there could be corrected by geometrics, striping and signage. Mr. Saunders also stated that each of the intersections was detailed out with regard to dimensions, striping and signage in order to make sure that all of the conditions at the intersections would provide appropriate traffic, pedestrian and bicycle safety.

Mr. Saunders stated that he would like to respond to a couple of anecdotal statements from the applicant with regard to the current condition of the Elm Street business district in that it is not safe for pedestrians. He stated that in the applicant's numbers, it indicated that there were two bicycle and two pedestrian accidents in five years. Mr. Saunders noted that both of those were on Green Bay Road and that he would not in any way back up that statement that the business district is not safe for pedestrians and bicycles which he wanted to include on the record. He then asked the Commission if they had any questions.

Chairperson Dalman asked for the Commission's comments and questions for the applicant.

Mr. Golan stated that he had no questions.

Ms. McCarty also stated that she had no questions.

Ms. Holland asked Mr. Trandel when they began the process, the zoning ordinance stated that there is a height limit of 2½ stories and less than 45 feet and why are they pursuing a project on 1.6 acres which did not adhere to the zoning code. She stated that two weeks before the project went public, the ordinance was changed to provide more leeway for height, which also did away with intensity and parking restrictions. Ms. Holland then stated that she often wondered why they brought the project which is so excessive to the zoning ordinance which already changed over the last four months.

Mr. Trandel responded that with regard to the context, the site is unique in a lot of ways. He noted that it is significantly larger than the average site for which zoning was geared around. Mr. Trandel stated that in doing so, it provided more unique opportunities to eliminate certain things and that there are many things that people do not find attractive such as bulk. He informed the Commission that they look at zoning as a guide and commented that what they have done is not called excessive. Mr. Trandel indicated that there are lot of things to navigate since the site is unique.

Mr. Trandel then referred to the very interested party to the south and the fact that they have been very respectful to them. He also referred to the very interested party in the middle of the project

which is the pharmacy and the fact that they have been respectful to them. Mr. Trandel then referred to the Hadley institution to which they have also been respectful. He stated that there are tradeoffs and indicated that they were befuddled by the perpetual 60 foot height being considered as super tall. Mr. Trandel stated that they have to go back to the spirit of why the rules were relaxed to allow larger and taller [structures] in order to make the development economically viable and bring development into the Village.

Mr. Trandel also stated that in connection with the totality of the project, most of it is three stories. He noted that a majority of it complied with the existing standard. Mr. Trandel then stated that if they did what is allowed by right and the code, it would have significantly impaired the values to 711 Oak and would not serve any benefit when they push height out and questioned who would be harmed when there are 5 acres between Lincoln and the Village Hall. He also stated that there would be shadowing over homes and that the proposal is more respectful and would give light to 711 Oak as opposed to a box building of 45 feet in height which would be impairing other residents.

Mr. Trandel then stated that they would solve a lot of well-intended but conflicting interests. He stated that if you look at the total scale, it is the largest parcel in Winnetka owned by one owner and that by definition, it is unique. Mr. Trandel noted that the code was not written specifically for a 53,000 square foot site. He stated that they have to take all of that into context as to how to maintain and enhance the value of all of the property around and what could economically and viably be done.

Mr. Trandel also stated that the question is how to solve for the issues that they all live with everyday such as the lack of parking and the lack of retail options and retailers who are struggling. He reiterated that they spent a lot of money to solve the ills of the Village and that if it is done by the book, it would not get solved. Mr. Trandel then stated that they can do a 45 foot high building but that it would not solve parking or get retail parking. He added that they are taking a lot more risk in the proposal and that there would be more elegant buildings and that there would be three of them. Mr. Trandel then stated that it would not be excessive, but that it is a large site.

Mr. Trandel went on to state that when they took a step back at the first meeting, they wanted to avoid a monolithic view and wanted to determine how to make it feel more like a Village and how to more complement the project toward Elm and how to push the height out to Elm to maintain its charm. He noted that there was no ill intent with regard to how they are doing it. Mr. Trandel stated that the project is responsive to everyone's comments and that there has been a lot of constructive commentary. Mr. Trandel referred to the economics beyond other things to the Village which they did not harp on. He concluded by stating that there would be significant revenue brought to the Village and that the project would add more charm, livelihood and activity downtown which he felt as a resident, they sorely lack.

Ms. Holland stated that with regard to the storm water retention under the building, she asked if they planned to put storm water retention under the building and take the storm water from the east lot which would become a parking deck. She also asked if they planned to pump water uphill to be retained.

Mr. Trandel responded that it would be located below the building and that there would still be one level of parking under the building. He then stated that the other questions are engineering questions.

Ms. Holland then stated that she is concerned with regard to the talk about the Hadley School being an island and that she did not see that as an island.

Mr. Trandel stated that referred to when it rained.

Ms. Holland then stated that she is a trustee of the Hadley School and that there was also the mention of spending a lot of money on the school and that as a trustee, that has not come before the board of the Hadley School.

Mr. Trandel stated that they are talking to them.

Ms. Holland responded that is not the case and reiterated that the school is not an island when it rained. She also stated that they talked about the public plaza being a place for civic events, festivals and markets. Ms. Holland stated that it is also a public street with two way traffic. She indicated that she assumed that there would be curbs and that the designation on all of the renderings show people which she commented is misleading. She then stated that it would not be a plaza where people stroll, sit and enjoy it and that it would be a public two way street.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct and that it would be morphing at different times for festivals.

Mr. Thomas stated that he wore the Park District hat and that with regard to the aerial perspective looking east, he asked where is the bicycle trail. He also stated that it looked like it would not be separated from the train platform.

Mr. Trandel responded that there would be no removal of the bicycle trail. He then referred to the garage which would be on Winnetka property and confirmed that it would not interfere with the bicycle trail. Mr. Trandel also stated that it is accurate in connection with the 5 feet which would separate the bicycle trail and the garage.

Mr. Thomas then stated that the photograph showed the bicycle trail and the train station and asked what separation is there.

Mr. Trandel stated that the bicycle trail is there now and that it made common sense.

Mr. Thomas commented that it would not fly.

Mr. Trandel informed the Commission that they would paint it and stripe it as well as put in a stop sign.

Mr. Thomas then stated that with regard to the bicycle trail master plan for the Village, he stated that there are restrictions on the bicycle trails and that there has to be some physical separation between pedestrians and the bicycle trail.

Mr. Trandel stated that it is done on other bicycle trails and that they would work through the details.

Mr. Thomas commented that they would be generating a safety problem.

Ms. Morette stated that with regard to page 18 and the Village deeding land for the Village, she questioned 700 square feet.

Mr. Trandel stated that with regard to intent, they talked about different pricing matrices to buy land which would be deeded back to the Village for the underground parking.

Ms. Morette commented that it would be awesome if they could frame the economics so that people understand that it would not be a bad deal for the Village.

Mr. Trandel stated that they are open to look at a public/private partnership. He then stated that as to how it would be financed and owned, the Village would figure out what would work for the Village and that they should solve it on their side.

Ms. Fessler stated that the proposal is a dramatic change from what they have seen before. She also stated that the applicant has outlined the major things they are trying to accomplish which she commented is helpful in that it showed the applicants' responsiveness. Ms. Fessler stated that people have expressed concerns which added value to the whole project. She then asked if all of the units would be rental.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct and stated that they would be luxury rentals.

Ms. Fessler asked if the average size of the unit increased.

Mr. Trandel responded that they would measure over 1,400 square feet.

Ms. Fessler then asked that from an aerial perspective, she would like to see what the buildings looked like from a street level view looking north from 711 Oak and that the applicant did not respond to what the pedestrian view would be.

Mr. Trandel indicated that those are old digital renderings and that they can redo them.

Ms. Fessler stated that with regard to the height, she questioned the aerial perspective looking east and what is the height for 711 Oak.

Mr. Petrek noted that it is 42½ feet.

Ms. Fessler then asked how much further is it set back than the project would be on Lincoln relative to the train tracks.

Mr. Kisiel estimated it to be 15 feet.

Ms. Fessler stated that density is a big issue and that as they have listed to the evolution of the project, if a whole series of developers were to build each property to 4 stories, she asked how much of that square feet would be in that configuration versus the project. She indicated that she would like to see those numbers. Ms. Fessler then referred to having one monolithic building versus multiple developers.

Mr. Trandel responded that part of the reason is to create more open space.

Mr. Kisiel informed the Commission that they can cover the entire site except for the eastern 10 feet. He then referred to 15 feet of commercial and that typical ground floor contained commercial and circulation space. Mr. Kisiel also stated that above the first floor, there is residential development. He stated that there would be a double loaded corridor depth of 60 feet. Mr. Kisiel also referred to the 60 foot line at the perimeter, the second floor and that then it would go up to three stories. He then stated that with regard to the 4th story which is required to be set back 10 feet, that would be 182,000 square feet gross. Mr. Kisiel also stated that there would be issues from a quality perspective such as the interior courtyard residences looking at each other, which he commented would be less desirable.

Ms. Fessler asked what is the gross floor area of the project.

Mr. Kisiel responded 172,000 square feet.

Mr. Blum stated that now, there are separate parcels and asked if the applicant acquired them as separate parcels.

Mr. Trandel responded that there are separate pin numbers. He informed the Commission that there are two lenders involved for the various parcels and that three of them are through one lender with one parcel owner cash and Baird as one lender.

Mr. Blum stated that with regard to the line running through, he asked what is the expansion of the footprint over the current footprint along the west edge to where the sidewalk is.

Mr. Trandel stated that it is 19 feet.

Mr. Blum then asked if the calculations discussed using that wall.

Mr. Kisiel stated that they are using apples to apples and that the expanded footprint is as proposed. He indicated that it is to a comparison of what they could do as of right.

Mr. Blum asked if they did a market study for this.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct.

Chairperson Dalman noted that it is in the record.

Mr. Blum then asked with regard to the ramp to the underground parking, if that would be two way.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct and that contained the commuter garage.

Mr. Blum asked with regard to the colors, he asked if the digital rendering is more accurate.

Mr. Trandel responded that the renderings are a visual perspective of the prior configuration and that they will be redone.

Mr. Blum asked with regard to the revised proposal, if they reduced the amount of commercial space and whether there is a market study to support that.

Mr. Trandel described it as a chicken and egg situation. He noted that there are a lot of vacancies downtown for a lot of reasons. Mr. Trandel stated that to dig deeper, there is no commercial investment space at grade for retail which is available downtown. He also stated that is part of why the vacancy number is misleading since those spaces are not structures and styles which are attractive for retail. Mr. Trandel informed the Commission that they have had a lot of conversations with interested restaurants, shops and boutiques.

Mr. Blum asked if the study showed the reduction in commercial space over the previous proposal.

Mr. Trandel stated that when you lower the density, you would lower the retail which was their train of thought. He added that they took out 50 residential units.

Mr. Blum then asked if no land would be given.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that they would pay for land.

Mr. Blum asked if there would be expansion over the current right-of-way toward the west on Lincoln.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Blum then asked why that is necessary.

Mr. Trandel referred to the ownership of Phototronics and stated that they do not have a usable corner and the fact that they would have to work around the Conney's parcel. He noted that Conney's has a 6 foot easement and that the street is as wide as it is. Mr. Trandel then stated that they went over the history as to why it is that way. He also stated that it would make for a better project and that there would be a tradeoff with the garage underneath.

Mr. Blum asked if they are still asking for the expansion of the footprint with the underground parking.

Mr. Trandel responded that there is no option without the commuter garage.

Mr. Blum then asked if there is an option without the underground garage.

Mr. Trandel confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Blum then referred to the letter addressed to Conney's and asked if it did not contain legal advice.

Mr. Trandel responded that it did not. He added that there is no animosity and that they felt like they have made a lot of progress.

Mr. Coladarci asked with regard to the traffic flows in and out of the commuter garage, when did they see the most traffic going in and out in the morning or in the evening.

Javier Milan of KLOA stated that with regard to traffic study, he referred the Commission to Figure 8.

Chairperson Dalman asked if that is in the revised submittal.

Mr. Milan noted that it was part of the original application. He then stated that in the p.m., in the peak hour in the evening, there is a total of 78 vehicles which would be exiting the lot with a few entering and that in the morning, it would be reverse situation with 88 vehicles going in and 6 exiting. Mr. Milan described it as pretty much even.

Mr. Coladarci asked what is the peak hour.

Mr. Milan responded that based on the counts, the peak hours are 7:45 a.m. to 8:45 a.m. and 5:00 to 6:00 p.m. in the evening. He added that the garage for Metra might peak earlier. Mr. Milan then informed the Commission that they analyzed the worst case scenario.

Mr. Coladarci asked what time Willowwood would be picking up and dropping off.

Mr. Milan responded that he did not know.

Mr. Coladarci asked if most people would be exiting the garage between 5:00 and 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Milan stated that depending on the number of trains and the schedule, the surge at the exit would happen later if commuters leave downtown at 5:00 p.m. based on the survey of the existing parking lot. He reiterated that they assume the worst case scenario. Mr. Milan then stated that the network peaked from 5:00 to 6:00 p.m. and when the parking lot for the commuters who also park. He indicated that it could peak at 4:30 or 4:45 p.m. Mr. Milan stated that they assumed everything peaking at the same time. He added that for commuters, there would be 144 new underground spaces.

Mr. Coladarci stated that he is concerned with the figure of 100% of the lot in terms of usage.

Mr. Milan confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Coladarci then stated that there would be a lot of traffic in and out at one exit across 711 Oak. He also referred to the drop-off at New Trier or the Skokie School and asked did they get a sense of what kind of congestion they are talking about.

Mr. Trandel stated that during drop-off, they would be staying at grade. He then stated that when you combine the two, there is a real safety issue and that the two levels solved a lot.

Mr. Coladarci informed the Commission that when he goes to different courthouses in different counties, there are backups at 9:30 a.m. and that there is a huge traffic jam. He stated that they built in a ¾ mile crawl into the lot. Mr. Coladarci then stated that he is not asking for an answer now, but that it is a concern. He also indicated that there would seem to be a lot of traffic in that area based on the fact that there would be one entrance and exit.

Mr. Trandel indicated that they can look at Metra ridership and nail down how many people take each train.

Mr. Coladarci added that it would be a big jump over the existing condition with the additional parkers.

Mr. Trandel commented that is a good point.

Mr. Milan stated that when you look at that, in addition to the capacity analysis, they also ran simulations and questioned if there is this much traffic going out, how to accommodate it. Mr. Milan stated that they can run several simulations and that would be taken that into account as well as looking into the Metra schedules and ridership numbers.

Mr. Coladarci then asked with regard to storm water retention, for the bottom of the building, he asked if they had a rough idea as to how much water would be retained in connection with what Mr. Saunders referred to as one inch on the whole surface.

Mr. Trandel stated that in connection with detention, the capacity would be far more than what is required for the site. He indicated that they can get the information as to where they need to be from Mr. Saunders. Mr. Trandel then stated that with regard to the Hadley School or the people on Maple, he described it as a mess. He stated that while they are in the ground, they can solve the problem and that there is plenty of room for that. Mr. Trandel added that they would build a cement vault.

Ms. Crumley stated that she had no questions.

Chairperson Dalman stated that with regard to the Village staff, she stated that they can connect the dots. She then asked that around the Winnetka train station, how many commuter parking spaces are there, what is the monthly rate and will there be a potential increase and substantial revenues. Chairperson Dalman then stated that the problem when they talk about parking, with parking, she asked is that lot taken up by commuter parking.

Mr. D'Onofrio responded that he can get that information.

Chairperson Dalman noted for the record that in connection with the submission by Mr. Petrek, at the May 28, 2015 meeting, she referred to a summary and that there was mention of updating the shadow study and the light out of the parking garage and asked if that is in progress.

Mr. Trandel responded that they talked about the summer solstice which occurred a couple of times a year with regard to Mr. Petrek's points. He indicated that they will update it and that they may have a slide with that information.

Mr. Kisiel stated that this time year as the sun gets to the north, the sun angles have the potential to reach north of the property. He then stated that the remodeled shadow study on the prior proposal showed the shadows at 6:00 a.m. on June 22nd. Mr. Kisiel indicated that you can see that with regard to the angle of the sun at 6:00 a.m., the building would still cast no shadow on 711 Oak. He then stated that as you move through the day, the shadows get shorter. Mr. Kisiel stated that 7:00 p.m., the shadow is just at the edge of where the proposed building would begin to impact 711 Oak on the solstice and that in May, June and July, they would experience this. He also stated that when the shadow studies were done, the proposed building compared what can be done or as of right and noted that as of right contained the same or more shadows as the proposal. Mr. Kisiel then identified the shadows at 7:00 p.m. and at sunset on 711 Oak.

Mr. Coladarci referred to the Maple building.

Mr. Kisiel identified the yellow cast in the illustration at 7:00 p.m. and stated that the shadows do to reach the single family residences as well as the fact that there is significant tree coverages casting shadows.

Mr. Coladarci asked the applicant to address the questions of the people on Maple.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that they would be happy to submit an analysis for independent verification.

Chairperson Dalman stated that there was also mention of looking at lights out of the garage. She stated that it is her understanding that is the conception and that they do not have all of the engineering dimensions.

Mr. Trandel agreed to do it and that they would work with 711 Oak and added that if they have to screen the lot, there are a lot of ways to solve it.

Chairperson Dalman asked Mr. Kisiel with regard to as of right and not taking advantage of the planned development process, if the as of right analysis provided would assume that they did not have a 20 foot setback and that the only setback required is the current east parking. She noted that now, the proposal showed a 20 foot setback from 711 Oak where they could go to the property line.

Mr. Kisiel confirmed that is correct.

Chairperson Dalman stated that on the west side of Lincoln, she asked if the numbers assumed street vacation or not.

Mr. Kisiel confirmed that is correct and that it assumed street vacation. He then stated that there is no such thing as an as of right development because of the size of the property and that they were forced into the process.

Chairperson Dalman then asked for public comment. She reminded everyone to keep their comments as brief as possible and no more than five minutes. Chairperson Dalman also stated that for those who spoke before, to limit their comments to new information.

Rhonda Miller, 460 Green Bay Road, stated that her goal regarding this project is to protect the Village of Winnetka and all of its residents from assuming any risk in this project. She stated that the Commission must deal with the financial impact of this development on the Village. Ms. Miller asked if Village land is given to the developer, what is the Village getting in return. She also asked who would be responsible for the garage upkeep from day one.

Ms. Miller then stated with regard to the repayment of the \$6.5 million investment for the garage development, the developer stated that it would be paid in full in approximately 23 years. She then stated that approximately meant no firm end date for final payment and that the Village wanted a specific end date from the developer. Ms. Miller referred to an example of a person who cannot state an approximate year for completing mortgage payments.

Ms. Miller then asked who is responsible for the payoff of bonds. She referred to whether or not enough money is coming in from parking. Ms. Miller also asked if there would be a financial bond posted by the developer to guaranty the total repayment of the \$6.5 million of debt for the parking garage. She then stated that if the developer sells apartments and commercial property before 23 years is up, there needed to be a covenant on the title of the property assuring payment on the debt payoff to the Village.

Ms. Miller also asked who would be in charge of maintenance and the operating costs for the parking garage. She then stated that the developer has changed the configuration of parking spaces from two spaces to 1½ spaces which changed the present density requirement. Ms. Miller stated that the parking development as presently proposed will require security, police, cameras, etc. and asked who would be responsible for the added expenses.

Ms. Miller then stated that according to a reliable source, the Village only has \$40 million in reserve. She stated that Village money would be required for the tunnel system project and at least \$6.5 million for the parking garage. Ms. Miller stated that the development wanted 8,000 square feet on Lincoln and that it appeared that there would not be enough square footage for two-way traffic and that there would be potential drainage problems because there would be parking which would be underneath the street.

Ms. Miller asked who would be responsible for maintaining the two small decks, one of which would be below the parking lot and one on a different level. She stated that the Commission

needed a long term business development plan for the Village. Ms. Miller then stated that should this plan be approved even in part for the Village, she described the development as the tail wagging the dog. She stated that Winnetka to her is not just a place to live, but that it has been home to her family for three generations. Ms. Miller concluded by stating that they have to ask themselves what kind of Village do they want to leave for their children and grandchildren and that it is her hope that it would not be a concrete Village.

Ms. Fessler suggested that they ask the developer to take notes on the questions and to provide responses at the next meetings.

Chairperson Dalman agreed that is fine.

Katie Comstock (sp?), 811 Prospect, began by thanking the Village staff who has done a great job of posting everything online. She also thanked the developer for wanting to develop in town which she described as great and that they are is a lot of interest in new retail and restaurants.

Ms. Comstock then stated that she wanted to express four concerns with regard to the design of the plan as revised which include the design, height, the appearance of closing Lincoln and the number of rental units. She stated that with regard to the design, she questioned whether the design fit the character of the neighborhood, whether it went with their existing design context and whether it worked with the patterns and rhythms of their streetscape. Ms. Comstock stated that while it is such a beautiful design, she stated that it did not fit with the Village of 12,000 people and 4 square miles and that it felt out of context.

Ms. Comstock also stated that from the design guidelines, she read a quote which stated that “the character of a town is defined by the visual quality of the town and neighborhood. A single building out of context with its surroundings can have a remarkable and totally disruptive effect on the visual character of a place. It affects nearby buildings, streetscape and the image of the city as a whole.” She stated that so much thought has gone into this design and the plans, it seemed funny to her to have this Beaux-Art style in the Village. Ms. Comstock stated that they have an historical Village and that there is such wonderful and great style here, she did not understand why they would be introducing a new style.

Ms. Comstock then stated that for the height to be 6 stories and different heights, it would be appropriate for Paris which was referenced before and the fact that there is uniform height throughout the city along with similar architecture. She stated that they should apply the same thought process to the Village. Ms. Comstock indicated that she is confused as to why they are not applying their zoning guidelines to a significant major development but for which she is thankful would enhance the town. She added that Lucien Lagrange’s design did not fit with the town.

Ms. Comstock stated that the height would dominate the town and that there is a zoning requirement for four stories. She also stated that with regard to closing Lincoln, she loved the idea of a farmer’s market and for festivals is a great idea and suggested that it only be done on the weekends.

Everyone confirmed that Lincoln would remain open.

Ms. Comstock then stated that with regard to the number of rental units, if families move in, she asked if they considered the impact on schools and who would pay for that. She concluded by thanking them for bringing up the bicycle trail.

Ms. Miller asked when would her questions be answered.

Chairperson Dalman stated that Ms. Fessler suggested that they would be addressed at the next meeting. She indicated that many things were covered at other public hearings and that the question concerning Lincoln being erroneously closed up was cleared up at previous meetings. Chairperson Dalman added that they would not answer any other questions now and reiterated that they encouraged comments and questions in writing.

Gail Schecter introduced herself to the Commission as the Executive Director of Open Communities and stated that she has been working at 614 Lincoln for 22 years and that practically felt like a resident of the Village. She then stated that Open Communities which is referred to as Interfaith Housing of the Northern Suburbs is the area's fair and affordable housing advocacy organization and that she is here specifically to speak to those issues.

Ms. Schecter stated that Winnetka has no affordable housing or subsidized housing although what they are talking about here is essentially creating some subsidized housing so that the Village can give something back through the planned development process. She informed the Commission that she sat on the state's Affordable Housing Appeals Board which is to enforce the Act which came into effect 10 years ago because there is an affordable housing crisis in this state, especially in the Chicago area. Ms. Schecter stated that Winnetka is one of the 68 communities in the state which has well under 10% of affordable housing.

Ms. Schecter stated that this development would be the first development in Winnetka to be happening on this scale in the 10 years since the Act and yet, there is no affordable housing plan being planned here. She informed the Commission that she submitted a letter in March 2015 to the Commission and urged that at least 15% to 20% be designated as affordable. Ms. Schecter stated that there is no reason why all 70 units have to be dedicated to people at a rate of \$4,000 per month, which meant that they would be renting to families earning \$144,000 per year which is well out of reach of employees in the Village, those who are downsizing, getting divorced, etc. She stated that currently, the Village has little to no housing options especially with regard to new construction for people with disabilities.

Ms. Schecter stated that she would also add that from a fair housing perspective, Mr. Trandel was interviewed in *North Shore Weekend* about the development and that when the question was asked who is the market for these apartments, his response was that they are targeting the empty nester market and that they are also envisioning young professionals. She stated that was another way of stating that they did not plan to target families with children and that the Federal Fair Housing Act made it illegal to discriminate or in any way discourage any legally protected class. Ms. Schecter stated that the Village cannot condone any kind of housing where there is an intent to discourage any protected class.

Ms. Schechter stated that finally, she informed the Commission that they are a resource and are here to help the developer understand the Fair Housing Act and that the developer did not have to lose money by including affordable units. She stated that there are agencies which can work with the developer to make inclusionary zoning work and that they would be assisting a wider swath of stakeholders in the Village. Ms. Schechter concluded by stating that they want to have a Village that is inclusive.

Frank Petrek informed the Commission that they have talked with the applicant and that it was a productive conversation. He stated that the Commission should appreciate the fact that the residents of 711 Oak appreciated the efforts to make accommodations which are sensitive to them since they live closer to the project than anyone else. Mr. Petrek stated that the open space and plaza is very respectful of the biggest neighborhood next to this project which he stated has not gone unappreciated.

Mr. Petrek went on to state that people are not doing backflips on a 70 foot tall building which is 30% taller than the building they are living in now. He indicated that is something that most of the people living in the building would like to see and that he knew for a fact that several of the residents could not be at this meeting and that he felt obliged to speak on their behalf although he is not representing them.

Mr. Petrek stated that he wanted to follow up on Chairperson Dalman's comment with regard to some of the other questions which have not been answered, one of which represented the staging of the project which is going to be outside one of the north units at grade. He stated that was one of the issues that Dave and Kate brought up which was supposed to be looked into and that the applicant was to come up with staging located in front of their own property.

Mr. Petrek stated that another thing which was not mentioned here was the need for a stop sign on Oak. He stated that someone is going to get killed coming west on Oak and attempting to get into some parking and described it as dangerous. Mr. Petrek then stated that he is not sure what time nursery school started and that it may be 8:00 a.m. and that is something which brought up the traffic study which was not done on a computer model.

Mr. Petrek informed the Commission that he has been taking the train since January 1980 and that the train he liked to take is the 5:35 train since the first stop is Winnetka. He then stated that for those who take the train, rush hour for Metra stopped at 6:30 p.m. Mr. Petrek then stated that he often took the 6:31 train which got in at 7:10 and that he respectfully disagreed with the peak time for rush hour in Winnetka which he stated is not 5:00 to 6:00 which meant that people would be getting on trains at 2:35 p.m. or 3:15 p.m.

Christy Glick, 733 Elm, stated that her home is located across the street where the main part of the development would be. She then stated that she is part of a small minority of residents who live in the heart of that area and that she has lived in Winnetka for five years which she described as home for her. Ms. Glick then stated that if the development went through, with regard to her street, the parking lot and edge of the neighborhood would be under construction for 18 months which would not give her any reason to renew her lease. She stated that it would really impact her life,

particularly if the parking lot is under construction during at least one winter although she is not sure of the timelines for construction. Ms. Glick informed the Commission that she used the Village lot and the east lot and that it would impact herself and other residents in the building who use the public lot.

Zave Gussin introduced himself to the Commission as the attorney representing Conney's and that he would like to focus on one point. He informed the Commission that he filed some legal objections to the right of the Village and whether it is appropriate for the vacation of a portion of Lincoln to benefit a private developer. Mr. Gussin indicated that he doubted if the Commission would rule in terms of the legal objection. He also stated that he had not heard this discussed by the Commission on nearly as something as important as a request for a variation. Mr. Gussin stated that it is a situation where the owner of a property asked the Village to deed to it 39 feet into Lincoln in the amount of 7,000 square feet for private development. He then stated that issue aside from the legality is very uncommon and should be focused on. Mr. Gussin also stated that he did not hear it in the Village staff's report or anywhere else and the fact is that the request is to deed part of Lincoln for the project and extend the borders of the property. He described it as unusual and a factor which should be seriously considered by the Commission.

Chairperson Dalman stated that the applicant's attorney submitted at the end of May a letter responding to some of the legal issues with regard to street vacation and that it is on the Village's website. She then stated that she wanted to make sure that they have the benefit of that.

Mr. Gussin stated that in the original memorandum filed on April 19, 2015, it showed that they sent a copy to the attorneys for the applicant and that the memorandum filed on Monday showed that they sent a copy. He indicated that he did not receive a copy of that memorandum and that he was not aware of it until Chairperson Dalman mentioned it.

Chairperson Dalman asked Mr. Udell to follow up.

Mr. Udell agreed that would be fine.

Chairperson Dalman then asked if there were any comments.

Jack Coladarci, 568 Cherry, stated that with regard to the retail spaces, nothing has been locked in for what is going to be there. He asked do they know if somebody is coming in and how it would affect local businesses like a real estate office, a shop or restaurant. Jack then stated that for the businesses currently, he asked if they are to be removed permanently or if they would come back after construction is complete. He commented that he felt that it is important to remove all of the issues or conflict of issues as to the investors and that he hoped that they do that to clear the air.

Chairperson Dalman reiterated that people can submit anything in writing or at the next hearing.

Penny Lanphier, 250 Birch, stated that she would like to highlight some of the standards from the planned development [ordinance] which are also relative to the Comprehensive Plan. She stated that one is relative to the zoning standards, to promote a strong community identity and opportunities to interact while building a healthy commercial tax base. Ms. Lanphier also stated

that the standard read “similarly require development to be appropriate to the character of its surroundings. The development should interface with the surrounding neighborhood rather than exist as an isolated complex.”

Ms. Lanphier then stated that with regard to the way that the complex is currently designed which she described as lovely and that the aerial view is gorgeous, given the fact that mostly everyone except for the residents of 711 Oak will not have the advantages of that really beautiful view into the courtyard area. She stated that most of Winnetka is going to experience the buildings from the street level and that most of the residents of the Village would see it as a six or seven story building.

Ms. Lanphier stated that she liked the changes which were made along Elm which she described as much more fitting with the streetscape in terms of what they have in mind as to what would complement the Village’s development. She also stated that there is a lot of open space in the complex, but that unfortunately, it did not interface with the Village. Ms. Lanphier indicated that the complex struck her as being inward facing which concerned her relative to the intent of the planned development complex. Ms. Lanphier stated that it should be something which would become part of the Village fabric rather than becoming an isolated complex. She then commented that while it is a great plan, she wondered if it is a great plan for the Village.

Ms. Lanphier then stated that secondly, she is also concerned and not having heard enough information with regard to the variety of units which would be available, she stated that she is glad to see that there would not be as many small units. She stated that she is not clear on the variety and that one of the goals is to ensure that multifamily development provided a variety of housing choices for residents of all ages.

Ms. Lanphier stated that finally, one of the most important elements of the Comprehensive Plan is to continue to reinforce the Village’s identity by historic architectural nature. She commented that while Beaux-Art is lovely, it is more of an urban design. Ms. Lanphier stated that the mansard roofs were designed to allow an extra floor fitting with Paris law and that it did not provide the setback notion of having a pitched roof which she described as a half story. She then stated that they need to have more conversations and that the building should be four stories while providing more mass toward the center of the complex rather than at the periphery.

Chairperson Dalman then asked how many other people wanted to speak and stated that they want to get through it all at this meeting.

Bob Stephens, 687 Cherry, informed the Commission that he lived in a landmarked home directly south of the development. He stated that it is too big of a project and that they should stick to the zoning laws. Mr. Stephens then commented that while the step back is nice, it is too big for the site. He also stated that Winnetka would never be a destination location and that demographically, it represented a bad real estate investment in terms of commercial real estate in Winnetka. Mr. Stephens concluded by stating that they have Lake Michigan here, that it is not a good investment and that it should be kept small.

Gwen Trindl, 800 Oak, stated that she had a comment about the sun. She stated that there would

be a very remarkable change to the façade on Elm to give the opportunity to appear more like Winnetka in the vicinity it looks like. Ms. Trindl also commented that it is very creative.

Ms. Trindl then stated that on the other hand, when you come from the west, you would be confronted with a façade with a white wall which is high. She also stated that for people coming through Winnetka, they would be overwhelmed by that façade and that the rest of it would blur into what is the Winnetka they know. Ms. Trindl stated that those are her concerns and that while it is on its way, it has not gone far enough.

Ms. Trindl stated that first, there would be a good deal of tree landscaping, etc. on Lincoln and Elm. She indicated that she assumed that the developer would be undertaking that cost. Ms. Trindl commented that it is a great deal and that there would be nice trees. She then stated that with regard to the Lincoln façade, a lot of the building arches and that there is a wall down to a lower level and that she did not know what that is. Ms. Trindl asked who would take care of that.

Ms. Trindl also stated that from the drawings, it looked like there would be a fair amount of interior commercial space. She stated that to figure out if she was to go shopping there, from the commercial interior of the drawing, it is hard to decide if it is there or how get to it. Ms. Trindl also commented that it looked like a difficult decision to go shopping unless you know what is back there. She added that there is no commercial space on Lincoln yet and whether the building design would be similar to the front portion which has arched first floor levels. Ms. Trindl stated that there was no mention if that is commercial space and that it would be wonderful space for commercial space. She then stated that some of it is confusing and that she did not hear how storm water would be collected from 711 Oak and over to the detention area.

Ms. Trindl stated that with regard to her final concern, she knew how hard the Village has worked for a long time to get a plan for the business district and that they have thought about this for years and were hoping to get back to the notion of completing that portion of the 2020 Comprehensive Plan on which she has worked on as Chairperson of the Commission. She then stated that the Village Council has wisely made a plan to make downtown and that in the meantime, there were three changes which are essential to the laws of the Village including height of buildings, the number of parking spaces, etc. Ms. Trindl stated she is very concerned and that she hoped that when they made the plan for the Village and the business community, they would make one that they could live with and do what Winnetka looks for and lives for. She concluded by stating that is why Winnetka is practically a brand nationally on its own.

Ellen Thomas, 525 Ash, stated that as a disclaimer, her husband is on the Commission. She informed the Commission that they have lived here for 41 years and commented that the proposal is beautiful. Mrs. Thomas stated that she is concerned with regard to the comment made earlier by Ms. Miller and that 41 years goes by fast. She then stated that they should be looking at this in terms of what it would look like in 10, 15, 25 or 30 years. Mrs. Thomas also referred to the thinking with regard to an underground garage which would be parked in over the years. She commented that a 30 year underground garage would not be attractive to come to late at night and questioned who would pay for the upkeep as well as what it would look like as the years go by. Mrs. Thomas then stated that she would like to see more of the Village Council, the Commission and other boards address the proposition from a long term point of view and commented that it

might not be nice in 30 years.

Richard Sobel stated that his father, Walter Sobel, built the Fell site and that he submitted comments which he would summarize and that he would show photographs. He indicated that he is excited that the developers takes comments and do revisions. Mr. Sobel then referred to the first four criteria which he stated exactly coincide with what they have been proposing which is adopting the reuse of the Fell site to accomplish the goals of the developer.

Mr. Sobel described his father as a visionary and had planned the Fell story to address the residential questions arising now. He then provided the Commission with photographs which he wanted included in the record. Mr. Sobel stated that the iconic Fell building shown captured the nature of it as an icon and part of the neighborhood. He identified a photograph of his father looking at designs created for residential space on top of the Fell building. Mr. Sobel also identified a rendering of the Fell building and two stories above. He stated that they worked with some architects, developers and real estate experts and stated that the schematic design for the site accomplished many of the goals they are talking about which would not be so high and would not be so uniform. Mr. Sobel informed the Commission that there are exciting ideas which would result in more diversity of architecture as shown in the illustrations.

Mr. Sobel then stated that he would go through the four elements which exactly match what his father was talking about with regard to the way for a developer and the Village to obtain and reuse the Fell building. He stated that they should think of the Fell store and his father as an element of design. Mr. Sobel stated that first, he referred to the excessive building height and that the alternative proposal contained a maximum of 4 stories or 4½ stories with a mansard roof design which can be developed in the existing zoning requirements or with small variations using the Fell store. He then identified the housing on Elm in the schematic design and stated that the architectural style is not keeping with the surrounding buildings. Mr. Sobel indicated that the adaptive reuse of the Fell building could include award winning use of a modern building. He noted that his father won an award for building. Mr. Sobel stated that the new elements above the notable base would add to this.

Mr. Sobel stated that with regard to the architecture itself, he described it as a wonderful element. He also commented that there are an excessive number of units. Mr. Sobel referred to the reduction in the amount of units from 120 to 71 and that in working with an architect analysis, reduced the number of units to 72. Mr. Sobel concluded by asking the Commission, the Village staff and developers to think about working with them.

Sarah Knight, 1016 Spruce, informed the Commission that she has three boys and has lived in the Village for 8 years.

Natalie Todd, 437 Chestnut, informed the Commission that she has four children. She then stated that they are not only residents of Winnetka but that they are small business owners who own Kid Motion at 732 Elm and that One Winnetka would directly impact their families and their business. Ms. Todd then stated that during the process when they were purchasing Kid Motion, the uncertainty of their location was made obvious. She informed the Commission that they were told by Mr. Trandel and Stonestreet Partners that they had plans to redevelop.

Ms. Todd informed the Commission that they met with Mr. Trandel and described him as extremely forthcoming. She stated that he shared with them their plans and support for creating a space for Kid Motion within One Winnetka. Ms. Todd also stated that they found Mr. Trandel honest and approachable and the idea of a new space for Kid Motion and a breath of life for them in the Village as intriguing and exciting.

Ms. Todd then stated that with One Winnetka, Kid Motion must temporarily relocate which would put a tremendous strain on them, their staff and the Kid Motion family. She informed the Commission that Mr. Trandel is supporting them through this challenging process and is doing everything he can to keep them in Winnetka. Ms. Todd also stated that he has met with them many times to brainstorm temporary locations and has contacted other property owners in Winnetka in hopes of finding them similarly sized space which met their safety requirements. She stated that included parking which is easily accessible, immediately available and space for their young families.

Ms. Todd stated that they are excited and are looking forward to a revitalized downtown which would create more choices, greater convenience and a higher quality of life for their young families. She then stated that although they have not lived in Winnetka as long as others, they are very active participants in the public schools, the Park District, community shops and local restaurants and that they plan to participate in the next 40 years in Winnetka.

Jen McQuet, 528 Maple, informed the Commission that she lives next to the Hadley School. She stated that she still has serious concerns as a near neighbor to the structure, especially with regard to parking and that shadow in her backyard and that they would be looking at 7 stories, as well as traffic down the biggest hill in Winnetka. Ms. McQuet stated that there is a lot of traffic at that intersection and that with the proposed units, it would be worse. She then stated that she would be in support of the project if it was half the height and not as French and if it had affordable housing. Ms. McQuet also questioned where the trash was going to be and that she heard that it would be at the corner of Elm and Arbor Vitae.

Chairperson Dalman stated that in the materials, it indicated that deliveries would be off of Elm.

Mr. Trandel noted that it would be screened off at Elm at the corner of the building. He added that the walkway is for interior use and that there would be an interior walkway to get to the dumpster.

Jane Dearborn, 585 Arbor Vitae, asked how the building is going to function day to day. She indicated that it seemed as though there would be noise, mess and smelly aspects placed at that corner. Ms. Dearborn also stated that with regard to garbage, etc., with a west wind and 71 residential units and commercial space, the smell would waft down to the homes below. She also stated that there would be garbage trucks coming and going in a tight, congested area. Ms. Dearborn then stated that for commercial deliveries on Elm, it is a tight spot and would place an unfair burden on Arbor Vitae, the townhomes and the homes on Maple. She referred to the mention of being sensitive to 711 Oak but that there was no mention of the residents on Arbor Vitae and Maple. Ms. Dearborn stated that as they contemplated the plan, they met with a group who were open to hearing from the community and that they spoke and that while the plan was

revised, they were not part of the revision. She concluded by stating that now, they would have extra parking with the revised plan.

Michael Levitan, 507 Cedar, informed the Commission that he lives on the Village Green facing up the hill. He stated that his perspective of this project from his view has not been discussed which are the sight lines of the project from what he described as the most important property in Winnetka which is the Village Green and where they hold a lot of events. Mr. Levitan then stated that when you look up the hill, now you see the 711 Oak building which he stated fortunately in the summer is largely shielded by trees since it did not go above the tree line. He stated that the way in which the building is proposed to be built right on the extreme western edge of the property would leave no room for trees and that it would loom way above any tree cover.

Mr. Levitan then stated that they are taking the tallest proposed portions of the building and pushed them almost all the way to the extreme west edge of the property. He estimated that the hill is at least 35 feet above the level of the Village Green and that would result in it being an almost 100 foot building from the perspective of being on the Village Green. Mr. Levitan then stated that if they were to push the eastern wall of the building back 10 or 20 feet, there would be room to plant trees there which would provide some cover. He also stated that when you look at the American flag, you see blue sky and that after the building is built, you would see balconies but not trees or the flag. Mr. Levitan also stated that it would affect the light and quality on the Village Green for the children who play ball and that it would have an impact on their important historical place. He then stated that of the three or four spaces that a plan which might come out hoping to show tall buildings in Winnetka, this is the worst possible place for it and that other locations are more level and would not have the same visual impact such as on this important Village property.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other comments. No additional comments were made at this time. She then confirmed that the next meeting date is July 22, 2015. She noted that they would continue the public hearing until that time and confirmed that public comment would not be closed, but that they would continue it. Chairperson Dalman also stated that everyone had the opportunity to submit comments in writing and suggested that they go to the Village's website and look at the Community Development Department under Projects. She added that everything would be scanned and posted as to what has been submitted to the Village. Chairperson Dalman reiterated that the next meeting would be July 22, 2015 at 7:30 p.m.

Public Comment

No additional public comments were made at this time.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Antionette Johnson