WINNETKA PLAN COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

MARCH 25, 2015

Members Present:	Tina Dalman, Chairperson Caryn Rosen Adelman Jan Bawden Jack Coladarci John Golan Louise Holland Matt Hulsizer Scott Myers Jeanne Morette John Thomas Richard Kates
Members Absent:	Paul Dunn Keta McCarthy
Village Staff:	Peter Friedman, Village Attorney Michael D'Onofrio, Director of Community **D**evelopment Brian Norkus, Assistant Director of Community Development

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Dalman at 7:35 p.m. Chairperson Dalman took a roll call vote of the Commission members present.

Chairperson Dalman then stated that the Commission would review the minutes from the December 17, 2014 meeting. She asked if there were any corrections or concerns.

Ms. Adelman noted that Mr. Dowding was not absent from the meeting, but that she replaced him on the Commission.

Ms. Bawden pointed out that a correction was necessary regarding the motion made on page 1.

Mr. Norkus informed the Commission that he would check the audio.

A motion was made by Mr. Thomas to approve the Plan Commission December 17, 2014 meeting minutes as amended to confirm the elimination of Chuck Dowding as a Commission member. Mr. Hulsizer seconded the motion. The meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

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 before the Commission commenced this portion of the meeting including public comment, given the number of people in attendance at the meeting, she stated that it would be a good idea to set expectations for the meeting and the conduction of the hearing and public hearing portion of the planned development. She informed the audience that if they submitted public comment to the Village on the proposal and if it was received by 5:00 p.m. today, the Commission has a copy of it and would review it. Chairperson Dalman also stated that they will receive copies of the comments made tonight which would be reviewed and entered into the record. She then stated that she would go over the schedule for the meeting.

Chairperson Dalman stated that this meeting would be the first of a number of meetings before the Commission and that later, staff would provide an outline of the process for an application submitted for consideration of planned development so that everyone understood the procedure when an application is made for planned development. She stated that they would be opening the public hearing and continue that portion at the next meeting scheduled for April 22, 2015 and that if it is needed to be continued, it would be continued to the Commission's following meeting on May 27, 2015. Chairperson Dalman indicated that it would depend on whether the applicant completed their presentation and expert testimony.

Chairperson Dalman informed the audience that they would adhere to the strict schedule and for the Commission's questions and Village staff comment to be held until after the applicant's presentation. She noted that it is important to allow the applicant to present their entire proposal and that everyone would have a chance to ask questions. Chairperson Dalman also stated that the plan is to allow no questioning until after the applicant has finished their presentation. She stated that she wanted to ensure that there is a fair public hearing and that the interested parties are given the opportunity to present their positions. She noted that the Village staff would provide an overview of the planned development process and referred to the opportunity for the Commission's questions and the standards that the Commission is tasked with looking at. Chairperson Dalman reiterated that the applicant will make their presentation and that after that, there would be a brief Village staff review. She indicated that it is important that the applicant have sufficient time to explain the proposal and its specifics.

Chairperson Dalman then stated that the applicant must end their presentation by 9:00 p.m. and that if they did not complete their presentation, they would be given an opportunity at the next meeting to pick up on that presentation. She stated that they expected a lot of people to show up at the meeting and that they want to make sure that the Commission can ask questions as well as the public who came to the meeting. Chairperson Dalman then stated that at 9:00 or 9:30 p.m., the Commission would ask questions and noted that it would not be their only opportunity. She stated that they are doing that so that at 9:30, the mike would be open for public comment. Chairperson Dalman noted that it would be for general public comment and not for cross-examination. Chairperson Dalman informed the audience that there would be a separate time for the interested parties to cross examine the witnesses or consultants. She also stated that

the Commission would be adopting those procedures at the April meeting.

Chairperson Dalman informed the audience that at 10:00 p.m., she stated that they intend to end the public comment portion of the meeting and adjourn at 10:15. She noted that for everyone who is concerned with not getting an opportunity to speak at this meeting and did not get a chance to talk or ask questions during the public comment portion of the meeting, she encouraged the comments to be submitted and that the written concerns and comments would be entered into the public record. Chairperson Dalman informed the audience that there would be significant additional time for subsequent meetings for public hearings and comment. She added that the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) would also hold a public comment portion at their meeting. Chairperson Dalman stated that they want to ensure that for any interested parties, if they want to present witnesses, to hold off until the April meeting and the May meeting, if necessary.

Chairperson Dalman then read the rules for the proceedings. She stated that in order to ensure that there is a full and fair hearing, for both the applicant as well as members of the community, it is important that the public hearing proceeding be orderly and conducted in a fair manner. Chairperson Dalman stated that they would not be taking questions from the floor outside of the timeframes which have been outlined. She stated that questions and comments from the Commission and members of the public be made only during the abided allocated times. Chairperson Dalman asked the audience to please consider that if someone has spoken during the public comment period and has addressed a concern or question that you intend to raise, consider not speaking tonight so that they can get as great a variety of comments as possible. She reiterated that there would be ample time for public comment and participation.

Chairperson Dalman went on to state that they would limit comments during the public comment portion of the meeting to five minutes. She noted that anyone who spoke tonight and ran out of time would have the opportunity to supplement their comments in writing, at another meeting or if there is additional time at the end of tonight's proceedings, they can go back to the people who felt that they did not get an adequate amount of time to speak. Chairperson Dalman then stated that Mr. D'Onofrio would provide a quick review of the planned development process.

A woman in the audience commented that it is outrageous that there would not be enough time to speak.

Chairperson Dalman stated that her comment would be duly noted. She stated that they are acknowledging that they cannot possibly get to everyone who wanted to comment in this room at this time. Chairperson Dalman referred to the adoption of the rules and regulations which is within the Commission's rules and stated that it is a fair way to proceed. She reiterated that there would be adequate opportunity for public comment at this hearing and subsequent hearings and that the public comment portion would remain open until it is officially closed. Chairperson Dalman then asked everyone to silence their phones.

Mr. D'Onofrio stated that he would provide a brief overview of the planned development process. He noted that he would not go into the detail of the One Winnetka project, but the process that the applicant is required to go through. Mr. D'Onofrio began by stating that the overall intent behind the regulations which were adopted in December 2005 was to provide a greater degree of

flexibility for development of sites which measure over 10,000 square feet. He then read a portion of the Section 17.58.020 of the zoning ordinance in that it described the purpose of the planned development regulations as follows. Mr. D'Onofrio stated that it further describes the purpose of the planned development which is to "make available a special use procedure that departs from the strict application of the specific zoning ordinance requirements of the district where the development is located. In an effort to promote progressive development and redevelopment of land in the multi-family and commercial zoning districts by encouraging more creative and imaginative design for land development than is possible under the zoning regulations that apply in those districts."

Mr. D'Onofrio stated that further in that section, there are five intent statements, the first of which is permit the creative approach to development, the second of which is to achieve a more desirable, physical environment by allowing flexibility, building design and site planning flexibility than is possible through the strict application of the underlying zoning district regulations. He stated that the third statement related to the allowance of a more efficient use of land or the facilitated development pattern that is in harmony with the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan and the district purpose statement. Mr. D'Onofrio stated that the final statement is to allow for the relaxation of certain requirements based upon procedural protections and to provide for the more detailed review of individual proposals or more significant multi-family and commercial developments.

Mr. D'Onofrio then stated that he would describe the actual process that an applicant for planned development would go though. He informed the audience that there would be two rounds of review. Mr. D'Onofrio stated that in 2008 or 2009, there was a planned development request for the multi-use redevelopment on the same site being presented this evening. He noted that the first round of reviews is known as the preliminary review phase and that this phase included the review and comment by the Commission, the ZBA and the Design Board of Appeals (DRB). Mr. D'Onofrio informed the audience that each body conducted its own meetings and hearings with the Commission and ZBA holding formal public hearings which are noticed by mail, newspaper and signage on the property. He noted that with regard to the ZBA, this same type of notification takes place for those located within 250 feet of the subject property and that they are notified via mail, newspaper and with signage on the property. Mr. D'Onofrio then stated that the DRB sends copies of the agenda to those located within 250 feet of the subject property. He stated that the plan at this time required the Commission to have a complete review of the planned development before it is referred and considered by the ZBA and the DRB. Mr. D'Onofrio added that those meeting dates have not been established yet.

Mr. D'Onofrio went on to state that each of the bodies has their own set of standards to review. He stated that the Commission generally reviewed the plan and that detailed in Section 17.58.110 of the regulations, it stated that the Commission is looking at the planned development for consistency with the goals and objectives of the 2020 Comprehensive Plan. Mr. D'Onofrio stated that the ZBA considered the same standards for any special use permit application as to whether the planned development would be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare of the Village, whether it would be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property owners, whether it would impede the normal and orderly development of other property, whether ingress and egress would be affected, whether it conflicted with pedestrians and vehicles, whether there would be

adequate facilities and drainage as well as whether it conformed to all of the other applicable regulations. He then stated that the DRB review entailed whether the building design and landscaping conform to the design guidelines.

Mr. D'Onofrio then stated that after the completion of all of those reviews, each body comes up with findings which are forwarded to the Village Council for consideration. He noted that the Village Council takes all of the data into account and considers the application. Mr. D'Onofrio stated that if the application is approved, the next step is the final approval phase. Mr. D'Onofrio stated that phase has to be commenced with 18 months of preliminary approval. He added that the final approval required review by the Commission, the ZBA and the DRB.

Mr. D'Onofrio indicated that this would be the first of a number of meetings of the Commission. He informed the audience that there were numerous meetings with the first planned development for a total of 16 meetings between the three advisory bodies before final approval was granted. Mr. D'Onofrio stated that for future meetings of the Commission, they would notify the people who signed in on the sign in sheet. He stated that concluded his presentation.

Chairperson Dalman stated that before the applicant made their presentation, she would like those who intend to speak during the public comment portion of the meeting, to provide their name and address, as well as to be sworn. Chairperson Dalman then swore in those that would be speaking on this case.

Mr. Kates asked Mr. Friedman if because of the large crowd, can the Commission vote to hold additional meetings to make sure that there is full public participation.

Mr. Friedman confirmed that is correct.

Glenn Udell introduced himself to the Commission as an attorney with Brown Udell Pomerantz & Delrahim, Ltd. representing the developer, Stone Street Partners, Winnetka Stations, LLC and the principal, David Trandel who is a resident of Winnetka. He stated that would introduce Mr. Trandel who would speak with regard to the project overview and generally, the concept behind the project. Mr. Udell stated that George Kisiel of Okrent Associates would speak with regard to the regulatory history trends and planning issues. Mr. Udell stated that Daniel Weinbach is the landscape architect and that the project architect, Lucien Lagrange, would speak generally with regard to the project design and architecture. He also introduced Javier Milan as the traffic and parking engineer and Pat Dimmer who would speak to site engineering and infrastructure. Mr. Udell stated that they would then turn back to Mr. Kisiel who would speak with regard to the zoning regulatory issue overview and that they would finish with Mr. Trandel with regard to what he and the developer believe to be the project benefits to the community and the financial overview of the project. He stated that since there is a limited amount of time, that concluded his introduction.

David Trandel stated that he represented the development team for One Winnetka and thanked the Commission for making time for the presentation and the citizens. He stated that he would also like to thank the officials and that as a resident of the Village, it is great to see the revitalization of the central business district. Mr. Trandel then stated that as a developer and resident, he would

like to thank the Commission, Mr. D'Onofrio and Mr. Norkus with regard to their efforts on behalf of the citizens of Winnetka and the development team.

Mr. Trandel began by stating that the project represented a bold vision and an exciting plan by accomplished professionals in their respective trades. He described it as a joint endeavor which would result in an architecturally significant landmark which would serve Winnetka today and be a model for future development around the country. Mr. Trandel informed the Commission that the plan took over two years to design and that it is merely a continuation of the brilliant plan from 94 years ago by Edward Bennett. He stated that on a personal note, he is asking for support to take the necessary action required to improve the daily quality of life for the Village's residents, no matter what their age. Mr. Trandel then stated that the turnout at tonight's meeting reflected a deep desire and presented a special moment in time and that the Village can do something extraordinary and worthy of building in Winnetka.

Mr. Trandel stated that Winnetka is personal to everyone. He informed the Commission that he raised his children here and that it is truly a personal endeavor. Mr. Trandel indicated that it took local knowledge and drive to get something done which would be truly extraordinary. He then referred to Winnetka's nationally recognized and accredited schools, beaches and the Skokie lagoons which he commented made Winnetka idyllic. Mr. Trandel stated that until you try to park downtown in the business district as it is currently configured, the feeling changes. He stated that downtown and the central business district should be representative of its residents, their lifestyles and their tastes and supports the highest level of surface amenities which are commensurate with Winnetka. He indicated that there are a handful of quality restaurant and shops, all of which he patronized which he stated lack the draw and sense of a place to make it unique. Mr. Trandel then referred to the survey which reflected the overwhelming desire to create some form of vibrancy.

Mr. Trandel stated that the project was aimed to be the cornerstone of revitalization of downtown Winnetka because they are proposing a long term fix to the underpinning shortcomings which are the root cause of the current blight. He stated that there are difficult choices to make with the intention to create a true focal point with the design, as well as with light and air and have a social gathering destination. Mr. Trandel informed the Commission that it is a plan with a European inspired plaza which would give life to festivals and markets which do not exist in that form today. He stated that the plan would be forever stymied until they take responsibility and respond to the challenges facing the community. Mr. Trandel also stated that they have to find the fortitude to solve the current shortage of retail and commuter parking. He then stated that if it is done right, it would make Winnetka more attractive for future generations, future retailers and future restaurants, all of which are important in terms of quality of life.

Mr. Trandel went on to state that they have taken a painstaking approach which has lasted for over two years and that he personally tried to each out and meet everyone who would be the most affected by the project. He commented that change is difficult. Mr. Trandel then stated that they designed the project to accomplish three goals while retaining the inherent charm and elegance of their hometown. He stated that their first objective is to foster renaissance and the revitalization of the downtown area in a manner which is consistent with their core values. Mr. Trandel stated that second, they wanted to use this moment in time to create something truly special and offer the

people of the North Shore a truly unique experience. He stated that the third goal is to satisfy the two very underserviced and critical constituencies in their housing supply for those people who have nowhere to go.

Mr. Trandel then referred to Daniel Burnham as a famous architect from the late 1800's and early 1900's as well as Edward Bennett. He informed the Commission that Mr. Bennett was longtime partner and author of the 1909 Chicago Plan. Mr. Trandel stated that when they started the process, they knew they had to do something which is important which is not just their idea, but which would be embraced for far longer than they live.

Mr. Trandel then stated that when they discovered the 1921 Winnetka plan, they were amazed. He stated that like Chicago, it contained Parisian and European influences which were obvious. Mr. Trandel stated that the Village Hall was meant to be a confluence of government buildings of private enterprise to create a sense of space, park and outdoor living. He then referred the Commission to an illustration of Paris today and the height restriction to 7 stories which he commented was done well. Mr. Trandel stated that when they discovered this, they wanted to carry that vision forward and that he convinced his friend, Lucien Lagrange, to take the team to task. He added that Mr. Lagrange has done projects locally and worldwide and referred the Commission to the illustration of those buildings.

Mr. Trandel then referred the Commission to an illustration of the project and that they would later get into the specifics. He informed the Commission that they are proposing 120 luxury rental units which would be geared toward empty nesters with no choices for alternative housing and young professionals. Mr. Trandel noted that there would be 45,000 square feet of retail space on the first floor and that there would be high interest from high quality users. He stated that their goal is not to cannibalize the existing businesses with a national brand and that they are committed to local and family owned businesses.

Mr. Trandel stated that the biggest point related to the 800 pound gorilla in the room which is to solve for the Village's parking ills. He noted that the project would consist of 538 parking spaces which would result in a net increase to the Village of 383 parking spaces to be used for retail users and commuters. Mr. Trandel indicated that they all know how parking is currently stifled and stated that the proposal would clear the streets of parking and have it located underground and out of sight. He then stated that the unintended consequence of the plan called for sunken railroads. Mr. Trandel stated that the project represented a unique opportunity to create a public plaza which could provide for civic events and have commuter parking to the train track platform. He stated that represented a broad overview of the project and that it is important to hone in on the key points. Mr. Trandel stated that as a resident, it is hard not to feel that they are not keeping pace with their neighbors with regard to the revitalization trend of a transit-oriented downtown and that they look forward to working with the Commission for a terrific solution. He then stated he would then turn the presentation over to George Kisiel.

George Kisiel of Okrent Associates introduced himself to the Commission as the president of the company. He informed the Commission that they are based in Chicago and that he has been a licensed architect and planner with 30 years of experience on planning and zoning issues. Mr. Kisiel also stated that he has been an expert witness and has appeared before numerous boards in

Chicago and the metropolitan area. Mr. Kisiel stated that they are here for two purposes. He stated that he would provide a brief background and history of Winnetka and its planning heritage. Mr. Kisiel also stated that he would speak with regard to recent developments in demographics and planning trends and how the project would fit into that set of circumstances. He then stated that after the presentation with regard to the architecture of the project, he would speak with regard to the zoning relief being requested and the standards that are reviewed for approving those types of deviations from zoning standards, as well as the criteria that the Plan Commission will review for planned developments.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that with regard to the background and history, he would talk a little bit about the Village origins and planning heritage; he would talk about the the current development context and events that have occurred, over history and more recently. He stated the he would discuss some of the more recent planning efforts that have occurred here in Winnetka, particularly the recent Urban Land Institute study, and a recent change to your zoning ordinance that has really sort of cleared the way to allow a type of development that we are proposing on the site, that has to do with the elimination of density standards really, and some setback relief also. Mr. Kisiel stated that with regard to the Village origins, Winnetka was platted in 1850. He noted that there was a low period of growth in the 1920's and that Winnetka developed a majority of its housing stock which was built before the Depression. Mr. Kisiel then stated that there was a period of rapid growth from the 1890's to the 1920's which spawned the town planning movement. He stated that the Plan Commission was formed and Edward Bennett was hired to prepare the first Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Kisiel stated that with regard to the Bennett plan, it sought to preserve the pastoral character of the community. He stated that the key aspects of that plan provided a lot of the character of the current community, the preservation of the Skokie marshes, the separation of the railroad from grade level and that which was the most relevant to the development is the configuration of central civic space. Mr. Kisiel informed the Commission that Bennett envisioned the central space of the corridor of the Village which consisted of the Village Hall, the cultural center on the site of the post office and commercial block which is the subject of the project.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that the block was known as the Prouty Block and referred the Commission to the Sanborn map from 1914 and identified the subject property which is outlined in yellow. He informed the Commission that the Bennett plan had some specific recommendations for the site which included the setback and frontage, to create a business street appropriate for adjacency to the railroad and also to recognize that the prominence of this frontage is desirable for a permanent building to be uniform and attractive in terms of its architecture.

Mr. Kisiel stated that they realized very early on at this point in time that the large expanse of open space and frontages measured approximately 6.25 acres when considered with the open area of the train tracks and the adjacent parks and roadways.

Mr. Kisiel stated that with regard to the context of development, it is important to consider history and the changes which have taken place. He then stated that the boom of the 1920's brought Winnetka to near full build-out and that there is no room for Winnetka to grow. Mr. Kisiel identified some of the key changes which have occurred since the 1920's as the change in

technology, particularly auto ownership. He stated that what this did is that it had a profound effect on the downtown retail district and railroad suburb centered downtowns. Mr. Kisiel stated that these locations were erased with the advent of automobiles, shopping malls, parking lots, larger scaled developments, etc. He then stated that more recently, putting pressure on railroad centered downtowns is the advent of e-retailing and internet sales. Mr. Kisiel stated that they know that this has had an effect on the downtown business district and Winnetka and referred to the high vacancy rates in the East Elm business district and added that the subject property accounted for a significant amount of that space. He referred to the configuration of these buildings and attempting to get retail tenants in them has caused some of this difficulty.

Mr. Kisiel stated that another trend which seemed to drive the demand in terms of housing is the transition from the movement of the baby boomer generation as they age. He indicated that there is an entire market which has reached empty nester status who have a desire to stay in the community and that the opportunities for them, specifically in terms of railroad suburbs, are very few.

Mr. Kisiel went on to state that with regard to current planning, consistent with Winnetka's heritage of planning, the current document is the Winnetka 2020 Plan which was drafted in 1999 and is similar to the Bennett plan, focused really on conservation. He then referred to its purpose statement which talked about maintaining traditional residential density patterns and lowering densities in multi-family districts. Mr. Kisiel referred to the amount of teardowns which took place and the fact that nearly 10% of the Village's housing stock was lost. He also stated that it was the first time that any redevelopment was seen in the East West Elm business district with the addition of 812 Oak Street and the Winnetka Galleria. Mr. Kisiel noted that the document focused on limiting and controlling new development and avoiding any potential impacts on the infrastructure.

Mr. Kisiel described the Winnetka 2020 Plan as becoming a bit long in the tooth in that they had not anticipated many of the trends relating to the current development context. He stated that it did recognize the demographic trend and illuminated the need to find housing alternatives for those who wished to age in the community. Mr. Kisiel stated that it also recognized the need for commuter and retail parking in the East Elm business district. He stated that it also recognized issues with regard to existing development on the site.

Mr. Kisiel went on to refer to new trends in urban planning thought and the rise of new urbanism. He stated that what Winnetka created through its Comprehensive Plan is the model for a railroad suburb. He indicated that one of the key components behind the idea of new urbanism is transit-oriented development which moved toward creating greater densities, more walkable downtowns and vibrant central business district communities. Mr. Kisiel noted that there has been significant investment in transit-oriented communities and referred to Glenview, Wilmette and Glencoe. He stated that the trends toward higher density in mixed use are the way to counter the negative impacts on central business districts and downtown retail.

Mr. Kisiel stated that Winnetka has realized that this is the situation and commissioned the Urban Land Institute (ULI) to perform a study of the business districts and stated that one of the key findings from the study which was the impetus of the document was the idea of place making and

creating spaces for people to gather and to provide a focal point or something that drives and attracts people to a particular location. He indicated that the key element of that is civic space and the creation of spaces where place making can occur. Mr. Kisiel referred to examples as the use of farmers markets, etc. to draw people to a place and give people a sense of ownership of a public place. Mr. Kisiel added that the key driver to all of this is density.

Mr. Kisiel went to state that the ULI study contained a resident survey, the results of which indicated a demand for more restaurants and dining options, particularly for the East and West Elm districts. He stated that it also expressed a lesser degree of satisfaction in terms of streetscape and the physical configuration of the downtown area. Mr. Kisiel then referred to the more recent 2015 survey which garnered 45% of the respondents responding and that one of the key findings is that over 77% found the revitalization of the central business district to be a high priority.

Mr. Kisiel stated that the idea of One Winnetka is to complete the Bennett vision for central civic retail and cultural space and that it responded to the community's preferences for the revitalization of downtown. He also stated that it is consistent with the current planning thought with regard to transit-oriented development and revitalizing downtowns and that it responds to the elements of the current Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Kisiel added that it also reaffirmed the traditional role of Winnetka's downtown. He then introduced Daniel Weinbach who would speak to some of the larger scale planning issues including the plaza space and landscape architecture.

Daniel Weinbach of Daniel Weinbach and Partners, Ltd. introduced himself to the Commission as the landscape architectural firm which is based in Chicago. He stated that he has been practicing for 42 years and has worked with Lucien Lagrange on a number of projects. Mr. Weinbach then stated that he would go through the major landscape components of the project and also the vision in connection with the Bennett plan. He stated that a lot is not directly related to the One Winnetka project, but that it is relevant.

Mr. Weinbach then referred the Commission to the overall development plan. He stated that with regard to the right side of the proposed project, he referred to the railroad tracks and stated that it would cross over to the current park and Village Hall and the continue the west and terminate at the block of the current post office site.

Mr. Weinbach then stated that the project has three landscape components, the first of which he described as the most important and is the creation of a plaza on Lincoln Avenue and which would have parking angled on both sides. He stated that it would become a public plaza developed with European flavor which related to the architecture of the building. Mr. Weinbach noted that there would be a large central open space and that its character would be heavily patterned along with paving. He then stated that traffic would be allowed in two directions flanking the plaza and that there would be two shade trees from the surface providing shade comfort and allowing for events such as markets and festivals to take place below the canopy of trees. Mr. Weinbach added that the idea is for a very richly designed plaza to allow total flexibility for use.

Mr. Weinbach stated that the second element related to the south side of the building and referred the Commission to the courtyard space which is vehicle drop-off space with a surface of pavers and that it would contain a water feature. He stated that lastly, there would be a small pocket park

on the north side next to the parking lot on Elm Street which would be infilled as necessary.

Mr. Weinbach then referred the Commission to the large open space between the Village Hall and the proposed development. He stated that they are suggesting that the park remain but that more importance be given in connecting the elements of One Winnetka to the Village Hall and beyond. Mr. Weinbach stated that it is a simple diagram which would create central space with trees and the addition of the proposed cultural center on the north side to complete it with regard to the Elm Street character and would serve to define the edge of the central space. He referred to the park being developed in the Bennett plan and that it being a strong feature is the intent here.

Mr. Weinbach stated that the next illustration showed some connections on either side of the Village Hall which would continue west to Chestnut Court and stated that it would provide a nice pedestrian garden space in the center. He stated that they are suggesting making that an entirely pedestrian street and to expand the use of it for a variety of festivals.

Mr. Weinbach stated that to the west, he referred the Commission to an illustration of the cross at Chestnut which would terminate at the post office site. He indicated that there is a strong movement to move the post office site and leave the block available for retail or housing development which is the terminus of the proposal. Mr. Weinbach noted that everything they see in the illustration is an idea to give the concept of what it might look at in terms of expanding the green pedestrian aspect of the downtown area. He then introduced Lucien Lagrange.

Lucien Lagrange introduced himself to the Commission and stated that he has been living in Chicago since 1978 and has been practicing architecture for 37 years. He then stated that he has been practicing architecture for 43 years (?) and that he lives in Chicago because of its architecture. Mr. Lagrange described it as a great city and that he also been fortunate in meeting Mr. Trandel. Mr. Lagrange informed the Commission that he has done three major buildings in Chicago and referred to the team and two plazas which were done.

Mr. Lagrange stated that in having established a program, he referred to residential retail and how to integrate the design on the site. He described it as an incredible site which faced six acres on the site and is located on the outskirts of the Village Hall. Mr. Lagrange then stated that on the east side, they planned to create open space between the two buildings on Elm Street and stated that the south side has 70 feet. He stated that the mass above on the second floor would create 56% of the open space and that the underground open space led to 15%. Mr. Lagrange then stated that on Elm Street, they planned to create two levels on the street to make a link to Lincoln Avenue. He noted that there would be no curb cut anywhere with the exception of the entry to the parking on the south side of the site. Mr. Lagrange also stated that retail would continue on the street with no interruption. He then referred the Commission to an illustration of the south side which contained the entrance to the project and provided access which led to the motor court. Mr. Lagrange described it as an important aspect of the project to have a private entry for the residents.

Mr. Lagrange then stated that with regard to parking, all of it would be located underground. He noted that there would be an increase in commuter parking by 110 spaces and that the Village parking on the east side would increase by 35 spaces, all of which would be underground. Mr. Lagrange referred to parking for retail, the residents and commuters and reiterated that it would be

the only new access curb cut to underground parking.

Mr. Lagrange described the most important aspect of the project as the plaza which he also described as very special. He informed the Commission that it looks to the west and across the big open space and referred to the view of the Village Hall. Mr. Lagrange stated that it was designed for farmers markets, book fairs, etc. and that it would be close to Lincoln Avenue.

Mr. Lagrange stated that with regard to the architecture of the building, he described it as very classic architecture. He stated that with regard to the reason why, he referred to the Chicago architecture of the 1800's and 1900's and that the architect was trained in Paris. Mr. Lagrange also referred to the Blackstone Hotel which was done by Benjamin Marshall of Paris. He stated that they brought the quality of the architecture.

Mr. Lagrange went on to state that the design of the building base is strong and that there would be a more detailed second floor. He stated that the third and fourth stories would be simple and that the fifth and top story would have a mansard roof and mantel. Mr. Lagrange noted that there would not be a big slab and that the building would have very strong horizontal lines. He informed the Commission that the building would have a stone base with bays at the windows open to retail. Mr. Lagrange then stated that on the second floor on the west side, the building would be sitting beyond the ground floor and would contain retail space and a fitness center. He then referred to the east side amenities and the pool. Mr. Lagrange noted that they planned to use light stone which would be a buffer and would be a warm and inviting. He added that there would be a change in material for the fifth floor and then to the mansard roof.

Mr. Lagrange stated that with regard to the corner, they planned to soften the corner and make it round because of the angle of the site which is acute at 90 degrees. He stated that they would visually soften the edge and for pedestrians, to provide an inviting way to turn the corner to retail from Elm Street to Lincoln Avenue. Mr. Lagrange also stated that it would create a landmark which would be visible from the west. He added that it would establish the east side of Winnetka and bring the east and west sides of Winnetka together.

Mr. Lagrange then referred the Commission to an illustration of 65 East Goethe in Chicago. He described Lincoln Avenue as the most important elevation which can be seen from everywhere. Mr. Lagrange stated that the façade would have three components and referred to the center which would project the building a few feet to create the main entry for the residents. He stated that it would create a strong image. Mr. Lagrange then referred to the north corner of the building and that it contained a very Chicago-like round corner which is very common to see there. He noted that at the end of the plaza, there would be two levels of parking and that they would be creating architecture to work with the building so that you do not see the vehicles.

Mr. Lagrange stated that they planned to use a different style of architecture and that Winnetka is very eclectic in terms of its architecture. He indicated that they do not want to compete with the materials of the Village and that they want a high quality of material. Mr. Lagrange concluded by stating that this building would be of great quality and would be the best work he has done.

Chairperson Dalman reminded the audience to withhold their support in order to maintain a fair

hearing.

Mr. Kisiel stated that he would now speak to the zoning analysis. He stated that with regard to the zoning issues and the Commission's criteria to review, they are requesting five zoning exceptions which related to building height, setbacks and the amount of parking provided. Mr. Kisiel then referred to the standards for the exceptions and that a site which measured more than 10,000 square feet had a mandatory planned development review. He stated that with regard to building height, the maximum which is allowed under the ordinance is four stories and 45 feet. Mr. Kisiel referred to the fact that the ordinance was amended recently to increase the height up from 2½ stories. He noted that they are proposing a height of seven stories at a maximum and 83 feet. Mr. Kisiel also stated that they requesting relief from the rear yard setback on the east end of the property where 10 feet is required and they are right on the property line. He noted that on the fourth story, an upper level setback of 10 feet is required which they would not be providing. Mr. Kisiel informed the Commission that the project would contain the upper two floors with a mansard roof as a similar effect to try to mitigate the height perception. He stated that they are also asking for residential parking relief in that 174 parking spaces are required for 120 units and that they would be providing 159 parking spaces. Mr. Kisiel added that there is also a need for relief from the commercial parking requirements in that 92 parking spaces are required with 45 parking spaces being provided.

Mr. Kisiel stated that with regard to the building height and why it would be as high as it is, it related to a combination of the density of the development being proposed, 120 units and the program for retail, and the way that the building volume is configured. He stated that with regard to the density of the development, there would be 120 units on 1.4 acres which did not include the land for the east parking lot; if we include the land for the east parking lot the dwelling units per acre go down to about 65 dwelling units per acre, but it's 85 units per acre if that's not part of the calculation. Mr. Kisiel then referred the Commission to a chart in the illustration as a reference with regard to what 85 dwelling units/acre would be in terms of general development. He stated that the chart illustrated that up to eight dwelling units/acre is really single family detached housing; 16 dwelling units/acre related to two flat development as seen in Chicago; 40 dwelling units/acre related to more dense, more compact row house development; 80 and more dwelling units/acre related to low rise multi-family housing, 160 dwelling units/acre midrise, etc. He indicated that the proposed density they are talking about for the site related more to low rise multi-family residential housing, in terms of the spectrum.

Mr. Kisiel then stated that for typical transit-oriented developments in railroad suburbs, the recommended densities are between 30 and 60 dwelling units/acre which is for the area within either a ¼ or ½ mile of the transit node. He stated that with regard to the effect that density would be on downtown Winnetka, he referred the Commission to a map which illustrated what the residential densities are on each of the blocks which closely approximates a ¼ mile radius. Mr. Kisiel identified the areas in blue as the equivalent of single family residential densities and that the green and yellow areas are representative of two flat and townhome type densities. He stated that the block that the subject site sat on is 8.4 dwelling units/acre and that the overall density within a ¼ mile is 5.9 dwelling units/acre, and if you compare that to the recommendations for transit oriented developments and downtowns of 30 dwelling units per acre, there is a significant amount of room for additional density in downtown Winnetka without any thought of adverse

impact. Mr. Kisiel then stated that for the subject block, the density goes from 8.6 units per acre, with the proposed additional 120 units, to 31.8 dwelling units/acre which brings it to a threshold where transit-oriented development is viable and revitalization starts to occur. He stated that overall, the dwelling unit density reaches 8.7 dwelling units/acre which is well below the minimum standards. He added that the height is derived at how the building is programmed and the density configured.

Mr. Kisiel went on to state that it is important to note the overall context for the development site. He then referred the Commission to an aerial view of the site and stated that immediately west, there is large open space with Station Park, commercial development on Elm Street and commercial development on the south side. Mr. Kisiel also stated that there are single family homes to the northeast and east of the subject property. He indicated that they have been sensitive with regard to those areas when we are creating larger buildings, bigger volumes, density, etc. Mr. Kisiel then stated that with regard to the configuration of the building's volume, Lucien has explained his rationale behind it, and I think it's a very good one - the establishment of a larger portion of the building volume adjacent to the open space does a lot to mitigate the effect of any additional height. Mr. Kisiel also stated that the location of the secondary mass of the building in the north-south direction also does a lot to present the smaller façade to the adjacent residential development that is closest by, to the northeast, whereas to the immediately to the east, there would be the buffer of not only the parking lot, the Hadley School which is a non-residential use; there are a few houses that front on Maple also, but there is another expanse of open space to the east. Mr. Kisiel noted that the configuration of the open space and the configuration of the building volumes really does respect, in trying to minimize the impact of additional height that we are asking for.

Mr. Kisiel informed the Commission that he would like to reiterate, as Lucien stated, that the larger, taller portions of the volume of the development would comprise only 44% of the site area. He stated that a full 56% of the site is two stories or less including about 15% open space.

Mr. Kisiel stated that another mitigation of height is the separation that the site naturally provides. He stated that the site is surrounded by the large open space, the street to the north and, to the east, there is the municipal parking lot, which provides about 175 feet. Mr. Kisiel also referred to the natural buffer around the building based on the existing site conditions. He noted that another thing the north-south orientation does, and Lucien did point this out, it does as best a job possible of providing more open space around the immediate neighbor to the south at the 711 Oak Street building.

Mr. Kisiel then referred to the perceived negatives of tall building, stating that it is something people get a little bit agitated about.

Chairperson Dalman noted the time and asked the Commission members if the applicant should proceed with the full presentation. The Commission members agreed that would be fine.

Mr. Kisiel informed the Commission that decreased light and air are perceived as significant negative impacts and stated that they have talked about the ways in which it would be mitigated. He stated that the separation of north-south orientation does a lot as well as the site's natural

buffers. Mr. Kisiel stated that another perceived negative is the shadow and wind effect and that a study was prepared. He then stated that the study was done for the date range of March 20 through December and covered the gamut of the impact at 2:00 p.m. which he identified on an illustration for the Commission. Mr. Kisiel stated that on June 22nd, the shadow illustration showed the effect at 6:00 p.m. He noted that the winter time shadows are the longest but that it represented the shortest amount of sunlight. Mr. Kisiel then referred the Commission to an illustration of the shadow effect on December 21st at 2:00 p.m. and noted that a lot of the shadows are then caused by the existing buildings. He noted that there would be no effect on wind at a height of 83 feet. Mr. Kisiel added that the tree cover provided friction and takes care of the additional velocity of the building height which is the same as mature trees.

Mr. Kisiel then referred to the deviation from established building heights and stated that with regard to the surrounding buildings, the project would be adjacent to one of the taller buildings in Winnetka at 711 Oak Street and referred to that building's large footprint. He stated that the proposed footprint would not be out of context with the adjacent development. Mr. Kisiel described it as a departure from tradition and that taller buildings in the 1920's were not considered for the downtown areas. Mr. Kisiel then stated that with regard to the loss of human scale, they have done a good job of breaking up the dimensions of the façade to three to four pieces slicing it horizontally and creating a base, middle and top portion along with a mansard roof. He added that the rich detail of the base of the building along with generous landscaping would bring the elevations in the public space down to human scale. Mr. Kisiel informed the Commission that he would not get into the zoning exceptions now.

Chairperson Dalman stated that she appreciated the speed at which the applicant made their presentation. She encouraged the applicant with regard to the elements which were cut off to invite them to continue their presentation at the next regular Commission meeting. Chairperson Dalman noted that there was a lot of important information made during the presentation and that the Commission needed the opportunity to ask questions.

Mr. Myers thanked Mr. Trandel in terms of taking leadership of the project which is different and the innovative, high quality team which was put together and stated that as a resident, that took energy. He then stated that there are elements of the proposal that he found appealing such as the plaza and the linking of the plaza to the west side of the railroad tracks and parking underground. Mr. Myers stated that there are a lot of detailed questions he would like to raise later with regard to parking and economics and that his questions now are broad questions. He stated that the Commission is asked to evaluate the relevance of the development in terms of history and architecture in the Village.

Mr. Myers noted that there is an architectural feel to the Village. He then stated that his question related to the fact that it would be a Beaux-Art building and that it would be very unusual in the Village. Mr. Myers stated that therefore, while it would be distinctive, there is a negative side to distinctive and that this building would be very unusual in the Village. He asked how did the Commission evaluate the differences between it being unique and what is unusual in this context.

Mr. Myers stated that his second comment related to scale and that he understood the economics behind scale in that 120 units made sense. He then stated that other than economics, why would

they want a building this big in this location.

Mr. Trandel stated that there are a lot of ways to discuss preferences, taste and architectural style. He indicated that there is an abundance of Tudor in the Village which he described as a holdover and which was the last wave of measurable development in the Village. Mr. Trandel stated that it would be more relevant to hold 1940's Tudor and historic context and what kinds of architecture raises the bar and brings value to the Village. He indicated that it is all a tradeoff and that if they cannot arrive at a certain value, then everything would be diminished. Mr. Trandel described the Village Hall as extremely eclectic in the commercial district and that it is not easily definable. He also stated that it is not Tudor. Mr. Trandel stated that a nice job was done to complement and not overstep its relevance. He stated that personally, it is what people want. Mr. Trandel referred to the confluence of addressing tastes and stated that they can provide quantity of data that the highest value of properties are in a mixed use setting in Chicago and Manhattan which comes to the Beaux-Art style. He added that it also worked in Paris. Mr. Trandel stated that there is not an absolute answer and that a combination of factors would get the highest value to minimize impact.

Mr. Trandel then stated that with regard to economics and scale, they are not trying to rattle cages in the Village and that they understand the sensitivity to height and stated that it is a product of the situation unfortunately. He stated that they can get by with three stories or 45 feet which would be fine if they did not have the 800 gorilla in the room which is the lack of parking or lack of interesting retail options. Mr. Trandel referred to the conundrum of not pushing it from a height perspective and stated that height is a very misunderstood context. He indicated that they tried to minimize the impact of height and that it is necessary to address commuter and retail parking which meant that they need to get to a certain density. Mr. Trandel also stated that there would be two buildings and not one big mass. He noted that there are buildings in Winnetka which are taller than 45 feet. Mr. Trandel stated that they appreciated the context to keep the scale with the neighbors and stated that the design is staggered and that the setbacks pay respect to 711 Oak Street and the three story building on Elm Street and that it would fit in well.

Ms. Holland stated that she is a representative of the Landmarks Preservation Commission in the Village and has been on the Commission. She stated that she appreciated the amount of time spent including this project with the Bennett plan. Ms. Holland then stated that across the street from the project are Tudor buildings at 545 Lincoln Avenue and a corner building on Elm Street which Bennett said in 1915 should be the architectural theme of Winnetka. She also stated that it was said that contribution to the commercial district should be a pastoral one. Ms. Holland asked that aside from vacating the Village street, where is the pastoral contribution of the project to the Village.

Mr. Trandel stated that they are not asking to vacate a public street, but to enhance the street and transform the plaza to take on numerous personalities throughout the day. He reiterated that there would be no vacation of a street. Mr. Trandel stated that it related to the Bennett discussion of Tudor and that they can sit for a long time discussing opinions on their favorite architectural style. He referred to the data which pointed to why and described this as a tradeoff. Mr. Trandel also stated that they wants rents and that the value is not as high for a fabricated Tudor building built in 2015 as in 1915. He added that is not where people's tastes are and that it required freshening up. Mr. Trandel then stated that he appreciated the discussion with regard to Tudor and informed the

Commission that they took a sample pool of the last 100 homes built which showed that Tudor was not the predominate style.

Ms. Holland noted that the plan included linking the East West district to Elm Street, the Village Hall and the post office site. She stated that her feeling is that Winnetka is not a community under economic siege. Ms. Holland stated that it is a well-established Village and that they can add buildings with a view to continue careful planning, restrained nature and architecture which encouraged their brand and well known Tudor facades. She stated that is her opinion from the LPC. Ms. Holland noted that they have not landmarked any public buildings except for the Village Hall and the New Trier Township building.

Mr. Trandel stated that he appreciated her position. He informed the Commission that the project is conceived to cost $90 million and that realistically, they love what is idyllic and what is practical. Mr. Trandel noted that they spent two years and $14 million to get to this point and that there would be no Tudor.

Mr. Thomas stated that he would like to echo the concerns made with regard to Tudor vs. Beaux-Art. He commented that while it is a beautiful building, he is not sure it fits. Mr. Thomas referred to the DRB and indicated that it would be interesting to see their comments. He stated that if the building was seen at 10 feet lower, that would be okay. Mr. Thomas commented that it looked to be too massive of a scale compared with the rest of the Village and Elm Street. He stated that an argument for the other hand is that they need a few taller buildings and that if they have to have them, this is the best way they could be. Mr. Thomas referred to its location near 711 Oak Street and stated that it would be interesting to hear the Village commentary.

Mr. Trandel referred to the tradeoff with regard to parking and stated that if they had sufficient parking, the two levels of underground parking here would provide parking for commuters to get vehicles off of the street so that retail can breathe. He also stated that if they were not worried about parking, the building would not be configured the way it is. Mr. Trandel stated that a parking option is the structured parking garage behind the Community House and commented that any structure for parking is a nightmare and that for any above grade parking to solve the ills of the Village would not include Tudor or be architecturally significant and would stick out like a sore thumb. He then commented that the plaza landscape would be beautiful and would be solving parking by having it located underground and added that it would be expensive to do that.

Mr. Trandel stated that the parking study said that they need 30 additional vehicles which would create a one-time solution and that as future development takes place, it would not be perpetually solving the parking problem. He noted that the retail owners say that parking is a nightmare and that the only reason the building would be this tall is because of parking which he commented is a fact of the matter. Mr. Trandel stated that referred to the decision made as a town to have vibrant retail or the status quo as acceptable and sleepy versus having a lack of choices. He stated that with regard to the vast majority, the Village has spent a lot of money doing surveys about what the residents want as taxpayers. Mr. Trandel stated that they felt it would be a gorgeous building and that it would be expensive. He questioned whether this addressed every one item which is important and referred to the concern of those who live here. Mr. Trandel stated that they commissioned a team and interested citizens to solve the problem and reiterated that they spent

two years on the project. He indicated that they can work with the Village and that if it is said that they do not need parking, he did not know what the solution would be. Mr. Trandel reiterated that they spent a lot of money trying to take direction from the course that the officials want taken as to what they want.

Mr. Kates asked if the applicant is asking for $6.75 million from the Village as a contribution.

Mr. Trandel responded that they are not asking for tax incentives, TIF grants or special tax treatment. He stated that if the Village wanted them to solve the parking problem, they are asking the Village to pay toward those costs.

Mr. Kates asked that if the Village Council did not provide $6.75 million, then what.

Mr. Trandel stated that is the Village's decision if they need retail and commuter parking. He stated that they took a broad stroke approach here to address things that are important and that how they get there is important. Mr. Trandel indicated that if it is not important to the Village, they would not have to build that. He referred to the unintended consequences smothering the dynamic retail environment and described it as a tradeoff.

Mr. Coladarci stated that he is bothered by the applicant's "lump it" attitude toward the Village. He stated that the project would be eight stories on the heels of New Trier Partners who had difficulty with a 4 to 5 story project. Mr. Coladarci described a Beaux-Art style building at 8 stories as tall. He stated that the applicant is thumbing their noses at the Village, the boards and the residents and referred to Mr. Trandel's comment that if they did not get what they wanted, they would take parking out of the project. Mr. Coladarci described it as insulting to tell the Village that its preference of Tudor architecture is old fashioned and not what people want as irrelevant and outdated. He also referred to the comments that people want this architecture in Chicago, Manhattan and Paris. Mr. Coladarci stated that it would be a beautiful building anywhere other than here. He described the applicant's attitude as hard to take and that there are lot of other questions. Mr. Coladarci stated that the applicant is saying that the Commission members are idiots for not agreeing with their choice.

Ms. Adelman stated that she has lived in the Village for over 40 years and is enthusiastic about change and that she hoped there would be economic development and something happening in the Village. She also stated that she has spent time in Chicago, Manhattan and Paris. Ms. Adelman indicated that she would like to see comparisons architecturally and projects where people live in the community. Ms. Adelman then stated that with regard to the pieces and how the applicant is presenting them, the plan fits into the Village Hall and open space and referred to the Village Hall and train tracks and then the leap to something else. She stated that she wanted to hear the public comment with regard to those who live on the other side of the tracks in Hubbard Woods or near the marshes who also care about what is going on here.

Ms. Morette stated that she had a different take on the project and thanked the applicant for their presentation. she described the quality of the presentation and the materials as outstanding. Ms. Morette then stated that they are always talking about the site and the desperate need for revitalization and development. She indicated that she heard the concern with regard to density

and its size and that she is hoping that there is a way to get both sides to come together and make this work for the Village.

Mr. Golan stated that he reflected Ms. Morette's comments with regard to the project. He stated that they are becoming a Village of "no" and stated that they should move on with it.

Mr. Hulsizer referred to the Commission members sitting for hours frequently with regard to what to do. He referred to the reconfiguration of the Hubbard Woods Park and other projects and stated that most of the time, they do not want to do anything. Mr. Hulsizer also referred to the Park District meeting where most of the time, they do not want to do anything. He then commented that personally, he did not love the building and referred to the alternative of the absence of anything else and commented that he is thrilled that someone wanted to do something. Mr. Hulsizer stated that otherwise, the stores would be vacant. He then stated that if everyone likes the style, that would be great and thanked the applicant for coming forward with something.

Chairperson Dalman referred to the part of the presentation and the assessment of having too much retail space and their thoughts. She stated that if the project is approved, there would be new buildings with higher rents and that it would be harder to lease the first floor space. Chairperson Dalman stated that she wanted to hear the Commission's thoughts. She then stated that while she is not an architectural expert, she appreciated good design and that she did not know what the right design, scale and mass would be. Chairperson Dalman stated that she is glad to see proposals come in. She also stated that they have heard the long, strong message from the survey. She informed the Commission that she lives in Hubbard Woods and the conversation with regard to having pick-up and drop-off locations at more restaurants, etc. in the Village. Chairperson Dalman reiterated that she very much appreciated the team and the presentation and the fact that there was a lot of good conversation. She also reiterated that there would be additional open public comment and referred to the 5 minute time limitation on comments.

Gwen Trindl, 800 Oak Street, informed the Commission that she has lived in Winnetka since 1971 and is very fond of the Village. She commented that she is feeling sad about the Winnetka they have known and are proud of. Ms. Trindl stated that the applicant has come along with a magic wand and wants to turn the Village into Evanston or River North without asking them if they want that kind of look. She agreed that obviously height is a serious problem. Ms. Trindl stated that it is her feeling that they would be able to develop a fine project without the proposed height. She stated that having the building loom over the rest of the Village is a real concern.

Ms. Trindl stated that while she looked forward to a congenial, well designed development on the property for a long time, it needed to be a reasonable height and size and that they should work hard to improve businesses. She also stated that whatever comes to this property will fit in a special way into the community that they love and should not be something which would blot it out. Ms. Trindl stated that nor do they expect the developer take some of the Village owned property for some of the building and stated that although the road would be interfered with, the applicant is not expecting to ask them to pay for a number of the improvements such as the east parking lot which the Village would have to pay for. She concluded by urging the Commission to take its rightful role in true planning for the town of Winnetka.

Chairperson Dalman reminded the audience that there would be no public displays of support.

Jessica Tucker introduced herself to the Commission as the chair of the Winnetka caucus. She stated that the ULI process jump started the conversation on revitalization and that there was definitely a cautionary note not to change the urban scale and recommendations to maintain, preserve and enhance the history and character of what made Winnetka special. Ms. Tucker commented that she was disappointed to see the New Trier Partners plan. She then stated that there was an open house and that they invited the various Village bodies, the Village Council and the public. Ms. Tucker stated that with regard to the public, it is important that they are here and referred to the need to support the project. She indicated that the open house provided the opportunity for dialog and that when the applicant filed their formal application, they garnered support and made revisions to the plan making it more in line with Winnetka. She noted that New Trier Partners received final approval for a 31 unit architectural Tudor style building with underground parking and which would be 4 stories with the upper floor setback at 49 feet.

Ms. Tucker stated that from what they are seeing here, she referred to the caucus and informed the Commission that they did an electronic survey and that 500 residents took it. She stated that it asked about the height on the proposal and that she recalled it being very clear that 65% of the respondents did not want 7 stories. Ms. Tucker noted that those who opposed wanted lower heights which were acceptable at 3 stories and that a handful of respondents supported 5 stories.

Ms. Tucker then stated that the third largest group said no to something of this size, scale and massing and that the results were shared with the Village Council. She stated that there were 195 comments regarding the 7 story proposal. Ms. Tucker stated that they should listen to the community and that it is important to take the time to visit the website in that all of the results are there. She indicated that she can provide copies for everyone's review.

Ms. Tucker went on to state that the results were presented to the Village Council at the February 17, 2015 meeting. She stated that they were assured that a 45 foot height maximum would not be the starting point for negotiation upward for any proposed development. Ms. Tucker also stated that they were assured that the density relaxation, parking or increase in density would not apply to any planned development. She then stated that they were told that the historic preservation of the commercial district would be the number one priority from the Village survey. Ms. Tucker stated that she would like to tell the developers that they did a great job and that she is all for development in the appropriate context, and suggested that they come back with a three or four floor, transit-oriented development. She also stated that there is no reason for a taxpayer subsidy on this development. Ms. Tucker then stated that with regard to density, she is curious if the applicant was to come back with three or four stories, the density to make the project work raised the question of whether there is going to be affordable housing or deed restriction. She then referred to the planned development ordinance.

Chairperson Dalman noted the five minute limitation on comments. She stated that they want to make sure that everyone has a chance to submit and suggested that Ms. Tucker submit her comments in writing.

Frank Petrek, 711 Oak Street, Unit 409, introduced himself to the Commission and stated that he

filed an opposition to the development and that his reasons are of record. He then stated that he took an oath to tell the truth like the others. Mr. Petrek stated that they were told by the developer on December 11, 2014 that they would need 80 residential units to make a profit and that now, the number has increased to 120 units. He also stated that he appreciated that there are lot of lawyers here and that they know about negotiations. Mr. Petrek stated that when you negotiate, if you come up with a crazy number, he referred to a case which was settled a week ago for $750,000 and that the starting figure was $25,000. He then stated that what they want from the developer is a real number. Mr. Petrek informed the Commission that there are 38 units in the 711 Oak Street building which is the largest multi-unit taxpayer in Winnetka and also which has the most filed objections. He described them as a close-knit community and that if the applicant built this building, it would destroy the neighborhood as well as the Village Green.

Mr. Petrek also stated that when turning left on Lincoln Avenue, for those who are catching the train, in his 35 years of living here, two people have died. He stated that there is a safety hazard with that much density and that the ULI study refers to taking a survey of the community. Mr. Petrek informed the Commission that no one asked 711 Oak Street about the proposed density which they still oppose.

Dania Leemputte, 135 Old Green Bay, informed the Commission that she has lived in the Village since 1985 although her husband wanted to live downtown. She commented that the applicant's buildings are her favorite. Ms. Leemputte stated that even though she loved them and Paris, they are not in Paris or downtown Chicago. She stated that while she is concerned with this architecture, the building is beautiful, but would not be in keeping with the pastoral feel of Winnetka. Ms. Leemputte also stated that she is not recommending that they go to Tudor. She indicated that she believed that there are other complementary architectural styles which would be more in keeping with the Village.

Ms. Leemputte also stated that she was concerned when she first looked at the project, she did not know the architecture and that she said it looked like a Lucien Lagrange building brought down to seven stories. She then stated that it would be appear to be a white albatross and that it reminded her of the Highland Park Renaissance project which she commented was done well. Ms. Leemputte also stated that there are empty stores there. She concluded by stating that while she is concerned, she would like to commend the applicant in that it is great what they want to do, but that she did not know if this is the right architecture and depth and that its scale would be too much for the Village.

Penny Lanphier, 250 Birch, stated that she has been on the Village Council in the 1990's and was involved with the Comprehensive Plan. She stated that her concerns related to massing, scale, the building relative to the site and the contours of the entire district. Ms. Lanphier also stated that she would like more information and that everything about the site plan is viewed from the east. She stated that it was not taken in context with the residential and commercial districts. Ms. Lanphier stated that the purpose of having setbacks is to scale away from the edges of the site relative to how it affected neighboring properties.

Ms. Lanphier also stated that with regard to the need to go to 6 or 7 stories, there has to be something significant and compelling. She stated that there is also a question with regard to

transit and the TOD. Ms. Lanphier then stated that she would like to completely applaud and encourage the use of transportation networks. She stated that given that there is one rail line with a limited schedule, she questioned whether this would be an effective option for this site. Ms. Lanphier reiterated that they need more information and conversation and that she would submit additional comments in writing.

Sue Wellington, 508 Maple, informed the Commission that her and her husband sent a letter. She informed the Commission that at the back of this development, there are five homes on Lincoln Avenue, Elm Street, Maple and Oak Street which would be affected in a very serious way. Ms. Wellington stated that she liked to see progress and change and that she would like to see the site improved. She then stated that she opposed this particular project because it is just too large. Ms. Wellington noted that the homes are the background to the July 4th memorial and that all you would see is an 83 foot structure. She stated that is not how they bought their home and that one wanted to see a 73 foot structure on top of a hill and that it would likely look like more than that from the backyard. Ms. Wellington commented that she liked what was done, but that it should be on a different scale.

Ms. Wellington stated that with regard to the residents, the issues keep repeating themselves in that the project is gargantuan in scale compared to others in Winnetka. She also referred to the fact that the project would need multiple zoning exceptions and that it would require taxpayer incentives in some way. Ms. Wellington added that they would also give away public land. She commented that she loved architecture and that the problem with the project is that it should be simply scaled and that it would immediately affect her home and others. Ms. Wellington concluded by suggesting that they bring in a junior version or restart the project.

Debbie Ross, 921 Tower Road, informed the Commission that she has lived in the Village for 40 years and that she is blown away by the arrogance of this project. She referred to the fact that Mr. Trandel has lived in the Village for a few years. Ms. Ross stated that no developer in Lake Forest would ask for these kind of zoning changes. She then stated that you buy property based on zoning laws, that it is not their job to make sure that the applicant made money. Ms. Ross stated that they chose to spend money on the project and that it should be made to work within the laws.

Ms. Ross also stated that her concerns relate to the fact that there would be rental units and that there are lot of transients. She also stated that the apartments would be small one bedroom apartments which would not be attractive to young people. Ms. Ross stated that she felt that Winnetka should not give the applicant one piece of property and that if they need a plaza, they have got an acre to the west at the post office site which Winnetka owned. She concluded by stating that it is too big, there would be too much impermeable surface and that the rents would not be cheaper than they are now. Ms. Ross added that the problem is that the downtown rents are too high.

Michael Levitan, 507 Cedar, thanked the applicant as a neighbor and commented that they gave a wonderful presentation. He then provided a photograph to the Commission for their review. Mr. Levitan described the project as impressive. He then stated that when it rained, the street next to them fills with water to the gutter and over the curb. Mr. Levitan stated that if they were to put this huge, dense project with a deep garage in the area, his property would flood and stated that he

is very concerned about any project of this scale.

Mr. Levitan stated that secondly, it is his guess that they are not going to have a 1920's something and that people who are older move in or those with children for the Winnetka schools. He stated that if they build a number of buildings like this, there would be too many people and that they would have to spend an amount of money to rebuild the schools.

Mr. Levitan stated that with regard to his final point, the photograph he distributed to the Commission is of the American flag in front of the Village Green. He stated that the proposed height is not really 83 feet since it would be located at the top of the hill and that he is guessing that it would be another 15 to 20 feet up. Mr. Levitan referred to the height of what used to be the tallest building at Tower Road. He referred to the comments that everyone hated density like this. Mr. Levitan then stated that you would no longer be able to see the American flag from the Village Green. He concluded by stating that the applicant talked about shadows but that they did not talk about light.

Chairperson Dalman reiterated that they would not be closing the public hearing portion of the meeting and that comments continue to be submitted. She also stated that they can come to the next meeting on April 22, 2015. Chairperson Dalman informed the audience that the Village established a special email account just for this project for public comment and identified the email address as *onewinnetka@winnetka.org*.

Chairperson Dalman then stated that in terms of how they would continue, they are not legally required to re-notice the public hearing since it is not closed and because they are concerned with people receiving adequate public notice, they would be sending notices and re-mailing to all of the residents within 250 feet of the property of the continuation of the hearing. She also stated that there would be notices on signage on the property indicating that the hearing would be continued as well as notice on the Village's website.

Mr. Kates stated that the Commission has the discretion to have an earlier hearing. He stated that he wanted the audience to understand the time limit in order to get more opinions and input and that he wanted to make sure everyone provided input. Mr. Kates stated that they do not want people to think they are cutting them off. He suggested that the Commission might want to consider having an earlier meeting in order to have more input sooner.

Chairperson Dalman stated that it would be at their discretion to set up a special meeting or move the meeting time up.

Mr. Kates then suggested that the Commission hold a special meeting and that the Commission can set an earlier start time. He indicated that there is a lot of momentum and that people are anxious to participate.

Chairperson Dalman asked the audience for a show of hands of who did not get a chance to speak. She then stated that for any public comments submitted, they would not be posted but would be available as part of the public record. Chairperson Dalman stated that it is open for Commission discussion and noted that the applicant was not able to do a full presentation. She then stated that

at the next meeting, there would be a continuation of the applicant's presentation then the opportunity for the Commission to ask questions and then it is the intent for the Village staff to present their review of the project in terms of the Village staff memorandum. Chairperson Dalman stated that would provide the Commission the opportunity to ask questions of the Village staff and receive their analysis. She also stated that there would be an opportunity for interested parties to present witnesses and evidence with regard to the application and for the Commission to have an opportunity to ask questions of the interested parties. Chairperson Dalman stated that then, there would be public comment again. She noted that eventually, the applicant would have the opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses presented by the interested parties and that then, there would be a full discussion of the Commission. Chairperson Dalman reiterated that at each meeting, there would be an opportunity for public comment, Commission discussion and questioning. She stated that is the intended schedule.

Mr. Kates stated that he would like to see a session devoted to the continuation of public comment and then to follow the schedule.

Chairperson Dalman stated that the Commission can consider having an open meeting for the next meeting with public comment. She then stated that for the public, they would not have benefitted from hearing the entire presentation from the applicant and that it is important for the public to have the full presentation. Chairperson Dalman stated that they are waiting for the zoning analysis to be presented by the applicant.

Ms. Adelman agreed that they should have all of the facts as well as the audience. She stated that it is her hope to have the opportunity to get all of the information first, then to hear comments. Ms. Adelman stated that the May 27th meeting should be only public comment and that for the April 22nd meeting to have all of the information.

Chairperson Dalman referred to the momentum.

Ms. Adelman stated that the audience can give written comments.

Mr. Kates stated that people want to be heard.

Mr. Golan suggested a second meeting in two weeks for the applicant to finish their presentation and then have public comment and resume the May meeting schedule.

Chairperson Dalman stated that they would need to check with the Village staff with regard to the meeting schedule. She asked the applicant how much time they would need to finish their presentation.

The applicant responded one hour.

Mr. Thomas suggested that the meeting in a couple of weeks should start at 7:00 p.m., give the applicant an hour to finish their presentation and then have the public hearing begin at 8:00 p.m.

The Commission members agreed that would be fine.

Chairperson Dalman noted that the applicant would not be going before the ZBA before the Commission finished their meetings. She then asked Mr. Norkus if they could convene a special meeting.

Mr. Norkus stated that if they sent out notice on Friday, that would give more than 10 days' notice for the April 8, 2015 meeting. He then stated that he cannot say with 100% certainty if the room would be available. Mr. Norkus stated that given the importance of the event, they should be able to sway the relocation of another group having a meeting here and that he would get back to the Commission in the morning.

A gentleman in the audience asked if they could arrange to have the meetings audio recorded and a visual recording put on the Village website for people to see.

Chairperson Dalman stated that the request would be noted, but that it is not required.

The gentleman stated that it is done for every Village Council meeting.

Chairperson Dalman stated that they cannot decide definitely if the space would be available and suggested that the Commission take a vote to decide whether to convene a special meeting on April 8, 2015 which would commence at 7:00 p.m. She then asked for a motion.

Mr. Myers moved to convene a special meeting of the Commission on April 8, 2015 at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion was unanimously passed.

AYES:	Adelman, Bawden, Coladarci, Dalman, Golan, Holland, Hulsizer, Myers, Morette, Thomas
NAYES:	None
NON-VOTING:	Kates

Chairperson Dalman confirmed that there would be a special Commission meeting on April 8th at 7:00 p.m. She then confirmed that this public hearing would be continued to the April 8th meeting at 7:00 p.m. if it is determined that they can have a hearing on that date. Chairperson Dalman noted that it would be posted on the Village's website. She then asked the Commission members how they felt with regard to the structure of the meeting, setting a special meeting or making rules.

Mr. Myers commented that a good job was done.

Ms. Adelman suggested that they rotate hearing public comment from both rows on both sides of the room.

Ms. Holland stated that there is a way of having comments without cutting people off. She noted that those who spoke have been respectful of the time.

Mr. Thomas stated that Chairperson Dalman should cut people off after speaking for five minutes

and that there has to be a limit.

Chairperson Dalman stated that they would work with the Village staff in order to find a balance. She asked if there were any other comments.

Mr. Thomas stated that he admired the fact that a 10:15 p.m. hold was put on the meeting.

Chairperson Dalman stated that if they needed to go later, she would not be opposed to that.

Public Comment

No additional public comments were made at this time.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Antionette Johnson