

is on that recommendation. Chairperson Dalman then asked if there were any other questions from the Commission to the applicant. No additional questions were raised by the Commission at this time. She then stated that they would now take public comment. Chairperson Dalman asked for those speaking to state their name and address and to limit their comments to five minutes. She also stated that if they are representing a group, to let them know so that they can ensure that there is efficiency in the public comment period to reduce the redundancy of similar comments.

Frank Petrek, 711 Oak, stated that since the new plans, he has observations or questions. He then complimented the applicant on a nice job done and the consideration given to the neighbors. Mr. Petrek then stated that this is the first time he has seen the condenser in any drawings and referred to illustration B34. He stated that the structure on the west tower was identified as a condenser and that he wondered whether the condensers can be moved further away 711 Oak. Mr. Petrek stated that now, they are 55% to 60% to the south center and suggested that they be moved further north and west where there are no residences. He then stated that he is not sure about technology for sound protection but that he did not see any reference to that. Mr. Petrek indicated that would be a moot point if there is sound protection and asked for the Commission to review the impact on the adjacent landowners.

Mr. Petrek stated that second, in connection with illustration C20, Mr. Kisiel mentioned that there were changes in parking on Lincoln Avenue at grade. He stated that this is the first time he has seen a handicap space drawn on the east side of Lincoln Avenue at Oak where most people come to their building. Mr. Petrek then stated that for the police or the Commission, who would go to make sure that 15 minute drop-off space affected the 38 landowners in the Village. He then stated that to make that a handicap space ignored the fact that there is a handicap space at the westernmost parking space on Oak at that intersection.

Mr. Petrek stated that lastly, he is concerned with regard to the entrance to the parking garage being moved further south since the original drawings. He referred to the proximity of exit egress and ingress from the parking garage to the intersection of Oak and Lincoln Avenue and that there is no traffic control signal there now. Mr. Petrek also stated that in the traffic studies, he has not seen it with the relocated entrance and exit. He stated that is a concern for safety for the building, commuters and residences.

Ms. Johnson informed the Commission that the ZBA was very concerned about the commuter parking ramp and safety and that they raised the issue of a stop sign on Oak going west. She indicated that she did not realize that the ramp entrance was moved further south.

Mr. Dimmer informed the Commission that the driveway was not moved further south and that it may have been further north on the architectural drawings. He confirmed that it is in the same location and that it is being kept as far south as it can.

Chairperson Dalman stated that the Commission saw in the beginning of the process it being closer to the north. She stated that it has not moved since the Village Council issued its approval. Chairperson Dalman also stated that they did not have the dimension on drawings and estimated it to be around 70 feet. She also stated that she remembered it being closer to where the motor court is. Chairperson Dalman then asked if there were any other comments.

Richard Sobel informed the Commission that his father designed the Fell store. He stated that he would like to refer to the issues highlighted and the question raised earlier. Mr. Sobel then stated that part of

the packet contained communication with Rachel Liebowicz who is the Deputy History Preservation Officer who repeatedly communicated because Fell was found to be eligible for the National Register and that there are now permitting requirements. He stated that the question continues to be raised with no definitive answer as to who is responsible. Mr. Sobel stated that he would like an answer on how to address the issues. He commented that the LPC did a wonderful report on the historic significance of Fell and that it is essential for each Commission and the packet to address permitting issues and the National Register of Historic Places eligibility. Mr. Sobel indicated that it is not enough for the Village to say this is the purview and that the question goes to the state and federal government. He stated that the question has been raised continually and that there has been no answer. Mr. Sobel then stated that once the building is declared eligible for the National Register, there are benefits for the developer and requirements and that it is important for the Village and each Commission and the Village Attorney to explain what needs to be done. He stated that the developer has responsibility and that the Commissions did too.

Mr. Sobel also stated that at the ZBA meeting, he asked about zoning requirements and was told that it was not the ZBA's determination but the Commission. He stated that there are a lot of ambiguous questions which need to be addressed and the permitting requirements. Mr. Sobel then referred to Ms. Holland's comment which mentioned storm water at Hadley. He stated that there are state and federal approaches. Mr. Sobel also stated that the LPC indicated that there is important architectural significance for the building and the Fell family and to encourage the developer and other Commissions to look for alternatives for adaptive reuse for the Fell building. Mr. Sobel informed the Commission that he has not been contacted by the developer or the Village Commissions. He stated that the case has been made both as to its significance and state permitting and that there have been no answers. Mr. Sobel then asked the Commission before they vote to address the issues and make sure that the permitting is done and for each Commission to address it.

Chairperson Dalman stated that they talked about this at the beginning. She stated that there is an independent permitting process at every level of government. Chairperson Dalman stated that with regard to the issues, there are nine criteria that the Commission is to take into consideration in their discussion before recommending approval of the final plan. Chairperson Dalman stated that for the developer, if they did not comply, there would be consequences. She added that this is not the jurisdiction to review permits and follow processes which are not part of their discussion.

Mr. Sobel then referred to Section 707 and 606 requirements.

Chairperson Dalman stated that she understood his frustration, but that the Commission has a very limited scope. She asked him to refer to the Village Council and that they would provide an answer. Chairperson Dalman noted that Section 707 and 606 are not under the Village jurisdiction. She also stated that they are not considering the issuance of permits but only zoning.

Mr. Sobel stated that he asked the question at the ZBA meeting and was told that those issues come to the Commission.

Ms. Adelman stated that Mr. Sobel kept using the words eligible for landmark status. She asked when had the process began to get it or to ask for it. Ms. Adelman then stated that it has been eligible since the day it was built.

Mr. Sobel confirmed that it is eligible and Ms. Liebowitz has written several times that it is becoming eligible to get on the National Register.

Ms. Adelman stated that each time they tried to get landmark status, she did not understand the process or when it was decided he wanted to do it, etc.

Mr. Sobel stated that with regard to the state historic preservation agency, he asked them and they came up with it.

Ms. Adelman asked when had he began this approach for landmark status.

Mr. Sobel responded about a year ago.

Ms. Holland informed Ms. Adelman that there is a difference between local landmark status and state or federal landmark status. She stated that under local Village landmark regulations, the Landmark Commission cannot initiate a landmark nomination, and that it must be initiated by the property owner. She then stated that the National Register of Historic Places is much different and that can come from any individual and that they can recommend to the state or the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency that here is a building that should receive National Register status. Ms. Holland stated that it has nothing to do with the Village or taxes and that the Village encouraged it. She then informed the Commission that there are five or six structures on the National Register.

Mr. Sobel stated that the state declaring it eligible triggered permitting requirements.

The Village Attorney stated that they would work with the Village staff and get to the issue to ensure that the jurisdictional requirements are met. He stated that to understand the difference between the Village landmarking process and the Commission's role in planned development, the best way to think of a landmarking situation, there are two separate issues. He stated that for example, the landmarking process under the Village code is triggered by a demolition permit and that they can do it without going through zoning. He also stated that it is independent of what is chosen to be built next and that it is a distinctly different issue.

The Village Attorney stated that in connection with the planned development application before the Commission and what in the future is a permitted use, they have to apply the planned development standards. He stated that a developer who wants a demolition permit is able to get it and that Mr. Sobel is worried about what is the result. He indicated that the nature of the site and alteration can be considered in the realm of the standards set forth in the code and that the Commission has nine standards to look at which are different than those before the ZBA. He then referred the Commission to the packet of materials on page 5. He stated that in terms of Section 707 and 106, the Village and the Village Attorney are to look it and ensure that it is complied with and that the Commission is to focus on their role.

Mr. Sobel stated that he would appreciate the fact that they look at it and get specific answers.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other comments.

Peter Milbratz introduced himself to the Commission as an architect working with Mr. Sobel on the issues regarding Fell. He stated that it is especially important that the LPC found it to be an

architecturally significant building and that there should be serious consideration to retaining it for adaptive reuse.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other comments.

Phil Hoza, 605 Cherry, informed the Commission that his family came to the Village in 1915 and 1921 and that he has seen a lot of progress. He then stated that he is confused and that this is the 26th hearing for the project. Mr. Hoza stated that the development is ongoing and that he did not know what they are voting on.

Mr. Hoza then stated when his family came to the Village it had just adopted its first Comprehensive Plan in 1921. He stated that the 1921 Plan envisioned a new Winnetka, with beaches, and a below-grade railroad. Mr. Hoza then referred to the lowering of the railroad tracks after a tragic accident. He stated that since then, the current post office was built on the site of the former Horace Mann School. Mr. Hoza stated that the town has had new growth with young, successful people and that they are tearing down magnificent homes as well as some which should be torn down. Mr. Hoza commented that lifestyles have changed, and that not as many people like small homes with their small rooms.

Mr. Hoza then stated that with regard to the Fell building, he informed the Commission that he was a New Trier Township trustee for 16 years and served on the ADA committee. He stated that the Fell building, ADA-wise, is noncompliant. Mr. Hoza then stated that the Fell building is, like many of the older houses in town, no longer functional for today. He also stated that as much as they appreciate it, it is a concrete structure with no historic value and that you cannot rent a building with multiple levels and stairs.

Mr. Hoza added that with regard to storm water, the problems are that the Village has 30 inch sewers on Lincoln Avenue and to the lake. He stated that an adjoining building would have poor drainage to the system. Mr. Hoza also stated that the 711 Oak building has a problem with a 10 inch drain and that it should be a 20 inch drain. He concluded by urging the Commission to vote for progress for Winnetka and for growth.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other comments.

Mary Nelson introduced herself to the Commission as the Chief Operating Officer of the Hadley School which is to the east of the property line of the development. She stated that she would like to speak to the Hadley needs that she would like for the Commission to consider.

Ms. Nelson informed the Commission that Hadley has a staff of 72 people, 12 of which are blind or visually impaired. She stated that they need assurances that there would be safe egress between the Metra station and Hadley for their commuting staff. Ms. Nelson also stated that they are concerned with regard to the egress on the south side of Elm Street and that the sidewalk would be impassable with tables and tree grates. She noted that the walkway needs to be wide enough for two people to walk together.

Ms. Nelson stated that Hadley is also concerned with the parking garage to the east of the property line. She stated that the entrance pillars would block the sight lines to their driveway and that the stairwell housing looked high. Ms. Nelson indicated that you cannot tell whether the sight triangle is the same as on the east side. She also stated that their visually impaired staff needed a sounding horn if a vehicle is

going out or in as well as to make sure that the entrance to their lot is maintained. She added that they only have one driveway.

Ms. Nelson then stated that with regard to deliveries every day, visitors, etc., they do a lot of recording which she commented is a critical part of their work. She informed the Commission that their sound and audio and visual studio is in the basement and that they are concerned about needing to move the studio during demolition and construction. Ms. Nelson then stated that when the neighbors to the east had work done 6 months ago, the drilling interfered with the recording. She stated that since they do it every day, they would need to relocate that staff.

Ms. Nelson went on to state that the integrity of the underground water vaults is important to them and that they do not want water leaking onto their property. She also stated that she would like to hold regular meetings monthly with the One Winnetka staff and Hadley project manager and address the concerns as they arise during the construction process. Ms. Nelson stated that Hadley appreciated some of the items that One Winnetka offered to them in prior meetings and that they would like for them to be formally added to the plans, such as heated sidewalks on Lincoln Avenue to their property, sounding alarms and a motion detector at the parking lot which alerts pedestrians and grated sidewalk material so that their staff are aware they are on the right path to the train, as well as guarantees that there would be no flooding which would be helpful. She concluded by asking the Commission to think about that when they are making their decision.

Chairperson Dalman stated that with regard to the east parking lot, there are two entrances and questioned whether they have seen more conflicts. She also asked if there have been accidents with the blind folks that she is aware of. Chairperson Dalman added that with one entrance, it would reduce the number of potential accidents.

Ms. Nelson agreed that one entrance would be better than two. She also stated that the Hadley staff maintained the hedging and trimming to make sure that the sight lines are good.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other comments. No additional comments were made by the audience at this time. She then stated that they would close the public comment period and the Commission would have their discussion. Chairperson Dalman stated that before that, she asked for the applicant to address the concerns raised during public comment. She noted that they answered Mr. Sobel's question and that the Village Attorney would provide guidance as to how to address the landmark status recommendation. Chairperson Dalman asked for the applicant to answer Mr. Petrek's questions about the condenser on the drawings, the handicap parking issue and the garage entrance being moved further south.

Mr. Kisiel stated that with regard to the handicap space adjacent to 711 Oak, they did not alter anything adjacent to 711 Oak. He indicated that is a Village issue. Mr. Kisiel then stated that with regard to the condensers, it was noted that they would be located a level above the height of 711 Oak and that they would also be screened with fencing to reduce the sound acoustics. He also stated that in connection with their location, he would defer to the architect. Mr. Kisiel then stated that with regard to the layout of the building, there is a limited amount of movement of them from the vertical chase and that they were moved as far away from 711 Oak as is feasible. He reiterated that they would be screened visually from the street and that the fencing would help reduce the sound acoustic issue.

Chairperson Dalman asked whether the entrance to the parking facility was moved further south.

Mr. Kisiel confirmed that it was not moved from an engineering perspective and that it is a function of the slope of the ramp and getting down.

Chairperson Dalman then asked for the applicant to address the concerns for Hadley in terms of mechanisms to address the safety issues. Mr. Kisiel deferred to the engineer to answer that question.

Mr. Dimmer informed the Commission that there have been a couple meetings with Hadley and that it was brought to the Village meeting with the staff. He stated that with regard to sight access, they cannot speak to construction-related questions. Mr. Dimmer then stated that with regard to the sight triangle question, there is a public sidewalk at their driveway north of the property line. Mr. Dimmer stated that a vehicle coming out of the Hadley driveway would have clearance to look west as much as angled parking allowed. He then stated that they can put together exhibits for the final approval.

Ms. Holland stated that there is no angled parking at the driveway.

Mr. Dimmer confirmed that is correct. He then stated that with regard to the sight from the public garage, there have been discussions on an audible versus visual signal and who would be alerted, the driver or the pedestrian. Mr. Dimmer indicated that there is no way to trip an audio signal when you enter the garage because the vehicle would have to be in the driveway in order to trip an audible sensor and that it would be too late then. He also stated that the Village staff was concerned about a loud, audible noise for the residences across the street at Arbor Vitae. Mr. Dimmer stated that an alert of vehicles to a pedestrian would be better suited. He also stated that the drawings include motion sensors on the sidewalk to alert vehicles on both sides of a potential pedestrian in the crosswalk about 10 feet on either side of the driveway.

Mr. Dimmer went on to state that they are open to discussions on further measures and would work with the Village staff and Hadley. He then stated that with regard to heated sidewalks, the grading drawings in the packet include notations for heated and non-heated sidewalks. Mr. Dimmer also referred to the current pedestrian bridge north on Lincoln Avenue and the elevation to Hadley which will be heated.

Mr. Dimmer stated that with regard to flooding, there is no guarantee that one person would never flood again. He indicated that the water might not be from their site. Mr. Dimmer noted that there would be a tank underneath the west ramp of the retail garage of the Village. He also stated that between the tank and Hadley, there is another bay of parking, and that if it ruptured, it would fill the parking area. Mr. Dimmer informed the Commission that it would be designed to accommodate a substantial rain and that there would be a buffer between the tank and Hadley. Mr. Dimmer also stated that the lower level of the garage would flood and that there is a substantial amount of volume protection there. He stated that they cannot say that any other water and that it might be above what they are required to do which is the best they can manage from their property. Mr. Dimmer added that they cannot control water coming from further east.

Mr. Dimmer then stated that the material the sidewalk would be 6 feet wide concrete which is wider than a typical 5 foot sidewalk. He noted that there would be no tables on the public sidewalk. Mr. Dimmer also stated that they would help monitor the placement of items on the pedestrian walk and that it would be wide enough for two people walking. He then stated that after discussions about the use of texture or a strip, there were ADA tiles you would see at the corners and that after discussions,

for them to be adjacent to the brick and for anything additional, there are good guides between the brick and the building. Mr. Dimmer stated that they can discuss them in other areas. He indicated that the Village is hesitant of putting this type of product in and that they are open to discussion if an area warranted it. Mr. Dimmer stated that nothing has been finalized at this point and that they can discuss further these measures. He concluded by stating that Hadley and the Village staff would come to a good resolution.

Ms. McCarthy stated that there have been months of Hadley meetings and that she is concerned with NTP safety in the neighborhood. She stated that they appointed an individual for that neighbor to call if there is a safety concern. Ms. McCarthy stated that the big concerns for safety for the visually impaired and that she hoped that there would be ongoing meetings especially during construction.

Rob Neumann informed the Commission that they have drafted a development agreement.

Chairperson Dalman noted that the development agreement is in the materials.

Mr. Neumann also stated that the Hadley plan is in the materials in the development agreement. He then stated that as part of the ordinance passed by the Village, the Hadley plan calls for regular meetings and that it is all in the ordinance. Mr. Neumann stated that once it is passed by the Village, it would become part and parcel of the final ordinance that approves the development. He added that it has not been executed yet.

Ms. Holland stated that with regard to the audible noise question, she asked if the alerts are put on a timer like at 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. to satisfy Hadley and not disturb the single family residences.

Mr. Dimmer responded that can be discussed between the Village staff and Hadley. He referred to the concern with an audible alert for the vehicles exiting the garage would be fine and that with regard to the concern for vehicles entering the garage from the street, there is nowhere to put any sensors which would indicate that a vehicle is turning in and that they would only be protecting half. Mr. Dimmer added that people leaving the garage are more aware than someone pulling in.

Ms. Holland stated that when you pull into the garage, you would slow down. She stated that when you pull out, when you see that it is empty and go and commented that exiting is more important than entering.

Mr. Dimmer agreed that they can have that discussion with the Village staff and Hadley.

Mr. Coladarci stated that to solve the problem of people pulling in, to put in a gate. He stated that people will stop and look and see if there is someone in the crosswalk and that would be a simpler system to maintain.

Mr. Dimmer stated that the Village staff would need to be on board. He referred to the Village owned garage and it being in the Village right-of-way. He reiterated that they are open to discussion.

Mr. Norkus stated that Mr. Coladarci's suggestion is legitimate. He then stated that he would forward the recommendation to Village Engineer Steve Saunders.

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other comments.

Mr. Sobel asked for the Commission to address his question.

Chairperson Dalman stated that the public comment portion of the meeting is closed.

Mr. Sobel stated that the storm water permits needed to be addressed and referred to the comment with regard to the 100 year storm event.

Chairperson Dalman stated that to be fair to everyone and the Commission, to honor the fact that they have closed public comment. She then thanked him for the clarification. Chairperson Dalman agreed that the storm water issue is number one in the Village and would be scrutinized by the Village Engineer. She also stated that they are looking to the Village Attorney for guidance with regard to the state permitting process. Chairperson Dalman stated that there would now be deliberation and discussion by the Commission.

Chairperson Dalman then stated that for those who came in late, the Commission's review tonight would be very narrow. She stated that they would be looking to see whether the plan is in substantial conformity with the final planned development with the preliminary approval adopted by the Village Council in January. Chairperson Dalman also stated that they are to determine whether it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and in conformity with the nine standards in the zoning ordinance, Section 17.58.101(c) of the zoning ordinance. She stated that they are to recommend to the Village Council the approval of the final planned development application based on that.

Ms. Adelman stated that on page 6, she referred to the conditions for the proposed approval and whether they are carrying them forward.

Chairperson Dalman responded that with regard to the recommendations attached to the Commission's 2015 recommendation, they were considered by the Village Council and many were not carried forward. She then referred to the inclusion of Conney's in the development. Chairperson Dalman also stated that there has been a substantial reduction to residential density, a reduction in the west building height which was considered and that it is not for the Commission to take recommendations again. Chairperson Dalman stated that the Commission provided them to the Village Council and that they decided to take them or not.

Ms. McCarthy asked Mr. Norkus if on the Hadley plan H65, if it is just a note. She also referred to the exhibit.

Mr. Norkus stated that is different and that was done to save pages in terms of the exhibits to the development agreement which amounted to 150 pages.

Chairperson Dalman asked Mr. Norkus if he would like to highlight the negotiation on the development agreement. She noted that it is not finalized and that it will be when the Village Council approves the final planned development.

Mr. Norkus stated that there is a partial preliminary version of the development agreement. He also stated that included in Ordinance M-1-2017 of the Village Council which is the ordinance granting preliminary approval of the project as well as set forth the general terms of the development agreement in draft form. Mr. Norkus informed the Commission that the agreement itself has progressed in terms of

Chairperson Dalman asked if there were any other issues. She also asked if there was any public comment or business to add.

No additional matters were discussed by the Commission at this time.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Antionette Johnson