



1 burgundy fabric to match that of adjacent tenant awnings to the east and west. Mr. Norkus also stated  
2 the awning copy would be white and the logo color is not specified. He noted the awnings comply with  
3 the sign code and the design guidelines. Mr. Norkus indicated the Board may request clarification or  
4 impose conditions on the use of color in the logos. He stated the proposed window signs exceed the sign  
5 code limit which limits window signs to 10% of the window area and the proposed size of 7.58 feet  
6 exceeds the maximum allowable by .9 square feet. Mr. Norkus stated in the agenda report, a suggestion  
7 was included that compliance with the Village sign code limit of 10% could be achieved by reducing the  
8 size of each of the window graphics by 2 inches and 1 inch in height which would maintain the  
9 proportions of the artwork and bring it into compliance with the 10% area limitation. Mr. Norkus then  
10 asked if there were any questions.

11  
12 The applicant arrived at this time and introduced himself to the Board as Alex Figueroa, one of the co-  
13 owners of Figueroa Orthodontics, and stated they are opening their new location at 1075 Gage and  
14 applying for signage and awnings. He stated to clarify the awning, the logo would be white and there  
15 would be no color other than white on the awnings. Mr. Figueroa also stated they would be willing to  
16 reduce the size of the signage to comply with the 10% maximum. He then asked if there were any  
17 questions.

18  
19 Mr. McLane moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness to approve the request with the reduced  
20 size. The motion was seconded. A vote was taken and the motion was unanimously passed.

21  
22 AYES: Albinson, Klaskin, Konstant, McLane, Meiners, Ritter (6)

23 NAYS: None (0)

24  
25 **Mathnasium - 1060 Gage Street: Consideration of Certificate of Appropriateness for Proposed Wall**  
26 **Sign**

27 Steve Santacruz introduced himself as the owner of Mathnasium. He stated they applied for a sign using  
28 a sign company permitted under the sign ordinance and learned the business next door to them had a  
29 slightly larger sign. He stated the Village staff recommended to them to expand the sign to match the  
30 height of their sign. Mr. Santacruz stated they are a franchise and have to commit to the style of the  
31 lettering, etc. He referred the Board to a photo of the sign in the packet of materials and asked if there  
32 were any questions. Mr. Santacruz informed the Board they are planning to add gooseneck lighting  
33 which is on the Laundry Mutt space which would be an exact match.

34  
35 Chairman Albinson asked the Board if they would be willing to consider approval of the lighting although  
36 it was not included in the packet of materials. Mr. Norkus stated it would save the applicant a return trip  
37 to consider approving it subject to the Village staff verifying the proposed fixtures match the  
38 Laundry Mutt fixtures.

39  
40 Chairman Albinson asked if there were any comments or a motion to approve the sign as recommended  
41 enlarged to match the other Laundry Mutt sign in proportion as well as the approval for the gooseneck  
42 lighting to be identical to what is on the building over the Laundry Mutt conditioned on the Village  
43 staff's review and approval. Mr. Konstant moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness to approve the  
44 request as stated by Chairman Albinson. Mr. McLane seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the  
45 motion was unanimously passed.

46  
47 AYES: Albinson, Mr. Klaskin, Mr. Konstant, McLane, Meiners, Mr. Ritter (6)

48 NAYS: None (0)

1  
2 **Amended Case No. 17-10-PD: One Winnetka - 511-515 Lincoln Avenue and 710-740 Elm Street: An**  
3 **application submitted by SB One Winnetka, LLC for the zoning relief: (A) to develop a mixed-use**  
4 **planned development, which would be located on the properties commonly referred to as 511-515**  
5 **Lincoln Avenue, 714-732 Elm Street, 736-740 Elm Street, and on the westerly portion of 710 Elm**  
6 **Street, and (B) to reconstruct a public parking lot on the easterly portion of 710 Elm Street**

7 Chairman Albinson asked for the Village staff to provide an overview to the Board followed by a  
8 presentation by the applicant. Mr. Schoon stated he would not go over what was presented at the joint  
9 meeting but would remind the Board where they are at with the process. He stated there are a variety  
10 of subdivision and zoning relief items which need to be reviewed by the Board, the PC and the ZBA. Mr.  
11 Schoon stated the two items the Board is responsible for are commenting on the design related to the  
12 planned development and given that the Village parking lot is being treated separately, a Certificate of  
13 Appropriateness for those improvements is necessary.

14  
15 Mr. Schoon stated they are currently considering an amended final plan and last July, the Board  
16 recommended approval of the final plan presented finding it is consistent with the preliminary plan that  
17 the Village Council approved. He stated in December 2017, the applicant presented a modified plan to  
18 the Village Council and the Village Council forwarded it on to the three advisory bodies with specific  
19 directions: (1) that the modified plan would stay at the final planned development process step, (2) the  
20 advisory bodies are to compare the July 2017 final plan with the modified plan presented tonight and (3)  
21 determine if any of the revisions made would change the Board's recommendation regarding the  
22 project. Mr. Schoon stated the Boards held a joint meeting at the direction of the Village Council and are  
23 separately deliberating on preparing a recommendation to send on to the Village Council.

24  
25 Mr. Schoon stated at the June 27, 2018 meeting, they noted changes between the July 2017 plan and  
26 the current amended plan. He stated since that meeting, they have received additional public written  
27 comments which the Board received in the packet and the applicant provided a response to the public's  
28 questions as well as the Village staff providing responses to public questions which are included in the  
29 materials. Mr. Schoon noted the ZBA reviewed the request last week and recommended approval 7 to 0  
30 with one change which was made at that meeting in that the applicant withdrew their request for the  
31 variation for the trash enclosure which was to be located on Village property. He stated the ZBA  
32 discussed that they would continue to use that area for the pickup of dumpsters when the refuse  
33 vehicles came and the dumpsters would be rolled to that area every morning. Mr. Schoon stated the  
34 applicant has since had discussions with the Village staff regarding another option which is to leave  
35 them within the structure and have the refuse vehicle pick them up adjacent to the structure but there  
36 are implications regarding circulation which the PC would consider in their review of the project. He  
37 noted the trash enclosure is no longer part of the request and there is no need for the Board to review  
38 and comment on the design of the trash enclosure.

39  
40 Mr. Schoon stated the Board's options include if they needed to have further discussion or information  
41 after this meeting, the Board could continue the meeting to a future date requesting the applicant  
42 present that information at a future date or consider recommending approval. He noted there is a  
43 motion in the materials on page 15 which a Board Member can make and the Board can include  
44 conditions on the motion. Mr. Schoon stated the third option included a motion recommending denial  
45 for which language is provided on page 16 in the materials which a Board Member can make. He noted  
46 on page 17 is the start of design guidelines for the Board to consider as they review the request. Mr.  
47 Schoon then asked if there were any questions.

48

1 Chairman Albinson stated to clarify for those here, what is the process they want to follow for tonight's  
2 meeting and as far as time afforded for additional public comments. Mr. Schoon stated the Board would  
3 provide the public an opportunity to comment. Chairman Albinson stated he would recommend  
4 allowing public comment with a time limit. He confirmed after the presentation by the applicant, the  
5 public would be allowed to comment. Chairman Albinson stated since there are no questions, they  
6 would now move on to the applicant's presentation.

7  
8 David Trandel of the development team introduced himself to the Board as well as other members of  
9 the design team. He stated he would like to discuss the elevation changes and recap where they started  
10 and where they are now and answer any questions. Mr. Trandel stated with regard to the project  
11 presented in July 2017, it included 60 residential units with 15 private residences for sale, 5 maisonettes  
12 for sale and 40 rental apartments.

13  
14 Mr. Trandel stated the total square footage in the July 2017 plan measured 189,845 square feet with  
15 32,700 square feet of commercial space. He stated it added 102 additional public parking spaces and a  
16 developer contribution of \$7.3 million in public benefits. Mr. Trandel stated for the proposal tonight, as  
17 they gleaned more of the market and where they are sitting today, he stated there would be 58  
18 residential units which include 15 private residences, 7 maisonettes and 36 rental units and a total of  
19 186,850 GSF. He also stated the current plan provides for 91 additional public parking spaces and the  
20 value of public benefit remained at \$7.3 million.

21  
22 Mr. Trandel referred to the July 2017 plan in an illustration and noted it required the acquisition  
23 of 7,767 square feet of the Lincoln Avenue right-of-way shown in red. He also stated it would have  
24 shifted Lincoln 22 feet to the west and reconfigured the right-of-way and contain three distinct parking  
25 structures including a garage under Lincoln, a residential parking structure under One Winnetka and a  
26 retail parking structure of a two level garage adjacent to Hadley. Mr. Trandel stated the current proposal  
27 moves the building 40 feet to the east and requires rezoning and the acquisition of 8,848 square feet of  
28 the east Village lot versus 7,767 square feet on Lincoln. Mr. Trandel then referred the Board to an  
29 illustration and identified the red highlighted area as the actual acquisition. He also stated it eliminated  
30 the west commuter parking garage under Lincoln. Mr. Trandel then identified the portion of the east  
31 parking lot surface at grade only and which consolidates a majority of the parking in one additional level  
32 underneath One Winnetka.

33  
34 Mr. Trandel then referred to an illustration of the Level B1 parking they are proposing which would be  
35 the commuter and permit parking level, which would be entered from Elm Street. Mr. Trandel noted  
36 there would be a total of 131 spaces which would be set by the Village and likely consist of a  
37 combination of commuter and long term permit parking of employees working at the establishments  
38 downtown.

39  
40 Mr. Trandel stated the illustration of Level B2 represented the second level of underground parking  
41 which consisted of 115 parking spaces to be used for the residents of One Winnetka both renters and  
42 owners. He stated that the current proposal is for Lincoln to be reconfigured reducing the carriageway  
43 to a consistent 20 foot width allowing a wider sidewalk to provide for alfresco dining adjacent to the  
44 building on Lincoln Avenue. Mr. Trandel stated that modifications to the plan eliminated the need to  
45 acquire the Lincoln right-of-way and eliminated the need for a new water main below Elm, reducing the  
46 amount of disruption for local residents and retailers in the area during construction.

47

1 Mr. Trandel then referred to the streetscape improvements being provided on Lincoln and Elm in the  
2 current plan which he stated are consistent with the new Winnetka streetscape standards recently  
3 adopted by the Village Council. He also referred to an illustration where you see the configuration from  
4 the July 2017 plan and the current proposal which was redesigned within the guidelines adopted by the  
5 Village Council. Mr. Trandel noted the plan still includes features they talked about over the years which  
6 include a new heated sidewalk to Hadley, new street lighting, new bump-outs on Lincoln and Elm and  
7 high quality pavers. He then introduced Lucien Lagrange and My-Nga Lam, the project coordinator, after  
8 which they would address the Board's questions.  
9

10 My-Nga Lam stated she would walk the Board through the minor modifications in the elevations. She  
11 first referred to the floor plan from July 2017 which is primarily retail on Lincoln and Elm. Ms. Lam stated  
12 it included a residential entry off the courtyard and loading and parking off the service drive. She noted  
13 the current plan remains primarily the same with regard to the access and the only two changes are  
14 the ramp to Level B2 parking which is deeper in terms of its location and the area in orange which  
15 represented commuter parking access to Level B1.  
16

17 Ms. Lam referred the Board to an illustration of Level B2 parking which is the residential level. She also  
18 identified the west building which would include 10 rental units, 5 maisonettes on Elm and 4 per floor of  
19 condominium units on the east building. Ms. Lam confirmed the only change is there are now 7  
20 maisonettes facing Elm instead of 5. She stated the two remaining buildings would remain the same.  
21

22 Ms. Lam then referred to a series of elevation side by side comparisons and stated in connection with  
23 the west elevation, there were minor window treatment and fenestration changes as well as a new  
24 commuter door to access the B1 level of parking. She then referred to the elevation along Elm in an  
25 illustration which she stated had few changes. Ms. Lam then stated you can see the development has  
26 moved to the east 40 feet and noted along Elm, there is a grade change. She stated when the building  
27 moves 40 feet to the east, there is also more elevation showing along the area and there would be 2  
28 feet more in the elevation. Ms. Lam stated it is important to note the overall height of the building is the  
29 same because it is measured from the corner of Lincoln. She stated on the east building, there would  
30 be slightly more elevation showing because of the grade change. Ms. Lam stated secondly, she pointed  
31 out with the maisonettes, there are 7 of them which are smaller as opposed to 5. She then identified the  
32 east side of the east building and the commuter parking entry door which would look similar to a  
33 retail storefront. Ms. Lam also stated there were minor window fenestration and treatments changes on  
34 the east and west building. She then stated on the east building elevation, the big difference is the  
35 commuter parking garage being moved so there is more elevation visible from the street. Ms. Lam  
36 reiterated you have an extra 2 feet of elevation, minor window treatment and fenestration and more  
37 pronounced balconies.  
38

39 Ms. Lam then stated on the south elevation along the public drive, there would be minor revisions to  
40 the window fenestration expression. She noted they brought some material samples for the Board's  
41 review and confirmed there were no changes to the materials and they are the same as was presented  
42 last year. Ms. Lam stated there were there for reference.  
43

44 Mr. Trandel stated in summary, the applicant is holding true to their commitment of \$7.3 million in  
45 public improvement value and feel the current plan significantly improves the access and site circulation  
46 a long way and to help cure the parking deficit and creating additional street retail spaces. He noted  
47 they are adhering to the new Village guidelines on streetscape by widening the sidewalk on Lincoln to  
48 create a plaza effect which is important to everyone. Mr. Trandel also stated the less obvious benefit

1 would be the less disruptive construction cycle since they eliminated the need to rip and close off  
2 Lincoln and which would also shorten the construction period of the project in total by least 4 months  
3 depending on the weather. He stated in terms of the big picture, they have stable buyers who showed  
4 up at the joint meeting and the project provides a needed choice for housing which did not exist  
5 downtown. Mr. Trandel stated it would also replace obsolete and commercially difficult retail space with  
6 an up-to-date facility which would be a Class A retail destination. He stated they are having a  
7 terrific response to the plan from retailers and commercial users and they have come a long way to  
8 the ultimate goal to help create and invigorate downtown to the standard they feel comfortable with  
9 but which would not over-invigorate and be burdensome. Mr. Trandel then asked the Board if they have  
10 any questions.

11  
12 Chairman Albinson asked if the next step in the process would be to take public comment. Mr. Schoon  
13 stated the Board can ask the applicant questions now followed by the public comment and then let the  
14 applicant respond to questions from the public or the Board. Chairman Albinson stated they would first  
15 take public comment.

16  
17 Richard Sobel stated his father, Walter Sobel, designed the Fell store and requested more time to  
18 comment over the 3 minute minimum. He stated it has been a long process and appreciated the help  
19 from the Board, the developer and others. Mr. Sobel then stated he asked specific questions at the ZBA  
20 meeting which were not answered and he is asking them now to the Board and would like verbal  
21 answers today and written answers after. He then stated he sent a communication to the Board this  
22 afternoon. Mr. Norkus confirmed it was received. Mr. Sobel then stated they would recall  
23 that AIA, Landmarks Illinois and Docomomo sent strong letters about the architectural significance of  
24 Fell and the LPC did a very thorough report which identified the Fell building as important architecturally  
25 and that there would be a great detrimental effect if it is removed. He also stated the State of Illinois  
26 weighed in. Mr. Sobel reminded the Board in communications that his father won an  
27 international design award for the Fell store and when it was designed, the current Fell building had  
28 plans to accomplish what the current plan does which is to add residences above and that it  
29 was designed to be built up. He confirmed those plans exist and recalled that Peter Milbratz did a  
30 schematic of how the current stores could be used accomplish to accomplish the goals.

31  
32 Mr. Sobel stated the backup plan for the site is to adaptively reuse the Fell building and accomplish the  
33 goals of the developer at a fraction of the amount spent on the project to renovate stores on Elm and  
34 Lincoln. He referred to comments made at the last meeting that until recently, half of the stores were  
35 active and another developer in Winnetka invested an amount in renovation. Chairman Albinson  
36 informed Mr. Sobel his time is up. Mr. Sobel again asked for more time. He continued by stating 12  
37 people spoke against the project with 5 in favor of it at the joint meeting. Mr. Sobel stated there is a vast  
38 majority against the plan.

39  
40 Mr. Sobel then stated his questions include: (1) has the DRB requested alternative plans to incorporate  
41 the adaptive reuse of the Fell building; (2) has the Board seen the LPC report, (3) has the  
42 developer considered alternative plans for the adaptive reuse and provided a detailed written  
43 description and analysis, and (4) what has been done to ensure compliance with the state preservation  
44 letter sent out last week which says since the building is eligible for inclusion on the National  
45 Register, plans need to be developed first and it cannot be demolished until that is accomplished. He  
46 also stated it is important for the Board to communicate with the other Boards and the Village Council  
47 and it is inappropriate to rush through the process during the summer when much of the public is not  
48 here and for no final decision be made until the fall until people come back. Mr. Sobel stated at the joint

1 meeting, there was a nice turnout and good comments were made which are in a vacuum since many  
2 people are away. Chairman Albinson asked Mr. Sobel to conclude his comments.

3  
4 Mr. Sobel then specifically asked the Board to respond to the questions. He noted some answers came  
5 up in the minutes, but they did not respond to the state letter and did not follow certain procedures or  
6 were left to the developer. Mr. Sobel stated there is a beautiful alternative in his father's plan to give  
7 consideration.

8  
9 Chairman Albinson asked if there were any other comments.

10  
11 Mead Montgomery, 945 Old Green Bay Road, stated it is hard to tell from the scale of the renderings,  
12 but when you look at the elevations, it seems to be a very substantial change in the look from the July  
13 2017 plan. He stated for the window treatments, there seemed to have been more details which made  
14 it interesting and definitive of unique architecture. Mr. Montgomery then stated the fenestration shown  
15 on the proposed changes appears simple, utilitarian and institutional and he hoped they would get more  
16 detail on that. He also stated from a distance, it looks vanilla where it looked unique and interesting  
17 before.

18  
19 Chairman Albinson asked if there were any other comments. No additional comments were made at this  
20 time. Chairman Albinson stated that would conclude the public comment portion of the meeting and  
21 they would move on to the Board's discussion and questions.

22  
23 Mr. Ritter asked the architects why there is only one Tudor maisonette out of seven. He commented it  
24 would look better to either have more Tudor style maisonettes or none and asked if it represented  
25 a nod to the Tudor style architecture across the street. Mr. Lagrange stated the architectural market  
26 decided the maisonettes and they are not too big or small. He then stated it is a question of different  
27 style and for the whole project remaining, they are working together and of the seven maisonettes, each  
28 one would be different. Mr. Lagrange stated they would include different detail, massing, etc. and one  
29 out of seven should be Tudor in style. He also stated it is because Winnetka has a history of Tudor  
30 architecture and they should have at least one of them be Tudor which belongs to Winnetka. Mr.  
31 Lagrange reiterated one is enough to respond to the history of Winnetka and if there were two or three,  
32 that would be much. He then asked if there were any other questions.

33  
34 Mr. McLane stated the applicant got the persistence award in meeting with the Village and Boards and  
35 thanked the applicant. Mr. McLane stated his concern is that he is not a big fan of the project at 617  
36 Green Bay Road in Wilmette, and explained that he is concerned that this project may be going down a  
37 similar path. Mr. McLane described the Wilmette building as a travesty of design and architecture, and  
38 that it set an example in terms of what not to do. He stated it seemed that with the recent changes that  
39 they are heading in that same direction, and they are seeing a façade which looks like it has been  
40 dumbed down and made less elegant.

41  
42 Mr. McLane stated where they were before was an elegant Beaux-Art mix and it was a nice elegant plan  
43 and what they have come to looks like a throwaway. He then asked how they can bring it back to the  
44 elegance in that plan. He also referred to the windows up at the top and other features and stated it  
45 was downplayed at the June 2018 meeting and the proposal looks clunky and not appropriate for  
46 the long term they envision in Winnetka.

47

1 Mr. Trandel responded by stating with time comes cost and in connection with the process they have  
2 gone through, there have been distinct tradeoffs. He described the original vision which was put forth  
3 and which Mr. Lagrange created as his best work ever and they are battling the needs of the investor  
4 development partner and are beholden to buyers and residents. Mr. Trandel stated there is real conflict  
5 here which would not be solved by continued time and described time as the enemy. He indicated there  
6 is only so much money people would be willing to pay to live here. Mr. Trandel also stated the soft costs  
7 are going up and it does matter since the project would have to be financially viable. He then stated  
8 when they made the submittal, they did not know what they were walking into yet and referred to the  
9 first time having a joint Board meeting and coming forth with something new and to get to the finish  
10 line. Mr. Trandel informed the Board he is personally committed to everything they talked about in  
11 detail and the look which became iconic. Mr. Trandel stated in terms of what they have put together, he  
12 thought what the Board is to look at as a condition to the recommendation is add some of those  
13 references back. He also stated the buyers have to want it too. Mr. Trandel then stated as they got  
14 through the process, there were a lot of constituencies to deal with and in connection with the  
15 neighbors and residences; they are trying to balance it. He also stated hundreds have touched the  
16 project and they would end up with something special. Mr. Trandel then stated they would like to show  
17 the Board a couple of ideas and noted at the meeting with the ZBA, they withdrew the request for the  
18 outside refuse container issue which was brought to them by Public Works.

19  
20 Ms. Lam stated with regard to the illustration, they are challenged with value engineering and to take  
21 something, simplify it and make it cleaner was welcome. She stated what was done for example; she  
22 referred to the dormer windows and roof with which they took a second pass. Ms. Lam then stated the  
23 elevations of the southwest facade are small in scale and hard to understand and they tried to show the  
24 detail as you go around the window and which is a lot simpler than previously shown. She also stated  
25 they had influences which they were looking at and some dormers are less ornate and cleaner and  
26 simpler all over Paris which she described as an inspiration for them.

27  
28 Mr. Trandel stated as you go through the process, what they had of the façade was an image and as  
29 you go through different channels, the insides have to match the outside windows and match the floor  
30 plans. He noted the original plan presented had balconies and reiterated all of the floor plans have to  
31 match with the windows and it is important to note that.

32  
33 Ms. Lam then referred to the illustration which contained portals on the corner and it is important for  
34 the west detail to have that detail on corner and the center expression. She referred to the identity of  
35 the building and the amount of exposure. Ms. Lam noted they studied the dormer window in a group  
36 and how portals integrate and it is important for there to be three on the corner and to have the taller  
37 roof portion which had more prominence.

38  
39 Mr. Trandel reiterated they are battling value versus engineering with what think the look needs to be  
40 and it would be nice if they were in sync. Mr. Trandel added they absolutely want to do it and if it is  
41 important to have a recommendation, possibly with conditions, from the Board, that would be fine.

42  
43 Ms. Meiners echoed Mr. McLane's comments and thanked the applicant for their efforts and  
44 persistence. She then stated while she is in support of the project, there is a disconnect for her. Ms.  
45 Meiners stated she appreciated the ornate features and simplicity but the window size disconnects with  
46 the style. She stated she understood how they add the portals and ironwork and wondered if a revision  
47 of the window size would make it more connected to the history and architecture they are trying to  
48 mimic or how it would affect the cost. Mr. Trandel commented that is a good point and it has to work



1 inside and out. He referred to the conflict with how the architects deal with managing light and air being  
2 on the inside from the outside. Mr. Trandel then referred to the inside of Paris buildings which he  
3 commented are beautiful outside and are dark inside and that they took a modernistic approach to that.  
4 He also stated that detail is really important to the aesthetics of the building and the aesthetics of  
5 downtown and that it needs to be distinct. Mr. Trandel stated early on, they were criticized it was too  
6 much and now it is too little. He added he agreed he would like to see the oculus windows back in and  
7 detail on the roof.  
8

9 Mr. Lagrange agreed the window point is very important. He stated in Paris buildings, the windows are  
10 the same size and that today, they cannot do that. Mr. Lagrange stated they have big windows and like  
11 light and noted the minimum window is 8 feet. He then referred to the window pattern in that this is a  
12 residential building with small bedroom windows and large living room windows. Mr. Lagrange stated it  
13 would be a modern building and modern lifestyle which he commented is important. He then referred  
14 to the effect on cost and stated inflation went through 20% in terms of affording what they want to do.  
15 Mr. Lagrange stated now, they have to find a way to achieve what buyers want and deliver a product  
16 that people want to live in. He stated moving the windows around would not work and in terms of what  
17 they are showing today, they have to find a way of doing it.  
18

19 Mr. Trandel informed the Board as they came back into the design and for the construction documents  
20 and matching the insides with the outsides, they are trying to maximize natural light which is important.  
21 He noted there is tremendous western exposure and stated people want light.  
22

23 Mr. Ritter asked the applicant if they considered not using orange brick and maintain the lighter color  
24 which matches the limestone on the first floor. Mr. Trandel stated part of the focus is on the changes  
25 and the outside purview is what they are trying to do here. He then stated with regard to the theme,  
26 they responded with different color brick in the discussion early on when they were told it was  
27 monolithic. Mr. Trandel stated they came forth with the same color and found examples from Europe of  
28 multiple colors of brick to give context between the floors and which fits in Winnetka which is more  
29 subtle with different textures. He added it was not their first idea but when you look at the tapestry of  
30 the entire look, it becomes soft and for a large building, it is not a bad outcome.  
31

32 Mr. Konstant stated he also had a problem with multiple brick colors. He stated in all of the time which  
33 transpired, he described it as a handsome building and out of context with the Village. Mr. Konstant  
34 stated real materials are what make the French vernacular although he knew it cost money. He  
35 indicated he worried about the reference to the Wilmette building colors and this building would reflect  
36 those colors. Mr. Konstant stated there is a lot more sophistication to keep the limestone color and  
37 painted roof and it would have helped not having multi colored brick.  
38

39 Chairman Albinson reiterated what the Board's objective is. He stated they have three options which  
40 include to recommend approval of the changes and that the request is in substantial conformity with  
41 the July 2017 final plan and the January 2018 preliminary plan or to deny that the request is not  
42 conformity with what was submitted or ask the applicant to come back and continue the conversation  
43 and make comments and there are prepared ideas which would get them closer to substantial  
44 conformity with the original petition. Chairman Albinson then stated he cannot approve the submittal  
45 since it is not in substantial conformity with what was submitted in July 2017 and January 2018. He  
46 stated what they can do is pick and choose to get back to where it originally was. Chairman Albinson  
47 stated his fear is the challenge that they would have to spend a lot of time going through every little  
48 item for it to be the same as what it was before. He also stated he did not know if the Board's role

1 tonight is to get involved with value engineering. Chairman Albinson commented he loved the project  
2 and wants it completed and there has been a lot of hard work and referred to the game plan approved  
3 last year. Chairman Albinson stated one thing he would ask for is the applicant to add the ornamental  
4 metal rail at the top of the mansard roof which was the only thing recommended to the Village Council.  
5 He indicated you see many changes from that point to today and it would be impossible unless they roll  
6 up their sleeves and design it for the applicant which is not their role. Chairman Albinson reiterated as  
7 much as he wanted to approve it, he cannot in its current form. He stated he is supportive of the project  
8 getting completed and he could not in good faith recommend approval of the application for this round  
9 and agree it is in substantial conformity.

10  
11 Mr. Trandel stated that on their side, timing is important. He stated he would prefer some  
12 recommendations based on certain things the Board wanted to add back into the project and those  
13 details would take time. Mr. Trandel stated this is the first time they have seen the inside match the  
14 outside and the ultimate governors are the buyers. He stated they are not pulling the wool over  
15 their eyes and they would like to move forward in a constructive manner with a conditional  
16 recommendation which would all have to be submitted by the Village Council to approve anyway. Mr.  
17 Trandel stated they would be opening Pandora's Box when you talk about certain design features and  
18 reiterated timing is important. He then stated he absolutely agreed on elements such as the railing and  
19 on the portals and there are certain things they can do to demarcate the penthouse from the other  
20 floors. Mr. Trandel also stated there are practical issues down the road and stated there is a 380 page  
21 construction document. He asked the Board to pick the elements they felt are important and do it. Mr.  
22 Trandel stated they need to agree to put things in they agree with and determine how to make it come  
23 to fruition.

24  
25 Chairman Albinson stated his goal tonight is to ask the applicant to come back with changes which might  
26 help the project get closer to what would be considered substantial conformity and he would not want  
27 to be in a position to deny project. He stated he feels strongly that the project is not in substantial  
28 conformity with the application from last year. Chairman Albinson stated with regard to his initial  
29 thoughts, he stated moving from 5 to 7 maisonettes is still in keep with the original application. He  
30 stated what is important to be restored to the original application from last year included the oculus  
31 windows and detailing with the mansard roof. Chairman Albinson stated the other major thing is the  
32 change in the number of windows and the window detailing. He noted he understood the detail that  
33 laying out the floor plans impacted the windows but he did not buy the argument that reducing the  
34 number of windows and having bigger windows for natural light and commented it negatively affected  
35 the elevations of the building. Chairman Albinson also stated he is underwhelmed and unimpressed with  
36 the new architecture submitted and what was submitted last year was a beautiful design and  
37 encouraged the applicant to bring back a lot of the original flair and architecture of the previous plan  
38 which would allow him to become more comfortable with the project being in conformity with what  
39 was presented last year.

40  
41 Mr. Trandel stated while Chairman Albinson's points are well taken, for the amount of detail it would  
42 take, their understanding is that the inside of the building is beyond the Board's purview. Mr. Trandel  
43 stated they will make the modifications suggested and would prefer to move forward. He referred to the  
44 higher standard of the buyers and if the project did not meet their demands, there would be no  
45 project. Mr. Trandel also referred to going back and forth over 60 to 90 days and to vote the  
46 project down or up. He confirmed they will adhere as it relates to the modifications on the portals and  
47 railings and it would be more productive to have a vote with conditions and advice to the Village Council

1 as they did before. Mr. Trandel reiterated the windows have to match the interior and it is not within  
2 the purview of the Board to discuss the interior.

3  
4 Chairman Albinson stated he understood Mr. Trandel's comments but they have reduced dramatically  
5 the number of windows on the building and referred to the detailing of the windows. Mr. Trandel stated  
6 there is a circular effect of the detail in the old plan versus the new plan with the upper panes which  
7 affects the look. He commented he would love to get the circle back in some of the windows and if they  
8 were hung up with that window manufacturer, that would not be a practical way to go. Mr. Trandel  
9 noted they own the land and are committed to getting it done. He also stated cost goes with tweaking  
10 and if the Board is suggesting to find an appropriate number of windows to have the feature, it would  
11 sound like common sense but the construction guys would not understand. Mr. Trandel stated there  
12 needed to be some flexibility and their objective is to make it as beautiful and ornate as they can, but  
13 taking more time makes it less interesting and it is function of mass. He reiterated if the Board was to  
14 make conditions, that would be awesome and recommendations would be great and they will get there.  
15 Mr. Trandel noted there have been 6 months of construction drawings and encouraged holding an open  
16 forum to get it approved and roll up their sleeves. Mr. Trandel reiterated conditions would be helpful to  
17 them and it is a matter of money and economics. He added they would be better off as a team in order  
18 to get where they need to go instead of going back and forth.

19  
20 Mr. McLane moved to conditionally approve the request with a review and another look at the brick  
21 color and one more window cut. He stated he would also like to see the project move forward. Mr.  
22 Klaskin stated if they whittle it down with minutia, there is a cost involved. He agreed if they insist it look  
23 a certain way on the outside, it would affect the inside. Mr. Klaskin then stated to sell a product  
24 which did not have an amenity, it would hard to sell.

25  
26 Mr. Klaskin seconded the motion. He then stated the brick color palate has been the same over the last  
27 three years and an illustration has been on Elm for three years. Mr. Klaskin stated whether it was the  
28 summer or fall, if there were objections, people have had three years to comment. He then stated the  
29 Board should give the applicant an approval with recommendations and allow them to move forward.

30  
31 Chairman Albinson stated he did believe what was submitted before was in substantial conformity. Mr.  
32 Klaskin stated although the applicant is asking for some differences, the concept is for the same project  
33 and it not so dramatically different. He also stated they have made adjustments because the process  
34 delayed them and referred to being one year behind schedule and the need to satisfy investors and  
35 lenders. Mr. Klaskin then stated while the Board's purview is aesthetics, if they whittle down every  
36 detail, it would not get done and they would fail the Village. He added while there were changes, it  
37 is still a good project overall and the applicant should move forward.

38  
39 Chairman Albinson stated personally, it has substantially changed since last year and he understood  
40 the challenge the applicant faced with the time delay. He stated the Board's responsibility is to inform  
41 the rest of community and the Board the project is not in conformity with the design approved last year.  
42 Chairman Albinson stated he wanted it approved and suggested the applicant make the changes and  
43 come back next month. He indicated he could make a recommendation for approval with conditions but  
44 not tonight.

45  
46 Mr. Sobel stated he would object to them not being responsive.  
47

1 Chairman Albinson stated they have a motion on the table which has been seconded, and asked if the  
2 Board had further discussion of the motion. Mr. McLane stated the best way to phrase it would be to  
3 move to approve the recommendation as set forth on page 15 of the packet with those conditions, and  
4 amended his motion accordingly. Mr. Klaskin agreed to the amendment.  
5

6 Chairman Albinson clarified the motion to state the following:  
7

8 The Design Review Board **recommends approval** of the final plan of the One Winnetka Planned  
9 Development and the additional requested zoning relief, and it adopts the following findings of fact:  
10

- 11 A. The Amended Final Plan **is in substantial conformity** with the July 2017 Final Plan and the  
12 January 2017 Preliminary Planned Development Plan;  
13
- 14 B. The One Winnetka Planned Development Plat, Plat of Subdivision and supporting plans  
15 **meet the standards** set forth in Section 17.58.090(C) of the Zoning Ordinance, in that plans  
16 have been approved by the Village Engineer as being substantially complete and in  
17 compliance with Village standards;  
18
- 19 C. The building design, landscape and streetscape plan, and other proposed exterior aspects of  
20 One Winnetka Planned Development **are in conformity** with the Village Design Guidelines,  
21 identified and articulated in Exhibit A - Village Design Guidelines; and  
22
- 23 D. The above recommendation is subject to the following conditions :  
24
  - 25 1. Rezoning of the Village Parcel from the B1 Multi-Family Residential District to the C2  
26 General Retail District, together with the following:
    - 27 (i) Inclusion of the approximately 40 westerly feet of the Village Parcel  
28 within the C2 Commercial Overlay District;
    - 29 (ii) Inclusion of the approximately 40 westerly feet of the Village Parcel  
30 within the Standard Height Sub-District of the C2 Zoning District (4  
31 stories / 45 feet); and
    - 32 (iii) Inclusion of the approximately 60 westerly feet of the Village Parcel  
33 within the Transitional Height Sub-District of the C2 Zoning District (3  
34 stories / 35 feet).  
35
  - 36 2. Approval of a Plat of Resubdivision of the Subject Property to create Lot 1 and Lot 2 of  
37 the One Winnetka Subdivision, which also includes a vertical subdivision of Lot 1 (Lot 3),  
38 and which requires approval of a variation from the Subdivision Ordinance to allow the  
39 side lot line of Lot 2 to abut the rear lot line of Lot 1;
  - 40 3. Approval of a Special Use Permit special use to allow the reconstruction of a public  
41 parking lot on the New Village Parcel;  
42
  - 43 4. Approval of the requested Variation to allow the required side yard setback along the  
44 east property line of the New Village Parcel to be less than 3 feet but greater than 0 feet  
45 to accommodate the proposed parking lot and approval of the requested Variation to  
46 allow the loading area and trash enclosure serving the principal use the One Winnetka  
47 Parcel to be located on the New Village Parcel.  
48

1 Chairman Albinson noted there would be a change in that item following the discussion with the ZBA  
2 and the applicant and asked to confirm how it should be phrased.

3  
4 Mr. Schuster stated the Board would strike the language with regard to the trash enclosure related to  
5 the variation.

6  
7 Chairman Albinson confirmed they would strike item D.4 relating to the allowance of a variation relating  
8 to the trash enclosure. He next stated the Board may find conditions which are warranted to adopt a  
9 recommendation of approval and asked Mr. McLane to outline the items discussed by the Board.

10  
11 Mr. McLane stated the applicant has heard oculus ornament comment, brick color look relook and  
12 fenestration which would be the conditions to relook and approve it with a basis of trust. He asked the  
13 applicant to do their best job and for them not to get something that looked 617 Green Bay Road. Mr.  
14 Klaskin seconded the motion.

15  
16 Chairman Albinson asked if there were any other conditions.

17  
18 Mr. Schoon asked for clarification and if the Board is deferring to the applicant to look at windows,  
19 fenestration and brick color without coming back to the Board.

20  
21 Chairman Albinson stated that is the danger in the applicant not coming back and compared it to giving  
22 them a blank check. Mr. Ritter stated he did not agree and there are a few limited things the applicant  
23 would have to tweak and come back. Chairman Albinson stated it sounded like the Board is giving a  
24 conditional approval and if they do that and it goes to the Village Council, is it conditioned on the  
25 applicant coming back to the Board to review the recommended changes and if the Board rejected the  
26 response later from the applicant, what happens.

27  
28 Mr. Schuster responded the condition would be a recommendation to the Village Council and they have  
29 an option to first, move forward without taking the Board's review that they had concerns and before  
30 the Village Council's approval, they would like one more chance to get input from the Board that is  
31 the Village Council's prerogative. He stated second, the Village Council could approve  
32 the recommendation and grant final approval provided that it goes back to the Board for additional  
33 comments on oculus windows, etc. Mr. Schuster also stated the Village Council can choose to ignore the  
34 Board's recommendations. Mr. Schuster stated one way to do it to avoid ambiguity is to ask the  
35 applicant to come back prior to going to the Village Council and leave it to the Village Council to  
36 determine what they want do. He agreed Chairman Albinson is correct if they make a condition it is to  
37 come back, it would be open ended.

38  
39 Chairman Albinson stated he wanted to approve the application tonight but cannot and it is his hope  
40 that there is enough support to ask the applicant and make the additional changes based on the  
41 comments and come back before the Board in order to make a decision for approval. He stated under  
42 the current motion, he would deny it. Mr. Klaskin referred to the oculus windows and ornamentation  
43 and with regard to window fenestration; he asked what does that mean. Chairman Albinson stated the  
44 challenge to him is that it is not in substantial conformity with what was approved last year. Mr. Klaskin  
45 asked Chairman Albinson how would they resolve it and noted the applicant has been responsive and  
46 determined the windows have to match the interior with regard to natural light. He asked how would  
47 the Board give the applicant guidance to get it approved and go forward. Chairman Albinson responded  
48 it would be a subjective evaluation since they do not know the interior space.

1 Mr. Konstant stated he found it hard to believe it did not relate to the interior before. Mr. Trandel  
2 responded over the course of 28 meetings, they tried to incorporate a lot of ideas and each Board has a  
3 different agenda which they respect. He noted they did not have balconies on what was approved  
4 before and changes were made which were promised to buyers which were not drawn in the  
5 prior drawings. Mr. Trandel stated they should not be penalized since they did not get to the level of  
6 detail for a balcony on unit 2B. He then stated he would rather the Board reject it and time is not  
7 their friend. Mr. Trandel noted they have proven they are highly rationale and are trying to come up  
8 with a solution that fits all. He stated if the Board made conditions and they went to the Village Council  
9 in terms of what was not addressed, they would be told to go pound sand. Mr. Trandel reiterated the  
10 interior is not within the Board's purview and the sooner the package goes, the sooner they can make it  
11 more ornate and beautiful. He reiterated they want it to be what was submitted and with another year  
12 of carrying costs, it is not an endless bucket. Mr. Trandel agreed that it is a big leap of faith to trust and if  
13 they were to come back in 30 days, there would be another question and it would not be perfect. He  
14 again asked the Board to approve it with conditions and they would come back tomorrow with Mr.  
15 Lagrange and put numbers to it and say this is what they want to do. Mr. Trandel then stated if they go  
16 to the Village Council without solutions, it would be a waste of time. He stated it is important to note  
17 they have all learned a lot and it would not be perfect or a perfect solution. Mr. Trandel reiterated they  
18 are committed to do the best they can do and still move forward and make the buyers and the  
19 community happy and that trust is needed.

20  
21 Chairman Albinson stated there is a motion and second asked if there were any other comments. No  
22 additional comments were made at this time. Chairman Albinson called for a roll call vote.

23  
24 AYES: Klaskin, McLane, Ritter (3)

25 NAYS: Albinson, Konstant, Meiners (3)

26  
27 The motion failed.

28  
29 Mr. Schuster then stated the Board can reformulate the motion and at the moment, the floor is open  
30 which means there is no motion. He suggested they revisit the conditions which may happen or  
31 a motion to deny. He confirmed there is nothing on the floor in terms of a motion. Mr. Klaskin suggested  
32 asking the applicant to return with those three specific items which include the windows, the  
33 fenestration, the ornamentation, the roof line and the oculus windows so that they would not be  
34 hearing additional comments which were not raised before.

35  
36 Mr. Schuster confirmed the motion as phrased did not pass and the floor is open for another other  
37 motion. Mr. McLane asked for those who voted against the motion, what would it take to change their  
38 vote. Mr. Konstant asked the applicant with regard to the fenestration shown, it looked like all picture  
39 windows on the east elevation which may influence his decision and asked what exactly it is they  
40 are proposing. He stated before, it included French doors and casement windows which looked like  
41 French architecture.

42  
43 Mr. Trandel stated a year ago, it did not contain the complexity of the inside compared to the outside.  
44 Ms. Meiners stated she agreed with Mr. Konstant with regard to the picture windows and asked why  
45 they cannot do what is in the illustration below.

46

1 Ms. Lam stated where you have the four windows, you start to break that down and express  
2 the verticals so they do have vertical proportions in the window. Mr. Trandel commented it is hard to  
3 see in two dimensional drawings.

4  
5 Mr. Konstant suggested the window have a wider style which takes on a different flavor. He agreed they  
6 could do the same opening and articulate the windows. Mr. Trandel noted they are operable windows  
7 and referred the Board to the center of the illustration and the big picture window and in the illustration  
8 below. He indicated they can break it up into two windows and that changes can be made to make it  
9 work. Mr. Trandel suggested the Board issue a condition to break up the windows for a certain amount.  
10 He stated that is why he suggested sitting with the Board next week and get them up to the date so by  
11 the time of final submittal to the Village Council, the Board would know all of their concerns are vetted  
12 and in the final approval. Mr. Trandel then stated they are governed by a development agreement with  
13 the Village. He stated they want to take the Board's guidance and not go back and forth for another 90  
14 days. Mr. Trandel added there may be a problem with the seasons, etc. He suggested they leave the  
15 thoughts and make broader strokes on the conditions the Board wanted to see addressed and they can  
16 respond to the Board and have a round table discussion and work through what they want to get to the  
17 Village Council. Mr. Trandel indicated that would be more constructive than going through a public  
18 hearing again with minutia. He then noted he agreed with all of the comments made.

19  
20 Chairman Albinson thanked the applicant for providing the additional sketches which made a huge  
21 impact on his perception of the project. Mr. Trandel agreed they could do ocular windows, ornamental  
22 railings on the turret and to create a more pronounced first floor entrance.

23  
24 Chairman Albinson thanked the applicant and stated if what is submitted is what Mr. Trandel showed.  
25 He stated the challenge is the applicant asked the Board to recommend approval of the final petition  
26 being in conformity with what was approved last year but they do not have all of the details and now  
27 they see this. Chairman Albinson then stated while he is not comfortable but with this added, it would  
28 make him vote yes.

29  
30 Ms. Meiners asked if a motion can be made to approve the earlier conditions outside be done to this  
31 and to have another meeting before the Village Council takes action. Chairman Albinson responded they  
32 cannot and referred to the Open Meetings Act.

33  
34 Mr. Schuster stated if the Board recommended approval with having another meeting prior to going to  
35 the Village Council, they could hold another public meeting but the approval vote would have already  
36 occurred. He stated for the next meeting and information and to provide additional comments, the  
37 Board would not have the opportunity to vote again. Mr. Schuster stated if they want the layout with  
38 certain conditions, to approve what was presented with conditions, for example to make as many  
39 windows of two instead of one then revisit before the Village Council and determine what they want to  
40 do.

41  
42 Ms. Meiners stated if it did not pass because they want to see a final draft, she asked if they could have  
43 another public meeting in a week. She stated she understood the time constraint and financing but that  
44 it has to be done right. Mr. Schuster stated the Board could hold another meeting with 48 hours' posting  
45 notice and the continued date would have to be 48 hours out. He stated they could ask the Village staff  
46 in terms of logistics if they were to do another meeting such as the room being available, having  
47 a quorum, etc. Mr. Schuster then stated the other challenge is if they have another meeting, whether  
48 there would be enough Members here or the same Members for a quorum and at the next meeting, the

1 makeup of the Board Members could change. Mr. Schuster agreed they can make a motion for it to be  
2 continued to another date if they like.

3  
4 Chairman Albinson stated he would ask for a continuance and to not make another motion for a vote  
5 tonight. Mr. Klaskin referred to the tight schedule and asked if the Board could make a favorable  
6 recommendation based on the final plan implementing the concepts shown in the sketch. Chairman  
7 Albinson stated he is satisfied with the west elevation and asked if they had sketches of the east  
8 elevation.

9  
10 Mr. McLane asked the applicant if they agree to that and if they can execute the bottom illustration with  
11 oculus windows. Mr. Trandel responded in connection with the illustration, what is important is what  
12 was lost on the submittal is the demarcation between the penthouse and lower floors. He also stated  
13 the cornice on the top separating the 4th floor from the 5th floor is not evident in the picture and they  
14 can only go so far with pictures. Mr. Trandel stated the big thing is the window count and addressing the  
15 break in the building. He agreed as long as it matches the floor plan, it would be fine.

16  
17 Mr. Konstant asked for clarification of the style and operation of the window, and referred to  
18 the comparison of the lower elevation windows to the one window in the upper illustration. Mr. Trandel  
19 stated while they can find chromatic, operationally state of the art windows with tint and energy  
20 efficiency would be great, that would also be costly. He stated he agreed with the bottom illustration  
21 but that it will be an operational decision and if the Board's recommendation is that they want breaks in  
22 the windows as close as possible to the bottom rendering, which is a good thing.

23  
24 Chairman Albinson asked about the other elevations. Ms. Lam stated they only have sketches of the east  
25 and west elevations.

26  
27 Mr. Konstant stated that the sketches are more consistent with the renderings from January 2017. Mr.  
28 Ritter stated if they can get it to look as much like the drawings as they can, he would be in favor. He  
29 added that the sketches looked better than the formal submittal. Mr. Trandel stated at the joint  
30 meeting, six buyers talked and all gave an opinion which mirrors the Board. Mr. Trandel added they can  
31 get there.

32  
33 Chairman Albinson asked if they can show other things to help bring the project closer to the original  
34 proposal. Mr. Trandel referred to the illustration and that they would bring out the first floor. He stated  
35 the submittal was not intended to be different than the sketch. Mr. Trandel noted there would be no  
36 pronunciation on the retail portion. Mr. Trandel then stated as they went to the ZBA meeting, they  
37 were concerned about not having a sidewalk between the building and 711 Oak and the response  
38 brought in the main entry and new entrance for the residents which would be the central focal point. He  
39 indicated they may lose 1,000 square feet of retail space. Mr. Trandel added the demarcation between  
40 the retail and higher floor jumps out as well as the 4th and 5th floors and they will get to that look.

41  
42 Mr. Konstant stated if it was more consistent with the sketches, he would vote for it.

43  
44 Chairman Albinson itemized the changes from the last vote taken. He stated that a member of the  
45 Board may wish to make a motion with everything stated in the last motion, but with the following  
46 changes: the Board would accept the sketches shown for the west elevation, the enlarged west  
47 elevation and the east elevation, the oculus windows and for what is not shown, the Board would  
48 expect for the applicant to add the same changes from the application to the theme of the sketches be



1 applied for the entire exterior and that it would have to be consistent on all elevations. He asked if  
2 there were any other considerations. Chairman Albinson added this is a continuation of what was  
3 submitted last year and the Board would be approving where changes were presented. Chairman  
4 Albinson stated in terms of materials, they would not be deviating from what was presented last year  
5 and the changes include the placement of the building and the articulation of the envelope.  
6

7 Mr. McLane made a motion to approve the request as stated by Chairman Albinson. Mr. Ritter seconded  
8 the vote. Chairman Albinson called for a roll call vote.  
9

10 AYES: Albinson, Klaskin, Konstant, McLane, Meiners, Ritter (6)

11 NAYS: None (0)

12

13 **Adjournment:**

14 The meeting was adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

15

16 Respectfully submitted,

17

18 Antionette Johnson

19 Recording Secretary