

**WINNETKA PLANNED DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
VIRTUAL MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 3, 2021**

Members Present:

Matt Bradley, Chairman
Tina Dalman
Layla Danley
John Golan
Kimberly Handler
Lynn Hanley
Bridget Orsic
Jay Vanderlaan

Members Absent:

None

Village Staff:

David Schoon, Director of Community Development
Brian Norkus, Assistant Director of Community
Development
Ann Klaassen, Senior Planner

Village Attorney:

Ben Schuster

Introductory Remarks Regarding Conduct of Virtual Meeting.

Chairman Bradley read the Oral Declaration into the record.

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Bradley at 7:14 p.m. Ms. Klaassen took roll call of the Planned Development Commission Members present.

Chairman Bradley outlined the agenda items and explained how the virtual meeting would take place. He also explained how public participation would take place and outlined the rules of procedure.

Approval of Minutes – October 7, 2020.

Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to approve the October 7, 2020 meeting minutes. Ms. Orsic moved to approve the October 7, 2020 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Danley. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed:

AYES: Bradley, Dalman, Danley, Golan, Handler, Hanley, Orsic, Vanderlaan

NAYS: None

Approval of Minutes – October 19, 2020.

Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to approve the October 19, 2020 meeting minutes. Ms. Dalman moved to approve the October 19, 2020 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hanley. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed:

AYES: Bradley, Dalman, Danley, Golan, Handler, Hanley, Orsic, Vanderlaan

NAYS: None

Case No. 19-15-PD: 688-694 Green Bay Road – The Walden – Preliminary Planned Development Review:

An amended application submitted by Walden Winnetka, LLC seeking approval of subdivision and zoning

1 relief to allow the construction of a new five-unit multi-family residential building with below grade
2 structured parking. The requested subdivision and zoning relief would permit: (a) a plat of consolidation
3 to combine two lots into one lot of record; (b) an exception from the maximum permitted building size
4 (GFA); (c) an exception from the maximum permitted building height; (d) an exception from the required
5 principal roof form; (e) an exception from the exterior wall articulation requirement along the south
6 façade; (f) an exception from the front yard setback requirements to accommodate surface parking spaces.
7 **The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**

8 Mr. Schoon went over the Commission's past review of the request and described the meetings held. He
9 stated public comment was received in support and in opposition of the project and described the concerns
10 raised. Mr. Schoon stated the Commission recommended denial at the October 2020 meeting and identified
11 the reasons for the denial. He then identified the project's location and size.

12
13 Mr. Schoon stated in connection with proposed changes to the project, he noted the building footprint would
14 be the same and the building was rotated 180 degrees which changed the pedestrian and vehicular access
15 points. He identified the location of two parking spaces in the front as well as a 4-foot tall retaining wall along
16 the west property line with landscaping to be used as a buffer. Mr. Schoon then described the storm water
17 and detention elements and noted the building has been reduced from four to three stories with five units
18 instead of six with 10 parking spaces on the lower level and storage units. He noted the units would measure
19 2,200-2,400 square feet with 10 foot high ceilings and stated the west elevation would be a two story element
20 with a common outdoor roof deck and garden space with storage units on the third story. Mr. Schoon
21 referred to the north and south building elevations and new renderings from Green Bay Road. He noted the
22 proposed driveway off Green Bay Road has a 15% slope for a distance of 17 feet which contained parking
23 spaces at the bottom of the slope which are required to meet ADA requirements. Mr. Schoon informed the
24 Commission Village Engineering reviewed the proposed grade and any refinements would be addressed at
25 the time of any final approval.

26
27 Mr. Schoon informed the Commission the DRB reviewed the revised design at their January 21, 2021 meeting
28 and unanimously recommended approval of the design as presented. He stated although the height has been
29 reduced, exceptions are still needed for height and GFA noting the impermeable lot coverage exception has
30 been removed. Mr. Schoon then stated the two variations for exterior wall articulation and principal roof
31 form are still necessary. He referred to the planned development and exception standards and the proposed
32 compensatory benefit from the applicant of providing the Village a donation of \$18,000 to go toward public
33 electric vehicle charging stations and identified their potential locations. Mr. Schoon identified the actions
34 the Commission may take and asked if there were any questions.

35
36 Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. Ms. Hanley asked why the 4 foot articulation is
37 required. Mr. Schoon responded it was an attempt to get at a design element to break up long walls. Ms.
38 Hanley asked if the DRB considered the roof form. He noted the DRB did not review the request in terms of
39 it being a zoning exception, but the Board found the proposed design to be appropriate given its location.
40 Ms. Orsic referred to the charging station and asked if that has been done before where the public benefit is
41 not at the site's location. Mr. Schoon confirmed that this is not an uncommon practice for communities, and
42 that such benefits have been similarly done in other communities. Mr. Vanderlaan asked if the public interest
43 benefit would be a conflict of interest and Mr. Schuster explained why it would not be. Mr. Golan asked how
44 far the building would be moved to the south. Mr. Schoon indicated it may be approximately 12 feet and the
45 applicant can confirm. He noted the building met all of the required setbacks with the two parking spaces in
46 the front yard being the setback issue. Ms. Dalman questioned the applicant's outreach efforts or meetings
47 with residents as well as landscape detailing. Mr. Schoon stated the applicant can respond.

48

1 Mr. Norkus allowed the applicant into the meeting. Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter.
2 Rick Swanson introduced himself as President of R. Swanson Architects and President of Swanson
3 Development P.C. He then went over the timeline of the project's presentation before the Planned
4 Development Commission and DRB. Mr. Swanson then began experiencing technical difficulties.

5
6 A motion was made by Ms. Hanley to recess for 10 minutes until the applicant resolved his technical issues.
7 Ms. Dalman seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed:

8 AYES: Bradley, Dalman, Danley, Golan, Handler, Hanley, Orsic, Vanderlaan

9 NAYS: None

10
11 Chairman Bradley reconvened the meeting at 8:10 pm.

12
13 Mr. Swanson continued by stating the Planned Development Commission had previously recommended
14 denial of the project and noted the denial was not based on the proposed project or intended use of the
15 property. He then identified the recommendations made to refine the project. Mr. Swanson stated the
16 project was revised and presented to the DRB on January 21, 2021 where unanimous approval was
17 recommended. He also identified the concerns previously raised which were considered in the project's
18 revision including unit density reduction, removal of the fourth floor space, reducing the height of the west
19 side of the building to two stories, relocating the primary entry to face north, shifting the building to the
20 south and confirming the quality of the materials would remain the same. Mr. Swanson confirmed the
21 building shifted 10 feet so that the building is 22 feet from the north lot line. He then identified the new
22 garage entrance which would be screened by retaining walls and landscaping material and removed the two
23 rear parking spaces which resulted in a reduction in impermeable surface eliminating the need for that
24 exception. Mr. Swanson referred to existing site photos, the surrounding properties and the new proposed
25 site plan. He then identified the significant amount of landscaping materials they would be able to add to the
26 property as well as the paver brick sidewalk noting a gradient heat system would be installed under the
27 driveway.

28
29 Mr. Swanson then referred the Commission to the revised third floor plan which would contain the rooftop
30 garden area and partial storage area for that unit owner. He then referred to the previously approved east
31 elevation and new east elevation improvements containing the same materials noting the two towers in the
32 front would remain at the same proposed height and would be 8 feet over the allowable amount. Mr.
33 Swanson also referred to the previously approved west elevation and proposed new west elevation noting
34 the elevation was reduced to two stories with a parapet wall reduction to 25 feet 6 inches. He identified the
35 previously approved north elevation and new proposed north elevation with the same change in massing as
36 the south elevation together with the removal of the driveway. Mr. Swanson stated they softened the peaked
37 roof element with an arched parapet element. He then stated shifting the building to the south would allow
38 more sunlight to the north property than if they were to build a pitched roof element at the allowed setback
39 line to address the neighbors' concerns. He identified the previously proposed and new south elevations
40 noting the only area not articulated related to this elevation and identified the elements changed including
41 existing trees, driveway, fourth story removal and roof design change.

42
43 Mr. Swanson then identified the proposed building's relationship to the existing structures and landscaping
44 plans on Green Bay Road and vault system plans. He referred to the building's section illustration and rooftop
45 element for the third floor. Mr. Swanson also identified the ADA slope requirements and then referred to the
46 artist's rendering of the building and landscaping from different street views as well as the proposed
47 materials which would remain the same. He then asked if there were any questions.
48

1 Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. Mr. Vanderlaan referred to emails from the
2 neighbors relating to privacy concerns in connection with the rooftop deck and asked Mr. Swanson to address
3 how the new plans would address those concerns. Mr. Swanson responded the Walden neighbors all have
4 backyards and the reduction to two stories and berm addition adding the balcony owners would not present
5 an issue. He also stated you would not be able to see into the backyards from the rooftop deck location. Mr.
6 Swanson also stated moving the garage to the front helped resolve any privacy and noise issues.

7
8 Chairman Bradley questioned the balconies' size dimensions on the side facing Walden. Mr. Swanson
9 responded they would measure 6x12 feet. Chairman Bradley referred to the third floor unit owner's rooftop
10 space being an exclusive private space as opposed to a communal space. Mr. Swanson responded they have
11 been in communication with Ruud Coster and discussed the issue with their brokers and decided to make it
12 exclusive to the penthouse unit. Mr. Golan asked if there would be a trench drain at the bottom of the
13 driveway and Mr. Swanson confirmed that is correct. No additional questions were raised at this time.

14
15 Chairman Bradley then asked for public comment. Ms. Klaassen confirmed the following letters to be read
16 into the record were not included in the agenda packet. She read communications from Liz and Max
17 Winemiller, 797 Walden, King and Hope Poor, 735 Walden, Mary Jo and Jim Buschell, 677 Walden and Nancy
18 Carley, 670 Walden, in opposition to the project.

19
20 Chairman Bradley noted there would be a three minute limit on public comments. Mary Ellen Stanfield stated
21 she would speak on behalf of her and Neal Peterson, 680 Green Bay Road. She referred to the building being
22 18 feet away from their building as being too close, she also questioned the proposed landscaping along the
23 south property line. Ms. Stanfield also voiced concern regarding the size of windows on the south building
24 wall and lights, concluding they are in opposition to the project. Chairman Bradley then swore in those
25 speaking to this matter. Mary Jo Buschell, 670 Walden, stated while she appreciated the changes made, she
26 strongly objected to the balconies and asked if the balconies could be changed to Juliette balconies which
27 would be less obtrusive. Neal Peterson, 680 Green Bay Road, questioned the rationale for moving the building
28 10 feet closer to their building to the south. Ms. Klaassen confirmed there are no other members of the public
29 at the Village Hall to comment.

30
31 Mr. Norkus then allowed members of the public into the meeting. Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking
32 to this matter. Ruud Coster, 696 Green Bay Road, stated he submitted numerous objections to the
33 development relating to mass, scale and height. He referred to the revised plans which do not represent the
34 proper tradeoff to the neighbors. Mr. Coster stated while they appreciated the changes, there would still be
35 a negative effect on their property in terms of height, mass, light and air. He also stated their privacy concerns
36 have increased due to the building's orientation change. Mr. Coster referred to the developer's initial
37 comments that the building size could not be reduced and still be financially feasible and the number of units
38 has now been decreased. He also stated the developer would have more benefit from the project with the
39 Village receiving a minimal public benefit.

40
41 King Poor, 735 Walden, referred to the public benefit defined in the ordinance and stated it should be
42 connected to the project to justify the exceptions. Mr. Poor then stated while he appreciated the changes
43 made, the balance weighed against approval of the exceptions including privacy concerns, loss of light and
44 the de minimus public benefit. He suggested progress can still be made to mitigate the privacy concerns.

45
46 Brandie Siavelis, 415 Cedar, stated one of the biggest complaints made related to privacy and the developer
47 made significant changes to address those and other concerns. She stated the balconies would not be used
48 year-round due to the weather and would be primarily occupied by empty nesters who would help increase

1 tax revenues. Ms. Siavelis referred to the private third floor patio which would be used by one owner as
2 opposed to six and there are many buyers who want luxury, maintenance free living. She stated this project
3 has been in the works for two years and the developer made numerous concessions to appease the neighbors
4 noting that neighboring properties can be developed.

5
6 Gordon Montgomery, 681 Walden, stated he appreciated the design changes but the conclusion did not meet
7 the reasons for which the Commission recommended denial the last time since there are still height, mass,
8 light and air issues. He also stated after the project revision, there would be more of an issue in terms of light
9 and noise. Mr. Montgomery stated the changes in totality do very little to move against the previous
10 fundamental issues.

11
12 Laurin Starck, 698 Green Bay Road, stated although modifications have been made to the building to address
13 noise and privacy issues, she referred to safety and traffic being brought to Green Bay Road during
14 construction. She also referred to the quality of homes and lifestyle expected by those living in Winnetka and
15 asked for the Commission to take all of that into consideration.

16
17 Mr. Swanson responded with regard to the landscaping question, he identified the materials to be planted
18 along the length of the property. He also noted with regard to the comment that the building is at 18 feet
19 away, the proposed building is located at 12 feet from the south property line, adding the building to the
20 south is located at 6 feet from the property line. Mr. Swanson also stated with regard to window size, smaller
21 windows can be installed with the lights on motion sensors. He then stated the balconies would be bay
22 shaped and would contain a limited amount of furniture with limited use. Mr. Swanson added they would
23 not be visible once the trees grow and he is willing to listen to comments relating to the balconies. He then
24 stated with regard to shifting the building to the south, the building to the south is a massive structure and
25 it made sense for the proposed building to relate to it as a transitional building and it would also contain 22
26 feet for landscaping material to the north and he is open to discussion. Mr. Swanson also stated with regard
27 to the public benefit, they would be constructing an attractive building that would provide a public benefit
28 serving the residents' needs and described it as a meaningful contribution. He concluded by stating they went
29 way beyond the call of duty in terms of addressing the concerns raised and added it is not possible to make
30 everyone happy. He then asked if there were any questions from the Commission.

31
32 Chairman Bradley then swore in Mary Ellen Stanfield. Ms. Stanfield questioned whether the landscaping
33 would be legally bound to hold to what is presented. Mr. Schuster described the process and conditions in
34 the planned development ordinance in that an approval is conditioned upon compliance with the approved
35 plans. He also stated the applicant would be required to keep the landscaping in accordance with those plans.
36 Mr. Schuster then stated with regard to public benefit, he explained the background behind the
37 compensating benefit for planned development noting it is not necessarily required to be on the property
38 itself and is based on the exceptions being requested. In response to a question of Ms. Dalman, Mr. Schoon
39 confirmed that the landscaping would be required to be maintained.

40
41 Chairman Bradley closed public comment and called the matter in for discussion. Mr. Golan commented the
42 applicant has done a remarkable job of addressing most of his initial concerns with the plans. He also stated
43 eliminating the sixth unit and lowering the west half of the building is more palatable to the west neighbor.
44 Mr. Golan also stated with regard to balconies, minimal time is spent on them and privacy would not be a
45 significant issue. He also stated moving the property 10 feet to the south is a great idea and he would vote in
46 favor of the request. Ms. Danley agreed with Mr. Golan's comments and stated the elimination of
47 impermeable lot surface is significant. She also stated the developer agreeing to work with the neighbors
48 further on landscaping is significant and the private third floor unit made the development more palatable.

1 Ms. Danley stated the building height reduction is an improvement and she is surprised the neighbors are
2 still against it noting she would be inclined to vote in favor of the development. Ms. Hanley agreed with the
3 comments made and stated while she appreciated the neighbors' concerns in terms of privacy, the Village is
4 dense and everyone deals with privacy issues. She does with her single-family home and her adjacent
5 neighbors. She also stated there would be a multi-family building in that space due to its zoning and did not
6 think the exceptions would unreasonably impede on the neighbors' quiet enjoyment. Ms. Hanley concluded
7 she would vote in favor of the request and commented the charging station is an excellent compensation.
8

9 Ms. Handler agreed with the comments made and referred to her initial concern with regard to the charging
10 station. She stated after the discussion, she realized it worked. She also stated the Green Bay Road corridor
11 is a mixture of residential, businesses, empty lots, etc. and the building would provide a benefit to the
12 community and concluded she would vote in favor of the request. Ms. Orsic commented the section
13 illustration demonstrated the nice transition between the buildings and agreed the Village is dense and
14 landscaping provides a buffer. She then stated the proposed landscaping would make a huge difference to
15 the neighboring properties and a building would be built on this site eventually. Ms. Orsic stated the
16 developer worked hard on making changes to the project and she is leaning in favor of approval. Ms. Dalman
17 stated she supported the project for several reasons and the property contained challenges relating to slope,
18 etc. and the developer made changes which affected his profitability. She stated it is difficult to address
19 everyone's concerns and the developer has done a good job doing that. She then stated with regard to
20 balconies, the DRB unanimously approved the design and the balconies provided architectural articulation.
21 Ms. Dalman stated the Village made the decision to have a planned development process with a request not
22 being strictly held to the zoning standards to address and meet the Village's goals. She agreed with the offsite
23 public benefit given the site size and noted for the record they would be addressing an existing storm water
24 drainage issue in the neighborhood by putting in a vault benefitting the Walden neighbors. Ms. Dalman
25 concluded she would be in favor of the request.
26

27 Chairman Bradley stated he initially was against the project for the reasons stated with the revised
28 application resulting in a much more scaled back project which ended with a better result with significant
29 reductions which mitigated the issues raised. He noted with regard to the planned development process, the
30 overages and exceptions are allowed to be requested by right which are weighed against the planned
31 development standards and determine whether such projects should proceed. Chairman Bradley noted the
32 impermeable lot coverage was eliminated and moving the entrance to the other side addressed a number of
33 noise and safety concerns. He referred to the front yard exception related to getting vehicles in and out of
34 the driveway from Green Bay Road. Chairman Bradley asked for a condition on the motion to state that the
35 third-floor outdoor space be set off as an exclusive right for the third-floor unit owner. He then stated if the
36 building height was 35 feet and for the west neighbors, there could still be balconies by right. Chairman
37 Bradley then stated with regard to the 18% GFA overage, there was a dramatic reduction from 50% from the
38 previous proposal. He noted the height issues and the way in which the parapet is measured, those are
39 aesthetic portions which would not affect light and air and moving them to the south ensured more visibility
40 for the north neighbors. Chairman Bradley stated the articulation issue is limited to the south wall and did
41 not create the same concern as it would have for the north neighbors.
42

43 Chairman Bradley then encouraged the developer to work with the Walden neighbors with regard to
44 landscape materials and address the window concerns. He stated the standard that the use would not
45 immediately impede the neighbors' use and enjoyment has been addressed by the project revisions. He
46 added for the record the project met the standards and planned development exception standards with the
47 public benefit being difficult to include on the site and he commended the developer for the proposed
48 compensating benefit. Chairman Bradley concluded he is in favor of the request with the condition he

1 previously stated and also asked for a condition that the second floor balconies be removed.

2
3 Ms. Orsic states she did not agree with that suggestion to remove the second-floor balconies, which did not
4 present a big privacy concern. Mr. Golan asked if the landscaping would be maintained and added the
5 charging station would most likely be used by visitors to the Village and how it would be maintained. Mr.
6 Schoon confirmed a third party would provide the service and users would be charged for the electricity
7 noting the Village had to pay for its installation. Ms. Handler agreed the balconies should not be removed
8 and are important architecturally which would be seldomly used. She also stated the third floor deck did not
9 require a condition for its use only by the third floor owner. Ms. Handler also stated they cannot instruct the
10 third floor owner on how to use their deck. Mr. Vanderlaan agreed with the comments made and stated the
11 Village is sorely lacking housing options for older residents. He stated this project would fill that need and
12 would be a great benefit for that population.

13
14 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion recommending approval with the condition that the third floor patio
15 be privately used by that unit owner only. Ms. Danley moved to recommend approval of the preliminary plan
16 for The Walden Planned Development to be located at 688-694 Green Bay Road and to adopt the findings of
17 fact as indicated on page nos. 18 and 19 of the agenda packet with an additional condition that the third floor
18 deck space be committed to the third floor unit owner's use. Ms. Orsic seconded the motion. A vote was
19 taken and the motion unanimously passed:

20 AYES: Bradley, Dalman, Danley, Golan, Handler, Hanley, Orsic, Vanderlaan

21 NAYS: None

22
23 **Other Business.**

24 a. March 3, 2021 – Quorum check.

25 Mr. Schoon confirmed there are no items on the agenda for the March 3, 2021 meeting.

26
27 **Public Comment.**

28 Mr. Norkus asked the remaining members of the public for comment. No additional comments were made
29 at this time.

30
31 **Adjournment.**

32 A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Hanley and seconded by Ms. Orsic. A vote was taken and the motion
33 unanimously passed:

34 AYES: Bradley, Dalman, Danley, Golan, Handler, Hanley, Orsic, Vanderlaan

35 NAYS: None

36
37 The meeting was adjourned at 10:26 p.m.

38
39 Respectfully submitted,

40
41 Antionette Johnson

42 Recording Secretary