

**WINNETKA PLANNED DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
JULY 19, 2023**

Members Present:

Matt Bradley, Chairman
Mamie Case
Layla Danley
Chris Foley
John Golan
Liz Kunkle
Mike Nielsen
Todd Vender

Members Absent:

Lynn Hanley

Village Staff:

David Schoon, Director of Community Development
Ann Klaassen, Assistant Director of Community
Development

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Bradley at 7:00 p.m. Ms. Klaassen took roll call of the Planned Development Commission Members present.

Approval of Minutes:

a. February 3, 2021, Virtual Meeting Minutes:

Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to approve the February 3, 2021, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the February 3, 2021, meeting minutes was made by Ms. Danley and the motion was seconded by Golan. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 8 to 0:

AYES: Bradley, Case, Danley, Foley, Golan, Kunkle, Nielsen, Vender

NAYS: None

Public Comment:

No comments were made at this time.

Community Development Report:

Mr. Schoon provided the Commission with an update with regard to the Village Council's consideration of four lakefront ordinances and provided additional information with regard to the nine month permit abeyance period.

New Applications:

a. Case No. 22-25-PD: 714-16, 718-732, 736 & 740 Elm Street and 511 & 515 Lincoln Avenue - One Winnetka Preliminary Planned Development: An application seeking the following approval of subdivision and zoning relief to allow the construction of a new four-story mixed-use building: (1) a plat of consolidation to create one lot of record, which consolidation requires an exception to allow a side lot line to abut a rear lot line; and (2) preliminary planned development plan approval with the following zoning exceptions and special use approvals: (a) an exception from the maximum permitted building height; (b) an exception from the maximum front yard setback requirement; (c) an exception from the maximum corner yard setback requirement; (d) an exception from the minimum rear yard setback

1 **requirement; (e) an exception from the rear yard landscaped area requirement; (f) an exception from**
2 **the minimum fourth story setback requirement; (g) a special use to allow parking on the ground floor**
3 **level; (h) a special use to allow medical office uses within the C-2 Commercial Overlay District; and (i) a**
4 **special use to allow financial service office uses within the C-2 Commercial Overlay District. The Village**
5 **Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**

6 Mr. Schoon stated he would provide a general review of the site and the request as well as a review of
7 the planned development process, the Village Council's concept plan review, the Design Review Board's
8 review of the application, and then followed by the zoning and subdivision relief being requested. He
9 identified the site, noting the current proposal only related to privately owned land, and its current zoning
10 designations as well as the Comprehensive Plan goals and vision statements the Commission is to consider
11 applicable to the request. Mr. Schoon outlined the Village Council's concept plan review which identified
12 their initial thoughts on the proposal that are not binding and which he identified for the Commission. He
13 explained the Village Council's comments relating to the zoning request for medical and financial service
14 uses. Mr. Schoon then identified the process' next steps following the Commission's review, which
15 includes Village Council consideration and approval.

16
17 Mr. Schoon provided the Commission with an update of the DRB's comments including comments relating
18 to the fourth floor level and Tudor elements as well as for the pedestrian passageway to Elm Street to be
19 redesigned. He stated these comments were addressed by the applicant with the Design Review Board
20 (DRB) recommending unanimous approval with several conditions which he identified for the
21 Commission. Mr. Schoon also identified details in connection with the zoning relief and several exceptions
22 being requested as part of the application. He then stated given a portion of the site is in the Overlay
23 District, special use approval would be needed for certain land uses, including medical and financial
24 service uses. He noted the applicant is requesting that these two particular special uses go to Planned
25 Development Commission and Village Council in terms of the operational aspects of these special uses
26 which is not the Village's typical approach that required consideration of particular tenants. Mr. Schoon
27 stated the applicant would provide further detail regarding this request.

28
29 Mr. Schoon stated in terms of the planned development, he explained the process in terms of exceptions
30 requiring zoning relief and that the applicant would elaborate on the specifics of the request. He then
31 identified the various standards the Commission is to consider with this application. Mr. Schoon
32 summarized three potential actions the Commission can take following the applicant's presentation and
33 public comment. He then asked if there were any questions.

34
35 Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. He referred to the compensating benefit with
36 regard to zoning relief and exceptions. Mr. Schoon responded the compensating benefit should provide
37 some relief to the community in response to the requested exceptions being requested. No additional
38 questions were raised at this time. He then asked for the applicant's presentation.

39
40 Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. John Murphy of Murphy Development Group
41 stated he would provide the Commission with an introduction of their firm and that Jon Talty with OKW
42 Architects would provide details in connection with the proposal. He reviewed several projects they have
43 worked on as well as renovation work.

44
45 Mr. Talty began by referring to views of the proposal in illustrations from Elm and Lincoln along with how
46 it would respond to the community and the street. He identified the main entrance in an elevation which
47 was revised following comments they received. Mr. Talty referred to the building's views looking from
48 across the street from the Hadley School for the Blind and identified how the view addressed the

1 transformer visibility concerns previously raised. He also referred to the blind arches sitting along the
2 parking area which were infilled with a trellis. Mr. Talty stated windows could not be installed on that
3 ground floor elevation due to the zero-lot line condition. Mr. Talty also identified views of Lincoln and the
4 residential entrance which he described as an elegant and quiet space as well as the ramp down to private
5 parking for the residences and an opening on the ground floor which is a driveway to parking for the
6 ground floor commercial spaces.

7
8 Mr. Talty stated in terms of building height, he identified the highest point at the site's southwest corner
9 with the lowest point at the northeast corner. He stated they were careful in considering floor heights for
10 the commercial spaces and identified how it varied due to the grade level change. Mr. Talty identified how
11 they addressed the concerns raised regarding the covered pedestrian walkway from the parking area,
12 which walkway was ultimately eliminated. He identified the underground parking spaces for residential
13 use as well as storage space. He then referred to the second floor residences, courtyard and private
14 amenity terrace and its features. He described the third floor as more traditional and the square foot
15 range of the luxury units rental between 1,000 square feet and 2,000 square feet. He noted the fourth
16 floor would be set back from each elevation and identified the provision of terraces where appropriate.
17 Mr. Talty noted specific outdoor spaces for the fourth floor were intentionally not provided as a gesture
18 to the 711 Oak neighbors immediately to the south.

19
20 Mr. Murphy stated with regard to community benefits, he referred to the widened sidewalks and
21 crosswalks along Lincoln and Elm as well as streetscape and landscape improvements, additional street
22 lighting and bike racks. He then referred to the elements which would enhance the environment and
23 increase sustainability as the inclusion of a green roof, lower level storm water detention, infrastructure
24 and electronic vehicle charging. Mr. Murphy then stated the new residential units would bring
25 approximately 100 residents to the downtown area which would patronize businesses and activate the
26 area and the Village's economy. Mr. Murphy also described how the new electric transformer would
27 benefit the community. He stated the enhanced architectural integrity at the corner of Lincoln and Elm
28 would serve to anchor the intersection and complement surrounding structures as well as influence
29 design for future development. He concluded by stating the redevelopment would be an improvement of
30 the long vacant site.

31
32 Mr. Talty informed the Commission of their consideration of keeping Phototronics and their ability to
33 obtain Conney's Pharmacy which positively affected the development. He stated although the ground
34 floor tenant has not yet been determined, the plaza amenity is important, also noting the project would
35 reduce the vehicular travel lanes and widen the sidewalk on Lincoln Avenue. He also explained how the
36 Lincoln Avenue improvements would enhance the community.

37
38 Mr. Talty then referred to the requested exceptions noting height is being driven by the market demand
39 for 15-foot ceiling heights for the commercial space and described the second, third and fourth residential
40 ceiling heights. He described how the building was designed from the inside out in terms of glass and
41 transparency. He reiterated the building height of 53-57 feet is being driven by its programming noting
42 they had the same conversation with the DRB and the Village Council. Mr. Talty stated the setbacks are a
43 function of the zero-lot line and the building's undulating façade with the result being a better overall
44 building.

45
46 Mr. Murphy stated the ground floor would be a special use of medical, financial and diagnostic services.
47 Mr. Talty then described the types of medical uses they propose for the space which would accommodate
48 the Village's demand. Mr. Talty then referred to the various elevations and stated the mixed-use building

1 would serve a multitude of masters including pedestrian and vehicular activity which required them to
2 ask for setback exceptions. He also referred to the elevations to further explain the need for the building's
3 height and grade variations. He then referred to pockets cut into the building along the east wall to
4 accommodate the emergency generators. He stated the fourth floor being pulled back served to pull the
5 building back and lessen the height impact from the street while identifying its proximity to 711 Oak and
6 Elm. Mr. Murphy also described how the building is pulled back on the Lincoln Avenue frontage, the
7 courtyard shape and expression and lower level residential parking. He explained the shadow study and
8 how it would impact surrounding properties.

9
10 Mr. Talty then stated in terms of how the building height would be impactful from the bridge over the
11 tracks on Elm, he identified an illustration from the midpoint view of the bridge looking east which he
12 commented he felt would fit in as time goes on. He concluded by stating a lot of information was
13 presented to the Commission and asked if there were any questions.

14
15 Ms. Danley referred to the Conney's Pharmacy authorization submitted as part of the application packet
16 and asked for a status update. Mr. Murphy responded it is under contract with a hard deposit and the
17 property would ultimately be acquired. Ms. Danley referred to mechanical equipment in the rendering
18 and its screening and asked if it would be visible from the street. Mr. Murphy stated it may be visible from
19 certain angles and they are making every attempt to minimize it. Ms. Danley then referred to the
20 commercial space on page 5 and asked if they did not plan to subdivide the space. Mr. Murphy responded
21 it may be broken down to five to seven tenancies.

22
23 Ms. Case asked if the commercial space would have conditions such as a potential restaurant use. Mr.
24 Murphy indicated they would be open to lower-intensity use restaurants, and they are cognizant of the
25 effects of full-service restaurants on the residential tenants. He added the additional uses they identified
26 as potential tenants would be similar to those in a high-class mall which tenants would be an amenity to
27 the Village.

28
29 Mr. Golan questioned the building's color. Mr. Murphy responded it would be white brick with contrasting
30 hardy board stone. Mr. Golan referred to nighttime lighting and whether it would be similar in intensity
31 to the surrounding blocks. Mr. Murphy responded it would be in context with the community and would
32 have a soft glow. Mr. Golan then questioned whether rules would be instituted for balconies near 711
33 Oak. Mr. Murphy stated there would be restrictions such as no barbeque grills, etc.

34
35 Mr. Vender stated with regard to alternative medical uses, he asked if they considered allocating a certain
36 amount of space to those uses due to its resistance from the community. Mr. Murphy responded their
37 plan is to have it integrated with several tenants. He also stated integrating the space with several tenants
38 would mitigate risk, downtown vacancy, etc. Mr. Murphy added they would prefer a high end bistro for
39 the space at the end.

40
41 Chairman Bradley stated the applicant is seeking a special use in advance which is not how it is typically
42 done and would allow the applicant to accelerate the process of acquiring a tenant and would create a
43 precedent. He commented he did not prefer for it to be done this way and any specific tenant which is a
44 special use would have to ask for approval. Chairman Bradley then referred to how the conditions applied
45 to the application would be applied to push those types of uses to the periphery. Mr. Murphy described
46 it as programmatic sensitivities and those types of high end tenants would want to know who would be
47 adjacent, etc. He also stated it would allow them to do the best they can for the community. Chairman
48 Bradley then asked if street grade parking on the ground floor would be designated for the commercial

1 tenant.

2
3 Chairman Bradley swore in Javier Milan with KLOA. Javier Milan stated a parking survey was conducted to
4 determine the current demand along with several other factors. He stated shopping centers represent a
5 combination of many different uses and described the typical demand. Mr. Milan informed the
6 Commission when combining peak season parking demand with the vacancies, there would be ample
7 parking in terms of what the space could generate. He then stated if the business is geared more toward
8 employees than customers, he referred to the use of parking lot permits. Chairman Bradley stated
9 blanketed special use approval should not be granted for an undetermined tenant with an unknown
10 parking demand and suggested conditions that could be imposed on an approval.

11
12 Ms. Danley asked the applicant if they have spoken to particular tenants and Mr. Murphy confirmed they
13 have. Ms. Danley then asked what type of restaurants they would consider appropriate for the space and
14 referred to the impact of deliveries. Mr. Murphy stated they would not seek high intensity restaurant uses
15 and indicated they spoke to a downtown Chicago restaurant as a potential tenant adding that there is
16 adequate demand to fill the space.

17
18 Mr. Foley agreed special use approvals should be individual determinations and commented it would be
19 problematic to do it in the aggregate and in advance. He asked if there would be a leasing office in the
20 building. Mr. Murphy responded there would be a leasing office for residential tenants. Mr. Talty stated
21 with regard to the 15 foot floor ceiling height for the retail space, it would actually be 12 feet after
22 accounting for mechanicals. He then stated on the Elm Street corridor with three tenants, it addressed
23 the issue of the grade change with three finished floor elevations requiring a wall between them.

24
25 Chairman Bradley commented the building design is beautiful and commended the applicant on their
26 presentation and asked for additional details on the residential units. Mr. Murphy stated in response to
27 the surveys done, he described the average unit size as 1,500 square feet and rent for the different size
28 units would range between \$7,500 and \$10,000. Chairman Bradley questioned the amount of noise
29 generated from the courtyard aggregation space. Mr. Murphy described sound sensitivity as a priority
30 with its design not yet finalized with landscaping to absorb noise along with low level music. Mr. Golan
31 referred to the east side and asked if it backed up to the Village parking lot. Mr. Murphy confirmed that
32 is correct. Mr. Murphy further described how different areas of the space could be used by tenants.

33
34 Ms. Kunkle commented the applicant has done an amazing job and accommodated the concerns
35 previously raised. She agreed with the concerns raised with regard to approval of hypothetical tenants.
36 She stated she also appreciated the incorporation of a green roof, storm water and the introduction of
37 windows and natural lighting which she commented is huge. Ms. Kunkle also commended the applicant
38 on providing the shadow study. No additional questions were raised at this time.

39
40 Chairman Bradley then asked for public comment and swore in those speaking to this matter.

41
42 Frank Petrek, 711 Oak, commented the applicant has done a good job in considering the neighbors'
43 concerns. He referred to his letters submitted as part of the packet. Mr. Petrek then identified his unit in
44 the illustration and referred to the complex's driveway in relationship to the applicant's property. He also
45 referred to Figure 15 on page 13 of the amenity terrace on the south elevation and asked for confirmation
46 as to whether there would be balconies or terraces on the south elevation except for the two units on the
47 southwest corner. Mr. Petrek also referred to paragraph 3 in the summary that the proposed exceptions
48 would not cause an adverse impact on neighboring properties. He then referred to the driveways between

1 the two properties and the building's wall on the setback line. Mr. Petrek stated they would be affected
2 and commented while the proposed building is beautiful, he wanted to bring the matter to the
3 Commission's attention.

4
5 Bob Wozniak, 699 Elm Street, stated he is the owner of townhouses across from the Hadley School. He
6 described the project as beautiful and questioned the angle parking on Elm. He asked if parallel or
7 alternative types of parking could be used to reduce the number of vehicles. Mr. Wozniak also described
8 it as a safety issue and suggested the use of bump-outs or landscaping.

9
10 Carolina Polo congratulated the applicant and described the project as amazing which addressed the
11 comments raised. She stated the community should be on the forefront as to how land is used and
12 referred to how situations have changed since Covid. Ms. Polo asked if additional research could be done
13 as to how the land can be used alternatively and suggested Winnetka could set an example by becoming
14 a trendsetter in terms of how space is used, such as a WeWork space. No additional comments were made
15 at this time. Chairman Bradley then closed public comment.

16
17 Mr. Talty stated he understands Mr. Wozniak's comments and regarding the Elm Street elevation, he
18 noted he worked on the downtown master planning taskforce with the proposal being part of the
19 downtown overall concept suggested by the consultant, Teska. He then stated in response to Mr. Petrek's
20 comments, he referred to the south elevation that Mr. Petrek referred and described it as the inside face
21 of a wall along the interior amenity terrace, which would not face the 711 Oak building. He confirmed
22 there would no balconies on the third and fourth floors on the south elevation and described how the
23 elevation stepped back. Mr. Murphy also confirmed there would be no balconies on the north elevation.

24
25 Chairman Bradley then called the matter in for discussion and outlined the Commission's options. Mr.
26 Vender referred to parking and restrictions and how it is used which represented his concern. He also
27 referred to the potential tenants and the special use steps that would need to be incorporated for special
28 use application approval. Mr. Vender commented he would prefer retail over medical uses and referred
29 to the amount of taxes a retail use would generate. He commented the design is fantastic, the scale is
30 reasonable and he would be in favor of recommending approval.

31
32 Mr. Golan referred to the previous proposal and how the current proposal has come a long way which he
33 described as phenomenal and would be a huge asset to the Village. He then stated with regard to indoor
34 parking, he referred to the elimination of the pedestrian corridor and shoppers' desire to park in front of
35 where they shop. Chairman Bradley questioned how parking would be enforced. Mr. Murphy responded
36 they would be vigilant in terms of management.

37
38 Ms. Case commended the applicant on their presentation and stated she is not opposed to the setbacks
39 and restrictions and her hesitation related to preauthorization of medical or financial special uses which
40 would require the imposition of too many conditions. She stated any special use applicant should come
41 before the Commission and she would rather not have preapproved of the medical and financial services
42 special uses as part of the application. Ms. Case concluded she is very much in favor of recommending
43 approval.

44
45 Ms. Danley agreed it is a beautiful and well thought out project and agreed with the Commission
46 Members' comments. She also agreed she did not agree with prior special use approval although she may
47 agree with its use on the periphery. Ms. Danley stated their preference is for retail at the prominent
48 corner. She then stated the building would serve to attract others to the Village.

1 Mr. Nielsen stated commercial parking represented his biggest concern and he is fine with the height,
2 setbacks and landscaping. He stated he would also prefer not to see a financial use in the space and
3 commented it is a great project compared to the presentation years ago.

4
5 Mr. Foley congratulated the applicant on an excellent presentation and referred to the traffic study done.
6 He agreed with the proposed height, setbacks, transformer location and lot consolidation as well as the
7 upper level setbacks. Mr. Foley also agreed with the comments made relating to preauthorized special
8 use approval. He referred to the benefits including the streetscape improvements which he commented
9 are necessary as well as the proposal's reference to the new Comprehensive Plan and included a variety
10 of residential options. Mr. Foley concluded the project would eliminate the current vacant lot and he is in
11 favor of recommending approval with stipulations. Ms. Kunkle agreed with the comments made including
12 not allowing preauthorized special use approval of medical and financial uses.

13
14 Chairman Bradley stated he agreed it was a wonderful presentation and referred to the planned
15 development standards and public benefits achieved that are the right balance with there not being
16 extraordinary exceptions being requested. He also referred to the height and parapet which would not be
17 visible from the street and setbacks in connection with the plaza and benefits achieved by the project.
18 Chairman Bradley then referred to the standards addressed by the proposal. He also agreed with the
19 concerns noted regarding precedent setting in connection with preauthorized special use approval
20 although the request is for a planned development. Chairman Bradley asked the applicant if they want to
21 remove the special use portion of the request, or the Commission can make a recommendation with
22 conditions noting the Commission is generally in favor of the request. Mr. Schoon clarified if the planned
23 development is approved by the Village Council and is silent on special use approvals, those special use
24 approvals would not come back before this Commission but would go to the Plan Commission.

25
26 Chairman Bradley suggested the Commission continue the request to a date certain in order for the
27 Commission to make their actual recommendation to the Village Council to determine whether conditions
28 are to be included or the full removal of the special use portion of the request. He then asked for a motion
29 to continue the public hearing to August 14, 2023, to provide the applicant and Village staff with additional
30 time to address questions and comments from the Commission and for the Commission to consider
31 recommending approval of the planned development and associated exceptions. A motion as stated by
32 Chairman Bradley was made by Mr. Golan and seconded by Ms. Kunkle. A vote was taken and the motion
33 unanimously passed, 8 to 0:

34 AYES: Bradley, Case, Danley, Foley, Golan, Kunkle, Nielsen, Vender

35 NAYS: None

36
37 **Old Business:**

38 In response to a question, Mr. Schoon provided the Commission with an update on the Walden project.

39
40 **New Business:**

41 a. August 2, 2023, Regular Meeting - Quorum Check.

42 b. August 14, 2023, Possible Special Meeting - Quorum Check.

43 The Commission Members previously discussed their availability.

44 c. August 16, 2023, Possible Special Meeting - Quorum Check.

45
46 **Adjournment:**

47 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. A vote
48 was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 8 to 0:

1 AYES: Bradley, Case, Danley, Foley, Golan, Kunkle, Nielsen, Vender

2 NAYS: None

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

4

5 Respectfully submitted,

6

7 Antionette Johnson

8 Recording Secretary