

**WINNETKA PLANNED DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES  
JANUARY 22, 2024**

**Members Present:** Matt Bradley, Chairman  
Jonathan Alt  
Mamie Case  
Layla Danley  
Chris Foley  
Lynn Hanley  
Mike Nielsen  
Todd Vender

**Members Absent:** Liz Kunkle

**Village Staff:** David Schoon, Director of Community Development  
Ann Klaassen, Assistant Director of Community Development

**Attorney Present:** Courtney Willits

**Call to Order:**

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

**Approval of Minutes:**

Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to approve the August 14, 2023, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the August 14, 2023, meeting minutes was made by Ms. Danley and seconded by Ms. Case. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 8 to 0:

AYES: Alt, Bradley, Case, Danley, Foley, Hanley, Nielsen, Vender

NAYS: None

**Public Comment:**

No comments were made at this time.

**Community Development Report:**

Mr. Schoon provided the Commission Members with an update in connection with the One Winnetka project including finalizing the development agreement details. He also provided the Commission Members with updates that the Village Council is considering adopting steep slope regulations along the Lake Michigan bluff as well as amendments to the zoning and subdivision code. No questions were raised at this time.

**New Applications:**

a. **Case No. 23-05-PD: 791 Elm Street - JPMorgan Chase Bank - Preliminary Planned Development:**  
An application seeking the following approval of subdivision and zoning relief to allow the construction of a new three-story commercial-use building: (1) a plat of consolidation to create one lot of record; 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

1 **setback requirement; (d) an exception from the minimum interior side yard setback requirement; (e)**  
2 **an exception from the minimum rear yard setback requirement; (f) an exception from the rear yard**  
3 **landscaped area requirement; (g) a special use to allow parking at street level; (h) a special use to allow**  
4 **a bank use within the C-2 Commercial Overlay District. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this**  
5 **request.**

6 Ms. Klaassen provided an overview of the site information and the overall project, the planned  
7 development process, the Village Council's comments during the concept plan review, the Design Review  
8 Board's review and recommendation and a summary of the zoning relief being requested. She then  
9 identified the three components of the property's planned redevelopment which include ground floor  
10 retail bank and a lobby measuring approximately 8,500 square feet with corporate offices on the second  
11 and third levels measuring approximately 18,000 square feet and outlined the proposed parking.

12  
13 Ms. Klaassen explained the three step planned development process noting the applicant is at the second  
14 step of the process – preliminary plan. She stated the proposed project being presented to the  
15 Commission is generally consistent with the site layout and building floor plans the Village Council  
16 reviewed in June 2023 noting the building façade changed in response to comments received. Ms.  
17 Klaassen then outlined the Council comments/issues for the applicant to consider during the review  
18 process relating to the design materials, the proposed height, reconsideration of the parapet height and  
19 additional articulation to minimize the height appearance. She also stated the applicant was asked to be  
20 mindful with regard to parking.

21  
22 Ms. Klaassen stated the Design Review Board (DRB) made a recommendation for approval and following  
23 this Commission's review and recommendation regarding the zoning relief being requested, the Village  
24 Council would consider the project and if the preliminary planned development is approved, the applicant  
25 would be required to submit all the necessary documents for final approval. She stated during the final  
26 review process, the Village Council could find it necessary to refer the project back to the DRB or the  
27 Planned Development Commission if they feel it is necessary, otherwise only the Council will review the  
28 final plan. Ms. Klaassen then provided a summary of the DRB's project review and their comments with  
29 the applicant then revising the building's design. She noted the DRB recommended approval included the  
30 overall building height being reduced in several areas as well as a reduction of the window sizes.

31  
32 Ms. Klaassen identified the pedestrian and vehicular entrances with the vehicular access points being  
33 consolidated. She stated the applicant would provide the 31 parking spaces required by code while also  
34 adding an additional on-street parking space on Green Bay Road. Ms. Klaassen summarized the Village's  
35 commercial parking requirements for new buildings and informed the Commission that the applicant  
36 submitted parking and traffic studies. Ms. Klaassen then described the current parking use by the  
37 applicant's employees and their use of parking passes and permits. She stated the Village's Director of  
38 Engineering found the parking and traffic studies met the standard methodology for such studies and  
39 found the proposed development would not create an adverse impact on traffic and parking. Ms. Klaassen  
40 then described the proposed streetscape improvements and light fixtures which are consistent with the  
41 Village's streetscape plan. She also described the trees which would be removed and replaced along with  
42 additional landscaping in bump-outs on Elm Street as well a description of landscaped areas at the  
43 northeast corner of the site and at the corner of Elm and Green Bay Road.

44  
45 Ms. Klaassen identified the existing utility pole at the northwest corner of the site in an illustration which  
46 serves neighboring properties and would remain, while also noting a pad mounted transformer in the  
47 same location and trash and recycling containers would be screened with decorative fencing. She  
48 informed the Commission the applicant is working with Village staff, legal counsel, and the Water and

1 Electric Department with regard to a utility easement for the transformer and the existing utility pole as  
2 well as considering the use of the easement in terms of future developments. She also explained that  
3 storm water detention is not required for the development due to the fact that the site is currently  
4 covered with impermeable surface.

5  
6 Ms. Klaassen identified the zoning exceptions and special use approvals required for the property relating  
7 to the plat of consolidation, height exceptions, setback exceptions, minimum rear yard setback and the  
8 proposed street level parking special use permit, all of which she described in detail. She also stated the  
9 retail bank use on the ground floor required special use approval noting there would be no drive-through  
10 facility. Ms. Klaassen stated in terms of compensating benefits, the applicant will elaborate on those  
11 during its presentation.

12  
13 Ms. Klaassen then referred to the standards the Commission is to consider and identified the next steps  
14 in the approval process with draft motions included in the agenda packet. She asked if there were any  
15 questions.

16  
17 Chairman Bradley also asked if there were any questions. Ms. Danley asked what the current corner and  
18 side yard setbacks are. Ms. Klaassen identified the setbacks in an illustration for the Commission and  
19 referred to the plat of survey on page 73 with the existing building being located on the property line  
20 along Elm Street and Green Bay Road with the exception of the corner at Elm and Green Bay. She noted  
21 the existing building is setback at the corner, similar to the condition being proposed at that corner. Ms.  
22 Hanley asked if there is existing access to the alley. Ms. Klaassen responded currently parking is located  
23 in that area so there is not access to the alley today. She noted the proposed plan included access being  
24 prohibited to the alley with signs to be posted.

25  
26 Chairman Bradley swore in those speaking to this matter. Scott Hurst of Gensler Architects, Christopher  
27 McKenna, JPMorgan Chase Project Manager, Brendan Penny, Meltzer Purtill & Stelle and Michael  
28 Werthmann, KLOA, introduced themselves to the Commission. Mr. McKenna provided the Commission  
29 with a project overview noting their business has grown and the existing building no longer  
30 accommodated their operations. He stated a bank has occupied the site for over 100 years and described  
31 the construction timeline which is to be completed by the end of 2025. Mr. McKenna described the  
32 proposed building and parking and identified the proposed building materials.

33  
34 Scott Hurst referred to an illustration for the special exception diagram and illustration of the proposed  
35 building. He also referred to the side yard setback request noting a zero lot line will not be maintained  
36 and the setback would be less than 3 feet from portions of the west property line because the property  
37 line is not perpendicular to the south property line or parallel with the east property line. Mr. Hurst stated  
38 with regard to the rear yard setback, a 10-foot setback would be maintained above grade and below grade  
39 parking would be built to the lot line to maximize the parking program. He stated with regard to  
40 landscaping, a 5-foot minimum landscape area is required for the rear lot line and there would be no  
41 landscaping provided at the rear to the north with the parking lot extending to the north lot line.

42  
43 Mr. Hurst then identified illustrations of the 24 below grade parking spaces, the retail branch on the Elm  
44 and Green Bay Road corner as well as the through lobby connecting to the parking lot to the north, the  
45 building entrances and street parking at the site entrance on Green Bay Road. He confirmed there would  
46 be a 6 inch curb at the alley entrance designed to allow for emergency vehicle entrance only. Mr. Hurst  
47 then described the programming on the second and third floors as well as the solar panel array and green  
48 roof system.

1 Mr. Hurst stated in terms of height, he referred to the 45 foot datum line and the discussion relating to  
2 breaking up the building scale and rhythm and highlighted the Elm Street road entrance. He noted the  
3 roof would be below the 45 foot height limit and described the limestone band around the building base  
4 and illustrations of the different parapet heights. He then referred to an illustration of the existing and  
5 proposed buildings to compare the height. Mr. Hurst also identified brick and limestone samples to be  
6 used along several elevations. He added the materials would wrap around toward the alley entrance.

7  
8 Mr. Hurst then identified the rear yard area where the above grade portion of the building is set back  
9 considerably from the north lot line noting the area below grade required the setback variation. He also  
10 referred to the shadow study performed which concluded there would be no impact to surrounding  
11 neighbors. Mr. Hurst then asked if there were any questions and identified the community benefits  
12 offered with the proposed development.

13  
14 Chairman Bradley asked if the building would apply for LEED Certification. Mr. Hurst responded since the  
15 building would exceed LEED Certifications, they may not seek that specific certification and identified the  
16 ILFI Core Certification they planned to seek.

17  
18 Michael Werthman stated they performed a traffic and parking study and identified 31 parking spaces  
19 provided by the proposed development which represented a 55% increase over the current condition and  
20 identified the parking space use. He noted the parking spaces would be sufficient to accommodate  
21 customers and clients with there being additional parking available surrounding the site which he  
22 described many trips to the site being part of multi-purpose trips to the business district. Mr. Werthmann  
23 identified the areas where employees would park reiterating the 31 parking spaces provided met the  
24 Village code. He noted the Village Engineer is comfortable with their findings and asked if there were any  
25 questions. No questions were raised at this time.

26  
27 Brendan Penny recapped the request the Commission is being asked to consider and referred to the  
28 standards and their responses submitted. He then asked if there were any questions. No questions were  
29 asked at this time.

30  
31 Chairman Bradley stated the Commission would first discuss parking. Mr. Alt stated the amount of  
32 employees onsite would result in a parking deficit. Mr. Werthmann responded the bank would need 16  
33 additional parking spaces and stated following a survey of the public parking lots in the West Elm district,  
34 they determined there would be a sufficient amount of parking and explained how the conclusion was  
35 reached. Chairman Bradley asked if there were comparables in terms of retail users who would use  
36 underground parking versus bank patrons. Mr. Werthmann identified the number of times wealth  
37 management clients would be directed to use underground parking. He referred to possible surface  
38 parking signage directed toward surface parking clientele and the possible consideration of timed parking.  
39 Member Vender questioned whether an additional vehicle charging station would be added with the one  
40 charging space being included as part of the proposal. Mr. Hurst responded it can be considered in the  
41 future. Ms. Case asked how patrons would know if underground parking is available. Chairman Bradley  
42 referred to Figure 13 on page 17. Mr. Hurst responded they are comfortable there would be parking  
43 available and they can explore technology to alert whether parking is full.

44  
45 Ms. Hanley asked if all parking spaces would be available to bank customers only or to the public as well.  
46 Mr. Werthmann responded all except for five, which would only be available for senior bank employees,  
47 would be available to bank customers, and the EV parking space would be open to the public. Ms. Hanley  
48 asked if the garage door would only be open during bank hours. Mr. Hurst confirmed it would remain

1 open during bank hours only. Ms. Hanley referred to the traffic study and with the increased use, she  
2 asked if there would be difficulty with left turns exiting the lot. Mr. Werthmann explained how traffic  
3 would maneuver on the site. Ms. Danley asked the applicant to incentivize ways for customers to park in  
4 allotted areas. Mr. Werthmann stated it would be the responsibility of the bank to alert customers where  
5 to park. No additional questions were raised at this time.

6  
7 Chairman Bradley stated the Commission would now discuss height. Member Vender stated the height is  
8 fine. Ms. Hanley asked if the solar panels would be visible and asked how the green roof would be  
9 accessed. Mr. Hurst identified how the green roof would be accessed and stated they are discussing ways  
10 to minimize the solar panel visibility noting the parapets would provide a screening benefit. Ms. Hanley  
11 suggested green roof elements not be visible from the street. Mr. Hurst identified the plantings which  
12 would not be visible from the street and which are still under discussion. He noted the height exceptions  
13 related to the parapets and the building's architectural features.

14  
15 Chairman Bradley asked for an explanation of the DRB's request for the building height reduction. Mr.  
16 Hurst explained the features and mechanicals which were reduced in order to bring down the building  
17 height and provided an explanation of the floor to floor ceiling heights. Member Vender questioned how  
18 45 feet for four floor height limitation was determined. Mr. Hurst stated four floors at a 45 foot limitation  
19 did not take into account the use of mechanical elements.

20  
21 Ms. Danley referred to page 37 of 298 and the applicant's response to maintaining certain aspects of the  
22 historic structure and modernizing the building's exterior. Mr. Hurst indicated they may relate to a  
23 previous proposal for a redesign of a building which predated the existing building. Member Vender asked  
24 if the wood ceiling would be visible inside the building. Mr. Hurst explained how they planned to include  
25 that design element. Mr. Alt asked the applicant if they considered two levels of underground parking.  
26 Mr. Hurst responded it would have been cost prohibitive. Chairman Bradley questioned the construction  
27 plans for the site. Mr. Hurst explained how the general contractors are being considered and how they  
28 would maintain the site.

29  
30 Chairman Bradley asked if there were any comments from the public. He swore in those speaking to this  
31 matter.

32  
33 Earl Fry asked if the EV would be a level 3 charger. He referred to the number of parking spaces and  
34 explained his difficulty in finding parking with the bank's current lot being used by non-bank customers  
35 and asked how the proposed parking would be policed. No additional comments were made at this time.

36  
37 Chairman Bradley called the matter in for discussion and identified the items the Commission is to  
38 consider. Mr. Vender stated there is not a lot which is controversial in the application and commented he  
39 liked the design and product. He stated all of the parking concerns he had were addressed and agreed  
40 with the suggestion of the use of the fastest EV charger and the limitation in terms of client parking and  
41 timed parking. Mr. Foley stated his questions were also answered during the presentation. Ms. Hanley  
42 agreed with the comments made and stated her questions related to height were addressed by the  
43 comparison illustration. She agreed parking is a concern and questioned how it would be managed. Ms.  
44 Hanley agreed with the recommendation of a fast EV charger and parking signage. Ms. Danley stated the  
45 applicant's response to the DRB resulted in a more natural development. She referred to left turns exiting  
46 the lot and asked if there is a Village limitation of having a smaller vehicle park to the south and if it  
47 represented a safety issue. Mr. Schoon responded in order to create space exiting a driveway, there is a  
48 minimum amount of space needed in that area which can be limited to use by compact vehicles. He also

1 stated he is not aware of the area being currently designated for compact vehicles only in terms of safety  
2 issues. Mr. Schoon noted the Village Engineer considered the design, traffic and parking study and did not  
3 find it to be an issue and if there is an issue later, it can be adjusted.

4  
5 Mr. Nielsen stated he would be in favor of the request and his questions relating to height were also  
6 addressed. He also stated there would be more parking spaces which would be achieved with  
7 underground parking being made available. Mr. Nielsen stated the EV space being a public benefit would  
8 be well used and suggested an additional EV space in the underground parking lot. He concluded by stating  
9 he would be in favor of the request. Ms. Case stated she is not concerned with the plat consolidation, the  
10 front yard setback and rear yard setback although she is concerned with parking. She suggested  
11 employees be required to use the underground parking which would free up on-street parking. Mr. Alt  
12 agreed with the comments made and described the proposal as well thought out with amenities. He  
13 referred to the additional amount of parking and the curb prohibiting alley access. Mr. Alt also agreed  
14 with Ms. Case's suggestion to have employees park underground and suggested not installing the EV  
15 charging space which would lend to an additional parking space being available. Chairman Bradley agreed  
16 with the comments made and stated he is also in support of the request although he is challenged with  
17 standard (a). He then identified the standards and special use which have been met. Chairman Bradley  
18 referred to the parking space gain as a result of the development and agreed with the suggestion of a  
19 faster EV charger.

20  
21 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to continue the request to their next meeting date of February 7,  
22 2024, to recommend approval of the request. The Commission Members discussed their availability and  
23 alternate meeting dates. Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to continue the application to February 21,  
24 2024. A motion was made by Member Vender and seconded by Member Danley. A vote was taken and  
25 the motion unanimously passed, 8 to 0:

26 AYES: Alt, Bradley, Case, Danley, Foley, Hanley, Nielsen, Vender

27 NAYS: None

28  
29 **New Business:**

30 a. **February 7, 2024 – Quorum Check.**

31 The Commission Members previously discussed their availability. Mr. Schoon explained the public notice  
32 issues for the Commission's meeting following DRB meetings and asked for the Commission Members'  
33 comments regarding moving their regular meeting date to the third Wednesday. Members present stated  
34 they would be available on the third Wednesday of the month for a regular meeting. Mr. Schoon stated  
35 staff would talk with the member not present to find out their availability on the third Wednesday of the  
36 month.

37  
38 **Adjournment:**

39 Chairman Bradley asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Hanley and  
40 seconded by several Commission Members. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 8 to  
41 0:

42 AYES: Alt, Bradley, Case, Danley, Foley, Hanley, Nielsen, Vender

43 NAYS: None

44  
45 The meeting was adjourned at 8:48 p.m.

46 Respectfully submitted,

47 Antionette Johnson

48 Recording Secretary