

**WINNETKA PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
JULY 23, 2025**

Members Present: Layla Danley, Chairperson
Matthew Bradley
Jonathan Alt
Christopher Blum
Mamie Case
Kate Van Vlack

Members Absent: Chris Enck
Liz Kunkle
Cyrus Subawalla

Non-Voting Members Absent: Bridget Orsic

Village Staff: Scott Mangum, Community Development Director
Ann Klaassen, Assistant Director of Community
Development

Call to Order & Roll Call:

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Danley at 7:03 p.m. Ms. Klaassen took roll call of the Commission Members present.

Approval of June 25, 2025, Meeting Minutes:

Chairperson Danley asked for a motion to approve the June 25, 2025, meeting minutes. A motion to approve the June 25, 2025, meeting minutes was made by Mr. Bradley, and seconded by Ms. Case. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

AYES: Alt, Blum, Bradley, Case, Danley, Van Vlack

NAYS: None

NON-VOTING: None

Public Comment:

No comments were made at this time.

Community Development Report:

Mr. Mangum advised the Commission of the status of the Hubbard Woods train station special use and Certificate of Appropriateness application considered by the Village Council.

Chairperson Danley noted the second agenda item would be renoticed for consideration at a future meeting.

New Applications:

a. **Case No. 25-11-SU: 720 Elm Street - Charles Schwab & Company:** An application seeking approval of a Special Use Permit submitted by Charles Schwab & Company, Inc., as the prospective lessee of the commercial space located at 720 Elm Street to allow a financial counseling office in the C-

1 **2 General Retail Commercial Overlay District. The property is currently owned by MDG Winnetka One,**
2 **LP. The Village Council has final jurisdiction on this request.**

3 Ms. Klaassen summarized the application to relocate an existing Charles Schwab office in the Village into
4 the One Winnetka building and identified the property owner, its location and zoning classification in the
5 overlay district. She then identified allowed special uses and referred to the red cross hatched area in an
6 illustration which represented the overlay district. Ms. Klaassen then summarized the partial approval of
7 special uses and findings granted by the Village Council for the One Winnetka Planned Development. She
8 stated the applicant provided illustrations of other offices which showed how they are viewed from the
9 street as well as the proposed signage package to be reviewed by the Design Review Board (DRB). Ms.
10 Klaassen summarized the proposed occupancy and street frontage with the financial service use
11 complying with the required location and limitations outlined in the ordinance approving One Winnetka
12 and the medical uses and financial service uses, and identified the number of employees, office hours,
13 planned event functions and current level of use by employees and visitors.

14
15 Ms. Klaassen then described the proposed parking plan and the amount of parking provided in the One
16 Winnetka development. She then identified the special use standards the Commission is to focus on and
17 the applicant's responses which are included on page nos. 15 and 16. Ms. Klaassen stated following the
18 applicant's presentation, the Commission Members may make a motion recommending approval or
19 denial with draft language provided in the agenda packet and noted staff did not receive any public
20 comment on the request. She then asked if there were any questions.

21
22 Mr. Alt questioned the East Elm parking lot and asked if the parking lot would remain as part of the
23 development site. Ms. Klaassen responded that area is no longer part of the development site with the
24 Village owned public parking lot to remain. She added there would be underground parking spaces for the
25 residents on the One Winnetka site and described the amount and location of the proposed parking and
26 how it would function. Mr. Bradley referred to the previous discussion with regard to certain allowed
27 special uses in terms of how the Commission would consider the standards. He also referred to the
28 amount of adequate parking and issues with regard to signage being consistently applied for subsequent
29 tenants. Ms. Klaassen responded signage issues would be individually addressed in terms of consistency.
30 Chairperson Danley stated the DRB would review those issues.

31
32 Mr. Blum questioned the lease term and how the space would be divided. Ms. Klaassen responded the
33 applicant can respond and referred to the different floor plans provided to show proposed locations of
34 the commercial spaces. He then questioned parking for commercial tenants. Ms. Klaassen confirmed
35 reserved spaces are not required. Ms. Van Vlack questioned the hours of operation and whether their
36 other locations had Saturday hours and parking during the week. She also commented on the proposed
37 signage for the building which would not fit in terms of Village standards. Ms. Van Vlack then referred to
38 the building's visual appearance on the weekends when the tenant is closed. Ms. Klaassen responded the
39 Village has a restrictive sign code which needed to be met or they would have to request approval of a
40 sign code variation. She stated the representation presented by the applicant may not necessarily be
41 approved by the DRB. No additional questions were raised at this time.

42
43 Chairperson Danley swore in those speaking to this matter. Brandon Garnett, Project Manager of the
44 Charles Schwab Commercial Real Estate Development Group, introduced the team to the Commission.
45 Linda Short, Charles Schwab Leasing Manager, and Deirdre Clein, with MDG Winnetka One, the landlord.
46 He then referred to the provisionally approved sign in 2024 for One Winnetka and explained that the
47 photos provided an image of the proposed lobby space. Mr. Garnett stated their signage package
48 represented their initial design and they are working with the landlord's group in terms of consistency.

1 He also described the approval package with regard to parking including hours of operation, etc. Mr.
2 Garnett then described the traffic flow and the amount of time customers would visit the location. He
3 informed the Commission of the limited amount of anticipated planned evening events.
4

5 Chairperson Danley asked if the 12 employees would be at the office at the same time. Mr. Garnett
6 confirmed that is correct and explained the amount of employees anticipated to use the space and their
7 plans to fully maximize the space. Mr. Blum asked what the current square footage of their existing space
8 is. Ms. Short responded the current square footage is 3,500 square feet and that the new space would be
9 approximately 1,000 square feet larger and explained the reasoning for relocating to the larger space.
10

11 Ms. Case asked if the evening events are for customers. Ms. Short responded they would be client events
12 or investment seminars as well as how parking would be addressed for such events by using valet parking.
13 She also explained their consideration of several other areas for relocation. It was confirmed the lease
14 term would be for 15 years. Ms. Van Vlack questioned security measures. Ms. Short responded the
15 deposits made are not cash and confirmed they do not have a security guard. Mr. Garnett explained the
16 wireless holdup buttons and security system they have in place. Ms. Short and Mr. Garnett explained their
17 community wall and how the space would appear visually in terms of window heights, etc. Chairperson
18 Danley referred to the proposed plan in Figure 5 with regard to the window's appearance. Mr. Garnett
19 summarized the items contained in view of the window. He also explained the beverage bar and proposed
20 planting they planned to use. Mr. Garnett and Ms. Short then explained how confidential transactions
21 would take place and not in public view in the front conference room. Mr. Garnett added they are in the
22 planning phases in terms of signage for all of the retail tenants in the building, in terms of consistency. He
23 also explained the staircase in the center and access between the parking on-site and the office.
24

25 Mr. Blum questioned the parking lot access off Lincoln and referred to the limited number of doors in that
26 area. Deidre Clein explained the division of the space and the grade change with the ground floor being
27 occupied by four tenants as well as the rear corridor access. Mr. Blum asked about the allocation of
28 interior parking spaces. Ms. Clein explained the parking spaces to be occupied by residents would be
29 accessed separately and would be below grade, and that 10 of the ground level commercial spaces would
30 be reserved for Charles Schwab during business hours and the remaining spaces would be first-come first-
31 served. She also informed the Board of letters of intent for future tenants which may require special use
32 approval. Ms. Clein also explained how the future tenants may not need special use permits. No additional
33 questions were raised at this time.
34

35 Chairperson Danley noted there is no one in the public to comment and called the matter in for discussion.
36 Mr. Bradley stated he would be in support of the request and commented the applicant did a wonderful
37 job, with his only concern relating to the signage cohesiveness on the exterior which is not within the
38 Commission's purview. Ms. Van Vlack agreed with the comments made and stated she would be in
39 support of the request. Mr. Alt agreed with the comments made and stated that he would be in support
40 of the request. Ms. Case, Mr. Blum, and Chairperson Danley also stated they would be in support of the
41 request. Chairperson Danley noted her only concern related to standard no. 9 in connection with the
42 windows. She then asked the applicant to be conscious with regard to its appearance not being a blank
43 space and asked for a motion.
44

45 Mr. Alt moved to recommend approval of the requested special use to allow the applicant to operate a
46 financial counseling office at 720 Elm Street in the commercial overlay district based on the findings of
47 fact he read into the record from page nos. 15 and 16. Ms. Case seconded the motion. A vote was taken
48 and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

1 AYES: Alt, Blum, Bradley, Case, Danley, Van Vlack
2 NAYS: None
3 NON-VOTING: None
4

5 **b. Case No. 25-12-SD: 881 Private Road and 883 Private Road:** Applications seeking approval of (i)
6 a Final Plat of Subdivision to relocate the lot line dividing the two properties, which requires a finding
7 of "No Material Increased Adverse Impact" for the existing improvements on proposed Lot 2 (881
8 Private Road), which currently (a) observe less than the minimum required total side yard setback; and
9 (b) exceed the maximum permitted width for a front-facing attached garage; and (ii) zoning variations
10 to permit: (a) proposed Lot 1 (883 Private Road) to provide less than the minimum required front street
11 line for an interior lot; and (b) proposed Lot 2 (881 Private Road) to provide less than the minimum
12 required lot depth in the R-2 Single-Family Residential Zoning District. The Village Council has final
13 jurisdiction on this request. This item is not ready for this meeting. Notices will be sent when the item
14 is ready for consideration by the Plan Commission at a future meeting.
15 This agenda item would be renoticed for consideration at a future meeting.
16

17 **New Business.**

18 a. August 27, 2025, Meeting – Quorum Check.
19 The Commission Members discussed their availability.
20

21 **Adjournment:**

22 Chairperson Danley asked for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Bradley. The
23 motion was seconded. A vote was taken and the motion unanimously passed, 6 to 0:

24 AYES: Alt, Blum, Bradley, Case, Danley, Van Vlack
25 NAYS: None
26 NON-VOTING: None

27 The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.
28

29 Respectfully submitted,

30
31 Antionette Johnson
32 Recording Secretary