



VILLAGE OF WILMETTE

1200 Wilmette Avenue
WILMETTE, ILLINOIS 60091-0040

MEETING MINUTES PLAN COMMISSION

**TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 2015
7:00 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

Members Present: Scott Goldstein, Chairman
Michael Bailey
Richard DeLeo
Christine Norrick
Steven Schwab
Maria Choca Urban

Members Absent: Gary Kohn

Staff Present: John Adler, Director of Community Development

I. CALL TO ORDER.

Chairman Goldstein called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES; PLAN COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 3, 2015.

Mr. Adler said the meeting minutes were not included in the Plan Commission's packet so they will be on the agenda at the next Plan Commission meeting.

III. 2015-P-01 607-617 GREEN BAY ROAD - PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

A request by M & R Development, LLC for approval of a Planned Unit Development Preliminary Plan and Special Use to permit the construction of a mixed use building containing approximately 6,550 square feet of commercial space and approximately 95 rental apartments on the property at 607-617 Green Bay Road.

Ms. Urban moved to continue the case to the April 8th meeting. Mr. DeLeo seconded the motion. The vote was as follows:

Charmain Goldstein	Yes
Michael Bailey	Yes
Richard DeLeo	Yes
Gary Kohn	Absent
Ms. Norrick	Yes
Steven Schwab	Yes
Maria Choca Urban	Yes

Motion was carried

Case Minutes are attached

V. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

VII. AJDOURNMENT.

At 8:15 p.m., Ms. Urban moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. DeLeo. Voting yes: Chairman Goldstein, Mr. Bailey, Mr. DeLeo, Ms. Norrick, Mr. Schwab and Ms. Urban. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

The meeting was thereafter adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

John Adler
Director of Community Development

3.0 TESTIMONY, COMMENTS AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

- 3.11 Mr. Hal Francke, Meltzer Purtill & Stelle LLC., attorney
- 3.12 Mr. Bill Patrun, M & R Development
- 3.13 Mr. Brad Lewis, Schwarz Lewis Design Group, architect and site planner
- 3.14 Mr. Bill Schwarz, Schwarz Lewis Design Group, architect
- 3.15 Mr. Brett Duffy, Spaceco, Inc., civil engineer
- 3.16 Mr. Luay Aboona, PE, from KLOA, engineer
- 3.17 Mr. Daniel Weinbach, Daniel Weinbach and Partners. LTD, landscape Architect

3.2 Summary of comments

- 3.21 Chairman Goldstein said that the main subject for the meeting is 607-617 Green Bay Road Planned Unit Development proposal.

He discussed the meeting procedure. This is an important block. Planning efforts for this block include the Comprehensive Plan, a ULI study, the master plan for the Village. The zoning ordinance was rewritten that updated the standards of review for the VC.

The Commissioners will look at how tonight's proposal fits with the standards set out in the ordinance for a planned development. They are looking for overall consistency with the standards. The commissioners are weighing the exceptions the applicant is requesting from zoning against public benefit and what is a benefit to the Village.

People who intend to speak at the hearing will be sworn in. The applicant will make a presentation. Public comments are then invited. If people came in groups, they should come up to the podium together and have one spokesperson, if possible, but others in the group can also make remarks. If any members of the public have questions for the applicant they can ask them when they speak. After the public hearing is closed, commissioners will discuss the standards and exceptions.

- 3.22 Mr. Adler said this is case 2015-P-01. It is a request by M and R Development LLC for approval for a planned unit development preliminary plan and a special use to permit the construction of a mixed use building containing approximately 6,550 square feet of commercial space and approximately 95 rental units on the property. The PUD process consolidates the zoning board of appeals, appearance review commission, and plan commission reviews into one process. Included in

the request is zoning relief outlined in the case report on pages 5, 6 and 7 and approval of the consolidations of the parcels on the site into one lot of record. That is document 1.28.

The applicant has submitted responses to the various PUD appearance and special use standards. Those responses are attached to the case report as document 2.9. The ARC held an advisory review of this development on November 3, 2014. The minutes from that meeting are attached as document 2.22.

He spoke about various areas discussed at the ARC meeting because the report does not get into that amount of detail. The ARC provided suggestions at that meeting and the applicant responded to the suggestions including providing parapet wall detail, on document 1.15 sheet A17; they improved the alignment of the first floor to better relate to the upper stories; they reduced the height of transom windows at the residential entrance; they reduced the size of the projecting sign for residential apartments; they extended the sun shade above the fifth floor windows one additional bay towards the center of the building. Regarding the rear elevation, they added brick to the fourth floor; they provided greater detail of the landscape plans consistent with conceptual plans presented at ARC. There were two items that the ARC discussed that were not addressed. There was a discussion of the possibility of planting some trees on the east side of the Village parking area west of the proposed development and the desire to have customer parking and a way to go through the parking area to Green Bay Road.

Village staff at tonight's meeting includes Mr. Adler, Brigitte Berger, Director of Engineering Services; Luke Mattson, Village consulting engineer; Michael Zimmermann, Village attorney.

- 3.23 Mr. Francke said he will make introductory remarks. The property is under contract to his client. The seller is the Village. The contract was signed many months ago and there have been many meetings with Village staff to create the plan before the commissioners. They went to an advisory ARC meeting and will discuss this during their presentation.

The contract contemplates what they are presenting this evening to the public which is a mid-rise building of no more than 77' above grade as measured to the top of the roof slab, approximately 7,000 square feet of commercial retail space on the ground floor on Green Bay Road, 94 to 98 rental units above the ground floor with an average square footage of 991 square feet per unit, and at least 125 accessory parking spaces for commercial and residential. There are a series of plans that are attached to the contract that require the developer to come in with plans that substantially conform to those. Ultimately to be built is what is approved by the Village Board after getting input from tonight's meeting and what is referred to in the contract as municipal approvals.

The contract laid out clear guidelines as to what the Village expected in terms of a development that would further the goals and objectives of the comprehensive plan and the VC master plan. The property is zoned VC. They are seeking a special use for a PUD. They are seeking a combined preliminary and final PUD plan approval with exceptions that are within the nature of a PUD. They will talk about the exceptions at the meeting. They are asking for a consolidation of the existing parcel into a single parcel of record.

He introduced Bill Patron. He and Mr. Patron have worked with the people behind M & R Development since the 1980s. M & R Development is a premier first class very experienced developer of mixed use developments.

- 3.24 Mr. Patron said they are very happy about this opportunity. It does not come around too often. They tried to put a program together that is representative of their obligations under the contract and to start to build the dialog with the Village moving forward.

He gave a history of M & R Development that was founded by Tom Moran and Anthony Rossi Sr. in 1986. There were other affiliate partnerships involved from the late 1980s. They are one of the largest developers of luxury high-end rental properties and communities in the suburbs and in the city of Chicago. They developed 14 properties, 3,755 units. This proposal is setting a new standard. He talked about high-end amenities and finishes. In this project they are proposing a 10' ceiling, which is something special. There is a lot of detailing, computer niches, high-tech wiring throughout units, 42" cabinetry in the kitchens, first-class finish materials. They are dedicated to building green and providing sustainable projects. He talked about other projects they recently completed. Their three latest projects obtained LEED gold. They strive for that on their project in the Village.

They have retail experience and retail space is important for the project in Wilmette. They have to capture the right retail tenant. They are working on a project in the city with 175,000 square feet of retail. One important element of a community like this is property management. They connect with the residents at every level. They want to connect their residents with the Village.

He talked about Central Station in Evanston, which is a development that recently opened. Village staff visited the site and got a feeling for the level of quality. That is also a mixed use development. He talked about the level of finishes and amenities at Central Station. A lot of attention is paid to detailing in the units. They always keep in mind a sustainable environment.

- 3.25 Mr. Lewis said they are thrilled to be involved with this project. He has been involved in a lot of these projects. Their original concept was to create the look/feel of a luxury boutique hotel. The building is casual and relaxed with a cyber cafe and sitting rooms. The finishes will be of the best quality. They will have a fitness center and yoga rooms on the first floor. On some of the upper

levels they will have gaming areas, conference rooms, and business centers. He talked about garden terraces where residents can look down onto the terraces. There is a landscaped area for residents. They created terraces on the upper roof that are more private. They are trying to create a sophisticated casual contemporary look. There will be a mix of tenants.

They employ a popular transitional architecture. They want to take a contemporary interior and combine it with a more traditional exterior. It has a triple part building with a strong base, middle and top. The Village was adamant that a building be created that had a lot of undulation and moved from the bottom to the top. The building has a lot of movement all the way around it.

He showed an aerial of the location. He described the site. They felt strongly that they had to create more interior views for the residents. He explained the site data including a lot area of 40,107 square feet and lot coverage 37,008 square feet. There are 95 units and a mixture of one, two and three-bedroom units. Approximately 6,550 square feet of space is commercial retail. There are 129 parking spaces. The height is 78' to the top of the roof and five stories of residential and one story of commercial. There is a two-level parking garage.

He showed the building footprint. There is a 5' setback in the front. They tried to soften the streetscape per the Village's request. There is a 20' alley in the back. There is a loading zone on the north side. It is a zero lot line building.

He showed the first floor of 6,500 square feet of commercial. There is also a leasing office and parking on the first floor. There will be parking for retail tenants. Garbage pick-up is in the back. They like the idea of having the fitness center and leasing on the first floor. It shows activity in the building and tenants like that and prospective shoppers also like that.

He then showed the second level and parking garage. There is a mezzanine area. He exhibited the first level of residential. There are gardens. He showed another level. There are large storage areas for tenants. The second floor has the garden spaces for residents. The residents can use the whole building. The two largest units in the front of the building have their own private terraces. The roof plan shows the condensers, screening around the building, penthouse. It is not just a big box of a building.

When they met with the ARC, they got some good suggestions and tried to follow as many of them as possible. They were looking for a better relationship between commercial and residential. They were concerned about some building massing. They wanted to enhance the center of the building and make it more prominent and so that there was a focal point. They wanted the developer to increase the amount of masonry around the building.

He showed the front façade. The relationship of the windows to the first floor needed to be a more vertical statement per the ARC. They brought the middle

portion of the building forward so they have a focal point.

He showed the west side of the building. The ARC wanted them to raise the brick another level, and bring the same materials around the sides and the rear.

The south side of the building shows materials and banding returning. There are vertical details tying the two top window elements together.

The north side of the building also shows material and banding returning all the way around the building.

- 3.26 Mr. Bill Schwarz explained some of the exceptions they are seeking. There are 13 of them on the list.

Ground floor office use – the development team wants the leasing office on the ground floor. Per zoning that would require a special use.

Parking at grade – the ordinance does not allow for residential parking at grade. It is for below or above grade. They will have parking in the garage on the ground level.

Increase in maximum permitted height – the core district allows for 65'. They are asking for 78' to the top of the roof system. The contract was at 77' to the top of the roof slab.

Maximum permitted encroaching of parapet walls – Once they are above 65', parapet walls can be 2' above that. They are at 78' and plan to go up 2' and 5'. They are also using parapet walls to screen mechanicals. They are 18' above the allowed dimension.

Elevator override and stairways going up to the roof and some mechanical equipment – they are allowed 12' above the 65' height per the ordinance. They will be at 11'10" for that space above the 78' proposed building height, 24'10" above the 65' height limit.

Varying roof line heights on east and west building façade in excess of 25' linear feet – the ordinance looked for a way to break up the mass of the building. They did a good job of breaking up that massing, but in some cases they exceed 25'. They have different intervals.

The misalignment of the horizontal ground floor and upper stories of the façade elements in comparison to elements of surrounding buildings – the existing streetscape has 18' to 24' high buildings. They have a 20' ground floor. They are at 78' because they need extra height on the ground floor to get to two levels of parking. They are 10' floor to ceiling in the units.

The reduction in the minimum number of off-street parking spaces devoted to the proposed commercial space – they looked at different types of uses because they don't know what their final use will be. If they have two fast food type places, they need a lot more parking. He doesn't see that happening and a sit down restaurant would have a lesser requirement.

The reduction in the minimum number of dedicated pedestrian access paths – they are over 150' in the length of the property and the code requires 2. They are proposing not having any because the path would lead to an alley system which is not a safe environment. There is no sidewalk system in the middle of the block.

The reduction in the minimum ground floor transparency from 40% to 32% - he is not sure how transparency is calculated and if they include window frames they are much closer to 40% but they took the glass area.

The increase in the maximum permitted area ground floor residential common space from 600' which is required – they have about 3,400 square feet which a lot is back of the house areas. The leasing office and other amenities are 1,200 square feet. In the back is bike storage and a dog grooming area. They are asking for this exception so they can have their leasing office and other spaces which would exceed 600 square feet.

The increase in the maximum permitted height of an outdoor fireplace from 15' to 35' above grade – the ordinance indicates that it cannot be more than 15' but that is contemplating it being on the ground. They are starting their unit 20' above. They are not sure that they are doing fireplaces and are currently not showing that. There are some fire pits but no chimney at this time.

Regarding signage, the ordinance indicates that one primary sign is allowed. They have the leasing center and possibly two other tenants so they are looking for three signs. They are allowed to have one secondary projecting sign and they are asking for three. They are asking for a projecting sign that is 14 square feet, which is larger than allowed. They had that sign projecting further so they are asking for a 5' versus a 4' projection.

- 3.27 Mr. Duffy showed an aerial of the site. To the east is Green Bay Road, to the north is retail and then Central Avenue and to the south there is more retail. The Village provides water service to the building through a 12" main that runs along Green Bay Road. Sanitary sewer collection will be into the Village's 18" sewer which is in the alley behind the building. It will discharge for storm water and sanitary sewer.

Regarding storm water management, the building will be drained through a system of roof drains routed to a detention vault located under the first floor of the garage. It will then discharge into the combined sewer in the alley. The

detention meets the Village's requirements. The Village was concerned that they meet the existing release rates for the site in its current condition, which is a park with a rain garden. The detention vault was sized to release water at the same rate as it does now. The site was previously a fully paved car dealership. They will meet the current run off requirements. Access to the building parking will be from the rear alley. The entrance to the front of the building is via the sidewalk along Green Bay Road.

- 3.28 Mr. Aboona said his firm provided the traffic study for the project. He referenced the aerial and talked about the study area, which included the intersections of Green Bay and Wilmette, Green Bay and Central, and Wilmette and Park, all which are signal controlled and the intersection of Central and Park, which is an all stop control. They looked at the alley intersections of Wilmette and Central. Those are six key intersections impacted by the proposed development. They took counts during the morning and evening peak periods. They considered the impact of the train and the crossing events and how that impacts Green Bay Road and the signals at Central and Wilmette. When that happens, traffic backs up on Central and on Wilmette. Green Bay Road gets an extended green time. There was queuing of traffic on Central and Wilmette and it extends beyond the alley during those times. When the gates are up, traffic and the queues tend to clear in 2 to 3 cycles. They estimated the traffic that would be generated by the development. Given the location and proximity to the train, some residents will take the train to work. About 15% of the residents in the area currently take the train.

Regarding the commercial space, they looked at two scenarios – one with all retail and one with all restaurants. Given the location of the site and the ability of traffic to go in many directions, there will not be a significant impact on any intersection. The maximum amount of increase is less than 2% and that is at Green Bay and Central. That is a minimal increase. None of the traffic operations, level of service or delays will be increased significantly. The intersections will operate at current service levels.

They made some recommendations to help traffic from the alley. There should be a sign on Wilmette Avenue at the alley facing west saying do not block intersection. Regarding the alley at Central, there is a blind spot because of the building being so close to the sidewalk and they recommended that a sign be put up saying watch for pedestrians.

The alley is being used now and is active. The residents of this building will become familiar with the alley and its constraints.

He showed an exhibit depicting Green Bay Road treatment and striping at the intersection of Wilmette and Central. There are left turn lanes on Green Bay as well as right turn lanes. There are on-street parking spaces, 12 on Green Bay Road on the east side and 9 on the west side. There are not a lot of spaces in front of the site, which has 175' of frontage on Green Bay. There is a depressed

curb that served the car dealership and there is a fire hydrant. Those spaces are limited to two hour parking between 8-5, Monday-Friday.

The exhibit shows the proposed treatment of the curb side on Green Bay along the frontage. They maintained the number of on-street parking spaces along Green Bay. They eliminated the depressed curb that exists. They relocated the hydrant further south and maintained 9 spaces and created a drop off and pick up zone about 50' long. It would allow for two cars.

The exhibit also shows the alley and proposed access. There will be two curb cuts into the garage. The southern access point will provide access to ground floor parking, 61 spaces, 10 reserved for retail/commercial employees. The driveway will allow for two-way movements with exiting traffic under stop sign control. There is access to mezzanine parking with 68 spaces. There will be a two lane ramp – one up and one down – for serving that level, which is for residents. Cars exiting will be under stop sign control but they are also recommending mirrors to help and some warning devices for vehicles exiting the garage. Through the existing east/west alley, the loading dock to the building will be provided. All deliveries will be made through a single unit, 30' panel trucks. They ran some truck turning diagrams. Because of the width of the alley and power poles there are some constraints. They will have to come south on the alley, back into the loading dock and go south when exiting onto Wilmette Avenue. They have been working with Village staff and the Village's consultant regarding the traffic study and the results. They have gone through a few iterations and have provided staff with all requested information. They all agree with design with some minor adjustments.

- 3.29 Mr. Weinbach reviewed the site landscape plan. Currently along Green Bay Road there are existing trees in tree grates. They are proposing to put new trees into open planters. This is better for the trees. They proposed Honey Locusts, shrubs, and perennials in the linear planters. The tree at the bottom is an existing tree at the property line that will be maintained.

The second floor shows an amenity deck for all residents. The north side is a series of private spaces for the units that open out onto it. Other than the paving for the units, the rest of the deck will be entirely planted. It will be planting with shrubs, trees, ground cover and perennials. The south deck is the amenity deck. There are a few units that have spaces that open out onto this deck, but they will be screened. They tried to create semi-private spaces so if one has a small gathering there are alcoves for sitting and for privacy. Along the south edge are square spaces that will have a pergola above them. They will be surrounded by plantings. There are two more spaces on the north side. In the center are more communal spaces. On the left side is a fire pit with seating, planters and a built-in table with a fire element that is in the center of the space. On the right side, there is a grilling station with three grills. The rotated square is a specimen tree with plantings.

They are required to do a detailed landscape plan and the plan specifies everything but the final selection of perennials.

On the sixth floor are two communal spaces. One enters at an angle and there is a small fire pit with a planter behind it. These are meant for 2 to 3 small gatherings or one larger gathering. The slides show details they will use. There is a roof garden. The pergolas are typical of what they do although they might not use the exact design. There is a series of alcoves with an open structure. He showed the type of precast pavers they would use and they would be on a pedestal system. The walls are a precast block wall with a horizontal linear quality.

- 3.30 Mr. Francke wanted to highlight a few of the goals and objectives of each plan that the proposed development accomplishes and furthers. There are unique features for the development.

This information is in the packet. The PUD will further the following goals and policies of the comprehensive plan.

- 1-encourage retail facilities that serve the needs of Village residents
- 2-provide housing option that compliments the single family character of the Village
- 3-provide market rate multi-family housing for older residents of the Village who want to remain in the Village
- 4-provide for non-single family detached housing options
- 5-encourage the redevelopment of underutilized commercial properties
- 6-provide an attractive appearance along the public way

Regarding the VC master plan:

- 1-this proposal will provide new residential uses that will support and help sustain an active VC
- 2-it will provide higher density multi-family residential opportunities that support current and future lifestyle needs
- 3-maintaining a balanced retail environment and experience that consists of independent retailers and restaurants
- 4-providing a well-integrated and design strategy with increased density with little impact on surrounding residential single family neighborhoods
- 5-provide for continued streetscape and open space improvements
- 6-achieve a critical mass of energy and market activity that will support existing and future businesses in the VC
- 7-promote the development of a vacant and underutilized parcel of land
- 8-create a development that is not a big box and not a drive through
- 9-create an opportunity for first floor retail on Green Bay Road
- 10-provide open spaces, public and private, and streetscape environments
- 11-help create a new vibrant and economically sustainable VC
- 12-increase the VC's recognition as a desirable place to live and shop
- 13-help further the development and improvement of other high quality

development in the VC
14-it will promote a mixed use commercial environment
15-provide a new high density opportunity for multi-family housing

He asked the PC to find favor with the plan. They think that the plan is fabulous for the Village and look forward to questions and comments.

4.0 INTERESTED PARTIES

4.1 Persons speaking on the application

- 4.11 Ms. Kathleen O’Laughlin, 341 Greenleaf, President, Wilmette Public Library Board
- 4.12 Ms. Virginia George, Wilmette Public Library Board Trustee
- 4.13 Ms. Lisa McDonald , Wilmette Public Library Board Trustee
- 4.14 Ms. Ellen Clark, Director of the Library
- 4.15 Ms. Lorelei McClure, 1135 Wilmette Avenue, President, Wilmette Cares
- 4.16 Ms. Lisa Braganca, 2125 Washington Avenue, Vice President, Wilmette Cares
- 4.17 Mr. Carter Cleland, 1216 Lake Avenue
- 4.18 Mr. Jim Griffith, 1210 Glendenning
- 4.19 Ms. Jennifer Peters, 2427 Pomona Lane
- 4.20 Ms. Ellen McManus, 705 11th Street
- 4.21 Mr. Bob Surman, 915 Amherst Lane
- 4.22 Ms. Christine DiClementi-Harlow, Owner, A La Carte Catering
- 4.23 Mr. Jim Versino, 1400 Orrington Road, Deerfield, Owner, Wilmette Bicycle and Sport Shop
- 4.24 Mr. Luke Mattson, Ciorba Group, Village consulting engineer

Summary of comments

- 4.21 Chairman Goldstein asked that questions for the applicant be directed to the PC who will then direct questions to the applicant.

- 4.22 Ms. O’Laughlin said she was the Library Board President and introduced two Library Trustees, Virginia George and Lisa McDonald and the Director of the Library, Ellen Clark, who were also at the meeting. The Library is the largest neighbor of the proposed development so they have a strong interest in the property and in the appropriate development of the parcel. They look forward to working with the developer in implementing the plan.

There are about 1,100 people who visit the library daily. That was not mentioned in the traffic analysis because the studies were done before the library opened and during the evening rush hour. There is continual traffic on Wilmette and Park and the library parking lot and the Village lot leased by the library. They have daily deliveries off of the alley as well as trash and recycling pick up.

Regarding construction, they are starting a year-long construction project. The library is a heavily used building that requires constant maintenance. Parking continues to be a problem. The transportation committee is looking at reducing some of the parking along Wilmette Avenue for bike routes.

The traffic study did not look at mid-day activity. There is a certain amount of pedestrian traffic across the alley. It is her understanding that there will be no way to walk through the proposed development. She is not sure how that will impact traffic coming to and from the library.

Parking is a big issue for the library. They limit programs and sometimes host programs off site due to construction. She reiterated that the property is very busy.

- 4.23 Ms. McClure said she was the President of Wilmette Cares. Wilmette Cares advocates for affordable, inclusive and accessible housing in the Village. They welcome Wilshire and were happy that the development will have younger and older residents, but it leaves out those who have needs for accessibility and who need affordable units, and asked the developer to speak to that at some point.

They are lacking in knowledge about how one came to this place in the process. She does know that the process does include the developer meeting with the Village’s Director of Community Development. She does not know about the conversations between the applicant and Village officials that have them come to the conclusion that having affordable units would not be a good fit for the property. Not knowing what was said, she can’t agree or disagree.

In 2009, the Village engaged the Lakota Group, Goodman Williams Group, Gewalt Hamilton and Duncan Associates to initiate a planning process to create a VC master plan. The project was funded and coordinated through the regional transportation authority’s community planning program. One of the RTA program principles included planning for improved mobility for seniors and people with disabilities. Also included and under the area that talked about residential needs, the plan states that a lack of multi-family residential options in

the VC is felt as a missed opportunity. There is a lack of housing options and amenities for the aging population, empty nesters and young professionals in the VC. Affordable housing options need to be addressed.

There is a perceived demand for multi-family housing in the VC. VC housing should be near transit. There are college students, workers, young professionals and teachers that do not live in the community and empty nesters that have limited housing options. She knows from the Village's affordable housing plan that Wilmette is built up and there will not be many more opportunities for affordable housing and some were missed earlier on, yet still the Village remains committed to affordable housing. She read portions of the Village's 2004 Affordable Housing plan. While the Village accepts the Act's 10% standard for the purpose of this plan, it also approaches the issue of affordable housing not in a mathematical matter but based on real life experience addressing the need for affordable housing in the past and its knowledge of its residents and potential residents that give rise to this need. The population of the Village is aging and some older residents with fixed or diminishing incomes may wish to continue living among their family and friends but in housing commiserate with their means. Non-resident parents of current residents may wish to move to the Village to be close to their adult children during their golden years. Our community also includes persons with disabilities. Some of whom are adult children of long time Wilmette residents whose incomes or resources limit their housing options. There are persons with low or moderate income who work in or for the Village and whose residency would enhance the overall spirit of community. While the Village lacks the ability to accommodate all such residents and potential residents with affordable housing needs, it intends to continue to address these needs by increasing the number of affordable units in the manner set forth in the plan. Later in the plan it lists suitable sites, some of which are lost to us now such as the Kohl Children's Museum and National Louis University. The plan recognizes that there are other potential development sites particularly in the NR, VC, GC-1 and GC-2 zoning districts for multi-family buildings or mixed-use commercial/residential buildings with affordable housing units. Each site that presents itself will require careful review through the planning and zoning process designed to protect neighborhood and community interest.

The plan later on adopts a goal of making 15% of all new residential development or redevelopment consist of affordable housing units. This goal will be pursued by concentrating attention on multi-family buildings defined in paragraph 1.4 and asking developers of such buildings to consider including at least 15% affordable housing units in the manner described above. Those are just some of the excerpts in the 2004 Village of Wilmette Affordable Housing Plan. This proposal presents an ideal opportunity for this to be realized because it is traffic and pedestrian oriented, and it has the library, post office, and faith institutions nearby.

Personally, her advocacy for affordable housing has a long history. She has belonged to several groups that advocate for affordable housing on the North Shore. She lives in an affordable housing complex for seniors. She is hopeful that affordable housing will be available for many more. She talked about Wilmette Cares' new nine and a half minute video called Embracing Our Diversity, Preserving Our Heritage and Keeping Our Promises. In the video they look back to when Wilmette had the amount of affordable housing it needed. Our needs have changed, our population has changed and we need more. In the video you will see ordinary citizens talking about their housing-related situations. You will see leaders in the community and local and state officials talk about the essential benefits and need of affordable housing in Wilmette.

In a recent interview in the Wilmette Life, Village President Bielinski stated that more affordable housing is needed. It deserves discussion. She asked the developer and any commissions, boards or staff that are involved in this process to go back to the drawing board and deeply consider the needs and benefits of affordable, inclusive and accessible housing in Wilmette.

- 4.24 Ms. Braganca is the Vice President of Wilmette Cares and the mother of a 14-year-old with autism. She is connected with the many Wilmette parents of children with disabilities who want to see their children grow up and live and work and play in the Village. In past years, there was a long history of people with disabilities being sent away to institutions to be cared for. We now know that is wrong. People flourish when they live in their communities. The way you live in your community is to have a support systems around you and the best support systems are family and friends. She is not going to live forever so having her son live with her is not going to work and she wants him to live on his own in this community where we have the best schools. The level of improvement and independence that her son has achieved through being in these schools is stunning. We also have an outstanding police department that really thinks about how to effectively work with people with mental illness, autism, different behavioral issues. She doesn't want her son to have to move away from that. That is why she lives in Wilmette. We have a fire department that gets it. We have a library that is welcoming. We have a park district that is accommodating. She feels fortunate to live here for many reasons. The Village's retail is open to persons from JJ's list coming in. Even more impressive is that Wilmette's retail provides jobs for kids as they become young adults. It is disappointing that many young adults won't be able to live and work here. If they want to be independent they will need to move far away where there is more affordable housing and that means they lose their jobs, they lose their support systems, they lose access to the library and the protection of the police and all the great things about Wilmette. Many residents appreciate all the wonderful things about the Village. Isn't there room in this development, in a perfect location for those who don't drive, close to where jobs are, for a few affordable units so they can stay and live near family and friends and all that is wonderful about the Village of Wilmette?

- 4.25 Mr. Cleland said his late mom, Jean, was an advocate for affordable housing and justice rights issues. She fought on the civil rights side in the 1960s. He read excerpts of a letter to the editor that his mother wrote about affordable housing and diversity when Lexington Homes was looking at this property. "A very recent phone call from one of the candidates for Village President in response to my question said that he does not support the inclusion of units that would be less expensive on the property to be developed on the Ford site on Green Bay Road... because it would cost Wilmette money. That means local tax payers, so be it. We are already paying for quality schools, police and fire protection, snow removal, fine parks, a first class library. Those are what we want in our community in Wilmette. Some of us also want diversity even if it costs. All those things are beautiful things but without diversity and equal rights for all" those enrich our community and empower our community. None of us wants to live in a homogeneous lily white community without any diversity, any ethnic diversity, without any religious diversity or without any economic diversity. On her behalf, he thinks that she would be in favor of the developer adding some affordable housing in the project.
- 4.26 Mr. Griffith said while he didn't hear all the people who spoke he felt the developer did a good job of putting together a plan with great detail and he is very interested in seeing the high degree of green construction in the building. He was a Village Trustee from 2003 to 2007. They attempted to bring affordable housing to the Village during his tenure and they have several precedents to go by. The Plan Commission hasn't divulged their exact thoughts about affordable housing. He didn't think the developer should be beseeched to let us have affordable housing in the development, it should be just a question of how it was going to be done and how much will it cost. There are precedents like Mallinckrodt, which has a number of affordable units and that worked out very well. The Red Seal subdivision provided monies towards affordable housing. He talked about a building that did not move forward based on the economy at that time. He talked about the height of that building and there was disagreement about 4 versus 5 stories. At that time they looked at a successful building in downtown Glenview that was 3 stories. They also looked at a 4 story building in downtown Winnetka that is doing quite well. He thought with 6 stories that there might be enough flexibility that a few affordable units, maybe 15%, would fit in that building. Affordable housing in the Village is only at 4.1% and has been decreasing for some time and is continuing to decrease. There should not be an elitist housing situation in the Village. He believes that the Village is in good hands with this board, developer and architect and thought affordable housing could be worked into the proposed development.
- 4.27 Ms. Peters commended the developers on the plan. She would be interested in having any one of her daughters live there and she is happy it is coming to Wilmette. She moved to Wilmette in 1986 and raised 4 daughters in Wilmette. When her youngest daughter, now 22 years old, was born with Down syndrome, she worried about what she would do. Her eldest daughter who was 13 at the time told her that there were other kids at her school with Down syndrome. Her

daughter was one of the first with Down syndrome to be in the Wilmette public schools and at Ronald Knox Montessori. She is proud of this receptive community. The entire New Trier Township has earned quite the reputation for parents that want to have their children with special needs educated. She wants to set an example now and all people need to be welcomed into the community in a way that benefits the entire community.

- 4.28 Ms. McManus said she and her husband have lived in their condo for 8 years. There are 54 units in her building. They have all the great benefits within walking distance that the proposed development is looking to take advantage of. She speaks through 2 hearts. One heart is her daughter who is 38 and has Cerebral Palsy and went through the New Trier School system. She has lived in the community for 16 years, 7 blocks away from where her parents live. If she had not had this experience, the quality and enrichment of her life would have been totally different. They have had real experience with our Village standing behind them at times when they needed help for her. She also speaks for herself. She see herself as being in the senior category and wants for every senior and for every person who has a disability to have affordable housing choices. Diversity makes everyone a better person.
- 4.29 Mr. Surman said he was on the plan commission eight years ago and is currently on the ZBA. The project is well done. The previous project had a driveway that went right through and he thought that it was a poor solution and would cause traffic issues. He is glad that they went with all retail across the first floor and had parking go through the alley. In the previous proposal, balconies were on the lot line, which was an issue because it affected neighboring property. There are no windows on the lot line with this project. However, he felt that there was one issue the Plan Commission should consider: looking towards the future, how does this development impact the neighboring properties? If the bike store and the old Koenig & Strey property owners decided to put up a building of similar height, it would pretty much block any light from the south from hitting the second floor garden. The second floor garden is a nice feature but when the bike shop and Koenig & Strey say they want to put up a similar building, it will completely block all the light. It would be a solid wall right on the lot line, which they are able to do. What will M&R or the current owner say at that time? They are likely to find it injurious to this property. He noted that an adjacent project could go right up to the fifth floor balcony of this project.
- 4.30 Ms. DiClementi-Harlow said her business, A la Carte, had been in Wilmette for about 34 years and they recently moved to Highland Park. She would like to be in the first floor retail space and be in a prime location. She supports the project.
- 4.31 Ms. George said she was speaking as a resident and not as Library Board trustee. Part of the exceptions include provision of public benefits. She reviewed the list of public benefits which includes \$80,000 for the affordable housing fund and they are attempting to be a LEED certified building. She thinks that the project will be an asset. She likes the way they are emphasizing green space for their

tenants. Her concern is that they are taking a big green swath of land that will be covered in pavement. There is no pedestrian walk through and there should be two according to the ordinance. Not providing a walkthrough cuts done on the livability and walkability for the rest of the Village. She asked for a walkway to increase pedestrian access.

- 4.32 Mr. Versino said he is concerned about parking. He said there are ten spaces for employee parking. Is there parking for customers? It seems like all customers will come through the front door. It looks like they plan for customers to park on Central and Wilmette Avenues. His lot is privately owned for him and the corner building. He is concerned that people may encroach onto their parking lot. He is little concerned about the alley. He questions the alley width – whether it is 20’ or 13’ wide. Which figure is accurate? There is an issue with snow in the alley. The building is right against the alley.

In the drawings it shows a roof slab that goes beyond the property line, exhibits 1.16 and 1.20. Does it go onto his property?

They did not show the alley that came out of his parking lot on their plan.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY THE PLAN COMMISSION

- 5.1 Ms. Urban asked if the cyber café and fitness center are open to the public or are they strictly for building residents.

Mr. Patron said they are for exclusive use of the residents. They are non-public spaces. They are a plus for marketing the development. They are designed for the number of residents who based on their experience will comfortably use that space.

- 5.11 Mr. Bailey said the Village Plan talks a lot about linkages of this project to other buildings, to the other side of the Village Center, to the community to walkability. He did not hear anything about how the proposed development links to the rest of the VC and how it relates to other buildings.

Mr. Francke said they believe it relates to the Village Hall side of the tracks. It will be a typical transit oriented development and the residents of the building will walk across Green Bay Road and take advantage of all the restaurants in that area. Regarding linkage to the west, they went through a lot of plan iterations on this project. One plan had a pedestrian linkage at the north end of the site with a walkway from Green Bay to the west. Through discussions, they determined that this passageway would become a security and safety issue. The Village realized that if this was done, some retail space would be sacrificed. Determination was made to keep the curtain wall along Green Bay Road and that northern walkway went off the plan.

Mr. Adler said that staff did not indicate that retail was more important than linkage. The applicant came in and said that if there was a walkway they would have to give up some retail. This was discussed with the Village Board and staff.

- 5.12 Mr. Bailey said the master plan contemplates two buildings with a walkway between them. He felt that to be one of the lynch pins of the Master Plan. There would be this walkability and space between the buildings. Why has that been abandoned?

Mr. Adler said that there were nine iterations in this round and four iterations prior to this round when Lexington was in. There were four development proposals prior to this including a drive through CVS, a medical office with CVS drive through, a five story and a six story building both with curb cuts on Green Bay Road. It became clear during the Lexington process and their about year-long attempt to put together additional property that the large walkway between the 2 buildings probably would not happen in the short run. During the last marketing round the Village made it clear to prospective developers that it wanted a project proposed only for the property it controls at 607-617 Green Bay Road. The Village was very happy to give Lexington time to try to deliver what would be a better overall development on the property but that did not come to be. The Village Board made a decision that there are many other benefits to doing a development of the proposed type on this piece of property with an understanding that if there will be public open space, it would come elsewhere. They don't know where that would be. The Village also owns 1225 Central on the same block. It might not happen. From staff's point of view, that is why we are here with this proposal.

- 5.13 Mr. Bailey said when one looks at what the master plan says, the proposed project looks nothing like the master plan. The master plan indicated an opening in the middle of the block and now this is like a big wall.
- 5.14 Mr. Goldstein said to have enough area would need the additional properties.
- 5.15 Ms. Urban said they would need to wrap the corner at both ends to achieve the preferred plan.
- 5.16 Mr. Bailey said the Village has a unique opportunity to reserve some land for the walkway. They own the property. That is a mistake to give that up. The Village can require this. Regarding the six and seven stories, there was a lot of discussion in the community when the master plan was being developed about five stories. There was concern. He thought that was a key point in the master plan that the community was assured that the buildings would not be higher than five stories. Now it is six to seven stories.

Mr. Adler did not see the master plan process that way. He saw that there was a consensus of five stories by right and this height was supported. There was no prohibition of someone coming in with something higher. This is the center of

the block and if there is a place to do a higher building, this is probably the place. After going through 17 iterations and none being built, including a 6-story rental building proposed by Lexington, it was felt that if something was to happen here today, the proposed is what they probably would see height-wise. The Village Board believes it is important to help our Village Center businesses by increasing density in the Village Center, both residential and day population. They have seen good things happen in the VC recently and this is furthering those goals.

- 5.17 Mr. Bailey asked if the Central Station development was four stories.

Mr. Patron answered yes, it is four stories.

- 5.18 Mr. Bailey said it is a big building and this one would be 50% taller than that. It will not be an insubstantial presence on the street.

- 5.19 Chairman Goldstein said that is at the heart of the issue. There is no single family immediately adjacent to the site. There are institutional and retail uses. From the ARC, they wanted to enhance the stature of the property with the central element to show a substantial building. This can be revisited when talking about standards.

- 5.20 Mr. DeLeo asked if there were studies done in regards to stacking in the alley going south and trying to make a left turn onto Wilmette.

Mr. Aboona said they studied both ends of the alley at Wilmette and at Central. While it is a difficult movement people are doing the above during the peak hours. They counted five cars in the AM and eight in the PM. Some of the residents may do this. They have the option of going north and making a right on Central to avoid congestion. This goes back to their recommendation of putting in a sign for queued vehicles not to block the alley. It is impacted by traffic queueing especially when there is a train crossing.

- 5.21 Mr. DeLeo thought the Village should consider making that alley one way, going north. It is a busy area with the library, post office and Village lots. If the alley is made one way there will not be stacking at Wilmette Avenue. He said with cars going west on Wilmette Avenue and the parking spaces on Wilmette Avenue to the east of the alley, it is very difficult to exit the alley at Wilmette Avenue.

Mr. Aboona said there are no sight line issues coming out of the alley onto Wilmette Avenue. Buildings are set back. There are sidewalks and a wide area for green space. He does not want to place restrictions on the alley because you would force all the traffic onto Central Avenue. His suggestion would be to monitor the situation and perhaps prohibiting left turns during certain hours of the day with signage.

- 5.22 Mr. DeLeo asked if the loading dock berth will be deep enough given the dock is proposed to be 25' deep but the study was done showing a 30' truck using the

dock. Will the loading dock berth be deep enough? Should it be 30'?

Mr. Aboona said that the standard in the Village is 10' x 25'. There will be a 5' overhang. There is additional depth so it can become 30'. Mr. DeLeo asked if that would prevent trucks from extending into the alley. Mr. Aboona said if there is 30' for the loading dock the trucks would not block the alley.

- 5.23 Mr. DeLeo asked if the garage parking is for employee parking and if there is a restaurant with delivery, how would we control that. Is there a restriction to put in place?

Mr. Adler said that depending on the type of restaurant, they might have to go through the special use process to get approval. A restaurant that does mostly delivery would need a special use but delivery associated with a sit-down restaurant would be consider ancillary and permitted because it is at a lesser rate.

- 5.24 Chairman Goldstein asked the applicant to show the slide of the first floor plan showing the parking layout. He asked if it possible from a physical point of view to move the controlled entry further into the garage to allow shared parking spaces for the commercial tenants as staff recommended.

Mr. Schwarz answered that it was possible to move the garage door elsewhere.

- 5.25 Mr. DeLeo asked what the trash access for the retail use was and whether it was a shared trash access.

Mr. Schwarz said depending on how the retail was developed there could be a back corridor. It depends on how many retailers there are. The garbage refuse space is enclosed. It is just below the ramp at the alley. The residents have their own trash and recycling with trash chutes. From the loading docks, there is additional room to the door of the building. Retail would have access through the garage for loading/deliveries.

- 5.26 Mr. DeLeo asked in regards to the trash room for the residents, will there be a truck in the alley?

Mr. Schwarz answered yes, someone from the garbage company would roll out the trash on a cart.

- 5.27 Mr. DeLeo asked if they considered locating the trash areas closer to the loading docks.

Mr. Schwarz said the ramp and the dock area does not have building above. It is parking and green space above that area. They tried to do trash over there but there were conflicts of trash crossing the path of residents coming from parking to elevators. It would be more convenient to have trash off of the alley. The containers are all stored inside and move out when truck comes.

5.28 Mr. DeLeo asked when the anticipated trash pickup days would be. Mr. Schwarz answered that he didn't know.

5.29 Mr. DeLeo asked the traffic engineer what his assumptions were about trash pick-up and impact on alley traffic.

Mr. Aboona said it is possible there could be traffic and trash at the same time. It is happening in the alley and not on a major arterial. When that happens, the time period will be short. Residents will have option of going in the other direction if the alley is blocked.

5.30 Mr. DeLeo asked if there were any considerations to having a green roof on top of the building.

Mr. Weinbach said a green roof was not discussed. There are a lot of mechanicals on the roof. It was not a consideration. There is a lot of green space on the roof of the building in general.

5.31 Mr. DeLeo asked if there was an area for a green roof.

Mr. Schwarz said for LEED they will have a white versus green roof. There are 95 ac units running down the middle and two big units for the common areas. There is not a lot of space left. It would be difficult to access and maintain.

5.32 Mr. DeLeo asked how they plan on controlling residents coming in and out of the building. Is it keyed entry? Intercom?

Mr. Schwarz said on other projects, most doors are controlled by fobs. There is an intercom system. The front door is open so people can go to the leasing center. Once one is beyond the lobby, the area is secure. People coming in off the street cannot access elevators. Same thing with back doors and bike areas – they are all controlled. There are cameras.

5.33 Mr. DeLeo asked if the south elevation is a solid wall up to the property line.

Mr. Schwarz said that the front portion of the south elevation is up to the property line. There are no windows or doors. That is the main reason why the building is set back 60' by the court yard area. At the north and south ends, there are faux windows. Another building could go in adjacent and be just as tall. On the north the parcel is almost the same size. On the south the parcel is smaller.

Mr. Schwarz said on both sides of the building they have buffers to the property line so they can have windows and balconies. When they are too close to a property line they are restricted on the number of windows and the wall's fire rating. To the front of the building they are orienting out to the east and to the west and there are no windows looking to the south. The stairwell is at the south end.

Mr. DeLeo asked if they were asking for a 20' first floor, instead of the minimum required 14', to allow the vehicle ramp and two levels of parking.

Mr. Schwarz said the ordinance is 14' minimum and you can't get two levels of parking in 14'. There is not enough room on the site to have ramps that long. They have a ramp that leads up to the second floor that takes up a lot of space. That is why they have 20' on the front retail and two levels of parking on the back.

Mr. DeLeo asked what the height to the head of the window was at street level.

Mr. Schwarz said that they left 5.5' to 6' at the top for signage. With stonework, they are about 14' to 14.5' to the top of the transom. Some of the transoms might be grills or louvers.

Mr. DeLeo said that on adjacent properties, the head of the windows is at about 8-10'. They are not that high. Part of the master plan is a continuous storefront.

Mr. Schwarz said retail uses want as many windows as possible. They originally had the glass going all the way to the ground. After listening to public works on how they salt and shovel the street, they put in 2' of brick at the bottom.

- 5.34 Ms. Urban asked what was happening in the penthouse. There has been no discussion regarding this.

Mr. Schwarz said there will be an elevator that overrides into the upper limits of the building that is about 12'. They might have an equipment room up there. They were trying to make it look symmetrical. They will reduce it as much as possible. They might have a central boiler for the hot water system up there. There is no living space up there. There is a single stair going up there. Only maintenance and management can go up there.

- 5.35 Mr. Bailey asked if they considered underground parking.

Mr. Schwarz said that did not consider that due to the cost and storm water management. The tank they proposed for managing the storm water is already 8' deep and if down even further, it would need to be pumped.

- 5.36 Mr. Bailey said other developments in the Village, like the Optima development, have underground parking. The zoning ordinance generally does not allow for at grade parking and that is one of the exceptions being requested. He asked Mr. Adler what the general reason was for not favoring at grade parking. The master plan talks about underground parking and parking above grade.

Mr. Adler said when they looked prohibiting residential at the first floor, they did so because they did not want to see a fully residential building being proposed. If parking wasn't limited, a developer could then put the 600 square

feet of common space on the first floor and have the rest of the first floor being parking. Constructing the building on silts. They wanted to prohibit that. There is one building on 12th Street in the VC district where it has a small office and depressed parking and it is a basically a fully residential building. They also thought there was more flexibility by going go down with parking. It would create an easier east/west connectivity by not having a parking structure to go through.

- 5.37 Mr. Bailey said if the parking was below grade than the building would only be five stories, as contemplated by the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Adler said that the building still would be six stories because it is five stories above and one story of commercial. It would be lesser in height by approximately 5' to 6'.

- 5.38 Ms. Urban said it appeared that the developer was proposing more residential parking than the code requires. How much parking is required for the mix of units?

Mr. Adler said that 99 spaces are required. He explained how they arrived at this number.

- 5.39 Mr. Bailey asked about the office space and the fitness center on the grade level, which wouldn't be accessible to the public. One of the principles of the master plan is to encourage retail at ground level. Why couldn't they move the office to another level and have public space accessible at grade level?

Mr. Patrun said that they have seen in their experience with these types of properties, that is an important area of use. It is important that the public has easy access into their marketing window. That is why they group the amenities there. They can experience the impact immediately in terms of amenities. If they were to remotely locate that they would take away from some of the sex appeal and that would hurt their effort to market the project. Even though these uses are for the exclusive use of the residents, they are attractive functions to have at the streetscape. They are used considerably and at all times. It all goes back to marketing. It is important to have management centralized. It is better for security.

- 5.40 Mr. Bailey asked if they anticipated any problems in marketing the units.

Mr. Patrun said the combination of the amenities and leasing staff creates a synergy and should be in one area and at grade level. They don't market one time like a condominium development. They are marketing and reaching out to attain as close to 100% occupancy as possible.

- 5.41 Mr. Bailey said the master plan shows two buildings, each with 10,000 square feet of retail. This one is bigger than either one of those but it has much smaller retail space.

Chairman Goldstein said the point of the building is to be interdependent with the VC and not be exclusive to residents of one building. This is a pivotal block.

- 5.42 Chairman Goldstein suggested that the applicant consider moving the lobby to where the fitness center is located which gives more direct access to the lobby bank. That allows for a corner retail space. He agrees with the applicant on the synergy but you can do the synergy with a public use instead of a private use. Depending on the type of retail use in the building it can be an amenity to the residents. In the spirit of the master plan, he agrees with Mr. Bailey that having public use on the first floor is important.

Mr. Patrun said that is something they can consider and will continue that discussion with staff.

- 5.43 Ms. Norrick said that the applicant spoke about adding brick elements on the rear of the building at the upper floors but she was unclear on what the treatment for the parking garage portion was.

Mr. Schwarz said the intent was to keep the same materials running all the way around the building so the lower level would have a manufactured stone that looks like limestone. It is nicer than what they have used in the past. They will have manufactured stone, then the brick veneer and then a reveal Hardy system above that. There will probably be additional louvers added for exhausting. There will be a louver above the door for fresh air.

- 5.44 Ms. Urban said if she read the materials correctly there will be ivy planted on the back of the building to soften it. Is that on the first floor as well as upper stories?

Mr. Weinbach said there would be ivy planted on the west elevation and portion of the north and south elevations. It is Boston Ivy and will add a lot of greenery to the space. It will go up to the top of the second level of parking.

- 5.45 Ms. Norrick asked where the fire hydrant was being moved.

Mr. Adler asked the applicant to show the drawing indicating how they will change the fire hydrant location.

Mr. Lewis showed the new location on the plan. It will be moved further to the south but still in the front. This will allow for an additional parking space. The no parking requirements for a hydrant are 15' on either side, 30' total.

- 5.46 Chairman Goldstein asked what would be the total change in parking spaces.

Mr. Lewis said would be no change in parking spaces. Mr. Adler pointed out that the old abandoned curb cut for the car dealer wasn't counted as existing parking. Mr. Lewis said that was correct, when the original development was in place that was an entry to the driveway to the parking lot and not stripped for parking. That is being eliminated and they are using the area for a loading/drop-off zone and maintaining the same amount of street parking.

- 5.47 Chairman Goldstein asked staff to comment about Mr. DeLeo's comments about making the alley one way and the traffic flow in the alley.

Mr. Mattson said regarding traffic flow, specifically left turning out onto Wilmette Avenue, it is a valid concern. They will need to look more closely at additional alley signage. Rather than making alley one way, it could be right turn only at that intersection. Regarding general alley circulation, there are a few movements that the site creates such trucks backing into the loading dock. During final review they will need to refine the alley signage for people coming into the building and people doing special deliveries in the alley. Making the alley one way may cause circulation restrictions.

- 5.48 Mr. DeLeo said a lot of people get packages – Amazon, Peapod, and FedEx. How will that work and not impact traffic on Green Bay Road? Is there a loading zone in front of the building and does that reduce parking? Or should something be done in the back?

Mr. Mattson said there is a loading zone shown in the front. There may have to be some considerations by management on what is allowed in the back alley. There should be some restrictions on what can go back in the alley. There needs to be some refinement on signage and access control in the back.

- 5.49 Mr. DeLeo asked if the alley at the loading dock was a public alley. Mr. Adler answered yes.

- 5.50 Mr. DeLeo asked if it was to be vacated. Mr. Adler said that the alley would not be vacated. The 25' loading zone is on private property.

- 5.51 Mr. Bailey said that the master plan showed a big parking facility coupled with the residential rental or condo project. It seems that the master plan contemplated traffic backing up on the north side where the parking facility would be but not necessarily all of this traffic in the alley way.

Mr. Mattson said that when looking at the alley KLOA talked about a level of service grade and then they regarded based on new capacities. They showed negligible change in that level of service. Movement to the north went from A to B level of service and both are good levels.

- 5.52 Mr. Bailey said it seems that what is being proposed is a more intense use of alley that is different from master plan.

Chairman Goldstein said there has been direction from the PC that they did not want a driveway onto Green Bay Road because of potential conflicts with pedestrians.

Mr. Schwab said the traffic study mentioned the negligible impact to the alley. They only looked at peak times, like rush hour. Someone from the library mentioned that the usage of the alley is heavier during off-peak times. That coupled with the potential garbage issue, should a study be done about usage of the alley during non-peak times?

Mr. Mattson said Mr. Schwab was correct that the traffic study did not talk about off-peak. The residents would be active more at peak time. But the library has a different circulation. It may be warranted to touch on this during the study.

- 5.53 Mr. Schwab said it wasn't necessarily a resident issue but things like deliveries to a 95-unit building.

- 5.54 Chairman Goldstein asked if there were slides showing proposed signage. He does not think that the ARC saw proposed signage.

Mr. Francke said that they didn't have the signage slides with them at the meeting. They have general signage but wanted to work on them before presenting them.

- 5.55 Chairman Goldstein asked them to review sign dimensions and quantity.

Mr. Francke said the front façade shows signage they are talking about but cannot present details tonight.

Mr. Adler said that part of the process is relief for the residential signage. Each tenant space is allowed one primary sign and one secondary sign. He said that they are asking for relief for projecting signage to be slightly larger and slightly farther out. There is a potential sign above the canopy. It may or may not be attached to the wall.

Mr. Schwarz said in the original submittal, tab 11, option 5, shows the canopy signage. It shows the projecting sign at 4' x 4'. Zoning limits size to 2' x 3' for projecting signage. The other sign would either go on the canopy or a wall sign above. The next page shows a sign for a tenant and that is the maximum size. Those go in two locations. Their projecting sign is the smaller sign that meets the ordinance.

Mr. Adler said that the sign might not be conforming due to coverage. It is limited to 30% of the signable area. The signable areas might be less where the

architecture breaks up the building. Depending on the outcome of this meeting, they will address signage.

- 5.56 Chairman Goldstein asked what signage exceptions are they asking for.

Mr. Schwarz said they thought they were only allowed one primary sign for each frontage but Mr. Adler clarified that they are allowed one sign per tenant. The signage would be needed for Wilshire and two tenants.

Mr. Adler said that staff interprets the ordinance allowing one primary and one secondary sign for each tenant space.

Mr. Schwarz said then they are only asking for one projecting sign to be larger than ordinance allows. 4' x 4' instead of 2' x 3'.

- 5.57 Ms. Urban asked if one of the recommendations of the commission is that more retail be added in the cyber café/lobby space, is that space entitled to signage?

Mr. Adler said that space would be entitled to signage.

- 5.58 Chairman Goldstein followed up on Mr. DeLeo's question about green roofing. They are proposing a fairly large amount of green roof area, which is wonderful but what about the sustainability of those materials?

- 5.59 Mr. Weinbach said they generally use as sustainable plantings as possible. They are doing that. A green roof is considered seed and trays and they are proposing a step above that. They plan on native plants and drought tolerant plants. They are proposing a drip irrigation system for establishment.

- 5.60 Chairman Goldstein asked if they could point to any specific plantings that are native or producing water retention. He understood that on a roof you might not want water retention because of weight.

Mr. Weinbach said for this type of planting, they do not water retention so there is a drainage mat to eliminate water. He referenced the north court yard area which is predominantly plantings. Other than the hedges, the rest are native plantings. Grasses, flowers, orbs. It is sustainable. The south garden is an attempt to use more drought tolerant plants, but not necessarily all native plants.

- 5.61 Chairman Goldstein asked if they getting credits for any of these elements as part of LEED certification.

Mr. Weinbach answered yes, they are getting credits by both plant selection and irrigation system.

- 5.62 Chairman Goldstein said the applicant needs to get more direction so the Chairman asked commissioners to continue discussion. Given the late hour, the subject proposal would most likely need to be continued until a future Plan Commission meeting.

He referenced the various standards and the petitioner's responses. Start with Site Plan Review standards. Is there any discussion about consistency or concerns with those standards?

- 5.63 Ms. Urban had a concern that insufficient parking is being provided for retail tenant customers or residential visitors. She suggested that the developer look at the parking situation. If they want potential for a restaurant, then they need to think about adequate parking. She is not sure that they need to hit that 53 number, which would mean food concessions in each tenant space. What type of parking does a sit down restaurant require? Can there be public parking on the ground floor of the garage?

Chairman Goldstein asked if it would be okay if there were less dedicated spaces for the employees and residential to increase the public use of some of the parking.

Ms. Urban answered yes. She said that she wasn't concerned about the fact that parking is at ground level because the building design does a great job of screening the parking from the street and keeping the street active with all of the commercial frontage.

- 5.64 Mr. DeLeo said if they open up the parking garage to the public, then security has to be addressed.

Chairman Goldstein said that is why he asked if the secure garage door could be move over to the next bay so that the first aisle on the south would permit shared use of parking. He said the other communities that the applicant has developed in are different than the proposed site. He is not sure there is a security issues for the residential spaces.

- 5.65 Mr. DeLeo said a lot of this depends on how far people will walk to go to a restaurant. There is parking on Green Bay, Wilmette, and Central.

Chairman Goldstein said that sometimes employee parking is located somewhere else and best spaces are for customers, which is not the way it is proposed in this development. That seemed a little odd.

- 5.66 Mr. Bailey said that parenthetically it is difficult to see how the alley in the long run would sustain traffic. There will be additional buildings in the future. Maybe that is unavoidable unless they can they expand the size of the alley?

Regarding parking, this is a private project but the master plan saw this property as the keystone to bring in the public. He has the sense that it is like a gated community. The public cannot go into the building to park or into the fitness center or other residential spaces. It is inconsistent with the master plan because the plan intended some of the space on this property to be public space. That would at least be mitigated if the parking and retail were made available to the public. That would be more consistent with the master plan.

- 5.67 Chairman Goldstein said it appears that the Plan Commission is okay with the parking to the front on Green Bay. We might be losing one space but we get the loading area, which is probably important for deliveries.

He explained that the PUD rules have changed. They will not see the final plat. One of the recommendations might be to continue to study the use of the alley. Can there be a contribution to improve the alley? It is functioning as a quasi-street. There are still some outstanding alley issues that need to be resolved with staff.

- 5.68 Mr. DeLeo asked if there has been any discussion about doing something with the alley to deal with storm water or run off.

Ms. Berger answered yes, they are looking at permeable pavers similar to what Chicago uses. There would be concrete ribbons on the outside of the pavers with an inverted V to collect drainage, with a permeable product between. The challenge is cost. The capital program is underfunded. They cannot build green alleys at this point. They are looking at various options including grants.

- 5.69 Mr. DeLeo asked if that has been discussed with this project. What is replacement timing for this alley and who is responsible?

Ms. Berger said nothing has been determined as to who will pay for the alley. The Plan Commission and Village Board can request that the developer participate in a cost share, at least to cover the transition from impervious to a pervious alley. The alley is in terrible shape.

- 5.70 Chairman Goldstein asked for a cost estimate for the alley.

Ms. Berger said she didn't have that information but can get it for the commissioners.

- 5.71 Chairman Goldstein said since there are no other comments regarding site plan review standards, they will take a look at the Appearance Review standards. Staff provided a report on the advisory Appearance Review Commission meeting and the changes that were made based on the ARC's input. There is minimal exceptions for signage except for a larger sign for residential portion and the sign projection.

He asked for comments on the south wall. That wall has high quality materials proposed but it is essentially a blank wall. Was that because this is a lot line development and in the future that wall may be blocked? Mr. Adler answered yes.

Chairman Goldstein said there will be less transparency through the windows than required by code, though not a lot less. Are there any comments or concerns about this? There are better materials but not as much transparency. Mr. Adler said that historically they have done the calculations including the mullions. It does get close to 40% at that point. The applicant measured in a more restrictive way so that number was used.

- 5.72 Mr. Bailey discussed the standard that deals with excessive similarity or dissimilarity in design in relation to surrounding structures. He believes the proposed development is too big. He knows the master plan was aspirational but the plan talks about allowing taller structures up to five stories. The new building will dwarf the older buildings and that is exacerbated by the increased scale of the building. The Village will not be able to say no to the next developer if they want to build a building of this size. In effect the proposed development says that the master plan standard has gone up to seven stories on this block. Mr. Adler said he didn't necessarily agree. Mr. Bailey said he understood but as a practical matter it is inevitable that five stories is going to be dissimilar from other properties and the additional height is just exasperating that.
- 5.73 Chairman Goldstein said five stories is by-right and they are going in under a PUD. Part of the role of the Plan Commission is determining whether or not the public benefits outweigh the exceptions.
- 5.74 Ms. Urban said there is no better place in the Village to go this high. It is a major arterial and there are no single family homes next door. There are other communities that do much taller and much denser buildings.
- 5.75 Mr. Bailey asked if there was any structure of this size on Green Bay Road on the entire span all the way up to Lake Forest. He thought that the residents who lived in back of the library would be at tonight's meeting to voice their opposition to such a large building.
- 5.76 Chairman Goldstein said the developer has provided generous setbacks, 25', on either side of the terraces. In his view, if they are going to do a taller building, they have gone the extra mile to soften the effect through roof terraces particularly on the upper level. The ARC actually asked the applicant to enhance the verticality of the building. You can make the argument that this building is reflecting off the Village Hall and is a more civic structure. He would agree with Mr. Bailey that he would like to see more public use of the building. He wanted to get the opinion of the other Commissioners regarding height and a taller building on this block, understanding that the Village Board provided guidance of 77' in the purchase contract. Again, the Plan Commission is still interpreting

the height from a commission point of view to understand just what that means.

- 5.77 Mr. DeLeo said he thinks that the building is appropriate at the proposed height. He would have a problem if it was just a block building. The petitioner has been creative in how they have broken up the mass with parapets and setbacks. Views and sight lines are optimized. He asked if a shade study was done. Mr. Adler said that staff is not aware of a shade study being completed.

Mr. DeLeo agreed that the building is a little higher than indicated in the master plan. There is no negative to go high on this site. The more one can build the better the cost basis. The more units on the site, the better for VC businesses and tax revenue. The PC should not fight about the height as the 77' was already set by the Village Board.

- 5.78 Mr. Bailey doesn't think that is true. There is a contract that was entered into. Maybe the village has expressed a willingness to consider those terms. He does not know what to make about the Village entering into the contract. The contract says that the applicant will buy the property if they get to build a certain type of building. The big question is whether the proposal is consistent with the master plan. The Plan Commission is supposed to review whether or not a development meets the spirit of the master plan.

- 5.79 Chairman Goldstein said the zoning ordinance specifically allows for exceptions to be granted as part of PUDs if enough public benefit is being provided. That is why the Plan Commission is reviewing the request.

- 5.80 Ms. Urban said that this is a nicely designed mixed use project that captures the spirit of the master plan. It may not capture the letter of the master plan in the sense that the plan anticipated two buildings, both of which would wrap the corners. It anticipated a large open space. Prior requests for proposals have not moved forward. With Lexington, they tried to assemble more property and could not do so. This is a handsome project that achieves the density, the variation in the type of housing that the Village is able to offer in a prime location.

- 5.81 Mr. Zimmermann said regarding the contract, one of the areas where the Village Board speaks to the public is through its ordinances. The contract was approved by an ordinance. He read a portion of the first page of the ordinance. "The Village Board finds that the project as proposed and if approved as part of a Planned Unit Development meets many of the goals of the Village Center master plan and is therefore a substantial public benefit to the Village." That is consistent with what Ms. Urban just said. It is not necessarily the letter of the master plan but the Village Board speaking through its ordinances has said to the public that this project meets many of the goals.

- 5.82 Mr. Bailey asked what that said about the role of the Plan Commission.

Mr. Zimmermann said the Plan Commission's role is exactly as Chairman Goldstein indicated. To evaluate the project, measure it against the goals of the comprehensive plan, and more importantly measure it against the standards in the zoning ordinance. The Village Board made a statement about the project. The role of the Plan Commission is no different than outlined in the zoning code.

- 5.83 Commissioner Schwab had no issue with the height. He agrees that if it is going to be in the Village, the proposed location is an appropriate spot. The front façade does a nice job breaking up the height. The west facing side is the more monolithic view. No residents are present to talk about this so does that mean they don't have any issues?

- 5.84 Mr. DeLeo asked if 77' was to the top of the parapet.

Mr. Schwarz answered that 77' is to the top of the roof slab. It does not take into consideration the insulation and the membrane. It is 78' to the top of the roof.

Mr. DeLeo asked if it was 88' to the top of the penthouse override. Is that the highest point of the building?

Mr. Schwarz answered that would be the highest point of the building.

Mr. Adler said that the height in the contract is to the slab. When the roof is finished it would be 78'. What is in the proposal is consistent with the contract. While the contract did not go into detail about parapets, height encroachments and/or overruns, it was understood that those items would be exceeding the 77' height because that is how the zoning ordinance is written.

Mr. Schwarz clarified that the parapet, mechanical screening and elevator overruns are keeping within the height encroachments amounts allowed in the zoning ordinance. They are just starting at a higher point.

- 5.85 Ms. Urban said that in return they are getting a development that has more generous first floor ceiling heights and more generous ceiling heights on each residential level.

- 5.86 Mr. Bailey said the first floor height is because of the parking.

Ms. Urban said parking is an important public benefit.

Mr. Bailey said residential parking on the first floor is another exception.

Ms. Urban said it is an exception because we didn't want to diminish the activity along the street front.

Chairman Goldstein said another reason was there was a prior project that was a single use with a large parking lot. The Plan Commission does not want to see a single use with large ground floor parking lot. They did a nice job of putting decent depth for retail in front of the parking. Often times you see a very narrow ribbon of retail that is completely dysfunctional and you can't rent it out. This gets to the special use issue and it seems appropriate to have parking on the first floor.

- 5.87 Ms. Norrick said she shared some of the concerns of the building's overall height regarding five versus seven stories.

Chairman Goldstein said it as six stories of occupied space and seven stories with parking.

Mr. DeLeo said that is with 10' ceilings in the units versus 9'.

- 5.88 Chairman Goldstein said regarding use the main issue that has come up is encouraging the developer to create more public use on the first floor for retail use and perhaps moving the lobby to allow for a corner space. They would need to move the health club and cyber café elsewhere in the building. There are common spaces on other floors for those uses.

- 5.89 Mr. DeLeo agreed that the ground floor retail space should be maximized on Green Bay Road. The fitness center could be moved to be off the street.

- 5.90 Mr. Bailey said for him one of the things that would be a special benefit is not just the building but also doing something for the community. Making more space available for the community. It doesn't do anything for the community to walk by and see the residents exercising.

Chairman Goldstein agreed. There should be an image on the ground floor of anyone being able to use those spaces and not just residents of the building.

- 5.91 Chairman Goldstein said the fact that they do not have a curb cut is beneficial. That was a major issue with past proposals. There was conflict between pedestrian movement and traffic going in and out of the curb cut. They also did a 5' setback. They are not asking for an exception to that requirement.

- 5.92 Chairman Goldstein asked if the applicant considered allowing outdoor café seating.

Mr. Adler said that could be done it would just depend on the level of comfort that could be provided. The landscaping they propose and the 5' width should allow for outdoor seating.

- 5.93 Chairman Goldstein said regarding the Planned Unit Development standards, some are repetitive with previous discussion.

Regarding public benefits, they are offering retail. This has been a major issue in the master plan. This block should be fully functional retail block. The variety of housing is needed. There is some rental housing in this area.

Mr. Adler said there are some rental apartments on Greenleaf, but there is little rental housing available and noted that this is arguably a luxury building which is a market that has not served in the Village.

5.94 Mr. Goldstein said they are offering \$80,000 for affordable housing purposes and that has been accepted by the Village Board as a public benefit. They are seeking LEED gold certification.

5.95 Ms. Urban said that not providing affordable at this location is a missed opportunity mostly from the perspective of giving someone of more modest means the chance to live in a very convenient location for many reasons. One could live in this location without a car and that is a significant cost savings. She does not know how much housing \$80,000 buys but it doesn't seem like very much.

Mr. Adler said that \$80,000 equates to approximately two years of funding for the Village's housing assistance program. It is being privatized. The \$80,000 would be for 19-20 people and that would be at \$150 or \$200/month. \$200 month is for rental assistance and \$900 twice a year is for property tax assistance.

Chairman Goldstein said there was testimony that the cost of setting aside a unit would be a \$125,000 loss per unit. \$80,000 does not seem commensurate with the impact. There is a lot of additional density on the site. He would try to offer a more substantial amount that is more commensurate with the impact. He wouldn't go as far to say inclusionary units because of the nature of the project. He understands that the Village Board accepted the \$80,000 and deemed it a substantial benefit but in his view, in terms of the density he would like to see a little more in that direction.

Mr. Schwab said he would support the above comment.

Ms. Norrick said she would support the above comment.

5.96 Chairman Goldstein that everyone was happy with the LEED gold and it is a public benefit. He asked the petitioner if it was a guarantee that they will get this certification. Do they have a LEED consultant?

Mr. Patrun said there will be a LEED consultant. The consultant has worked with them on other buildings. They have gotten LEED gold on their last three projects. Central Station is LEED gold.

Mr. Bailey asked if this was aspirational or is it contractual.

Chairman Goldstein said they cannot guarantee LEED certification because they have not gone through the process yet. He asked the petitioner if they were committed to reach the same standard as their project a couple miles away. Mr. Patrun answered yes.

Mr. Adler clarified that the LEED consultant took a preliminary look at this proposed project.

- 5.97 Ms. Urban said the ARC recommended having some landscaping on the east side of the Village parking lot to screen the west façade of the building and she felt that was a low cost suggestion that will enhance the proposal.

- 5.98 Mr. Bailey said the alley issue is still open. A cost to the Village may be wear and tear of the alley, which will be used more extensively. Is there provision in the plan to have a requirement that the alley be improved to accommodate this traffic? It is not unusual for a developer to add this element.

Chairman Goldstein said that the Plan Commission could ask staff to work with the developer to come up with a proposal for the alley. They are not the only user of the alley so they cannot be responsible for the full redevelopment.

Mr. Bailey said they could be responsible for full redevelopment of the alley as a public benefit.

Mr. Patrun said they are committed to improving the east/west alley, roughly 60' long, with a return to the north. Right now it is gravel and grass. It is difficult to maneuver. They are working with engineering and have committed to alley repairs and make it new. The design is not completed. They understand that the primary alley is in horrible shape and a shared program could be entertained. The alley is public right now.

- 5.99 Mr. DeLeo said that when they start construction they will have to close the alley. The alley use will be limited during construction.

Mr. Patrun said they have not figured that out yet but will work closely with Village departments on this. The closure could be partial or minimal. They have to go through a construction logistics plan for these types of projects. They want to ensure minimal disturbance to the public. They will need some element of temporary construction, i.e. quasi easement may be needed. It will be well planned and well-coordinated with the Village.

- 5.100 Chairman Goldstein said that the Commission should continue the case to a date certain and April 7th, the regularly scheduled PC meeting date is election night so they should choose another date. It was determined that Wednesday, April 8 was a date that work for all members of the Plan Commission. The agenda for that evening would be that the applicant respond to the Plan Commission's comments and concerns. The Plan Commission would review the exceptions and move towards a vote.

Mr. Zimmermann said typically public comment should be limited to changes in the plan.

6.0 DECISION

Ms. Urban moved to continue the case to the April 8th meeting at 7:00 pm. Mr. DeLeo Seconded the motion. The voice vote was all ayes and no nays. Motion carried.