

VILLAGE OF GLENCOE  
ZONING COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING  
JULY 9, 2012

1. CALL TO ORDER.

A meeting of the Zoning Commission of the Village of Glencoe was called to order at 7:30 p.m. Monday, July 9, 2012 in the Glencoe Village Hall, 675 Village Court, Glencoe, Illinois.

2. ROLL CALL

The following were present:

Chair: Barbara Miller

Members: James Clark, David Friedman, Ed Goodale, Jim Nyeste, Howard Roin, and Steve Ross

The following were absent:

None.

The following Zoning Commission staff liaison and Secretary were present:

John Houde, Building & Zoning Administrator

Andrew Fiske, Village Attorney's Office

Debra Zeit, Court Reporter for Village

3. PUBLIC HEARING TO MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR A REQUEST OF CHASE BANK TO WAIVE THE PARKING REQUIREMENT FOR A NEW OR SUBSTANTIALLY RECONSTRUCTED BUILDING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF PARK AVENUE AND VILLAGE COURT KNOWN AS 332 PARK AVENUE.

The Chair opened the public hearing and noted the following advance information had been distributed to Zoning Commission members and was also available on-line at the Village's web site.

**Background:** Chase Bank has requested permission to construct a new or substantially reconstructed building at the former Bank of American building at 332 Park (southwest corner of Park Avenue and Village Court). The current 2-story building has no on-site parking similar to most commercial buildings in our central business district. The proposed building has been designed to have the appearance of a 2-story façade to permit it to "fit" in with its proposed location, although it will only be a one-story structure. The building will have less than half the square footage of the existing building. The Zoning Code parking requirement for the building would be 1 space per 500 square feet of gross floor area or 7 spaces. Chase Bank requests that the Zoning Commission waive this parking requirement for the reasons outlined in its letter.

The Zoning Commission through the public hearing process is to make a recommendation to the Village Board of Trustees for this project. In the Zoning Code Standards the applicant must establish that:

- (a) Code and Plan Purposes. The Proposed use and development will be in harmony with the general and specific purposes for which this Code was enacted and for which regulations of the district in question were established and with the general purpose and intent of the Official Comprehensive Plan.
- (b) No Undue Adverse Impact. The proposed use and development will not have a substantial or undue adverse effect upon adjacent property, the character of the area, parking, utility facilities, and other matters affecting the public health, safety, and general welfare.
- (c) No Interference with Surrounding Development. The proposed use and development will be constructed, arranged, and operated so as not to dominate the immediate vicinity or to interfere with the use and development of neighboring property in accordance with the applicable district regulations.
- (d) Adequate Public Facilities. The proposed use and development will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services such as streets, public utilities, drainage structures, police and fire protection, refuse disposal, water and sewers, parks, libraries, and schools, or the applicants will provide adequately for such services.
- (e) No Traffic Congestion. The proposed use and development will not cause undue traffic congestion nor draw significant amounts of traffic through residential streets.
- (f) No Destruction of Significant Features. The proposed use and development will not result the destruction, loss, or damage of any natural, scenic, or historic feature of significant importance.
- (g) Compliance with Standards. The proposed use and development complies with all additional standards imposed on it by the particular provision of this Code authorizing such use.

In determining whether the applicant's evidence establishes that the previous standards have been met the Zoning Commission is to consider:

- (a) Public Benefit. Whether and to what extent the proposed **use** and **development** at the particular location requested is necessary or desirable to provide a service or a facility that is in the interest of the public convenience or that will contribute to the general welfare of the neighborhood or community.
- (b) Alternative Locations. Whether and to what extent such public goals can be met by the location of the proposed **use** and **development** at some other site or in some other area that may be more appropriate than the proposed site.
- (c) Mitigation of Adverse Impacts. Whether and to what extent all steps possible have been taken to minimize any adverse effects of the proposed **use** and **development** on the immediate vicinity through building design, site design, landscaping, and screening.

The Zoning Commission may recommend and the Board of Trustees can impose "such conditions and limitations concerning **use**, construction, character, location,

landscaping, **screening**, and other matters relating to the purposes and objectives of this **Code** upon the **premises** benefitted by a **special use permit** as may be necessary or appropriate to prevent or minimize adverse effects upon other property and improvements in the vicinity of the subject property or upon public facilities and services and to insure compliance with the standards in this Section. Such conditions shall be expressly set forth in the ordinance granting the **special use.**”

The June 21, 2012 Glencoe News contained the notice of public hearing, notice was also sent to 67 residential neighbors and business district owners. No letter or verbal inquiries have been received.

The Village Board’s referral resolution, the Applicant’s request Letter dated June 1, 2012, the Notice of Public Hearing, a list of neighbors notified, a map of the immediate area and a site plan were made part of the record.

The attached Village’s Court Reporter transcript is made part of the public record.

**Recommendation:** Based on the materials presented and the public hearing, it was the recommendation of staff that the special use request of Chase Bank be recommended to the Village Board of Trustees for approval.

**Motion:** A motion was made as follows:

***Move to recommend the Village Board of Trustees approve a special use ordinance request of Chase Bank for the property at 332 Park Avenue including possible consideration of a parking waiver contribution or off-site employee parking by the Village Board and conditioned on appearance review approval of the Plan Commission.***

This motion was approved by all members of the Zoning Commission.

4. PUBLIC HEARING TO MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES TO CONSIDER POSSIBLE AMENDMENTS TO THE ZONING CODE RELATED TO GROUND FLOOR USES IN BUSINESS DISTRICTS AND TO CONSIDER UPDATING THE USE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM FROM THE STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION MANUAL (SIC) TO THE NORTH AMERICAN INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM (NAICS).

The Chair opened the public hearing, member James Clark recused himself from this agenda item and left the Council Chambers. The Chair then noted the following advance information had been distributed to Zoning Commission members and was also available on-line at the Village’s web site.

**Background:** At the April 26, 2012 Village Board meeting Debra Dresner, resident and owner of the property at 378 Park, and Kevin Campbell, owner of the property at 651-669 Vernon and 341 Hazel, presented the attached information and March 4, 2012 letter to the Village Board. The letter suggested that with changing times and changing economic situations that certain business uses that are not allowed on the ground floor in our business district should be considered to be permitted. Staff would note that

some of the uses noted in the letter as not being permitted on the ground floor such as baked food vendors, travel agents, bicycle sales, and insurance agent offices are currently permitted on the ground floor. The Dresner/Campbell letter included other uses not permitted on the ground floor which have been included in the attached table summarizing survey results of our neighboring communities.

Additional ground floor uses that were not included in the current Zoning Code ground floor allowed use list but have been inquired about by potential renters in past years, have been added for consideration by the Zoning Commission. Note that some of these uses currently exist in our two business districts as secondary minority uses on the ground floor. For informational purposes staff notes that some of the storefronts shown as exhibits as having vacant ground floors have pending new tenants or building purchasers including 694 Vernon Avenue, 378 Park Avenue, and 332 Park Avenue.

The last time business district uses were examined by the Zoning Commission was in June 2005. At that time the question was whether the central business district should be divided into a peripheral overlay district that allows certain service uses such as banks, dry cleaners, hair salons, etc. only on the periphery of the downtown business district. At the time the Zoning Commission recommended to the Village Board that no change be made. This recommendation was made on the basis that Glencoe's central business district was too small geographically to divide up in this manner.

**Analysis:** In holding its public hearing and making recommendations to the Village Board on business district use list recommendations, the Zoning Commission reviewed both the short and long term overall impact of making any changes. Consideration is also being given to the mixed use nature of our business districts which adjoin single and multiple family uses that adjoin them. In our central business district, some buildings have 2nd and 3rd floors with rental or owned apartments and/or office uses.

Staff prepared a comparison table for each of the uses listed in the Village Board's referral resolution. The comparisons were to towns that have central business districts similar to our own, although Northfield's and Deerfield's are principally made up of strip malls or malls with parking lots in front of them. It was noted that although many towns do not allow many of the uses on this list, they have a provision that may allow some of the use categories if they do not comprise more than 10% of the overall business district frontage for which the applicant must then apply for a special use permit. Their special use hearing time frames typically take 3 to 4 months similar to our own. Going through the special use process does not guarantee approval of the particular applicant's request in that the applicant must be able to provide documentation that he meets the specific standards that a particular zoning code requires. In some other examples, a zoning code may require certain uses to go through the special use process without an initial 10% frontage limitation.

The secondary part of the Village Board referral was to review the Village Attorney's recommendation that the reference business use system be changed from the old SIC classification system to the NAICS system.

The Chair opened the hearing to public comment. The following people spoke:

Kathy Janega, 675 Greenwood, spoke noting there should be caution in adding uses that

could conflict with adjoining residential uses. She spoke with concern on the following uses: tax preparation services with high numbers of seasonal employees, dance/music lessons studio/school with the numbers of people this could draw, child day care that needs drop-off areas that are not available in the business districts. She spoke with concern to not allow uses that would aggravate parking in future better economic times.

Kevin Campbell, owns 651-669 Vernon, and 341 Hazel, spoke as a property owner trying to fill vacant spaces and with concerns with increasingly high real estate tax bills. He stated 80% of the economy is service based. Internet sales have cut into retail sales for small merchants. He noted a dance or music lesson studio would have uses later in the day when parking demand is less. He noted he is in favor of including tutoring uses, tech consultants, investment counseling, tax preparation and pet grooming to the ground floor use list. He did not favor lease time limits which were discussed by Zoning Commission members. Some Zoning Commission members recommended further discussions amending the zoning code special use format with a possible 10 year lease time restriction for some of the uses on the list. After further discussion members unanimously agreed to continue this agenda item to their September 10, 2012 meeting.

There being no further business to come before the Zoning Commission the meeting was adjourned at 9:50 P.M.

---

John Houde, Secretary

1                   BEFORE THE  
 2                   VILLAGE OF GLENCOE  
 3                   ZONING COMMISSION

6                   JULY 9, 2012  
 7                   7:30 PM

10                  PUBLIC HEARING

14                  HELD AT: 675 VILLAGE COURT  
 15                  GLENCOE, IL

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1   APPEARANCES:

2   BARBARA MILLER - Chairperson  
 3   DAVID FRIEDMAN - Commissioner  
 4   STEVE ROSS - Commissioner  
 5   JIM CLARK - Commissioner  
 6   ED GOODALE - Commissioner  
 7   JIM NYESTE - Commissioner  
 8   HOWARD ROIN - Commissioner

7   JOHN HOUDE - Community Development

8   HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP  
 9   131 South Dearborn Street  
 10  30th Floor  
 11  Chicago, IL 60603  
 12  BY: ANDREW FISKE, ESQ.

12  Assistant Village Attorney

14  NEAL & LEROY, LLC  
 15  203 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2300  
 16  Chicago, IL 60601-1241  
 17  BY: SCOTT R. BORSTEIN, ESQ.

17  appeared on behalf of Applicant Chase Bank

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1                   (Whereupon, the Chase Bank issue begins at  
 2   7:35 PM)

3                   CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Next item is the  
 4   public hearing to make a recommendation to the  
 5   Village Board of Trustees for a request by  
 6   Chase Bank to waive the parking requirement for  
 7   a new or substantially reconstructed building  
 8   at the southwest corner of Park Avenue and  
 9   Village Court known as 332 Park Avenue.

10                  And at this time I am going to ask that  
 11   anyone who will or might be speaking in  
 12   connection with this matter be sworn in.

13                  And John will do that.

14                  MR. HOUDE: Would you raise your  
 15   right-hand?

16                  (Witnesses Sworn In)

17                  MR. HOUDE: Thank you.

18                  CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Is anybody  
 19   here from Chase Bank?

20                  MR. BORSTEIN: Yes.

21                  CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Please introduce  
 22   yourself and proceed.

23                  MR. BORSTEIN: Thank you.

24                  Madam Chairman, members of the Commission,  
 25   Scott Borstein from the office of Neil and

25

1   Leroy on behalf of Chase Bank.

2                   We are here before you today because we  
 3   have an application to, it's actually to  
 4   construct a new bank branch at 332 Park Avenue.

5                   The existing building which previously  
 6   housed a bank has been vacant for the last  
 7   couple years. And as a result we can not  
 8   grandfather in under that prior use which also  
 9   had no parking.

10                  So we have to appear before you today to  
 11   seek your recommendation for approval to  
 12   eliminate parking with the new branch.

13                  The bank size is approximately 3300 square  
 14   feet which under your zoning rules would have a  
 15   seven parking space requirement.

16                  But again we are asking that it be reduced  
 17   to zero so it will be complete elimination of  
 18   the parking.

19                  Today I'm joined by our project architect  
 20   Tim Meseck, who's the Vice President of Tap  
 21   Architecture. And we also have a couple people  
 22   from Chase Bank who are here to answer  
 23   questions if they should so arise. Mr. Terry  
 24   Roswick and Mr. John Krissoff.

25                  So with that I will introduce Mr. Meseck.

25

1 This is basically a, he will be handling the  
2 responses in terms of the standards that are  
3 required for a special use.

4 And the way I have proposed to do it I  
5 will kind of ask him what the standard is and  
6 then let him answer and provide the response.  
7 And then of course you can ask questions of any  
8 of us.

9 MR. BORSTEIN: Go ahead state your name  
10 and address, your qualifications for the  
11 record.

12 MR. MESECK: Good evening. My name is Tim  
13 Meseck. I work with The Architects Partnership  
14 located at 122 South Michigan Avenue in  
15 Chicago, Illinois. And we are the architect of  
16 record for Chase Bank.

17 BY MR. BORSTEIN:

18 Q Can you just briefly state your  
19 qualifications, how long you have been practicing as  
20 an architect and so forth?

21 A Our architecture firm has been practicing  
22 in Chicago for 32 years. I have been with the firm  
23 for the last eight years and a licensed architect  
24 for the last five years.

25 We have done retail banking centers

1 and corporate work for banks for the last 32 years.  
2 And we have worked with Chase or their predecessors,  
3 First Chicago National Bank of Detroit for the last  
4 28 years.

5 Q Thank you. Can you now just describe the  
6 proposal for the Commission?

7 A Yes. The site is located at the southwest  
8 corner of Park and Village Court. It's the existing  
9 what used to be Bank of America site, two-story  
10 building and extends down Village Court about  
11 125 feet.

12 So the site itself is at the hard  
13 corner right across from the library, just west of  
14 the library. And it's 125 feet by about 28 feet  
15 until we hit the demising wall of the cleaners next  
16 door to us.

17 The existing building was a banking  
18 center that was operating up until a few years ago  
19 and similar use to what we are proposing for the  
20 Chase portion of the work.

21 However, the building was old and  
22 antiquated and didn't necessarily meet the local  
23 ordinance and code requirements that we're looking  
24 to enact. So we did a study of the existing  
25 building.

1 And actually before I jump to the  
2 existing building. As far as the park that  
3 surrounds this site we do have parking that is  
4 perpendicular to Park Avenue in front of the branch  
5 so just north of the site.

6 And there are parallel spaces along  
7 Village Court adjacent to the building. There's  
8 also public parking about 95 spaces in the public  
9 lot just south of our building.

10 And what's interesting about that  
11 existing building is it basically has three  
12 frontages so it has the north facade which faces  
13 Park. It's got the east facade which faces the  
14 library or Village Court. And then it's got the  
15 south facade which faces the public parking lot to  
16 the south.

17 The existing building is like I said  
18 a two-story building. It had the bank use at the  
19 first floor. It had apartments above and it was  
20 done in a I am going to call it a Tudor style that  
21 has stucco and wood clapboard siding.

22 The building itself, it started out  
23 as the original building at the hard corner of  
24 Village Court and Park. We believe -- and John  
25 could probably correct me if I am wrong -- that that

1 original building dates back to the 30's or 40's.

2 MR. HOUDE: Yeah. That's probably the  
3 vintage of that.

4 MR. MESECK: And the unfortunate part of  
5 that it's been rehabbed over time. So that  
6 original building didn't extend back a full  
7 25 feet. It was about 40 or 50 feet back from  
8 Park and that was the extent of the two-story  
9 structure.

10 Over time there was another structure that  
11 was on the south portion of the lot that was  
12 developed and that was a two-story structure as  
13 well. So for a time you had these two  
14 structures, the front portion and the back  
15 portion.

16 What had happened then that filled in this  
17 area here, the middle area between those two  
18 buildings. And it's basically a fake parapet  
19 that runs from the two-story structure up front  
20 to the two-story structure behind.

21 And they filled it in with CMU blocks,  
22 stucco on the block. And it's really a  
23 patchwork of these different buildings and  
24 structural systems.

25 The building also had a basement which

1 they have extended through the years. And it  
2 actually extends almost all the way back to the  
3 south property line.

4 Because the building has been cobbled  
5 together over time there's really no distinct  
6 architecture that tied that entire structure  
7 together that would be of a historic or, you  
8 know, a nature that would be compatible with  
9 the goals of the downtown area.

10 So working with Village staff we took a  
11 look and it. And we did some investigation how  
12 we could reutilize that existing structure and  
13 still meet the goals of the current ordinance;  
14 basically brick veneer throughout all three  
15 sides of that building.

16 In order to do that structurally we would  
17 have had to basically take it down not only to  
18 the sheeting but take it down to the studs and  
19 the framing and really start from that point  
20 and kind of build it back up.

21 So it was through that process where we  
22 started to investigate, you know, the  
23 feasibility of keeping the existing structure  
24 versus providing a new structure. And that's  
25 where through that feasibility study we started

1 to verify whether a new two-story structure  
2 that meets the goals and the ordinance of the  
3 downtown business district could suffice for  
4 this location.

5 And through that study the usability of  
6 that building and the longevity of that  
7 building we believe that the two-story new  
8 structure, two-story facade I should say, will  
9 give us not only a better building but will  
10 meet current codes and ordinances, will be  
11 environmentally friendly.

12 We will use environmental practices  
13 throughout the building and then also allow us  
14 to bring that building into the 21st Century  
15 from a banking standpoint.

16 So we took a look at the treatment of  
17 those three facades and how we would deal with  
18 those three frontages. And we have come up  
19 with a massing study you see in front of me  
20 today.

21 We are currently working with Village  
22 staff and eventually the Plan Commission  
23 approval and Appearance Commission process to  
24 come up with the architecture and the final  
25 design and details. But it is something that

1 we think that overall massing is very similar  
2 to the adjacent buildings in the area.

3 We are trying to tie in that two-story  
4 architecture to create that visible block where  
5 this will really be the starting point of what  
6 is happening to the west.

7 So we want to put a good face on that  
8 corner and do it in a way that's sympathetic to  
9 authentic detailing and architecture and also  
10 allow us to practice our business and the  
11 banking use inside.

12 So that's where we are today and some of  
13 the detailing thought that went into this  
14 proposal.

15 Just as some background to the need for  
16 the parking and what may be, you know,  
17 affecting that decision.

18 Q So we will get into the standards then.

19 Will the proposed bank branch and the  
20 elimination of required parking on the site be in  
21 harmony with the specific purposes for which the  
22 code was enacted, the regulations of the B1 District  
23 and the comprehensive plan?

24 A Yes. The general purpose of the code is  
25 to promote thriving businesses that complement

1 Glencoe's residential neighborhoods. And throughout  
2 the downtown central business district land use  
3 patterns and property values are to be protected and  
4 proposed businesses should provide convenience and  
5 meet the shopping needs of the area residents.

6 The comprehensive plan echos these  
7 goals and endorses the idea of eliminating parking  
8 requirement in the downtown area through the special  
9 use process.

10 Indeed, the special use for the  
11 elimination of the parking at this location is  
12 consistent with the existing land use patterns in  
13 the area.

14 The site and the former bank branch  
15 that was located there did not have any on site  
16 parking. The vast majority of businesses in this  
17 area utilize public parking facilities that I  
18 mentioned including the public parking lot that I  
19 mentioned immediately south of the subject site.

20 The proposed bank will replace that  
21 currently vacated building which was occupied for  
22 many years by the former bank.

23 As a result the new bank will again  
24 provide a convenience and meet the shopping needs of  
25 area residents in addition to enhancing the property



1 values in the area.

2 Q And will the proposed use and development  
3 have a substantial or undue adverse effect on the  
4 adjacent property, character of the area, parking,  
5 utility facilities and other matters affecting the  
6 public health, safety and general welfare?

7 A No. The proposed bank is replacing the  
8 former bank use at this location in a new and  
9 modernized building.

10 In addition, the design of the new  
11 bank branch is consistent with the height of the  
12 existing building at the site and the other  
13 structures in the general area.

14 The new building however is less than  
15 half the square footage of the existing building and  
16 will not contain any of the general office uses  
17 present in the old building.

18 Essentially it's the single-story  
19 branch occupying the 3500 square foot lot.

20 Further, by continuing to utilize the  
21 adjacent public parking as opposed to providing on  
22 site parking the proposed development will minimize  
23 any new curb cuts or change of traffic patterns  
24 which may impact pedestrian safety and welfare in  
25 the area.

1 The new building will be designed  
2 with glass and masonry, architectural details  
3 consistent with the character of the area, replacing  
4 the outmoded and vacant existing building with a new  
5 structure that meets the needs of the community will  
6 have a positive overall impact on the area.

7 Q Will the proposed use and development be  
8 constructed, arranged and operated so as not to  
9 dominate the immediate vicinity or to interfere with  
10 the use and development of neighboring property in  
11 accordance with the applicable district regulations?

12 A The proposed use and development will be  
13 constructed, arranged and operated almost exactly as  
14 the prior bank use at this location. Entry and aids  
15 at location remain exactly the same as prior use.

16 The proposed height and materials  
17 used on the new building are consistent with the  
18 overall area. Because of the former use and  
19 existing site had no available on site parking the  
20 proposed use will not interfere with or change the  
21 use of the neighboring property.

22 Q Will the proposed use require any change  
23 in public facilities or services such as streets,  
24 public utilities, drainage structures, police and  
25 fire protection, refuse disposal, water, sewers,

1 parks, libraries and schools?

2 A No. The proposed use will not require any  
3 change in public features, facilities or services  
4 such as streets, public utilities, drainage  
5 structures, police and fire protection, refuse,  
6 disposals, water and sewers, parks, libraries and  
7 schools.

8 Q And will the proposed use and development  
9 cause undue traffic congestion or draw significant  
10 amounts of traffic through residential streets?

11 A No. The proposed bank use with no on-site  
12 parking is replacing the former bank and office  
13 building at this location which also did not provide  
14 on-site parking.

15 As such, traffic patterns will not  
16 change. Further because there would be fewer uses  
17 in the building traffic levels will remain at or  
18 below the prior use avoiding any undue traffic  
19 congestion nor drawing significant amounts of  
20 traffic throughout the residential streets nearby?

21 Q And will the proposed use and development  
22 result in the destruction, loss or damage of any  
23 natural, scenic or historic feature of significant  
24 importance?

25 A No. The current building at the site

1 which is being fully replaced has no natural, scenic  
2 or historic features of significant importance.

3 As a result it's replacement with the  
4 building that meets the current needs of the banking  
5 community will help the functionality of the  
6 downtown central business district.

7 Q And will the proposed use and development  
8 comply with all additional standards proposed on it  
9 by the particular provisions of this code  
10 authorizing such use?

11 A Yes. The proposed use and development  
12 other than the request for the special use to  
13 eliminate the parking at the site will comply with  
14 all standards, regulations and requirements imposed  
15 by the Village of Glencoe.

16 Q And in your opinion are any special  
17 standards required for this proposed special use?

18 A No. Article 4, Section 4-103 does not  
19 impose any special standards relative to a special  
20 use for the elimination of the parking at this  
21 location.

22 Although the Board of Trustees may  
23 impose various restrictions relating to the proposed  
24 use of the bank no such restrictions are necessary  
25 in this case as the proposed new banking facility

1 will be replacing the former bank branch of the same  
2 size, character, operations and design as the  
3 proposed use.

4 Q Is the proposed use and development at  
5 this particular location requested necessary or  
6 desirable to provide a service or a facility that is  
7 in the interest of the public and convenience or  
8 that will contribute to the general welfare of the  
9 neighborhood or community?

10 A Yes. The special use request for this  
11 location will allow the proposed bank to be located  
12 at this location. Not having on-site parking will  
13 actually benefit the areas as adequate public  
14 parking is available nearby.

15 This will avoid the creation of any  
16 new curb cuts or traffic patterns in the area which  
17 would detract from the pedestrian friendly nature of  
18 Glencoe's central business district.

19 The new building will provide a  
20 modern facility which meets the current needs of the  
21 banking community thereby enhancing the  
22 functionality of the central business district.

23 The former bank branch at this site  
24 was successful but closed because it was acquired by  
25 a larger bank that already had another more modern

1 branch in the area. Accordingly, the continuing of  
2 the same type of use will provide a service and  
3 facility that is in the interest of the public  
4 convenience.

5 Q Can the public goals be met by the  
6 location of the proposed use and development at some  
7 other site or in some other area that may be more  
8 appropriate than at the proposed site?

9 A No. The existing structure at this site  
10 has been vacant for over two years.

11 As a result it would be a disservice  
12 we believe to the public and the goals of the  
13 Village of Glencoe to deny the special use for this  
14 project and prevent this site from being redeveloped  
15 with a needed use for the area.

16 Q And lastly, have all the steps possible  
17 been taken to minimize any adverse effects on the  
18 proposed use and development on the immediate  
19 vicinity through building design, set design,  
20 landscape and screening?

21 A Yes. The proposed building and  
22 elimination of on-site parking are consistent with  
23 the existing developments in the area.

24 As indicated this site has never had  
25 on-site parking and it has utilized the abundance of

1 public parking available in the area.

2 Granting the special use to eliminate  
3 the parking will help mitigate any adverse impacts  
4 on the area that might otherwise occur if a new  
5 driveway and parking lot were introduced into  
6 Glencoe's pedestrian oriented central business  
7 district.

8 In terms of the building design,  
9 landscaping and screening it will not have any  
10 adverse impacts on the area.

11 To the contrary, the current building  
12 is outmoded, vacant and its redevelopment will have  
13 a salutary effect on the area.

14 MR. BORSTEIN: That concludes the various  
15 standards and our testimony. As I say, we are  
16 all here available to answer any questions you  
17 might have.

18 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you. Anyone on  
19 the Board have questions for either of these  
20 two gentlemen?

21 MR. ROIN: So if they were to comply what  
22 would they have to do?

23 MR. FISKE: In terms of providing the off  
24 street parking it would be the requirement I  
25 believe that they provide seven off street

1 parking spaces.

2 MR. ROIN: That would have to be on-site?

3 MR. FISKE: That's correct. Yes.

4 MR. ROIN: Is that something that we said  
5 oh, no, you have to do it?

6 Is that something you would do, could you  
7 do it?

8 I mean, I'll just, you know. You a number  
9 of times, you referred to the abundant public  
10 parking.

11 Anybody who's has been hanging around the  
12 Village of Glencoe and these meetings knows  
13 that would not be the general view of the town.

14 Now it seems a little more abundant now  
15 because the town is deserted. So that's the  
16 general view around here is we don't have an  
17 abundance of public parking.

18 MR. MESECK: It is a difficult site.

19 When we first started taking a look at  
20 this property the fact that it sits where it  
21 does and it has those three frontages on the  
22 north, east and south present difficulties for  
23 the redevelopment of this property.

24 The fact that the property is only I would  
25 say about 28 feet wide presents additional

1 difficulties in how do you arrange that parking  
2 and still end up with a usable building  
3 structure that meets the goals of the central  
4 business district.

5 The fact that this is one of the more  
6 important corners and more visible corners is  
7 both a huge help for our business.

8 But it's also kind of I don't want to say  
9 hindrance but it causes us to take a look at  
10 that building in a different light. It's not  
11 just a building in the middle of the block  
12 that's a piece of the fabric.

13 It is actually a very important building.  
14 And that's where we have worked with staff to  
15 really do that two-story architecture, reuse  
16 that existing foundation so we don't have to  
17 get into some of the streets and the soils and  
18 some of those issues and really go above and  
19 beyond knowing that it can be a great building  
20 at a great location.

21 And I think the parking requirement would  
22 be a major hindrance to that goal.

23 MR. ROIN: Where are your employees going  
24 to park?

25 That is one of the issues that we have

23

1 cannot park in the business district, they have  
2 to use that other lot?

3 Can we do that as part of the special use?

4 MR. FISKE: Well, you have the ability in  
5 conditional special use to impose such  
6 conditions and limitations concerning use,  
7 construction, character, location, landscaping  
8 and screening I think and remembering again  
9 that you are serving as a recommending body in  
10 this.

11 I think you could recommend that the  
12 Applicant provide a plan that such employees  
13 would park in the employee designated lot. I  
14 think you could recommend that.

15 MR. ROIN: I just want to make sure I got  
16 it.

17 Are you saying that you can't sort of do  
18 your plan and have any parking spots?

19 MR. ROSWICK: I think that could sacrifice  
20 any available. It's so narrow.

21 MR. BORSTEIN: We can add we would be  
22 perfectly comfortable with requirement that our  
23 employees, you know, park at that other  
24 location.

25 MR. ROSS: How would those spaces be

1 had. There aren't a lot of parking spots in  
2 the business district.

3 And one of the issues the Village has  
4 repeatedly had is that it turns out the spots  
5 that you may hope your customers are going to  
6 use they are filled by your employees.

7 So your customers and the customers for  
8 whoever else in downtown find themselves  
9 circling looking for spots.

10 Can we do something about that?

11 MR. HOUDE: Let me address that.

12 I think the Applicant is unaware there is  
13 a Village parking lot for employee parking.  
14 And there's free employee passes provided for  
15 the Temple Court lot that's at the south end of  
16 the business district which occupies a half a  
17 square block.

18 So employees are encouraged with the free  
19 parking pass to park there versus moving their  
20 cars around every two hours in the business  
21 district.

22 MR. ROIN: But I know it's kind of a  
23 problem. Can we as part of the special use --  
24 if we were to grant this part of the special  
25 use -- can we say, okay, but your employees

24

1 accessible anyway off of?

2 MR. ROIN: Look. In theory they could  
3 build a taller building.

4 MR. ROSS: Still there would have to be  
5 curb cuts.

6 MR. ROIN: I know. I got it. I am not  
7 actually quarreling but I just wanted to.

8 MR. ROSS: Any other user would face a  
9 similar problem with an antiquated building.

10 MR. ROIN: My point is only that we can't  
11 do this based on the assumption that there is a  
12 lot of parking because.

13 MR. ROSS: No. This probably was not  
14 drafted quite effectively for the audience this  
15 audience. Mentioning the abundant parking was  
16 probably not the best thing.

17 MR. ROSWICK: If the Board decides to make  
18 it a condition of approval that the employees  
19 of the bank need to park in a separate lot and  
20 there's a provision available we would  
21 certainly accept that and make that work with  
22 the staff.

23 MR. BORSTEIN: Also, I mean right. You  
24 may not consider abundant, you know, whatever.  
25 I have been driving around myself. I am not a

1 resident here but I have come here and  
2 occasionally see it may be a depressed time.  
3 There has been a number of spots.

4 It's also also a pedestrian area. And the  
5 bank customers are a lot of pedestrians for  
6 traffic. And so it's not a car oriented  
7 project in the first place.

8 MR. ROIN: No. I can't tell you how  
9 many -- over the years how many times there's  
10 been a discussion of building a, you know, a  
11 parking lot or increasing the size of other  
12 parking lots because we don't have enough  
13 parking. And it's depressing commerce in the  
14 Village.

15 So every time, you know, we allow  
16 something like this we are subject to being  
17 criticized for not taking the opportunity with  
18 the bank that used to have money -- I don't  
19 know if you still do -- to, you know, get more  
20 parking.

21 Could we say, okay, but that as part of  
22 the trade help get us some parking that's not  
23 on the site as part of the special use?

24 MR. FISKE: One of the conditions for this  
25 particular type of special use permanent relief

1 is that under Section 4-103D of your code that  
2 the Board of Trustees may in approving this  
3 type of special use permit request certain  
4 relief that includes Subsection D3 requiring  
5 that the owner provide off-site parking.

6 That conception is a little different than  
7 what we have been talking about in terms of  
8 requiring their employees to use a certain lot.

9 MR. ROIN: Maybe, again the goal is not to  
10 get tough with these folks.

11 And if in fact, you know, we don't have a  
12 spot where additional off-site parking would be  
13 convenient for residents then forget it.

14 But it is something we can think about  
15 because we are always hearing about how we have  
16 parking problems in this town which we hear  
17 from, you know, merchants. Not you at the  
18 moment.

19 But we hear from merchants that it's  
20 depressing their ability to develop. We hear  
21 it from people that want to develop  
22 restaurants. We just always and we hear it  
23 from shoppers.

24 So those are two things we could consider  
25 which would not interfere with their

1 development of the spot but nevertheless would  
2 advance of the purpose of parking requirements,  
3 commerce to the Village.

4 MR. ROSS: What is the approximate value  
5 of the construction that you are planning to  
6 undertake?

7 MR. ROSWICK: 1.8 million.

8 MR. ROSS: John, what are the permit fees,  
9 you know, for the --

10 MR. HOUDE: Three percent of that.

11 MR. ROSS: Three percent. Thanks.

12 MR. CLARK: Explain what is going to  
13 happen to the second floor.

14 Is the interior going to be two stories  
15 high?

16 MR. MESECK: Yes. That is our intent.

17 We would create a two-story facility and  
18 it would have clear glass, double hung windows  
19 on the second floor.

20 MR CLARK: Yeah. We saw that.

21 MR. MESECK: Yep. And that would provide  
22 clear story light to the space below.

23 So from the exterior it would look as a  
24 two-story building. From the interior we would  
25 get light from both first floor and second.

1 MR. CLARK: 16, 18 feet with the height?

2 MR. MESECK: Yeah. Allows us to do some  
3 interesting geometries in the building to  
4 enhance that.

5 It also allows for that corner entrance  
6 that we are trying to develop right at Park and  
7 Village Court to create a kind of a more  
8 authentic two-story entrance element in that  
9 area as well.

10 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Back to the idea  
11 about requiring parking in other places. This  
12 has been talked about for years.

13 Are there any such other places that the  
14 Village owns?

15 I mean is that even, is that feasible?

16 MR. HOUDE: Not unless the Public Works  
17 garage is removed. There was no other area  
18 that could be used other than building a  
19 parking garage.

20 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: We have been through  
21 that.

22 MR. HOUDE: I should add a little factual  
23 thing that the Applicants know with relations  
24 to the existing building with reference to the  
25 overall business district the existing building

1 at this site is unusual in that as they noted  
2 it's cobbled together with the different pieces  
3 and the stucco facade was added to try to  
4 integrate it as the whole section of building I  
5 think when the building was constructed for a  
6 Feldner's Clothing Store which had a branch or  
7 main branch I think in Winnetka or Wilmette.

8 This was a clothing store before. And  
9 then I believe that Skokie Federal Bank Savings  
10 and Loan did the conversion at some point in  
11 the mid 1970's to provide the stucco facade and  
12 converted it to a bank use.

13 Most other buildings in the business  
14 district were all built as one unit so they can  
15 be easily gutted and remodeled. Where you have  
16 an integral brick structure around the  
17 perimeter.

18 This has pieces on the south side,  
19 concrete block covered with stucco. Some of it  
20 is frame covered with stucco so it makes it  
21 very difficult to work with existing structure.

22 It would be in the Applicant's interest  
23 just to keep the structure there. There is no  
24 reason to tear it down except for the fact that  
25 this is a hodgepodge of additions that was done

31

1 business district to have interruptions in  
2 driveways and parking in the street facade of a  
3 building.

4 The goal when you have an older business  
5 district is to try to keep those building  
6 facades intact. It's not to have strip mall  
7 interruptions or driveway interruptions which  
8 are not helpful for the overall health of the  
9 business district.

10 MR. ROIN: I mention this for folks in the  
11 off-site, question. Is there anything they can  
12 do for us to help us with off-site parking?

13 What is the plan for the employee lot?

14 Do you have plans to refurbish the  
15 employee lot?

16 MR. HOUDE: No. It was refurbished. It  
17 was resurfaced and landscaped some ten years  
18 ago when some of the other work in the business  
19 district was done.

20 MR. NYESTE: What is the business use of  
21 that during the week?

22 MR. HOUDE: There's spaces that are  
23 generally available in that parking lot.

24 MR. CLARK: All the stores are occupied,  
25 it's full by 9:00 o'clock.

1 over the years.

2 MR. CLARK: I think it's a benefit to the  
3 community.

4 MR. HOUDE: It is. Structurally --

5 MR. CLARK: Better looking.

6 MR. HOUDE: -- the existing building has  
7 got bigger problems that relate to fire safety  
8 and those types of things.

9 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So is your point that  
10 if they were to somehow work with the existing  
11 structure they wouldn't have to be here tonite?

12 MR. HOUDE: That's correct.

13 They could occupy the existing structure  
14 or substantially remodel the interior without  
15 any need to come to the Village for variation.

16 The only reason they are coming here is  
17 the fact that they need to demolish most or  
18 substantially most of the building that's there  
19 and build another building. Pretty much the  
20 same volume as what is there now.

21 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And the only issue  
22 before us is the parking?

23 MR. HOUDE: That is the only issue before  
24 you. From a land use perspective it's also not  
25 in the best interest of an older central

32

1 MR. HOUDE: Even at the far entrance, far  
2 end near Green Bay Road.

3 MR. CLARK: Every space is taken when the  
4 business district was occupied by the bank and  
5 including the others filled up. But there's  
6 alternate places to park for employees also.

7 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Is it possible for  
8 any of you to compare the number of people,  
9 say, customers -- let's eliminate employees for  
10 the time being -- the number of customers that  
11 might be there at peak times, Saturday morning  
12 or whenever that might be now versus let's say  
13 2007?

14 MR. ROSWICK: Yeah. We were talking about  
15 this earlier today. That's kind of a difficult  
16 number to qualify. We could look at this and  
17 approach it as if it were a standard retail  
18 bank that would be located at a pad or shopping  
19 center.

20 But we are looking at this as a little bit  
21 different because it's not a destination. It's  
22 part of the fabric of the community. People  
23 come for more than one stop. They would shop  
24 at one location. They will get a cup of coffee  
25 then do a little bit of banking. So it is not

1 a destination location, banking, traditional  
 2 strip center so to speak.  
 3 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: That would have been  
 4 true five years ago as well.  
 5 So in other words, I guess what I am  
 6 trying to do is see if we can get some handle  
 7 on is this going to be different for the  
 8 community?  
 9 Let's assume that some day the economy  
 10 picks up and the downtown isn't so depressed.  
 11 Is this going to have a different number  
 12 of customers and therefore cars?  
 13 MR. ROSWICK: From the prior use of the  
 14 bank?  
 15 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Right.  
 16 Is it a smaller bank or is it simply a  
 17 smaller --  
 18 MR. ROSWICK: For the type of bank we  
 19 typically build this is unique.  
 20 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Compared to the BOA.  
 21 MR. MESECK: It's a little bit different  
 22 in that the BOA that was originally there,  
 23 let's say before that, it had more open office  
 24 areas for employees that would meet with  
 25 customers.

1 second floor.  
 2 MR. CLARK: They haven't been occupied for  
 3 many years. I can't even tell you, probably  
 4 10, 15 years.  
 5 MR. ROSWICK: But in terms of the overall  
 6 potential use this is going to be diminished.  
 7 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Anything else from  
 8 our Commission?  
 9 MR. ROIN: The audience.  
 10 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Anyone from the  
 11 audience have questions?  
 12 MR. ROIN: In terms of what we should do,  
 13 I think there are two ideas. One, look. It's  
 14 been unoccupied. They certainly have done a  
 15 nice job.  
 16 It looks like it's going to be an  
 17 improvement. It looks like it will fit with  
 18 the town. I am no expert on that stuff. But  
 19 it looks okay to me.  
 20 But we ought to insist on steps to make  
 21 sure that their employees don't take our  
 22 valuable parking spots, and that's something  
 23 they would probably want anyway.  
 24 And then I don't know if there's anything  
 25 they can do in connection with this to enhance

1 We anticipate five or six offices and two  
 2 split teller lines. So employees for our  
 3 branch will be between five and ten employees.  
 4 The previous user had more office  
 5 component associated with the bank use and more  
 6 sit down areas. The reason for that split is  
 7 we are taking a look at more financial advising  
 8 opportunities.  
 9 And really it's more of a sit down with  
 10 known customers scheduled appointment. And  
 11 it's really a hands-on customer interaction  
 12 more so than just the come and go traffic that  
 13 you have with typical banking centers in a  
 14 strip mall application.  
 15 We won't have the drive through uses  
 16 obviously. The teller lines, we have some self  
 17 service tellers for that in and out traffic.  
 18 But it's really geared to our private  
 19 client services that provide some of those  
 20 additional benefits and services that aren't  
 21 found everywhere.  
 22 So the overall use will be we believe to  
 23 be less than the original banking center that  
 24 was on-site.  
 25 MR. ROSWICK: Plus we are eliminating the

1 our off-site parking. I haven't heard any  
 2 suggestion if there is anything they can do.  
 3 But it's worth exploring as part of this  
 4 project because the ordinance does require  
 5 parking. And I appreciate if they simply try  
 6 to use the existing structure they would be  
 7 grandfathered in. But that's not what they are  
 8 doing. And we don't have to extract the full  
 9 pound of flesh. But maybe there's nothing that  
 10 we need of off street parking.  
 11 But, John, I have a hard time believing  
 12 that. I have been hearing so much about our  
 13 parking problems. So those are the two things  
 14 I would consider as part of the recommending  
 15 approval of the special use.  
 16 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: If I am understanding  
 17 you correctly your ideal recommendation would  
 18 include the requirement on the employee  
 19 parking?  
 20 MR. ROIN: Yes.  
 21 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Using Temple Court  
 22 lot. And that the Village Board consider some  
 23 sort of off-site requirement such as available,  
 24 I am not sure.  
 25 MR. ROIN: Yes. We haven't heard one.

1 MR. ROSS: That could be handled in  
 2 separate motions.  
 3 MR. ROIN: Yeah. That's fine. I don't  
 4 know. That's okay. And I am not sure what it  
 5 would be. Just we have somebody in town who  
 6 was asking for, you know, an exemption to a  
 7 requirement. And it, parking is a problem in  
 8 this town.  
 9 And there might be something they can do  
 10 to enhance our parking problem and enhance the  
 11 solution to our parking problem.  
 12 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I am also wondering  
 13 isn't that really a Plan Commission issue?  
 14 MR. ROIN: I think it's now or never.  
 15 Once they are here they are here.  
 16 MR. CLARK: They have to go in front of  
 17 the Plan Commission anyways.  
 18 MR. ROIN: Once they get approval from the  
 19 Village Board for special use they are done.  
 20 MR. HOUDE: But they will, the process is  
 21 that they will need to iron out the building  
 22 plans with us, the staff.  
 23 And then this, if you approve this motion  
 24 they will have a recommendation. They will  
 25 have a condition.

1 The Plan Commission is the appearance of  
 2 the project, whatever, way they deem fit in  
 3 terms of input.  
 4 That packet will go to the Village Board.  
 5 It will not go separately to the Village Board  
 6 right now in special use until the Plan  
 7 Commission is completed with it.  
 8 MR. NYESTE: John and Andrew, if Chase  
 9 were to have disabled employees and we  
 10 condition their permission here on parking  
 11 remotely at the Temple Court lot what would be  
 12 done for the disabled employee, use a walker or  
 13 cane or just has trouble walking that far?  
 14 MR. HOUDE: The Temple Court lot is  
 15 handicap accessible. And the business district  
 16 in general is handicap accessible.  
 17 MR. NYESTE: It would be much more  
 18 convenient if they were able to park closer.  
 19 MR. HOUDE: They are handicap spaces.  
 20 MR. CLARK: I don't think they should park  
 21 remotely at handicap.  
 22 MR. ROIN: That's an issue. I don't know  
 23 if it's true. It might be true and it might be  
 24 the responsibility of the business to get their  
 25 employee there without taking our parking spot

1 if we have a handicap accessible place for them  
 2 to park.  
 3 MR. FISKE: I think that's certainly two  
 4 levels to that question. One is that there  
 5 would be within the Village lot designation of  
 6 disabled parking.  
 7 There is also the ultimate responsibility  
 8 in terms of providing compliance with the  
 9 Americans With Disability Act and other things  
 10 with regard to employees themselves would be  
 11 with the employer, not -- it's certainly  
 12 something that you can look at in terms of if  
 13 you don't want to frustrate the ability of  
 14 employees to use the disabled parking spaces  
 15 that are designated in the downtown.  
 16 Look at that time that way. But  
 17 ultimately you are providing disabled parking  
 18 but in the remote lot and in the street.  
 19 And ultimately in terms of how employees  
 20 get to their job that's the responsibility of  
 21 the employer rather than us.  
 22 MR. NYESTE: I'm just a little reluctant  
 23 to tie their hands to strictly when they are  
 24 proposing a new building that's quite a benefit  
 25 to the Village. The existing building is

1 literally an eye sore. It is not amenable to  
 2 our use.  
 3 MR. ROIN: They said they are happy to do  
 4 it.  
 5 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yeah. They are  
 6 ready. Okay. How many employees did you say  
 7 you are likely to have?  
 8 MR. MESECK: Maybe between five and ten  
 9 employees depending on shifts and need.  
 10 MR. ROIN: Obviously important those five  
 11 or ten employees do not park in our abundant,  
 12 you know, uptown parking spots. Anyway, those  
 13 are my two ideas.  
 14 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Anybody else?  
 15 MR. CLARK: Motion.  
 16 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: All right.  
 17 MR. ROIN: Yeah. Should I make it?  
 18 And I make the motion that we require that  
 19 the employees park in the lot available for  
 20 employees but not in the business district.  
 21 And I would recommend to the Village Board  
 22 they look into whether there's anything that  
 23 could be done in connection with this project  
 24 to enhance our parking problems, enhance the  
 25 solution to our parking problem. And, you

1 know, I would suggest that it not be the,  
2 whatever the cost of providing six spaces would  
3 be or something but maybe.

4 MR. ROSS: We are going to do that in two  
5 separate motions.

6 MR. ROIN: I, you know, if we need it to  
7 be done that way because one is going down and  
8 the other one is going up that's fine.

9 MR. FISKE: What I might suggest. You  
10 might want to just sort of get a straw poll of  
11 the group with regard to each of those separate  
12 issues before you have a motion. It seems like  
13 we have two.

14 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: That's the reason  
15 for --

16 MR. HOUDE: Let me add a little tidbit.

17 Historically there was a period of time to  
18 waive the parking requirement. There was a 15  
19 or something thousand dollar per space  
20 requirement that's part of the parking  
21 requirement in the zoning code.

22 That requirement came after the  
23 construction of the building at Park and Vernon  
24 at the northwest corner and then was changed I  
25 think some 10, 15 years ago back to what, not

1 back, to what it is now.

2 MR. ROIN: Which is special use.

3 MR. HOUDE: In other words, that dollar  
4 amount was deleted off.

5 MR. ROIN: It was special use.

6 MR. HOUDE: Went to special use format.

7 MR. ROIN: You apply whatever is  
8 appropriate, you know.

9 MR. HOUDE: Right.

10 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: All right. So it's  
11 my sense that at least one motion we could  
12 dispense with fairly easily. And that would be  
13 the employee, the employees using the employee  
14 designated lot on Temple Court.

15 Does anyone have any objections to that?

16 That we, so that it would make it subject  
17 to that. That's what has been noted.

18 Then may I have a motion on that?

19 MR. ROIN: I thought the suggestion was  
20 for straw poll to see if, what is happening.

21 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: On the other one.

22 MR. ROIN: On the other one.

23 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: See if we can do it  
24 at the same time. And on the issue of making a  
25 requirement. I am not sure it would be a

1 requirement but a recommendation that, that  
2 there be a consideration of parking some sort  
3 of remote parking that would have to be  
4 provided by Chase.

5 MR. ROIN: The idea is really what John  
6 talked about before which a contribution. It  
7 sounds like it would be a financial  
8 contribution to, you know, help with our  
9 off-site parking.

10 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: But it would have to  
11 be -- right. It wouldn't just be money in the  
12 general kitty. Right. It would be money that  
13 somehow would be used for this particular  
14 problem; not to pave the streets.

15 MR. ROIN: Well, that is the idea. I  
16 don't know. I guess the bottom line is money.

17 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I don't know whether  
18 that has to be the case or not because what I  
19 don't know is whether this idea is even  
20 feasible in terms of, you know, is there a  
21 physical place.

22 MR. ROIN: Sounds to me like what we are  
23 talking about there's certainly work that has  
24 to be done on all of our parking lots all the  
25 time. So I guess what I am talking about is

1 some contribution to that effort. But I think  
2 money is expendable and the recommendation to  
3 the Village Board that's something we should  
4 consider in granting a special use permit.

5 We don't have enough information to  
6 suggest what they should do. I would suggest  
7 that they consider --

8 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: A amount.

9 MR. ROIN -- a financial contribution to  
10 help us with our parking problem which we need  
11 work all the time.

12 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Any objections to  
13 that from anybody?

14 MR. ROSS: Just looking around. Well, I  
15 think it's interesting that John mentioned that  
16 in the past there was a precedent for a payment  
17 in lieu that was at some point deleted from the  
18 zoning code and it went to special, you know,  
19 this process of discussion of special use.

20 That means something to me that there was  
21 consideration in the past for some type of  
22 trading. And I wasn't aware of that.

23 And I felt that it clearly has to be  
24 discussed by the Board as to how much, what  
25 does it go for.



1 You are of the belief there is a parking  
2 issue and has been.  
3 MR. ROIN: I am.  
4 MR. ROSS: It's also a function of the  
5 economy and the occupancy in the downtown  
6 district. And that's, you know, that's soft  
7 right now.  
8 So what happens with those funds in the  
9 interim? What do they get used for?  
10 But the motion was considered in the past,  
11 and there was a precedent for it.  
12 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And it would be, it  
13 would be a recommendation for the Village Board  
14 to consider. And they would presumably have  
15 information.  
16 MR. ROSS: There is no question that this  
17 use is an improvement over the --  
18 MR. ROIN: There is no question.  
19 MR. ROSS: There is no question that curb  
20 cuts destroy the pedestrian fabric and it's  
21 consistent with what we want in the downtown  
22 area. All those things I hope we all agree are  
23 obvious.  
24 MR. ROIN: I think we do. Like I said, I  
25 don't know under the ordinance that existed

1 before was it like the Civil War where you  
2 could just buy your way out?  
3 MR. HOUDE: Yes. But it was never  
4 utilized.  
5 MR. ROIN: So I think the special use idea  
6 is better because there might be circumstances  
7 in which you wouldn't allow someone to buy  
8 their way out. You just insist, no, you have  
9 to put in parking.  
10 Here that's the opposite. On one hand it  
11 would be nice to have parking. On the other  
12 hand we don't want to put it at the site.  
13 So it's appropriate in the special use  
14 context with the site. Okay. What, is the  
15 developer still getting a break in not having  
16 to do this parking and should something else be  
17 required.  
18 And I think the answer might very well be  
19 yes. Not to penalize them because we have a  
20 parking problem even though it is a little  
21 invisible now because the economy is so  
22 depressed. It's not going to be invisible  
23 forever.  
24 MR. NYESTE: I believe that was deleted  
25 because the Village doesn't have the power to

1 do that.  
2 MR. ROIN: No.  
3 MR. NYESTE: Do we have the taxing power  
4 to do that?  
5 MR. HOUDE: We do have the power to do  
6 that. I think it was to represent the cost of  
7 parking improvements and infrastructure.  
8 MR. NYESTE: Why was it deleted; because  
9 it's impractical so there aren't places to do  
10 it.  
11 MR. HOUDE: In conjunction with a  
12 project -- I don't know which project -- there  
13 was a project that was being constructed that  
14 the Applicant said this is really unreasonable  
15 or too much, the seven times 15. And so the  
16 Board I believe at that time deleted that  
17 requirement.  
18 MR. NYESTE: Wait for 20 years until we  
19 have a large enough pot of money and that just  
20 isn't going to fly.  
21 MR. FISKE: I think in terms of thinking  
22 conceptually about the kind of conditions that  
23 you can put on it I think that the conditions  
24 in Section 4-103D talking about the relief that  
25 the Board can grant are in four general areas.

1 They are restricting the size of the  
2 building or addition; restricting the uses;  
3 requiring that the owner provide off-site  
4 parking and/or place any other restrictions or  
5 conditions on the special use permit as the  
6 Board deems necessary or appropriate.  
7 It's that last one that has the most  
8 breadth in terms of what the Board of Trustees  
9 could do. That said, I think that the focus is  
10 best on the issue of the provision of parking;  
11 that the question be to the extent that you  
12 support that type of condition that the Village  
13 Board explore alternative off-site needs that  
14 parking can be provided.  
15 I think the more you talk about some type  
16 of financial contribution or something like  
17 that I think it's a degree of remove that I  
18 think is not as supportable as keeping the  
19 concept tied to the issues tied to parking.  
20 MR. ROIN: The actual contribution to  
21 parking. I mean I can't believe we don't spend  
22 money all the time towards making sure that  
23 there's parking around this town.  
24 I just can't believe it. I am sure we do.  
25 MR. CLARK: I think we should go with your

1 recommendation of let the Village Board put it  
2 in their hands and just remind them that option  
3 is available.

4 The flip of that and the reality in this  
5 economy you guys are developers. No one is  
6 going to pay -- everyone should pay for the  
7 dirt and make a 1.8 million dollar improvement  
8 and put retail there. And if they did that's a  
9 lot more people than the bank is going to do.

10 But it just isn't feasible economically in  
11 today's world to spend the money for the dirt  
12 and build a building and then try to lease it  
13 out as a retail spot which would be ideal.

14 But I don't think it's realistic. So you  
15 know I think they made a nice effort on the  
16 outside and probably fine tune what goes to the  
17 Commission to look at.

18 And so I take the recommendation, pass the  
19 recommendation on. The Village Board can do  
20 what they want to do.

21 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Am I still correct  
22 that we should have two motions?

23 MR. ROIN: I think we can have one.

24 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Is everyone able to  
25 support both of those things or neither?

1 MR. ROSS: I think so.

2 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Do you need us to  
3 repeat?

4 MR. FISKE: I can rephrase it. We also  
5 want to incorporate the exterior design  
6 aspects.

7 It would be a motion to recommend approval  
8 of the requested special use permit subject to  
9 the conditions that the Applicant provide that  
10 employees of the facility park off-site, that  
11 the Zoning Commission recommends that the  
12 Village Board receive information from the  
13 developer about the provision of off-site  
14 parking or some type of financial contribution  
15 related to providing off-site parking and  
16 finally that the recommendation of approval is  
17 conditioned upon the Plan Commission's approval  
18 of the exterior appearance that's it required  
19 to do.

20 MR. CLARK: I don't know that we need to  
21 add that, do we? It's part of the ordinance to  
22 begin with.

23 MR. FISKE: It is. I think it's helpful  
24 to the motion because it just clarifies it.

25 It's not a bifurcated process because

1 yours really can't go forward if they don't get  
2 the building the way they want it to look.

3 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I was confused about  
4 their employees.

5 When you say off-site does that include  
6 the Temple Court?

7 MR. FISKE: Yes.

8 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So we are not sending  
9 them on the other side of Frontage Road, right?

10 I think, I mean if there's any possible  
11 ambiguity there I would rather say something  
12 like that designated.

13 MR. CLARK: Designated employee parking by  
14 the Village.

15 MR. FISKE: Yes. You can substitute that  
16 in the motion.

17 MR. CLARK: I will second that. That was  
18 yours I guess.

19 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. John, can you  
20 read the roll call, please?

21 MR. HOUDE: Jim Clark?

22 MR. CLARK: Yes.

23 MR. HOUDE: David Friedman?

24 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes.

25 MR. HOUDE: Ed Goodale?

1 MR. GOODALE: Aye.

2 MR. HOUDE: Jim Nyeste?

3 MR. NYESTE: Yes.

4 MR. HOUDE: Howard Roin?

5 MR. ROIN: Aye.

6 MR. HOUDE: Steve Ross?

7 MR. ROSS: Aye.

8 MR. HOUDE: Barbara Miller?

9 CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes. Thank you.

10 MR. BORSTEIN: Thank you, very much.

11 MR. ROIN: Thank you for a nice  
12 presentation.

(Proceedings conclude on this issue at  
13 8:30 PM)

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS )

2 ) SS;  
3 COUNTY OF LAKE )

4 I, Debra L. Zeit, do hereby certify that I  
5 am a court reporter doing business in the County of  
6 Lake and State of Illinois; that I reported by means  
7 of machine shorthand the testimony given at the  
8 foregoing Report of Proceedings, and that the  
9 foregoing is a true and correct transcript of my  
10 shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

DEBRA L. ZEIT, CSR  
Lake County, IL  
CSR License No. 084-003456

