

- 3.1.5. Ms. Chelebian wanted to verify that the reason there were only 48 students originally was because of the traffic study requirement.
 - 3.1.5.1. Ms. Nawagamuwa confirmed that was the case. Originally she had asked for 95, but they had set it at 88 and she is fine with that.
 - 3.1.5.2. Ms. Chelebian asked how many parking spaces there were.
 - 3.1.5.3. Ms. Nawagamuwa restated there were 100.
 - 3.1.5.4. Ms. Chelebian asked what the business hours were.
 - 3.1.5.5. Ms. Nawagamuwa answered 7 to 6 PM.
 - 3.1.5.6. Ms. Chelebian said that she would have liked to see more community input on this project.
 - 3.1.5.7. Mr. Popowich announced that Ms. Nawagamuwa did send a letter out to owners within 500 ft to let them know we were having a meeting.
 - 3.1.5.8. Ms. Chelebian asked for a copy and was provided one.
- 3.1.6. A stakeholder, and WNC Board member, asked how many children per classroom.
 - 3.1.6.1. Ms. Nawagamuwa answered there is an 8 to 1 ratio. Two full time teachers are currently employed and one assistant.
- 3.1.7. Ms. Chelebian asked if there were any complaints about noise.
 - 3.1.7.1. Ms. Nawagamuwa answered that there were none. The school's playground is surrounded by the church buildings.
 - 3.1.7.2. Ms. Chelebian asked if the grade levels would change.
 - 3.1.7.2.1. Ms. Nawagamuwa responded they would remain that same up.
 - 3.1.7.3. Ms. Lamishaw explained that the school is surrounded by the church on one side and an eldercare on the other side.
 - 3.1.7.3.1. Ms. Nawagamuwa stated that the eldercare love the children. They often visit them and sing for them.
 - 3.1.7.3.2. Ms. Chelebian said that was good because we are always concerned about impacting others.
 - 3.1.7.4. Ms. Lamishaw made a motion that we approve the project as is. Mr. Jurgenson seconded.
 - 3.1.7.5. Mr. Popowich called roll and the motion was passed 4-0 (Mr. Schulte was not present).
 - 3.1.7.6. Mr. Popowich explained the process that this would be recommended to the full Board and if they approved a letter of approval would go to the City Planning Department and the Councilman's office. A copy would be mailed to Ms. Nawagamuwa as well.

4. Discussion and possible action on a permit to reduce a side yard to 5 feet in lieu of the 6 feet required by current zoning at 8436 N. Irondale Ave, Winnetka. The property owners are adding two additional stories to a single story building. This is not a hearing on a building permit, but a variance to the side yard requirement only. No presentation will be made.

- 4.1. Mr. Popowich explained the item and asked if Committee's opinion on whether they wanted to address issues this small in scope.

4.2. Ms. Chelebian asked Ms. Lamishaw if this request was normal and if it was normal to hear these items.

4.2.1. Ms. Lamishaw explained the code in detail. She said that the city requires the extra foot in cases when they go to a 3rd story. She pointed out that it's a pretty insignificant request and only the abutting property owners are required to be notified.

4.2.2. Ms. Chelebian clarified who it was sent to.

4.2.3. Mr. Jurgenson clarified that it was only a one story structure at this time.

4.2.4. Ms. Lamishaw stated that the addition was not even a full 3 story height.

4.2.5. Mr. Popowich asked again if we want to entertain these types of notices.

4.2.5.1. Ms. Chelebian stated that since we do care about all people; even if it only affects one, we should still hear the issue.

4.2.5.2. Mr. Jurgenson said he agreed.

4.2.5.3. Ms. Lamishaw said that unless the person on that side of the property shows up and speaks out against it, the request would likely be approved.

4.2.5.4. Ms. Chelebian clarified what we would be stating.

4.2.5.5. Ms. Lamishaw stated that we can say we approve as long as no one objects to the project at the hearing.

4.2.5.6. Mr. Popowich made a motion to approve the request as is unless someone from the abutting property steps forward to register their objection. Ms. Lamishaw seconded the motion.

4.2.5.7. Mr. Popowich called roll and the motion was passed 4 – 0 (Mr. Schulte was not present).

5. Discussion and possible action to approve two letters on old business.

A. In the matter of a zone change for the project located at 20806 W. Community Street which was approved by the PLUM and subsequently approved by the full Board. The request is to allow Lot 1 to be 4,821 square feet, and lots 2 – 8 to be 4,869 square feet in lieu of the minimum 5,000 square feet required. The Chair would like to send a letter in support of this change since the full WNC Board already heard the project and approved the concept.

B. In regards to the project located at 20709 Parthenia St, Winnetka, which was approved by the full Board for an early start variance and a building line removal at our 06/08/04 Regular Board meeting. The project will be heard before the Planning Commission for approval of the preliminary parcel map. The Chair would like to send a letter in support of the project since we already heard the project and approved the concept.

5.1. Mr. Popowich introduced the next two items as old business that needed follow up.

5.1.1. Ms. Chelebian stated she had an objection to this item. She stated that she feels there are really three items listed here. Feels that the wording by the Chair taints the subject and is pre-disposed as in favor.

5.1.1.1. Mr. Popowich clarified that the full Board will be presented a slate of all actions taken by the PLUM and they can approve the slate. If they do not approve of a particular item on the slate they can open a discussion on just that item and vote on all items separately.

- 5.1.1.2. Ms. Chelebian asked if she can provide another example of how more than one item was included on a single item and then brought up the lease agreement for the Boards proposed office.
- 5.1.1.3. Ms. Lamishaw interjected that we can't discuss business like that unless the full Board is present.
- 5.1.1.4. Ms. Chelebian attempted to continue.
- 5.1.1.5. Mr. Popowich stepped in and said that he prefers not to discuss this in this venue.
- 5.1.1.6. Ms. Chelebian asked if she could contact him one on one via email.
- 5.1.1.7. Mr. Popowich agreed.
- 5.1.2. Ms. Lamishaw said that we the full Board has already approved this concept and because it was approved this was just a formality. She then re-explained how the PLUM's recommendations are dealt with and the process the city goes through on hearing these follow up requests.
- 5.1.3. Mr. Popowich asked to discuss item A.
- 5.1.4. Ms. Chelebian confirmed that the 8 lots were approved by the city.
- 5.1.5. Ms. Lamishaw agreed.
- 5.1.6. Ms. Chelebian asked why they want to reduce the size.
- 5.1.7. Ms. Lamishaw answered that the size was being reduced because the city is taking part of the land to widen the street.
- 5.1.8. Ms. Chelebian said so these remaining lots are the same.
- 5.1.9. Ms. Lamishaw said they are similar. But the two stories are taking up less space as far as a footprint goes than a single story full house. All set backs will remain the same and the open space will remain the same.
- 5.1.10. Ms. Chelebian asked if the City is the one forcing the change then why do we hear the issue.
- 5.1.11. Ms. Lamishaw stated even though they do force the issue they still have to follow due process and hear the matter.
- 5.1.12. A stakeholder said when the developer came they spoke in generalities and should have been specific when they were asked about the size of the property. We need to be clearer he said.
 - 5.1.12.1. Ms. Lamishaw confirmed we did ask and he had provided info which was in the minutes.
 - 5.1.12.2. The stakeholder agreed, but said he was not specific.
 - 5.1.12.3. Ms. Lamishaw explained that shortages between 0 – 10% of the original size are automatically approved, from 10 – 20 % are heard at a hearing, and over 20% require a full variance.
 - 5.1.12.4. Mr. Schulte asked if these developers should be here presenting this.
 - 5.1.12.5. Ms. Lamishaw commented they already did to the full Board.
- 5.1.13. Ms. Chelebian asked Ms. Lamishaw if this was a client of hers.
- 5.1.14. Ms. Lamishaw confirmed it was a client but only for mapping purposes they do not represent them before the City. She would withhold a vote.

- 5.1.15. Mr. Schulte commented he didn't see a problem with the request.
- 5.1.16. Mr. Jurgenson stated he didn't either but wished they could build 7 larger houses.
- 5.1.17. Ms. Lamishaw stated they are already spending a lot to widen the street and it wouldn't be cost effective.
- 5.1.18. Mr. Popowich made a motion to send a letter of approval to the City. Mr. Schulte seconded the motion.
- 5.1.19. Ms. Chelebian objected again that they shouldn't be sending a letter without the full Board's approval.
- 5.1.20. Mr. Popowich explained the process again on how PLUM Committee actions were handled.
- 5.1.21. Mr. Schulte agreed with Mr. Popowich and this is how all committee's he's send do it. He said that people have to do their homework.

Secretary's Note: There was a long and sometimes contentious discussion on how the Board approves committee actions.

- 5.1.22. Mr. Popowich called for a vote. The motion passed 4 – 0, Ms. Lamishaw could not vote.
- 5.1.23. Mr. Popowich explained item B.
- 5.1.24. Mr. Jurgenson commented it was the wrong project.
- 5.1.25. Mr. Popowich clarified which project it was and how the Chair would like to proceed.
- 5.1.26. Ms. Chelebian asked why we were hearing this again.
- 5.1.27. Mr. Popowich explained again that it was old business and we needed to send a letter.
- 5.1.28. Mr. Schulte made a motion to approve a letter be sent. Mr. Jurgenson seconded the motion.
- 5.1.29. Mr. Popowich called roll and the motion was passed 3 – 1 (Ms. Lamishaw recused herself from the vote).

Secretary's Note: Another discussion, too long to recount here, was had about whether we want developers to appear before the Committee after we've already heard them for each notice that is generated. The decision was informally made 3-1 that we would not require them to re-present.

A brief discussion about how different parts of the City hear different requests for the same project. Ms. Lamishaw commented that the only way you can even apply for a quick start such as JPL had done was if the project fit in with the existing zoning. This was a request to approve the tract map or parcel map. She went on to say that Councilman Zine's office has been very specific that they want to hear from us on all matters and it makes Maryanne King's life much easier if she refers the NC support for a project.

Mr. Popowich apologized to Ms. Chelebian for being a bit short earlier in the meeting.

A stakeholder asked if we would vote on a plan without specifics.

Mr. Popowich stated he would never allow a matter to come to a vote unless specifics were presented or were presented at a previous meeting.

6. Discussion and possible action on defining in more detail the “Make Winnetka Sparkle” program. This will include defining the size of the ad hoc committee, their first meeting date, and direction on their first project(s).

- 6.1. Mr. Popowich briefly explained the concept behind a “Make Winnetka Sparkle” program and that it was not defined, but just an idea.
- 6.2. Ms. Chelebian asked if the city doesn’t already have this type of program.
- 6.3. Mr. Popowich said they do not. They do have a clean up program which they sometimes refer to as Sparkle.
- 6.4. Mr. Schulte commented that he wants less government. He doesn’t’ fee we should go out looking for problems.
 - 6.4.1. Mr. Popowich commented that we would never do that. He said that he had envisioned the group working with Building & Safety when they issue a citation and that the program may be as little as making sure we have a list of resources for the property owner.
 - 6.4.2. Ms. Lamishaw explained the process that Building & Safety follow. She pointed out that they do not issue anything unless someone makes a compliant. Once a complaint is made and inspector will review it and if it’s valid they will issue a notice to comply. If the problem is not addressed then a citation. The problem will get fixed. She recommends that everyone join Councilman Zine’s POSSE group which provides excellent training.
 - 6.4.3. Ms. Chelebian said she would like to take the idea before the full Board. She also commented that we should have the full Board approve all sub committees.
 - 6.4.4. Mr. Popowich corrected her and said that any committee can create a sub committee or ad hoc committee. However no action can be taken by the committee without the main committee’s presenting to the full Board and receiving approval.
 - 6.4.5. A stakeholder commented that Burbank has a very strict enforcement policy.
 - 6.4.6. Mr. Schulte agreed.
 - 6.4.7. A brief discussion about other city’s enforcement and requirements was had.
 - 6.4.8. Ms. Chelebian asked if we can just let the committee define their purpose.
 - 6.4.9. Mr. Popowich agreed that is how he had envisioned this. This was only to set a time and date for them to get started. He said we would table this item for a future meeting.

7. Public Comments – Comments from the public on non-agenda items within the Committee’s subject matter jurisdiction.

- 7.1. A stakeholder thanked the Committee for providing him with a bigger picture of what’s involved in the processes.

8. Committee Business: A discussion and action was taken on the election of a permanent Chair (for a one year term) and a Vice Chair, as well as a regular meeting date and time.

- 8.1. None

9. Meeting adjourned.