Planning & Development Committee
Minutes of October 11, 2004
Room 2403 – 7:00 p.m.
Evanston Civic Center

Alderman Present: S. Bernstein, J. Kent, E. Tisdahl, M. Wynne

Alderman Delayed: A. Newman

Staff Present: J. Wolinski, A. Alterson, G. Morgan, C. Ruiz, E. Szymanski, J. Brownlee

Presiding Official: Alderman Wynne

DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chairman Wynne called the meeting to order at 7:21 p.m. She announced that Ald. Newman would join them later in the meeting.

APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 13, 2004 MEETING MINUTES

Ald. Tisdahl moved approval of the September 27th minutes, seconded by Ald. Bernstein. The minutes were approved with a vote of 4-0.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION
Chairman Wynne changed the order of the agenda to accommodate Ald. Tisdahl who needs to leave the meeting for an issue at A&PW.

(P2) 94-O-04 – Zoning Map Amendment, National Louis University Property
Chairman Wynne noted that this item was introduced and referred back to Committee for findings to make sure that the ordinance met legal muster. Mr. Wolinski informed that this is a revised ordinance that contains sufficient findings to go ahead with the rezoning. Ms. Szymanski added that since there were no findings at the ZBA, she would request that the Committee go through the findings and discuss them briefly for the record.

Chairman Wynne complied referring to Section 3 of the ordinance. She began with one of the critical issues that they discussed at the last meeting which was raised by the community is with monitoring institutional development evolution making sure that they limit the negative impacts on the surrounding community and ignoring land uses. She said a critical issue that was raised was that this is an island surrounded by R1 residential property and that includes with respect to Wilmette as well. She said it was a very big concern of the community members that we take into account that this is completely single-family residential surrounding the property and no institutional evolution occur which has a negative impact. Ald. Tisdahl agreed and added because of Evanston
Hospital’s proximity, parking and traffic circulation are major concerns. Therefore to have this property be R1 would be beneficial. Chairman Wynne said that would be with respect to subsection (D).

Ald. Kent said that truthfully he does not care whether this is surrounded by R1 properties because he thinks to a certain degree that what has been before this Committee is trying to create something that would fit into any community within the residential districts to include diverse housing. He asked if this R1 zoned property going to be for million dollar homes only because there is that opportunity here to create something to provide housing for moderate-income families with a style that is compatible with the surrounding houses, not like scattered site housing. He questions with all the talk about inclusionary housing, how does this help all of Evanston in the larger perspective. He noted that this building of diverse mixed housing has been accomplished in such communities compatible with Evanston like Highland Park, Lake Bluff and even Lake Forest. Ald. Tisdahl pointed out that in view of the entire National Louis property, they are only looking at the small portion that is Evanston, the vast majority is in Wilmette and they have already zoned their portion for R1. This section can accommodate 4 houses. She noted that Wilmette has asked that Evanston comply with their zoning to match. Ald. Kent said that there is no economic diversity here. Ald. Tisdahl said that along with diversity, there has to be some place for the million dollar homes as well.

Ald. Kent asked for staff’s opinion in conjunction with Ald. Tisdahl’s view. Mr. Wolinski responded that the Zoning Ordinance is the enforcement tool of the Comprehensive Plan. He would state on the record that the zoning of this property from U1 to R1 simply states that the rezoning will require a minimum lot size of 7200 square feet per lot. Whether or not you are going to build affordable housing on those lots, he does not believe the Zoning Ordinance concerns itself with the price of housing, the type, etc. It is concerned with bulk regulations, setbacks, minimum lot coverage, etc. He said there is nothing to say that if it is rezoned from U1 to R1 that those 4 lots of 7200 square feet could not be bought by a developer that does affordable housing. Ald. Bernstein said that the reality is that this can not happen because the acquisition cost of the land in that area would preclude any affordable housing. He said the cost would still be too high if the property were downzoned to R3. He understands where Ald. Kent is coming from but they run into this problem all the time with absence of subsidy in the acquisition of land makes it almost impossible to develop on. Ald. Kent said that he was under the impression that there was an offer by a developer who proposed building housing on smaller lots. The other Committee members said that he was probably referring to the Kendall College property that includes a lot more land as well. Ald. Tisdahl agreed because as far as she knows no developer has put in an offer and it may be some time with the land being less than one acre. Chairman Wynne reminded that Wilmette does have the majority of the property and that the Evanston portion is only .73 of acre in the area where the dormitory currently sits. Wilmette has asked Evanston to be uniform with their zoning.

Ald. Kent still argued the point of not addressing the problem with housing opportunities for residents that already live in Evanston and are eventually being forced out because
they can no longer afford to buy here. Ald. Bernstein asked Ald. Kent what he would propose as an alternative. Ald. Kent responded that he could not specify a plan but feels that with the R1 zoning and subsidy from the City, that at least one lot could be for housing for a moderate-income family. He assuredly feels that something could be created to conform on that property in combination with the million dollar homes as well. Ald. Tisdahl stated that without an affordable housing policy on the books it is hard to enforce the issue at this time, especially on such a small but expensive piece of land.

Chairman Wynne asked legal if they have adequately addressed the findings. Ms. Szymanski said that she believes that the discussion they has been had does support the findings of A, B, and C. However (D) still needs to be addressed which basically refers to parking and traffic circulation being adversely affective at that busy intersection and in being near Evanston Hospital with density greater than R1. Chairman Wynne included discussion that took place at the last meeting regarding school children crossing at this intersection that was a big concern of the neighbors. Ald. Kent asked if this was supposed to be sufficient in addressing the findings. Chairman Wynne recalled that there was a lot of testimony at the last meeting regarding traffic and pedestrian crossing. She said in combination with addressing subsections A, B & C this evening, she would concur that they have addressed the findings. Ald. Kent disagreed and added that he does not agree with the reasons that this has to be zoned R1.

Ald. Tisdahl moved approval of Ordinance 94-O-04 and acceptance of the findings as addressed by the Committee. Ald. Bernstein seconded the motion and the vote was 3 in favor and 1 voting nay (Ald. Kent).

(Ald. Tisdahl left the meeting at 7:54 p.m. for A&PW.)

(P1) PUBLIC HEARING – Exemption from Special Use Provisions for Homeless Shelter
Ms. Jan Klingman from Connections for the Homeless, gave a brief statement on behalf of the Shelter. She was here in place of Mr. William Sundblad, the Executive Director, who was unable to attend this meeting.

Ald. Bernstein moved to conduct the public hearing, seconded by Ald. Kent. The vote was 3-0 in favor of the motion.

Ald. Bernstein mentioned that Ald. Newman had received complaints of homeless people sleeping in vestibules in the area, which historically has always been attributed to the shelter. He stated that the shelter has been a good neighbor and he has heard of no problems from people in his ward. No comments or complaints came from the audience, nor was there any discussion amongst the Committee. Mr. Wolinski informed the Committee that only one call has been received in his office regarding the shelter and they were in support.

With no further discussion, Ald. Bernstein moved approval of extending the one-year exemption of Ordinance 49-O-86 with a request that staff bring back a modification
to the ordinance to lengthen the time frame for renewal. Mr. Wolinski reminded the Committee the original reason for the 1-year renewal was to keep a close monitor on the operation of the shelter and to insure close relationship with the management in case it were to change over time. Ald. Bernstein suggested a time frame of 10 years. Discussion followed. Ald. Kent said that he could not support 10 years, suggesting a period of no longer than every 5 years. The Committee agreed. Ald. Bernstein amended his motion for staff to modify the ordinance to extend the period of time for renewal to every 5-years. Ald. Kent seconded the motion and the vote was 3-0 in favor.

(P3) 715 Sheridan Resubdivision Plat
Chairman Wynne noted that this was held in Committee for appropriate findings. Ms. Szymanski said that since there were no findings at all, she suggested that the findings be read into the minutes particularly since this is not part of an ordinance. She said this should be done at the Council level, however here at P&D she believes it would be sufficient to reference the document prepared by Mr. Ruiz dated October 11, 2004 with the findings on the proposed subdivision. She said that there needs to be some discussion amongst the Committee involving the standards.

Chairman Wynne updated Ald. Kent on the discussion from the last meeting with one of the critical issues for her was with the Preservation Ordinance and all of the aspects that would protect this as property in the historic district. The proposed new construction on the proposed lot #2 would maintain the view from the street to the Lake. Another issue in support is the tremendous length of the property, which supports both parcels here. By creating these two lots, the lot is large enough and doesn’t subdivide the property into lots to provide several properties where there used to be only one house. She recalled that one of the things they heard from the architect, Mr. Knutson, was that the design of the new structure is compatible with the main house and will actually function on the property in the style of a coach house. She said the materials are similar and the rooflines as well, therefore the new construction will not look like a completely different style of architecture. She brought attention to the drawings submitted in Council packets and it confirms that there will be no blocking or obstructing the view from the public street or public way of the main house on the property. The new structure will be approximately 210’ from the front property line and located east of the landmark structure. She said as a result of that the critical features of the streetscape associated with the landmark would remain in tact. Chairman Wynne said on the question of whether this would adversely effect the traffic pattern, she does not believe it would because they are going to be sharing a common driveway. There will be little or not additional traffic caused by this subdivision. Ms. Szymanski approved as sufficient for findings. Ald. Bernstein asked about the easement on the property. Mr. Murray said that there probably will be so that new construction will not obstruct views from the main residence and vice versa.

Ald. Bernstein moved approval and to adopt the findings set forth in the memo provided by Mr. Ruiz dated October 11, 2004. Ald. Kent seconded the motion. Mr. Wolinski informed the Committee that he and Corporation Counsel just discussed the issue that the proposed subdivision meets the signature requirements of the various City
Departments including the Zoning Division, Public Works, Finance and Law Department. **With this amendment included in the motion, the vote was 3-0 in favor.**

(P4) Ordinance 101-O-04 – Special use (Type 2 Restaurant) for 1611 Sherman
Chairman Wynne asked the applicants for a brief statement and overview of their business. Mr. Tushar Vaidya and Mr. Purav Shah introduced themselves as the lessee’s. Mr. Vaidya gave the overview. The business name being Cold Stone Creamery operating as an ice cream parlor. They propose to be open 7-days a week, provide seating for 4-5 people with a seating area of approximately 55 square feet. He noted that they are aware of litter collection plan and have one in mind to pick up any litter within 500 feet of their store between 1-3 hours per day. They also have a parking plan to provide parking for their employees in the lot across the street. They have also set up with a local disposal company for garbage pick up 3-times and week and more if necessary. They will also train all employees to keep all waste receptacles cover protected at all times. The building has a back alleyway entrance where deliveries can be made and where all dumpsters will be located out of public view.

**Ald. Bernstein moved approval.** He commended the applicants awareness of the conditions involved with operation of a type 2 restaurant. He also told them it is in the best interest of all businesses to aid in keeping the downtown clean. He warned the applicants of the immense concern for litter, debris and garbage problems that have arisen since the rise in type 2 restaurants and that City Council has pledged to do something about it and City Staff is very much on the case in enforcing the regulations. Mr. Vaidya and Mr. Shah said that they understood the rules and consequences if not followed. With no further discussion, **Ald. Kent seconded the motion and the vote was 3-0 in favor.**

**ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

(PD1) Oakton Historic District – Nomination to the National Register of Historical Places
Ald. Rainey was called over from A&PW for discussion on this item. Mr. Carlos Ruiz gave a brief overview on the background of this request as stated on the agenda item sheet. Ald. Bernstein asked if the Committee is only being asked here for approval to refer this to the Preservation Commission for their comments and written recommendation to be forwarded to the State. Mr. Ruiz said that is correct and Mr. Wolinski pointed out that it has been requested for the Committee’s approval but is not mandatory.

**Ms. Barbara Gardner** continued on where Mr. Wolinski left off to explain how this confusion with the process keeps coming into conflict. The State Officials have letter from the Commission had no right to go without notifying P&D and having them say to the Commission to issue its findings. She said this is the confusion of the wording. As far as she is concerned, there is nothing to even discuss this evening because everybody is supposed to go about doing their thing when it was on the docket for P&D and the Preservation Commission has not even heard this yet. Ald. Bernstein agreed. Chairman Wynne said at the very least the Preservation Commission has to act really fast because
the State needs the letter by November 8th. Mr. Ruiz informed that the Commission has chosen two dates, October 19th or the 26th. Chairman Wynne asked if this matter needs to come back before P&D? Mr. Ruiz responded no because it is a National Register nomination instead of local.

(Ald. Newman arrived at 8:20.) He asked for an update on the discussion thus far. Chairman Wynne informed him that according to the staff, the State needs to hear from two entities: The Mayor, representing the Council, and the Preservation Commission. Ald. Newman asked for the language as written in the Ordinance that states this. It was noted that Mr. Ruiz read this from Section G, 7., of the Ordinance and is included in writing on the agenda item sheet. Ald. Newman recalled this same dispute with the Georgian where the Preservation Commission wanted to take a different view potentially than the City Council on the issue of whether or not the Georgian should be National. From his point of view, this does not need to go back to the Preservation Commission. He feels the City should take a position based on the advise of the Preservation Commission if requested, but they should be talking to the Alderman of Ward as to whether or not they want to support it or not. In his opinion, the Preservation Commission is not always totally in line, and they have the same problem here differently as they had with the Northeast Evanston Historic District where there was a complaint back then.

Mr. Jack Weiss, Chairman of the Oakton Historic District Committee. He addressed Ald. Newman informing him that the way the process is supposed to work, is that two people have responsibility for responding to this: the Mayor and the Preservation Commission. The review and written submittal to the State should come from the Commission with a letter from the Mayor. He said the Council is not supposed to hear this beforehand nor do they need to approve the Preservation Commission’s recommendation. Ald. Bernstein noted that what Mr. Weiss states is not clear in the wording of the Ordinance. Also, Ald. Newman pointed out that the final wording in that paragraph reads: "Upon request of the City Council." In his opinion the Mayor should not be writing letters on this. He said this is a Council matter and the Preservation Commission doesn’t get involved and this does have implications, even though there is no local district. When it is a National District, it creates advisory responsibilities for the applicant if they wish to effect any building in the historic district, where the case would then go before the Preservation Commission. Ms. Gardner disagreed. Mr. Ruiz stated that the Zoning Ordinance addresses that issue and further explained the process for properties in National Register districts. Ald. Newman pointed out that there still is no local requirement for demolitions, etc. but there is still an implication for the property owner. From his point of view in reading and understanding this, the City Council is elected Citywide and the Preservation Commission is a volunteer board with no election. He continued that the Commission is a hard-working advisory group for the City Council that has some final authority in some areas. However, when it comes to making a National District, the Council and ward alderman should make that review and decision. He recalled that the Mayor was out of sync with the rest of the Council by telling the people in Springfield that the City did not support the district after first stating that they did support it. In the end with the Georgian, the Preservation Commission by a 5-4 vote thought this building
should have been a landmark. The City Council, which is made up of 9 elected officials, said it shouldn’t be a landmark. In his mind, if the Commission would have been allowed to comment on this to the people in Springfield, there would have been a miscommunication by the state officials on what the position of the City of Evanston would be. Therefore, in his view, the way they should respond on Oakton District, he would be glad to support this if he heard the Alderman of the ward supported and made a convincing case for National status. However, he is opposed to having the Mayor comment and is opposed to having the Preservation Commission comment because they are an advisory board to Council. He did welcome the Commission to forward their advice which could have been done with this request.

Chairman Wynne asked how to address the point that what the State organization doesn’t recognize that the Mayor and the Council may not share the same view and where the Preservation Commission has an advisory role. Whereas the State may be technical “sticklers” for hearing only from the Mayor or only from the Preservation Commission. She stated to Ald. Newman that the Committee heard earlier before he arrived that with the Georgian, the State received the letter from the Mayor but very much wanted to hear from the Preservation Commission and they were quite concerned that they did not hear any recommendation from them. Ald. Newman said that he does understand why they would want to hear from the Preservation Commission but he questions the State Officials not wanting to hear from City Council and would like to hear from them in writing regarding this matter. In his belief, there is a very close working relationship between the Preservationist all around the State, which is acceptable because they all work together; local, state and federal. However, as far as he is concerned, the Preservation Commission in Evanston does not make policy on these issues for the people of Evanston. He reiterated that the Commission is an advisory committee and can be solicited by the Council and they shouldn’t be giving policy recommendations on behalf of citizens in Evanston; this is the responsibility of the elected officials. In the case of the Georgian, the State could have been forwarded the transcripts of the Preservation Commission findings. He feels that if the Commission does not receive this, then they need to make it more explicit in the Ordinance. He recalled when this first came up with the Northeast District, the people who opposed the District were all angry somehow that they were not able to participate in a process before they went as a City down-State to support the nomination. He stressed that they need to get this issue clarified. He also reiterated his opinion that the Mayor should also not be sending letters representing the City.

Ms. Gardner brought up an issue dated back to 1985, where the Mayor at that time signed an agreement with the State of Illinois making Evanston a Certified Local Government. She pointed out that in Council’s packet it explains what the responsibilities are, one of them is that the Mayor and the Preservation Commission are to comment on any nomination going for national landmark status. She stressed that this is clarified in the 1985 agreement and if they go changing the rules at this time, Evanston will not be a certified local government and there are economic benefits to the City that will be lost.

Ald. Rainey left the meeting at this point.
Ald. Newman questioned that allegation of losing any economic benefit. He noted that when this Preservation Ordinance was drafted back in 1994, the Preservation Commission at that time and an expert, Mr. White, went through every part of this ordinance and they all new at that time that the City of Evanston was a Certified Local Government. Therefore, to the extent that their Ordinance is in conflict with State rules, then he suggest that maybe they need to take a look at this. Ald. Bernstein asked legal about the wording in the ordinance “upon request of the City Council”. Ms. Szymanski stated that this is not mandatory. According to the words of the Ordinance, referral by the City Council is not mandatory. Ald. Bernstein said this is peculiar because he was under the impression that with the Georgian, the Preservation Commission’s recommendation was going to the State along with their recommendation against the landmark nomination. Ald. Newman agreed and had the same understanding. Ms. Gardner informed that there were two responses from the City, one from City Council and one from the Mayor, where she was opposed also. Ald. Bernstein questioned why the Mayor’s response was separate if she is supposed to be sending the response back in representation of the Council. He has no problems giving this to the Preservation Commission to conduct hearings with the idea being that their decision then comes back to P&D. His interpretation of the language before them seems that this may not be the case. He does not understand in any case why the Preservation Commission’s recommendation on the Georgian was not forwarded to the State. Mr. Ruiz responded that the whole ideal not to send the Preservation Commission’s recommendation was what was interpreted from the comments made by the P&D Committee and it was understood that the recommendation from Council would be the final decision to be forwarded to the State. This final decision was that Council did not support the Commission’s recommendation and this was all that was said and that was the Commission’s understanding at that time. Mr. Ruiz referred back to the 1985 agreement and this basically states that the Commission and the Mayor should issue the recommendations. Chairman Wynne added that it states that the Council’s responsibilities are to review and comment upon nominations to the National Register of Historic Places for properties within the jurisdiction. Within 60 days of receiving the nomination, submit to the State Historical Preservation Officer written recommendations of the Commission and the Chief elected official as to whether the property meets the criteria in the National Register. This is the agreement that Mayor Joan Barr signed in 1985.

(Ald. Tisdahl returned to the meeting at 8:38 p.m.)

The Committee agreed that there is a definite conflict with the current Ordinance and the 1985 agreement. Ald. Newman said that he thinks the Committee should not refer to the Preservation Commission. His reasoning is because he is not sure that the Commission will respect the City Council as the final authority on this particular point. It appears their belief is that they have their own independent powers that in some cases override City Council, which he finds in error. In fact, the Preservation Ordinance doesn’t exist in this City if there are 5 votes that says it doesn’t exist. He suggested that the Committee have the City Legal staff tell use whether the home rule ordinance of the City of Evanston
is over-ridden by the certified government agreement signed by Joan Barr, which he does not believe it is. He would like to know why the Preservation Commission and City staff spent thousands of dollars to hire consultants who should have been aware of that agreement when they worked on the draft ordinance. He noted that Mr. Ruiz was on staff in 1994 when the ordinance was being drafted and this agreement should have been presented before the ordinance was approved. He wants to know what the implications are from legal counsel with regards to losing our certified local government status. Chairman Wynne pointed out that clearly the 1985 agreement is not square with their own Preservation Ordinance. Therefore she counter-suggested that what they need to do is have communication directly with our staff and the State to explain this conflict between their ordinance and this agreement. We also need to clarify for the State the structure of our government in Evanston. Ald. Newman has a sense that when they adopted the ordinance in 1994, they repealed whatever the Mayor signed beforehand, this needs to be determined by Legal staff. He asked Mr. Ruiz if he discussed this 1985 agreement with Legal staff before writing his memorandum. Mr. Ruiz responded no. Ald. Newman said that he has a problem with this incident and the Department staff and Legal staff apparently not working in conjunction with each other. No memorandum of this nature should go out without Legal staff review and approval. He said this has been a continual problem within City departmental communication. He said Mr. Ruiz's responsibility is to the City and Council, not just the Preservation Commission and Council depends on staff to communicate any conflicts or problems such as this to them first. He commended Mr. Ruiz hard work with preservation, however any legal issues should be reviewed and interpreted beforehand and the Council informed in a timely manner.

Mr. Weiss said that he is here tonight on behalf of the Oakton District because they would like to have this request approved by the Preservation Commission and sent on to Springfield by November 8th. He said that if they are going to get into this legal battle, it will never happen. Ms. Gardner added that at this time there is the opportunity for both bodies to comment. Ald. Newman said his position is that he would be glad to comment on it with the advice of the ward alderman for the Council, right away.

Ald. Rainey responded that her comment after listening to the dialogue so far, is that if this Committee messes up any opportunity for this district to be formed, then she would be as disappointed than she has ever been in our City Council. She request to forward this on to the Preservation Commission so they can comment on it and then move on with this in a timely form to make the November 8th date. She wants to hear what the Preservation had to say about the Oakton Historic District and so do her constituents that live in that neighborhood. She would encourage bypassing the legal conflict for this particular request but pursue the matter of concern without holding up this request. She is not sure if everyone in the district approves, but she is sure that if the district is designated as a national district, then it is going to bring such prestige and attention to this neighborhood that she would be very proud of. Ald. Newman commented that the conflict here between the ordinance and the 1985 agreement is a very important issue that needs to be resolved and that staff has apparently known about it. He said that not following the law in a situation because we somehow have time pressure should not be
considered. As far as he is concerned, the State will probably make this a district whether or not they say so because they tend to support many things and this is a legitimate request to consider that district for designation. The process needs to be clarified and it is important to receive these interpretations. He strongly feels final authority and control should be with City Council. Ald. Newman said that he would like to see this district designated and suggested that the Committee refer this to the Preservation Commission for comment with an understanding in position that this be referred back to Committee by their next meeting so as to make the November 8th deadline.

Ald. Rainey noted that the conflict here has evidently been festering for some time with the issue of process. All she is asking is that the Committee not use this district proposal as an example and obstruct their chances and to meet the deadline date. She also noted that she has never discussed this district with the Mayor and was not aware of her having or needing to send a letter of comment to the State. Ald. Bernstein said that it seems that they are discussing 3 different issues here. First of which according to Ms. Szymanski, the Committee is given the opportunity but not the responsibility or absolute right, to refer to the Preservation Commission. Ms. Szymanski concurred that it is not mandatory. Secondly, the language from Springfield seems to read that they could send this directly to the State without any opportunity for Council or the Preservation Commission to comment. Thirdly, in that same letter the State has given their opinion that even if they don’t receive any comment, they already feel this district qualifies. He agrees with the procedure to refer to the Preservation Commission for their comment and have this come back to them by the next scheduled meeting. Chairman Wynne agrees with Ald. Rainey on this to meet the deadline and the process issue needs to be untangled separate from the Oakton District proposal so as not to obstruct their chances or not to meet the deadline for comments. Ald. Newman said that Ald. Bernstein made a good point with the opinion all ready received from a State Official that they feel this district qualifies. Therefore the clash with time frame pressure should actually be of no real concern. However, he would agree to moving forward with the suggested procedure including the Preservation Coordinator working with Legal staff to obtain an opinion before the next meeting as well.

Ald. Newman motioned to send this to the Preservation Commission with specific instructions to give their opinion as to whether or not this district ought to be supported and with the specific instructions that they must respond back to this Committee by the October 25th meeting. He said that this should be the first item on their agenda for that meeting date. Ald. Bernstein seconded the motion and the vote was 5-0 in favor. Ald. Bernstein made clear that his vote to send this on is not a statement for or against a district. Ald. Newman made clear that he does support the district.

Ms. Betty Sue Ester, raised the question about property values placed in the district, similar to the other historical districts in their assessment, will they be getting the same type of tax break as the other districts. If so, what will this do to the other tax payers and properties outside of the historical district. Chairman Wynne responded that this is a
good question that Ald. Tisdahl asked before the meeting. She suggested that an answer to this should be obtained by the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

\[Signature\]

Jacqueline E. Brownlee