Planning & Development Committee  
Minutes of February 23, 2004  
Room 2200 – 6:00 p.m.  

Evanston Civic Center  


Alderman Absent: J. Kent  

Staff Present: J. Wolinski, A. Altersen, E. Szymanski, J. Brownlee  

Presiding Official: Alderman Newman  

DECLARATION OF QUORUM  

Chairman Newman called the meeting to order at 6:20 p.m. He announced that they would address the 413-21 Howard Street issue first this evening and hear the appeal for 904 Hinman at 7:00 p.m. He noted that there are 3 items on the agenda tonight that require Alderman on A&PW to be present that he would like to cover first if possible.  

APPROVALS OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF JANUARY 26, 2004  

Ald. Wynne moved approval of the minutes of February 9th, seconded by Ald. Tisdahl. The vote was 4-0 in favor of the motion.  

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION  

(P4) Ordinance 29-O-04 – Zoning Planned Development: 413-21 Howard Street  

Mr. Altersen informed the Committee that staff is still waiting for the second half of the transcript which will be forwarded to the Committee at their next meeting.  

Chairman Newman acknowledged the representatives present for this project and asked them to introduce themselves and give a brief presentation.  

Mr. Jack Lawlor said that he lives in Evanston and is the attorney representing the applicant, Bristol Chicago Development. He introduced the principal, Mr. Bill Walsh, the architect, Mr. Jim Curtin, Mr. Neal Kenny from KLOA, and Mr. John Jaeger from Appraisal Research Co. Mr. Lawlor expressed their excitement about this project and a good way to implement the recently adopted Howard and Ridge TIF district. He turned to Mr. Walsh and Mr. Curtin for a brief presentation of the project.  

Mr. Walsh described the site location with the industrial district to the north occupied by the CTA yards, B3 districts to both the east and west of the subject and south of Howard there is the City of Chicago’s Gateway Shopping Center project, which is also in a TIF
district with the New Howard Street station and parking garage. He said from zoning standpoint, they are consistent with trends in the area and the site is somewhat isolated. He pointed out the challenging nature of the site by its narrow depth. He said the site has 220' of frontage along Howard and the challenge is that they only have 85' in depth and they will be pursuing an alley vacation immediately south of the wall separating the CTA yard from this site. This alley vacation will allow for 101' in depth that gives them the opportunity to be able to build on this lot. He said they are currently working with David Jennings and the Traffic Engineering group. He also pointed out that they will be providing a substitute alley system for the buildings located to the east by dedicating a 16' width along the eastern perimeter. He said this alleyway will be much more functional what is currently there now.

Mr. Jim Curtin gave an overview of the building itself and the floor plans. He said that on the ground floor there will be public building functions and fitness area to the east with the building office, main lobby and hospitality room as well. The parking lot entrance is located to the west end of the building adjacent to Howard; the lot will provide for 245 cars and will be 4-stories. Mr. Curtin said that one of the things that was recommended from their meeting with SPAARC is that they incorporate planter boxes on the streetscape by setting the window opening back 2-feet to allow for planter boxes within the property line along Howard Street. He pointed out the importance of having the 101' width provides for them to have the parking ramp located on the north side of the building versus having the ramp coming directly out onto Howard Street. He said that there will be 221 units in the building and the parking rate is 1.1 parking spaces per unit. Chairman Newman asked how many studios, one-bedroom, and two-bedroom apartments will be provided. Mr. Curtin informed that there will be 26 studios, 143 one-bedroom and 52 two-bedroom units. Mr. Jaeger, who is a feasibility expert, said that they projected an average rent of $1500 for the entire property, which would come to approximately $1000 for studios going up to $2200 for two bedrooms. Mr. Curtin gave an overview of the exterior of the building. He showed illustrations of the building from east and west views, the elevations, and views from the street level. He pointed out where there will be recessed balconies in all the units. He described the 4-story parking structure area where there will be patterned brick in two colors and other materials used in specific areas to shield the cars and make for a more aesthetically pleasing appearance. He pointed out where a projected canopy that will run the length of the project from the parking entry all the way to the main entry. There will be a 10' wide sidewalk and the canopy will enhance the streetscape along with new streetlights, tree plantings and planters placed within the recessed areas on the ground level. He described the materials that will be used for the overall exterior of the building and that they propose using two paint colors for a two-story rhythm that will provide a certain amount of elegance to the building. He described the main entrance of the building and the fitness center area.

Ald. Wynne asked if the garage is totally enclosed. Mr. Curtin explained that the garage will be naturally ventilated and the north façade is open and they are currently coordinating this with CTA in terms of providing that open ventilation. He is unaware at this point of any objection, however he would assume that they would probably have to provide some type of fencing. Ald. Bernstein asked about the alley vacation and if there
is sufficient space for trucks to maneuver. He also asked about the servicing and garbage pickup for the adjacent buildings and businesses to the east and west, such as Subway. Mr. Lawlor responded that it will actually be easier than how it is now, explaining that currently the stores have to put their garbage cans out onto Howard Street because the trucks can not make the turn. He further explained that Mr. Curtin has designed a notch in the building so that the smaller trucks can maneuver, however the large garbage trucks will still not be able to. Mr. Alterson brought attention to Committee that a copy of the draft of the dedication of the vacation of the alley in their packets. Ald. Bernstein said that from visiting the site and driving down the alley, he was surprised that there was not vent or outlet and the amount of garbage in that alley. Ald. Rainey informed Ald. Bernstein that there is a letter that the developers have from the building to the east thanking them and explaining their gratefulness for what they are proposing to do with the alley vacation and not having to put their garbage out in front of the store at the curb. Mr. Lawlor noted that the garbage pickup will be in the loading spaces in the rear and there has been no discussion about the pickup for the adjacent building because they were under the impression that they would still have curb pickup. However, he assured the Committee that they would work out something with the building owner. Ald. Bernstein brought this to attention because for the amount of rent they will be asking for, the expectation of garbage pickup and not having garbage set out at the curb with the building directly next door, is in order. He noted that there is a Starbucks and Bally’s within the Gateway shopping center and asked why they would offer a fitness center and coffee store on the ground level of this building. Mr. Lawlor responded that the primary reason was to offer amenities to the tenants of the building with the convenience of not having to leave the premises. He informed that Bally’s has sent their support for this development via letter also and welcome this building and the business because there are definitely going to be tenants that want a more full-scale workout and classes that are offered at Bally’s.

Chairman Newman raised question about the assessed tax amount per unit. Mr. Lawlor responded according to the tax lawyer, it would be approximately $3300 per unit, which comes to about $720,000 for the entire building. Chairman Newman noted that there is a fairly soft rental market at the current time and questioned the market for financing. Mr. Lawlor responded that the market is on recovery for rental developments. He pointed out that some of the major rental projects in downtown Evanston are offering concessions such as the Park Evanston and The Reserves. He said that they view this project as competing with the two previously mentioned and the Park Evanston is currently 90% occupied and The Reserves is currently 20% occupied since opening. He mentioned that their project will take approximately 30 months to completion if they can start construction in November of this year as planned.

Ald. Rainey informed the Committee that within the last 24 hours there have been emails to approximately 300 people being sent by the Housing Affordability Task Group. This email was not written by this group but it being forwarded by them. She requested to correct some noted errors in the email that is being very irresponsibly forwarded. First error, is that the City of Evanston did not suspend the rules on October 13th and pass the TIF without any discussion, however on this date Council suspended the rules to set the
date for a public hearing which was in December and also to set the date for the Board of Tax Review for all the TIF's. She noted that the public hearing was held on December 12th and introduced and was not voted on until the January 26th meeting, therefore this was not a rush deal and there was plenty of opportunity for people to express their opinion on the TIF. Another error she wished to make note of is regarding the potential tax for this property. She noted that their TIF consultant indicated that in the first year this building is up the City would get approximately $600,000 increment versus now where for all 4 lots current tax increment is $16,337 per year. Ald. Rainey said that she also wanted to address the issue of requiring lesser than market rents in some of the units in this building. She pointed out that for the entire City of Evanston per census block, the 8th Ward has the third lowest income census block group which is immediately adjacent to the census block group of the 400 block of Howard. This area also includes Howard Street from Ridge to Custer and the percentage is 62.2%. She noted that there is no other concentration of this devastating poverty anywhere in the City of Evanston including the 5th and 2nd Wards. She pointed out several locations within the targeted area where specific low income housing such as the Anixter Center for the disabled, two locations for the Housing Options for the Mentally Ill, and also a low income rooming house. She also noted that this area has approximately 67% of all the Section 8 housing vouchers for the entire City of Evanston as well. She aid it is her opinion and the opinion of many others in south Evanston that this neighborhood is doing more than its fair share for the entire City of Evanston in providing housing for people with special housing needs and assistance.

Ald. Rainey stated that one of the things she wants to do with this development is to provide for some balance development to bring in some market rate rentals and income qualified families, which is desperately needed for this area. She recognized the many conversions that have occurred in this neighborhood but thankful of the fact that most were of dilapidated buildings that were in a state of disrepair beyond any chance of being capable as rental property. She pointed out that over the last year in the 300 block of Howard Street there are 9½ pages of police calls to two buildings that range from dramatic domestic violence to vandalism and drug abuse cases, even calls on suspected prostitution. With all this in consideration, she expressed her support for this project in the 400 block of Howard Street where there will be no added retail offered in the ground floor frontage. Furthermore, she does not want to compete with all the wonderful store and business offered in the Gateway Shopping development directly across the street. Ald. Rainey noted that this building is going to be in the range of $44,000,000 and that is a terrific investment in the 8th Ward and that targeted area of Howard Street. She fully supports and welcomes this project as a positive entity for the area and for south Evanston. She reiterated on the affordability issue point and when this reaches a climax at Council when this issue is finally voted on, she will back her view on this matter and will remind all that she is the single Alderman in the City of Evanston who fought to make this source of income discrimination illegal when it comes to affordable housing, low income and subsidized housing. She supported this effort so that Evanston could open up their community and have a truly diverse forum where people of all economic background could rent throughout the City and not be denied solely on the basis of having Section 8 vouchers. In conclusion, Ald. Rainey urged and encourages the
Committee’s support of this project and strongly feels this is the best thing that has been proposed for Howard Street on the Evanston side. She stated that this project would parallel what Chicago has done with their responsibility for the improvement and gentrification of Howard Street. She said that this building is going to bring in 221 household family eyes to this street and if any street in this town needs it, it is Howard Street.

Chairman Newman moved approval of Ordinance 29-O-04, seconded by Ald. Bernstein.

Ald. Rainey introduced Mr. Michael Land, a representative from Ald. Moore’s office of Chicago that represents the ward adjacent to Evanston on Howard Street, which contains the Gateway Shopping Center. Mr. Land expressed full support on behalf of Ald. Moore’s Ward and staff on this proposed development. He informed the Committee that they would only add for the record that they urge the developers to not build any higher than needed to make a reasonable profit. He stated that they do concur with the proposed height of the development to be sufficient and the number of units and projected rental rates.

Ald. Feldman requested to comment on this project expressing his full support for this development. He agrees with Ald. Rainey and backs her opinions that this proposed project is the most important development to come to Howard Street and is confident that it will only be a positive move for improvement of that area, the neighborhood and for the 8th Ward. He said the approval of this project is in the hands of the Council and reminded that the neighborhood rests on this decision as the future effect on this area. He recalled that Council passed the TIF with a lot on its plate and this project is the most ambitious TIF that City Council has ever established. He is confident that this building will start and be the first step in contributing to the economic improvement and appearance on the Evanston side of Howard Street.

Chairman Newman called on citizens who wished to comment at this time.

Mr. Calvin Lynn said that he owns property on South Boulevard just north of this site beyond the CTA yard. He questioned if the developer has given any consideration to the added traffic and noise that he feels will definitely effect properties and the neighborhood on South Boulevard. He feels traffic will multiply on his street with detouring of vehicles down Chicago Avenue and onto South Boulevard when construction starts. He noted that this area has already been effected by traffic problems caused by the Dubin development and this proposed project will only add to that congestion. He is also concerned with the added noise level from the CTA yard with the echo that will come from the height of the proposed building once it is erected. He stated that the noise level has already heightened since the CTA has reconstructed their station. He is also concerned with the open area of the garage facing north, which will also heighten noise levels as well. Mr. Lynn strongly urged the Committee’s consideration of having a full traffic and noise study done to make sure this developer does everything possible to minimize any further noise levels from the open air parking structure or traffic congestion to the neighborhood on South
Boulevard. Chairman Newman told Mr. Lynn that he appreciates his comments but in terms of the other side of the street with the Gateway Center and the Howard Street El station, this area has always and still currently invites thousands of people everyday. He stated that even with the 221 units proposed with the development many will probably use the public transportation provided within close proximity to this building. On the other hand, even if this is not the case, he believes the positives offered from this project for Howard Street are inclined to outweigh the concerns for added traffic congestion to this area. He questions the real impact of any detoured traffic on to South Boulevard from this proposed project during construction.

Ms. Dorie Stein, 550 South Boulevard, seconded Mr. Lynn’s comments and concerns and the already existing traffic problems caused by the Dubin Development in their neighborhood. She said the traffic congestion on Chicago Avenue during peak hours is very heavy now and will only multiply during the construction period of this proposed building and even after with the added housing to this already dense area. She reminded that even if the Dubin Development provided parking spaces for each unit there was no consideration given to guest parking which overflows into the surrounding neighborhood that already suffers from lack of parking. She questioned if any consideration has been given to this same problem with for the new development on Howard Street where there is very limited parking available.

Ald. Bernstein responded to the comments and concern for traffic congestion and parking problems on South Boulevard. He stated from his experience and knowledge from having his business office at the corner of South Boulevard and Chicago Avenue for over 25 years, that he can agree and back the concerns with the Dubin project directly impacting that immediate surrounding area. He agrees that traffic problems have multiplied as well as parking problems within the neighborhood caused by the Dubin development. However, he can not see the seriousness of any immediate impact added to the South Boulevard neighborhood from this proposed project on Howard Street. He stated that Chicago Avenue will probably be impacted with additional traffic as well as on Howard Street, but not specifically on South Boulevard. He states this from his own experience being in the neighborhood from so many years and possibly longer than many of the residents that are currently there now. He clarified that he realizes the neighborhood property owners concerns but reiterated that the major impact has been from the Dubin Development on South Boulevard.

The vote was 4-0 in favor of the motion.

Chairman Newman requested that the last two speakers concerns be directed to Mr. Jennings and Traffic Engineering and that some type of response be forwarded to those citizens.

Mr. Lawlor asked for assistance from the P&D Committee on a change they would like to request in the draft ordinance itself. He pointed out that there is a routine clause stating that the owner, meaning the applicant and successor owner and operator of the property reads from the wording. He said that this is acceptable, however there is a previous
clause in Section 6, which states “currently no building permits shall be issued without the City having first received evidence satisfactory to it that the applicant is the owner of the subject property.” He said between now and then, Mr. Walsh may be creating a different investment vehicle and he requested that appropriate wording be clarified to address this issue without misunderstanding of the wording as currently stated in the ordinance. Chairman Newman suggested that between now and the next Council meeting, he should negotiate with staff and the Legal Department on what language is agreeable to address that issue. He directed that staff bring the final amended language agreed upon in the ordinance back before the Committee for final review. Mr. Wolinski assured that staff will work with the developer on this matter. Ald. Wynne asked if in the ordinance they require the same level of architectural detail as they did for 603 Main Street because she feels it is important that the same conditions be set for all planned developments to assure that the final outcome is the same as presented and approved by Council. Mr. Wolinski responded that the ordinance as it is drafted does not contain that level of detail. **Ald. Wynne motioned to amend the ordinance to include this level of detail, seconded by Ald. Tisdahl. The vote was 4-0 in favor of the motion.** Chairman Newman suggested that this amendment also be incorporated to the ordinance within the next 2 weeks as well. Ald. Wynne also stated for the record her opinion that she does not accept the close proximity to public transportation as a substitute to back the argument of less parking needed. This argument has obviously failed in the pass cases of developments built within walking distance of the public transportation stations.

(P7) **Ordinance 23-O-04 – Special Use for 1168 Dodge Avenue (Type 2 Restaurant)**
The Committee agreed, as well as the Ward Alderman Jean-Baptiste, to hold this item on the agenda due to lack of representation from the applicant, Gold Coast Dogs.

(P6) **Ordinance 22-O-04 – Special Use for 845 Dodge Avenue (Type 2 Restaurant)**
Chairman Newman recalled that this item was introduced on February 9th and referred back to Committee for further discussion with the applicant/business operator was not present at the last meeting. He acknowledged the Subway Restaurant owners, Mr. Moazi Verani. The hours of operation were discussed and confirmed allowing the restaurant to be open until midnight on weekends only. This was agreeable with Ald. Feldman as well. Chairman Newman recalled Ald. Feldman’s concerns with having public phone usage and requested that no public phone usage be allowed on the premises. This was agreeable with the owner. Chairman Newman also discussed with the applicant the condition of the 250’ radius for garbage and debris pick up this his establishment is responsible for.

**Chairman Newman moved approval of Ordinance 22-O-04, seconded by Ald. Bernstein. The vote was 4-0 in favor of the motion.**

(P1) **Appeal – 904 Hinman Avenue**
Chairman Newman asked staff the urgency in time for this appeal and if this Committee must act on this item tonight. Mr. Ruiz responded that the Committee must act on this matter tonight due to the 45 day time period for appeals and to allow time by the next regularly scheduled Council meeting.
Mr. Ruiz gave an overview on the history of this case up to date as summarized on the agenda item sheet. He distributed additional photographs to the Committee. He explained that on September 8, 2003, City staff issued a stop order for the ongoing replacement of steel casement windows with aluminum double hung windows at the subject property, which is an Evanston landmark. On October 28, 2003, the property owner, Mr. Perocevich presented an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to the Preservation Commission. The Preservation Commission reviewed the application and found that the window replacement as submitted did not meet the applicable standards for review of alteration. He read from the list of standards and addressed each one that the Commission felt was not met. He said the only standard that was met was number 10 because the new windows could be removed at any time without destroying the integrity of the structure. Ultimately, the Preservation Commission approved a motion to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness. Also, Mr. Ruiz pointed out that aside from the windows, no permits were obtained for any of the work done on this building.

Mr. James Murray, attorney representing the property owner, Mr. Ramo Perocevich, who purchased the property in April 2003. He explained to the Committee that the building at that time was in substantial state of disrepair and had been the subject of deferred maintenance program over the last 20-30 years. He acknowledged that the building has been designated as a landmark and they do not contest this historical status in that respect. He informed that the building has 157 windows, not including the storefront windows. A contract to replace all the windows was entered into in May 2003. The work commenced beginning in May also and continued through the months of June, July, August and into September when Mr. Ruiz became aware that work was being done on this building. As a part of the work contracted, the roof was replaced, new gutters were put up, the building was entirely tuckpointed, the halls were painted and floors re-carpeted. Also work was done on restoring the original colonnade balcony in the front of the building on Main Street. Mr. Murray acknowledged the fact that none of the work that was undertaken with a specific permit or application to the Preservation Commission. It is his understanding that there is no building permit required for the replacement of windows except when the building is a designated landmark and that there is no fee charged to the applicant but is forwarded to the Preservation Commission for review and approval. With a majority of the work being completed and approximately $60,000 had been expended into the project, then work on the windows began. By the time the work was stopped, 131 windows had been replaced leaving only 26 windows unfinished. He noted the hardship on maintenance and upkeep of the old steel casement windows from the owner’s experience as a janitor and owner of several building in Chicago. The tenants of the building were complaining and the windows were in desperate need of replacement. He said the contract to replace the windows was done as a means to enhance the quality of the tenancies within the structure and was not intended as a cheap means to solve the problem.

Mr. Murray assured that Mr. Perocevich was unaware that the window issue would be in violation of the Preservation Commission’s guidelines and Ordinance and would have chosen to paint and repair the existing windows if he had known of this violation. He
reiterated the hardship and maintenance problems with the steel casement windows and frames. From his point of view, it is clear that the Preservation Commission determined that it was inappropriate of Mr. Perocevich to replace the windows and that the design of the window replacements was indeed inappropriate for this landmark structure. Mr. Murray suggested and asks that the Committee would conclude as well that it is also inappropriate to squander $40,000 when that money could be better served in the further restoration of this historical landmark. He further suggested that the better choice of how to deal with this particular is to permit the property owner a means by which to amortize the value of these windows and the investment that has been made over a period of time. As an inducement to the City to permit them to do this and to forestall enforcement by means of whatever violation of the Preservation Ordinance that the City has determined to be existence. He said in this order of compensatory, that they would offer to undertake an aggressive program of restoration and improvement of this structure in the following respects. 1) They would propose that by Fall 2004, that the façade on the Hinman side, which is now in part boarded up and painted black. 2) As to the storefront on the first floor that this particular window that has existed there for over 50+ years, be replaced with the appropriate limestone. And the existing window frame be replaced and that the large pane glass that would normally fit within the window in two pieces, be replaced and the glass sense of the commercial property be allowed to be visualized interior to exterior and that the portion of the building be restored. They also suggest that the program would include a replacement and scavaging of the existing 26 that remain undone. In order to replace all those windows on the Main Street façade at street level, which there are only 12, with the original casement windows so that this façade will return to its former status. 3) By or before the end of October 2007, the star and/or remains of the star that effect the Hinman and Main façade, all this requires sort of cosmetic improvement and be removed and that portion of the façade be restored with limestone, glazing and other materials that are suitable. Finally, he hoped that the City would allow them to amortize that $40,000 expenditure that has been undertaken and allow them to retain by replacement or otherwise, in a fashion which is at least in compatibility for each façade of the building.

Ald. Wynne asked staff if the City requires a building permit for the replacement of the roof. Mr. Wolinski responded yes and also require a permit for downspout and gutter replacements; the applicant obtained none of these permits for the work done. He said that he could not comment on the roof because he has not seen the actually work that has been done; the City does allow for 2 layers before replacement. Ald. Tisdahl asked if the applicant has been fined. Mr. Wolinski informed that staff has taken no action yet until Council has made a ruling on the appeal. Ald. Wynne noted that there are two separate issues here; one being the appeal regarding the windows and the other the case of no permits being obtained for any of the additional work done beside the windows. Even the replacement of windows on an historical landmark requires a permit to receive approval from the Preservation Commission. Chairman Newman noted that all other interested parties before the applicant were fully aware of the National landmark status of this building and it is hard to believe that he was not conscious of this fact too. From questioning, Mr. Perocevich admitted that he owns other buildings in Chicago that he has also done work on. Chairman Newman said that this applicant as an experienced
property owner, should be aware of the building permit process and what is required to
do work. He said it appears obvious that this applicant clearly does not get permits or
respect local policies, which has nothing to do with the preservation issue but it how the
issue came about.

The Committee asked staff to clarify exactly what permits should have been obtained for
the work that has been done. Mr. Wolinski informed that permits are required for roof
replacement, gutters and downspouts, replacement of any plumbing or electrical work
however the interior maintenance work down is questionable. He said that permits are
not required for painting or carpet replacement.

Ald. Wynne said that she would like more information on the potential hardship of
casement windows and would also like the opinion from the Preservation Commission
and other architects on casement windows and what is considered an acceptable
replacement. The Committee also wanted to know exactly what work was done and how
much the permit fees would have been so that an appropriate fine can be issued.
Chairman Newman said that he is most concerned with the obvious defiance of the
Evanston codes and regulations that this applicant has shown. He said that it is very hard
to have any empathy for anyone that does not follow the rules that apply every property
owner that owns property in Evanston. The Committee questioned staff on any ability to
extend beyond the 45 days to allow for more information. Ms. Szymanski said that this is
possible if the applicant waives rights for appeal. Mr. Murray said that client would be
willing to do so. Ms. Szymanski recommended against holding this item in Committee
but instead to have the applicant waive his appeal and continue from there.

Chairman Newman asked the Committee’s opinion on this because he probably would
consider if there some evidence of acknowledgement of any wrongdoing here by the
applicant, but the applicant clearly shows no concern for intentionally defying the
procedures for obtaining permits. With this in mind, he moved to recommend denial of
the appeal, seconded by Ald. Wynne. The vote was 2 aye (Newman, Wynne) and 2
nay (Bernstein, Tisdahl). Due to the split vote, it was the consensus of the Committee
to pass this onto to the Council floor for consideration on how to proceed.

(P2) Request for Redevelopment Proposals
Ms. Aiello explained the RFP process and suggested to the Committee that a special
meeting be held at a later date for review of the proposals that come in from the RFP.
The Committee agreed. Chairman Newman asked for hands of those in attendance for
this item. Several raised their hands and were directed to give their names to staff for
notice to be sent to them when the special meeting is set. Discussion took place on the
replacement of existing parking on these lots. It was clarified that one of the
requirements to any potential developer is to provide and maintain the current number of
public parking spaces plus additional for any proposal presented. Ald. Bernstein
addressed the parking lot on Himman and South Boulevard which is opposed to for
further development since the Dublin project; noting that this development has provided
no additional parking in the area for guest or otherwise. However, he would be willing to
support if the current parking is maintained and according to the size of the proposed development. The Committee all agreed 4-0 to staffs recommendation.

(P3) Ordinance 28-O-04 – Amendment to Section 4-5-2 of the Evanston City Code with Modifications to Section F-502 and F-503 of the BOCA National Fire Prevention Code
Chairman Newman mentioned that this notice was sent out by staff without referring with him first because if they had of, he would have suggested scheduling this item for a later date such as March 22nd. The Committee agreed that sufficient time is needed for this item to allow for citizen comments and discussion. He recognized the few citizens that wished to make comment in opposition to this ordinance; Ms. Sioux Tourney representing the 1900 Sherman and 2300 Noyes Court buildings, a representative from the North Shore Hotel, Steve Ferguson from 2339 Sheridan Road (Northwestern Frat House), a representative from the Mather Foundation. Also there was a letter received from Ms. Barbara Gorham, owner of “The Margarita Inn” expressing her opposition to this ordinance as well. The main point of opposition in agreement with those citizens present is the economic feasibility and cost of installing this type of sprinkler retrofit work especially in the older and historical buildings. Chairman Newman addressed each representative from the locations mentioned above and asked each the cost estimate given to them for this work. The representatives from Northwestern said they were given an estimate of $180-$200,000, the North Shore was given an estimate of ¼ of a million dollars and there were several problems with the HUD funded buildings with regards to the fact that all their tenants are on fixed incomes and HUD does not have the funds to cover the cost to do this work at this time.

The Committee agreed to hold this item in Committee and will start the meeting at 6:00 p.m. with this matter on the agenda first.

(P8) Ordinance 24-O-04 – Amending the Membership Requirements of the Housing Commission
Ms. Judith Hurwich spoke on behalf of the Housing Commission. She said that the consensus of the Commission that they can definitely benefit from the landlords’ perspective and encourage this participation. However, she noted that the Human Relations Commission not the Housing Commission deals specifically with landlord/tenant issues. Therefore, she stated that the Housing Commission members support appointment as it represents those interests, but are opposed to making membership more prescriptive, which could result in longer vacancies on the Commission. Discussion took place between Ms. Hurwich and the Committee and it was agreed to require only 1 tenant and 1 landlord. Chairman Newman moved approval of this decision, seconded by Ald. Wynne. The vote was 4-0 in favor of the motion.

(P5) Ordinance 07-O-04 – Zoning Map Amendment: Rezoning of Kendall College
Chairman Newman acknowledged Mr. Maloney, attorney representing the property owner. It was agreed that a meeting with the Neighborhood Task Force needs to be scheduled before the March 8th P&D meeting. Mr. Maloney said that Mr. Bono has a problem in scheduling and will not be available before March 8th. Chairman Newman
suggested that he meet with Mr. Bono and then meet with the Neighborhood group to forward his comments or visa-verse. **This item was held in Committee until the March 8th meeting.**

**ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

(PD1) Consent Decree – Northeastern Historical District
The Committee agreed to keep this on their agenda for discussion at the March 8th meeting. Chairman Newman suggested that staff invite Mr. Bob Atkins to join the Committee for discussion.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacqueline E. Brownlee