Planning & Development Committee
Minutes of June 28, 2004
Room 2403 – 7:00 p.m.
Evanston Civic Center

Alderman Present:  S. Bernstein, J. Kent, M. Wynne
Alderman Tardy:   A. Newman
Alderman Absent:  E. Tisdahl
Staff Present:    J. Wolinski, J. Aiello, A. Alterson, V. Jones, C. Ruiz, D. Spiccuza, E. Szymanski, J. Brownlee
Others Present:  L. Widmayer, J. Lindwah, J. Fiske
Presiding Official: Alderman Kent

DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chairman Kent called the meeting to order at 7:11 p.m. He noted that Ald. Tisdahl would be absent this evening and that Ald. Newman was expected to arrive at 8:00 p.m. Therefore, he will hold off setting the special meeting for the Georgian until Ald. Newman’s arrival and will also try and hold off discussion of the 801 Chicago case since Ald. Newman had several concerns with this as well.

APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 14, 2004 MEETING MINUTES

Ald. Wynne moved approval of the June 14th minutes, seconded by Ald. Bernstein. The vote was 3-0 in favor of the motion.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

(P1) Temporary Sign Request for American Craft Exposition
Ald. Bernstein moved approval, seconded by Ald. Wynne. Mr. Wolinski noted that this request has been approved over the past 10 years or so. There are no changes in the sign locations and there has never been any problem with this request. The vote was 3-0 in favor of the motion.

(P2) HOME Fund Request for Housing Opportunity Development Corporation 3-unit Rental Rehab
Mr. Michael Roane, Housing Development Coordinator with the Housing Opportunity Development Corporation (HODC) introduced himself and gave a brief overview of the request. He stated that this proposal is for a 3-unit rehab that they intend to maintain as
low-income housing on Jackson Street. He said most of the rehab will involve maintenance or repairs to water damage of the building and also lead abatement through the house. He thanked the Committee and the City for their consideration of HOME funds and noted HODC’s long history of working with the City of Evanston. They have been very successful in the work done using these funds. Mr. Wolinski added that both the Housing Commission and City Staff support this use of HOME funds. He said there have been major issues on the 1900 block of Jackson with anti-social behavior for some time now and they have been working with the Police Department and other neighbors to try and get some ownership of some of those properties. They feel that HODC will be a very good landlord to have in this neighborhood. Chairman Kent asked if there are any tenants in the building at this time. Mr. Roane responded that 2 units are currently occupied and those families will be staying.

Ald. Bernstein moved approval, seconded by Ald. Wynne. The vote was unanimous 3-0 in favor.

Ald. Bernstein asked why the name change from Interfaith Housing. Mr. Roane explained that the name change occurred about 7 years ago to distinguish themselves as the development arm of Interfaith.

(P4) Ordinance 67-O-04 – Variation for 1500 Darrow (# Parking Spaces)
Chairman Kent acknowledged the owner of the property, Mr. Eric Kerlow. Mr. Kerlow said that he and his partner have owned this property for the past 5 years. The building is built on slab with 5 small 1-bedroom units. He informed that originally there were 3 buildings built in a complex, one on Lake Street, their building and one building adjacent to the north. There is a parking lot just north of the buildings on Darrow and originally at the time these buildings were built, they all shared this one common lot. In the mid-1960’s the buildings were separated and there was supposed to be a promise that the parking would be deeded for their building on this lot. However, 40 years ago the follow through was not completed and the deeds were not honored. Therefore, he and his partner are asking for major variance to the parking requirement for their 5-units, which the ZBA has recommended to grant. He said this is very similar to a condo conversion with the 5-units being fee-simple townhouses without parking. Mr. Kerlow assured that the street parking seem to be very adequate in this area. Ald. Wynne asked if they are planning to renovate the units and the exterior of the building. Mr. Kerlow responded that the building is in good shape but they are planning to do some upgrading to the interior of the units and will remain 1-bedroom 1-story townhouses.

Ms. Szymanski informed the Committee that when she received the transcript she observed that the ZBA did not make findings in this case. She clarified this means that Ms. Jackson (Zoning Planner) with the assistance of the ZBA Chair granted to proposed findings of section 2 of the Ordinance. She suggested a motion by the Committee to specifically adopt the findings as set forth in paragraph 2. Ald. Bernstein observed that it appears there were no objectors according to the report, he also has no objections to Ms. Szymanski’s information and suggestion.
Ald. Bernstein motioned to accept the recommendation of the Zoning Board subject to the modification which would include findings of fact as prepared by Zoning Staff. Ms. Szymanski stated to the Committee that she has reviewed this and feels staff’s report is adequate in supporting the findings of fact. Ald. Wynne seconded the motion and the vote was 3-0 in favor.

(P5) Ordinance 59-O-04 – Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment
Chairman Kent recalled that this item was introduced and referred back to Committee on May 24th and subsequently held in Committee at the June 14th meeting. He also recalled that within this time a meeting was scheduled for the City/Northwestern University Committee to meet on June 22nd to discuss the proposed thresholds at which an achieved consensus was agreed upon to exempt and remove certain properties from binding appearance review or any similar proposal in accordance to the Consent Decree as established on February 7, 2004. Ald. Wynne recalled that this was held because two Aldermen were absent at the last meeting but questioned if there were any other circumstances involved for holding this. Chairman Kent clarified that this was held so that the absent Alderman could make sure that their concerns were addressed and also to allow time for more investigation from the Legal Department to tie up and conclude certain concerns. Ms. Szymanski referred to Mr. Alterson in confirming that staff had to address the fact that since there were no findings in the Plan Commission transcript, Mr. Alterson reserved the situation and prepared a detailed presentation involving various projects and based findings upon them. Mr. Alterson agreed with Ms. Szymanski’s comments and stated that the information provided to the Committee in their packets is a literary presentation that includes a series of charts that are sorted by address and number of dwelling units. Ald. Bernstein asked for clarification that he understood that the Committee did vote on this with the understanding to bring back for the approval of findings in accordance to staff’s report. Mr. Alterson agreed and noted the inclusion of the Northwestern University/City Committee meeting discussion and conclusion on how to address the properties within the Consent Decree. Ms. Szymanski drew the Committee’s attention to the amended ordinance passed out this evening and explained that the amendment is to the last page, which adds a footnote to explain that the map referred to in Table 15C is in fact the map approved in the Consent Decree. This was done so that there is no doubt in the future reading of this ordinance.

Ms. Jeanne Lindwahl, 625 Library Place, informed the Committee that she did attend the Northwestern University/City Committee meeting and had a couple of questions and observations on the ordinance that she was concerned with that she addressed at that meeting as well. First, with respect to the 20,000 square foot gross area under roof development for planned developments, she pointed out the language reads that building area is limited to commercial, business retail or office use. This is probably acceptable in those districts, however the question is with respect to the special overlay districts that include the University districts. She asked what happens if they are dealing with a University use that is not among the excluded properties. Ms. Lindwahl suggested either ending the sentence after 20,000 square foot of building under roof or expanding it to include Institutional Uses as well. She directed the Committee to making this amendment on page 9 of the ordinance. She further noted that this language is carried
throughout the ordinance and suggested that this amendment be made where appropriate. She specifically pointed out on page 5 under Section 6-9-1-9(d) Business Districts, under number 5 to be amended as well as page 9.

Ms. Lindwahl continued that the other basic issue with respect to the findings of fact that were put together, she believes that the reference as to how this supports the Comprehensive Plan should also have referred to the objectives on institutions in Chapter 6. She noted that the objective is assured that institutional development enhanced surrounding neighborhoods as well as the economic development of Evanston. She continued that there are a whole series of policies under this objective that relate to the importance of ensuring that institutional development does not have negative impact on their surrounding neighborhoods. She concluded that this factor is important in including in the findings. She suggested that it would be helpful to include in the ordinance the map of the excluded properties since it is included as an exhibit. Staff assured that this map has recently been acquired and is available at this time. It was not when the ordinance was prepared. Mr. Alters for clarification read the definition of “Institution” as defined in the ordinance. “An organization establishment with providing religious, educational, charitable, medical, cultural, or governmental services.” He pointed out that this is not purely a University issue with the ordinance under “institutional” use category. He clarified that this is a decision of the Committee’s ruling on this category.

Mr. Widmayer clarified to all that it was never the Plan Commission’s intention to get involved with the institutional uses when this item was under their review. He continued that certainly it was not their intention to get involved with any educational uses, be it secondary, primary, or university setting. Ald. Bernstein asked Mr. Widmayer if it were their intention to exclude institutional from this ordinance. Mr. Widmayer responded that he recalled it was never a point of discussion except that at one point to discuss the University property not being included. He clarified that the main focus of discussion was on retail, the residential, and the office complex developments.

Mr. Ruiz addressed the Committee to clarify in terms of what is considered excluded and included from this research and determination. He stated that what came to his mind from discussion amongst the Preservation Commission, is that their opinion is based upon the providence that the designation applies to the developer of record, not just the building. Therefore, it would appear that anything that is built on that lot of record, the Preservation Commission would review in accordance to the Ordinance. Subsequently, this fact needs to be clarified to the fact of the building only or the owner of record, which is something that is useful for future reference.

Mr. Wolinski informed the Committee that he staffed the Northwestern University/City Committee meeting. He recalled that when Ms. Lindwahl brought up those issues concerning the Institutional Uses, he does not believe there were any response from the University representatives either pro or con on this issue. However, he noted that one thing they need to be clear on tonight is that if there is a movement towards including Institutions, he suggest that perhaps this item should be held tonight so that staff has an opportunity to inform the University representatives of this. He noted that in the
conclusion of the Northwestern University/City Committee meeting, they agreed that any changes that would be made to this ordinance would be forwarded to them and subsequently agreed upon before adoption of any changes.

Ald. Wynne acknowledged Mr. Wolinski’s comments and the position of the University/City Committee. Nevertheless, she would be reluctant to delay this for any period of time bringing attention to the time involved in consideration of this matter up to now. However she supports the need for more time to consider additional thought in terms of all institutional uses and if they should be incorporated into this ordinance. However, she stressed that the Committee decision should not be made too quickly. Mr. Wolinski informed that the University indicated that they had no immediate plans for further construction. However there are developments covered by this ordinance that are floating around that are not institutional uses that could be effected by this ordinance. Ald. Wynne stated that because the meeting has taken place she would hope that the map would clarify the University exempted properties to this threshold. She suggested that the Committee move forward on this and acceptance of the small technical amendments set forth. Ms. Szymanski stated in connection with the particular findings here as there were none at the Plan Commission, that Mr. Alterson has prepared for this the basis for your findings. She would strongly recommend that staff guide the Committee on some type of discussion through this so that there can be a record at this Committee followed by a specific adoption of the report prepared by staff. Ald. Wynne agreed completely that they should make this as proper as possible. Mr. Alterson stated that the issue is not so much that the principle of having all developments above a certain size required to come under specific review, which has been specified in the handout presented to Council in their packets. He stated several communities have adopted this principal including the City of Chicago. However the exact number you use for this threshold he believes is specifically something that is related to the Committee and asked that they look at this and decide whether or not these numbers concluded by the Plan Commission are acceptable. The Plan Commission suggested 25 dwelling units, 30,000 square feet of lot area and 20,000 square feet of floor area ratio as being appropriate in light of this list of previous developments and developments that are currently on the drawing board. Staff recalled from memory as best they could but there are probably still some developments that were not included on this list. Mr. Alterson referred to the second to the last column and said from his findings he questions will this proposal be captured by the thresholds that are under consideration right now and it is where the probably not meets with the probably that he would urge the Committee to take a good look at. He said his personal conclusion was that because their size and the amount of community discussion that they generated and because of potential impacts that those projects have had on the appearance of the streetscape and light, that the thresholds that they have working together in this draft do pretty well capture all of the developments that he believes there is a consensus in the community should have had some type of extraordinary review in the form of a public hearing. He said the ones that appear, although he is unsure of some of the floor areas that they would not have been forced over to a zoning hearing. These cases are the ones that he feels there is a consensus that these were a minimal enough size where they did not really cause any negative effect.
Ald. Bernstein felt that the list is very conclusive. Ald. Wynne agreed and feels that the list is very useful in terms of identifying above a certain level in which there is a significant impact on the community. She said that if you look at all the buildings that would definitely fall under this, they are all significant enough structures at this point that they do have an impact on the community, their immediate neighborhood, on the street and traffic impact. She said that it starts at the Edmonton project which is in the Third Ward on Chicago Avenue, with 20 units that probably would have come under the threshold. She pointed out that this building significantly altered the block and created a lot of community discussion. This building is a good example of the smaller end of the spectrum and would be appropriate to be included with this ordinance. Ald. Bernstein asked if she would suggest reducing the threshold back from 25 to 20 units. Ald. Wynne said that she would keep the number of units where it is at because of the floor area ratio factor. She said the whole point binding appearance review when this first started was to gain control over some of the appearance and bulk issues that they were experiencing in the community and this list just adds up to all of the reasons why people in the community have been so concerned. She agrees that this type of threshold is appropriate for Evanston and the size of the projects they see coming in.

Mr. Brian Callahan made comments on appearance in general. He has lived in Evanston for the past 17 years and has always loved the beautiful architecture here. He is not an architect, however when he sees some of the new developments, they are unattractive to even his untrained eye. He appreciates the work that Ald. Wynne and others have done to downzone some building heights. He has recently heard the phrase “taste police” and that the City can not be such, but he feels that the City should have a stronger appearance ordinance. There are other municipalities who have adopted such ordinances that are working for their community.

Mr. Alterson pointed out to the Committee to be aware that the ordinance before them that has come from the Plan Commission does not include the industrial or open space districts. Ald Wynne asked Mr. Widmayer if they are shelving the standards portion that was followed before. Mr. Widmayer responded no and that the Plan Commission is planning to discuss this issue of recommended City standards to be used whenever evaluating any architecture at their next meeting.

Ald. Wynne asked Legal Staff if they have met the discussion level for the findings. Ms. Szymanski felt their discussion was sufficient and suggested also adopting Mr. Alterson’s exhibit and make the finding to specifically adopt the findings set forth in the revised ordinance. Ald. Wynne moved to accept Mr. Alterson’s Section 2 as the findings to support the ordinance, seconded by Ald. Bernstein.

Ald. Bernstein said that one concern he has relates to the binding appearance review ordinance, which he could never understand. He is concerned because from previous discussion about this there was no consensus and he is not sure that the layman is going to appreciate the views of the architects as it was acceptable many years ago. In consideration of Mr. Callahan’s comments, many people do not agree from an untrained eye, with the newer architecture of the more recent developments. He said there are other
reasons for this ordinance and as a caution to the Plan Commission, he is concerned. He noted that the aluminum house on Main Street and the orange balcony building are ones that he has received numerous complaints against, however these two structures have both received architectural awards.

Chairman Kent asked how the number of 25 units was derived. Mr. Alterson responded that at one time a higher number was being discussed but did not capture some of the new condo buildings that actually have a large impact on the street. Mr. Wolinski added that he believes it was the 1672 Maple Building (Roszak Development) which is under construction at this time, that was the basis for deriving at that number. This development has 28 units. Mr. Widmayer concurred that is why they brought the number down to 25. The Plan Commission did not want to get into 2-, 3- or even 6-flats or the smaller developments. Chairman Kent said that his complaint to this is where it states “incompatible with the character of the neighborhood and contributes to a sense of overcrowding and cast shadows on existing properties.” In his opinion, he feels this negative effect can result from the smaller developments of 6-8 units or even less, depending on where it located or property adjacent to. He said depending on the neighborhood; a development could still be incompatible even on the smaller scale. His concern is with balance as development effects individual neighborhoods. The positive factor with this ordinance is that it gives neighbors the opportunity to be involved. He feels there are still many undesirable people that are milking money out of 2-3 flat buildings and the smaller scale developments. Even though these developments may seem minimal, they can be detrimental to a majority single-family residential neighborhoods or already dense areas. Mr. Widmayer concurred that the Plan Commission excluded developments on the smaller level. He agrees with Chairman Kent and the concern for the need to address the smaller scale developments as it effects certain residential areas and problems with density. However, this problem requires a different level of discussion than what they are dealing with when this ordinance was proposed but nevertheless is important and needs to be addressed. Ald. Bernstein recalled past discussion involving height and bulk as it effects adjacent property and is why he always agreed with the floor area ratio process. Mr. Wolinski noted that because they are setting thresholds does not mean that applicants can not use the planned development procedure on smaller developments. In fact it even appears that many developers prefer the planned development method for zoning relief. He said that when he is asked by developers on the best approach, either through planned development or variance requests before the ZBA, he suggest that they do the planned development method because of the controls plus it comes through the Plan Commission which is perhaps looking at things a bit more liberal than the Zoning Board does on a land use aspect and aesthetically.

Ald. Bernstein asked for staff’s opinion on including 2-flats under planned development. Mr. Wolinski responded that personally he feels this would be difficult or even possible to do. He noted that the planned development process takes 3-4 months now and if they added up all the new construction of 2 and 3 flats would put quite a burden on the Plan Commission and Council. Chairman Kent agreed that it would be a burden if they take
that path, however he suggest the possibility of developing a new process for the smaller scale developments or conversions into rooming houses, etc.

**With no further discussion, the vote was 3-0 in favor of the motion.** Ms. Szymanski reminded that this item will take 6 votes by Council.

(P3) **Ordinance 65-O-04 – Zoning Planned Development: 801 Chicago/525 Kedzie**

Chairman Kent welcomed Mr. James Murray to begin with his presentation and introduction of everyone present for this case. Mr. Murray, attorney representing the developer, Mr. Ornoff, also acknowledged two members of the architectural firm of Pappageorge/Haymes Ltd., Mr. David Haymes and Mr. Garrett Stefanowski. He noted the smaller rendition of the exhibit boards including in Council’s packet materials. He recalled that this matter was last before P&D in December 2003 and was referred back to the Plan Commission because of what was considered to be a failing version of the planned development. In that it could not call to the attention of the general public the fact that there were some requirements for a variation of the setback requirements of the parking structure. The variance would be required in order to establish a different requirement that the planned development multi-family building with a special use. He said there was a third item that was addressed with the issue of the alley setback and screening of the alley. He said there is a provision which requires that an alley loading zone which is adjacent to a residential district be screened with appropriate screening materials. In this instance they have represented that the screening issue is presented and was felt by almost all involved, including residents and Ald. Wynne, that this presented a) a security difficulty and b) a blockage of the alley which was intended to remain as open as possible. This also reflected the views of several residents. He said that when they were on their way back to the Plan Commission, Mr. Ornoff directed that a very serious review of the entire project be undertaken. And in response to criticisms that were made relatively loud and clear by the community and various members of the Plan Commission, a virtually entire redo of the plan was accomplished. He noted that the primary issues of concern including number of units, number of parking spaces, and number of types of use that would be on this property as part of the development, were substantially revised. The result was to reduce the number of units from 41 by eliminating the originally proposed 29 1-bedroom units and retain the larger units for a total of 28 units. He said they would retain virtually units that are considered to be more highly stylistic and well thought out aesthetic aspects of the project. He said the setback off of the alley would be maintained at 10’ and that the gallery along Chicago Avenue façade of 7’ will also be retained as part of the overall structural and design. Mr. Murray said as a result of the rethinking and redrafting of the project, the originally gallery for the courtyard at the level above the parking was eliminated and a more direct single façade was created but enhanced by substantial variations of masonry. He noted that height of building has been reduced to the maximum height within the district and as of right to 67’. Also the number of units within the FAR have been reduced to as-of-right number conformancy. He said there are no allowances being sought to add units or to seek additional relief from the parking regulation other than that regarding the setback. The setback was essentially attributable to the second floor of the parking structure and those areas, which are not part of any, eliminate of corridor or aisle, which he pointed out in the
Mr. Murray concluded that with respect to all previously stated, they have attempted to address all of the issues previously of concern. He noted that they have been back to the Plan Commission and have indicated the nature, size and market values and have presented new traffic and parking studies as well as tax studies. He said all of which underlie the positive values of this particular project. In his opinion, this proposed plan would be a very nice use of that site.

Ald. Wynne asked for clarification on the parking variance that is being requested only impacts the second floor. Mr. Murray explained that it does impact the second floor and that portion of the first floor that affects 4 parking spaces.

Ald Newman arrived at 8:05 p.m.

Mr. Murray pointed several issues relative to the ordinance which may need some amending because of an overstatement of the necessary eliminations of relief for this project. He pointed out there are three unnecessary items under Section 3 on page 3 which are C, D, & E that can be eliminated. These items have been adjusted and eliminated by virtue of design modification. He also pointed out that there is a blank space on page 1, which should refer to Section 6-10-3-3. The Committee agreed to these changes in the ordinance.

Chairman Kent called for citizen comment at this time.

Mr. Hans Vija, constructed a small-scale model of the site and proposed building before the Committee. He pointed out the previous brick building was a structure that did not fill out the entire site. He identified numerous problems that will be caused by this proposed structure involving traffic within the alley, problems with delivery trucks that need to use that alley for other business within the block. Also there are currently 144 cars that use this alley for people that live within this block. This project will add 30% more cars to an already congested heavily used alley. He feels this will create a very restrictive and negative impact within that area. Mr. Vija pointed out the north elevation of the building that will face the adjacent building to the north with a blank brick wall. He totally objects to this developers proposals, even with this second proposal which appears to be downscaled and still has the ability to shoe-horn a large building on this site. He believes Evanston has plenty of examples where this same occurrence has happened by the same method. He feels, based on principal, they should not be granted a variance unless the standards and facts are met. In this case, he feels they have not been met and disagree with the findings of the Plan Commission. Mr. Vija informed the Committee that the neighborhood group did have some expertise testimony at those meetings, however it is very expensive and would have cost the neighborhood many thousands of dollars to retain for all the meetings. He went into further detail explaining the traffic problems with this proposal and that this alley is the only ingress and egress for the majority of people that live within this block as well as the businesses. He pointed out that this applicant purchased this property at a high price knowing the problems involved with development on this site. He urged the Committee to consider all the negatives before acting on this case.
Mr. Tim Cronin, 811 Chicago Avenue, pointed out that this proposed development would be a true danger to the community for pedestrians and contributing to vehicular accidents as well. This area is already incredibly dense and congested during rush hour and this proposed building will only add to that existing problem. He feels it is inevitable that someone will be hurt eventually. He would like to see something built on this site that is compatible with that corner at a much lower scale and a lot less units.

Ald. Newman said that he is confused with all the traffic issues mentioned. He reminded that in reality the developer could build up to 37 units by right and the proposal is for 24 units. This result is actually for less cars than what would be allowed as-of-right, which he would consider much more as a threat than what is being proposed.

Ald. Wynne stated that she could not support this building. She pointed out that the Plan Commission originally unanimously denied this and this proposal is still too dense for this site in her mind. She said the standard of negative impact on adjacent property has not been met because it clearly takes away from the owners in the building next door. She does however, appreciate the building architecturally but there is still the need for a variance, which causes Council to act. If the building came within the package then Council would have not legal ground to deny. She strongly disapproves of the blank brick wall that the neighbors at 811 will end up with and reiterated that she feels the standards have not been met in this case.

Ald. Newman pointed out that there are 62 units at 811 Chicago Avenue and here the developer is proposing the addition of 24 units. He understands Ald. Wynne’s position, however the developer has addressed the concerns and issues presented originally and the building is being built within the envelope except to the setback requirement for parking. He noted that with this variance, you have to consider the effect and how it is almost impossible to come within the setback requirement in this case for this site. He pointed out that the building proposed is very attractive whereas the next proposal may not be if this is denied and someone comes in after him with a project that fits the envelope totally as-of-right. He reiterated that he feels the developer has addressed all concerns and issues from the original proposal and that he could support this. Ald. Wynne reminded Ald. Newman of his comments when this was last before the Committee that he could not support any proposal that would need zoning relief, it should come in within the building envelope. He agreed and feels that this proposal has come in within the building envelope and that the zoning relief requested in this case appear to be necessary and are minimal in comparison to his efforts in revising from his original plans to come this close within the building allowances.

Mr. David Haymes, architect, recalled comments that he heard regarding the point of deevaluation of property in the adjacent building. He said this is a fallacious argument and there is no entitlement here. Ald. Newman added that he feels the 811 Chicago building when built was the beginning of the height epidemic that kicked off the effort to change the zoning in that area. In reality, there was never any guarantee that 801 Chicago would not be redeveloped at some time in the future.
Ald. Bernstein stated that what they do here tonight will impact on future development on Chicago Avenue. He informed the Committee that he has received word of future development to the north on Chicago Avenue with plans of one of the car dealerships moving out because condo development is more beneficial in that area. He reminded of plans for future development of the Flannigan property as well. He also noted that no affordable housing component has been addressed here and questioned if there are any plans for this inclusion. Nevertheless, he appreciates the developers intent and evident efforts in addressing all the concerns that were raised with the original plan.

Ald. Wynne suggested holding this item because she feels more discussion is needed before the Committee should act on this. Ald. Newman suggested introducing and referring back to Committee so as not to hold this up an additional two weeks regardless of how the final vote will be. Chairman Kent agreed with Ald. Wynne’s suggestion to hold this item in Committee because he also would not like to see Council act on this item hastily. The developer has come this far and has made great effort in addressing concerns and revising their plans, so he would hope they would be understanding of the Committee’s position in this case.

This item was held in Committee.

(P7) Ordinance 70-O-04 – 422 Davis Street, The Georgian
The Committee members, staff, Mr. Paul Shadle representing the Georgian, and Ms. Judy Fiske of the Preservation Commission suggested and discussed several dates in July to set the special meeting. There was a final consensus on the date of Thursday, July 29th at 6:00 p.m. to be held preferably in the Council Chambers.

OTHER BUSINESS
The Committee asked for updates on several issues pending with P&D.

Chairman Kent asked for an update on the inclusionary affordable housing issue. Ms. Spicuzza responded that she has recently met with the members of BPI who forwarded a completed draft ordinance for staff’s review and comments. She stated that this ordinance was just received a few days ago and she will review and respond back to BPI for completion of the final draft.

Ald. Wynne asked for an update on the 904 Hinman case. Mr. Ruiz gave an update and said that he was in the process of setting up a site visit of the building with the owner and making observations and suggestions to work with the applicant.

The Committee asked the status of the rezoning of Kendall College. Mr. Wolinski informed that this was tabled at Site Plan to give the developer an opportunity to redesign his proposal. He said there is a nomination for landmark status for the Administration Building.
ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
Jacqueline E. Brownlee