
Alderman Absent: A. Hansen


Presiding Official: Alderman Bernstein

DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chairman Bernstein called the meeting to order at 6:48 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE JULY 11, 2005 MEETING MINUTES

Ald. Tisdahl moved approval of the July 11, 2005 minutes with the amendment noted by Ms. Brownlee to change the date in the header. Ald. Jean-Baptiste seconded the motion and the minutes were approved unanimously.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

(P1) Ordinance 90-O-05 – Major Variation Request for a Rear and Second-story Addition at 1044 Elmwood Avenue

This item was introduced at the July 11th meeting and referred back to Committee to review the amended ordinance to include language to provide the most effectively quiet condenser unit and additional language that all efforts be made to preserve the oak tree on the adjoining property. It was the majority consensus of the Committee to recommend amending the ordinance further by adding additional language “to meet or exceed the code at 55 decibels or if this does not work, add a device to insulate the condenser unit. Ald. Jean-Baptiste motioned to approve Ordinance 90-O-05 with the additional amended language, seconded by Ald. Wynne. The vote was 7 in favor of the motion and 1 voting nay (Moran).

(PLEASE REVIEW THE TRANSCRIPT FOR DETAILED DISCUSSION)

(P4) Ordinance 93-O-05 – Plan Commission Recommendation for Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment: Zoning and Administrative Adjudication

Ald. Rainey moved approval of Ordinance 93-O-05, seconded by Ald. Tisdahl. The vote was 8-0 in favor of the motion. Mr. Wolinski requested the Committee to consider
suspending the rules for this item because it takes approximately a month to put into effect with the Administrative Adjudication program and there are several zoning violation tickets that they would like to see go through this process. The Committee concurred with Mr. Wolinski’s request.

(PLEASE REVIEW THE TRANSCRIPT FOR DETAILED DISCUSSION)

(P2) Housing Commission Recommendation for HOME Funds for ECDA’s 736-38 Dobson Project

Chairman Bernstein acknowledged all those present representing this case from Reba Place Development and ECDA. Ald. Rainey informed the Committee that she has met with both organizations on this matter. She wanted to impose her opinion on this, especially to the housing experts on the Housing Commission that brought forth this recommendation. She noted that they have non-for-profits involved in this case selling a building for $750,000 so that it can then be converted to condominiums at the cost of another $600,000 approximately. She questioned if it would not make more sense, if the real goal is to provide affordable housing, to cut out the middle man in this case to consult with the Mennonite Church. Ald. Rainey believes that Mr. Banks and Reba Place could develop this property for Mennonite and they would still get the same $800,000 in sale price for the units and receive the $360,000 from the City. In her opinion, she feels they would have so much more affordability this way than the method being proposed here. She said this process is what causes the high price of housing with the addition of $750,000 to the cost of this project to purchase the building. However, Ald. Rainey stated that she will support this but the City need to get a better view on how to go about providing affordable housing. She noted that the way they go about getting affordable housing in Evanston is from the use of City housing funds to support the developer’s portion to make the property affordable. She pointed out that what the City is actually doing is increasing the value of this property and this should not be the case. Ald. Rainey stated that more thought should be put into the full scope of these affordable housing projects.

Ald. Rainey said secondly, that she has a grave concern about where the extra $146,300 is coming from. All she can account for here is the revenue is going to be $1,160,000 from the sale plus the City’s contribution. She noted that the applicant stated that the project cost $1,306,300, therefore leaving a shortage of $146,300. In addition, the applicant is stating that they are going to get this money from contributions from other churches and individual means. She said that this type of situation is not stable and concerns her very much. Ald. Rainey stated that in view of the applicant’s status, she believes that those contributions are possible, however she feels that going into a project like this is frightening when funds are short by that amount.

Ald. Rainey added that she would request that there be a condition placed that this building must be entirely converted to condominiums and not remain rental in any way. In her opinion, she feels that for the Mennonites, it is wrong to sell this building for $750,000 when the same amount of money can be used to renovate and then sell the units
without adding that extra cost and they would still profit the same amount of money. She noted that what causes the price of property to be so expensive.

Mr. David Janzen, Project Manager with Reba Place Development, wished to respond to Ald. Rainey’s comments. He informed the Committee that ECDA has hired their development organization to develop and general contract this project. He noted that this is also a partnership between their organizations to renovate and convert this building to condominiums. He said that the reason the Mennonite Church want to sell this property, which the sale price has been matched exactly by an appraisal, is because they want to buy another building and relocate. The Mennonite Church would like to continue its ministry in a different kind of setting above ground and in a more appropriate public and available location, they need to sell this property and use the proceeds for purchasing another building that will fit their needs. Mr. Janzen acknowledged the representatives present from the Mennonite Church who can elaborate further on their plans. Nevertheless, he can not understand a way or means to purchase this building further without the asking purchase price of $750,000. He noted that the Mennonite Church at this point does not wish to continue ownership. He stated that when they first approached the City with their proposal by contacting Ms. Donna Spicuzza and Ald. Rainey, they were informed that the City is willing to be a partner in this development, however it was made clear at that time that they sought funds from the Illinois Housing Development Authority, the Federal Home Loan Bank and other Evanston Churches, to come up with an additional amount of $120,000 in contributions. Therefore, he noted that the subsidy funds they need at $80,000 per unit, with the City HOME funds of $60,000 per unit, leaving $20,000 per unit. Mr. Janzen brought attention to the pro forma report included in the Committee’s packet which clearly defines and explains the cost and expenses of the project. Ald. Rainey pointed out that the pro forma noted $146,300 short fall, which is stated to be made up for in contributions. She reiterated her concern with the fact that there is no real commitment in writing or verbally for contributions to the shortfall amount. Mr. Janzen said that he feels certain that upon the purchase commitment that the anticipated contributions will come forward. Ald. Rainey clarified that the point she is trying to make is that the “middle-man” cost needs to be eliminated for affordable housing. The additional cost is not a savings for the City, nor does it aid in supporting the cost of affordable housing; it only adds to the value of the property in the end.

Ms. Robin Snyderman-Pratt, Chair of the Housing Commission, spoke in regards to the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, which is also on the agenda this evening for discussion. She pointed out in relation to this very matter how important this ordinance and regulation would be for the City of Evanston to aid in providing affordable housing. She said that this ordinance will aid even when it relates to the not-for-profit organization projects as well as the larger planned development projects that have overwhelmed the City in the past years. Ms. Pratt recognized that the City has a commitment to providing affordable housing and have federal dollars set aside to contribute to that cause, however in view of the present real estate market and cost of redevelopment and construction, the expense for providing such housing is very expensive and needs to be funded for provision. In her opinion, in the future that they are going to see a whole new pool of
opportunities created for providing affordable housing and more tools for the ability to help more qualified buyers purchase property at an affordable amount.

Ald. Rainey asked Ms. Spicuzza from the information received in Council’s packet, about her stating that she would be speaking with the Assessor about affordable taxes because she finds the amount stated in the pro forma may be short. Ms. Spicuzza responded that she just had an initial meeting with the Assessor’s Office and they looked at the documents being used in terms of resale restrictions and the time frame involved. She noted that from this observation, the Assessor’s Office did not give a definitive answer but there is a special assessment program division and they are looking at inclusion of this program for homeowners who purchased affordable housing property.

Mr. Keith Banks, Executive Director of ECDA, stated that they are centering their efforts as a faith-based organization to maintain and preserve affordable housing in the City of Evanston. He noted that it is a tremendous challenge and one of the things they have been unable to do unlike some other similar organizations in the City of Chicago, is to purchase and obtain property lots for one dollar or donated free of cost with the agreement to develop affordable housing on the lot. Mr. Banks noted here in Evanston they are expected to purchase the property or land at full market value and as a result, have to be very creative in order to develop affordable housing. Therefore, they have an advantage to try and galvanize the faith-based community as well as partner with the city, and partner with other not-for-profit organizations, also getting the community involved to succeed in the mission to provide any affordable housing. He stressed the fact that his organization has worked very hard to succeed in this mission along with all the other entities involved and that they are not doing this for the profit but more for the cause and the need. Mr. Banks elaborated on the purchase price of $750,000 to the Mennonite Church and their gift to pay the full down payment and closing costs. He reiterated Mr. Janzen’s statements to the Committee that the Mennonite Church’s desire at this time to sell the building and use the proceeds to purchase another building and relocate their ministry services to a more suitable location.

Ald. Rainey repeated her concern with the building being entirely converted to condominiums with no rental and she would like the Committee to support a requirement that in order to receive the HOME funds, the building must be totally converted and sold as affordable units as opposed to any extension of rental use. She explained that there remains some confusion and unsuresness from discussion with the applicants as to the continuation of renting units while renovating the building and the time frame for completion. Ald. Rainey stressed that she does not want to see that situation occur and wishes the immediate goal to be the total conversion of all the units. She strongly urges some restriction and time frame clarified for the rental use of this property. Mr. Wolinski responded that the ultimate goal here is that when all is said and done and the final rehab is finished, all the units will be converted and sold as affordable condominiums as stated. Mr. Janzen responded to Ald. Rainey’s concerns informing the Committee that their anticipated time frame for rehabilitation and conversion of the building is for the final plan to be ready within 6 months and then begin renovation and construction thereafter to be done approximately 1 year following. He assured that they would need at least 18
months and no more than 3 years in case of unforeseen situations. He did confirm that there will be a transitional period during the construction stage where some rental will take place so that the building will not be totally empty and some means of income will still be coming in. Mr. Janzen pointed out that any HOME funds will not be disbursed unless all guidelines are met and the condominium closing take place.

Mr. Wolinski addressed Mr. Janzen and Mr. Banks regarding the Mennonite Church services being held in the basement of this building and if the use will continue during the renovation of the building. Both gentlemen said the Mennonite Church will remain holding their services in the basement until they find and purchase a building and relocate. Mr. Wolinski recalled in the past, the Mennonite Church receiving a special use to allow a church use in that basement and he further recalled which Ald. Rainey backed up, the documented calls and complaints on property maintenance issues that have occurred at this address and with the Church use in the basement. He recommended to the Committee, in light of this knowledge, that he would not like to see some successor have to deal with this Church use at this property as a result of that special use that was granted years ago. He suggested to the Committee that some language should be added with the deed restriction regarding the release of the existing special use. Ms. Szymanski agreed with Mr. Wolinski and advised the legal language that should be added.

Ald. Rainey also agreed that there needs to be some agreement to the use of the basement in this building because the subsequent condominium association should not have to deal with the extended use of Mennonite Church services. Mr. Janzen responded that in this case, they would request as much but no more than 3 years in which to complete the entire condominium conversion of the building. He informed the Committee that in that time, they have an agreement with the Mennonite Church to allow their right of continuance of worship services for up to 3 years and no longer. He reiterated that the regulations of the HOME funds will not be allocated until the final disposition of total units is converted to condominiums.

Ald. Rainey’s strongly urged the Committee to support her request to hold this item on their agenda for further discussion of the issues of concern that were brought out this evening. She questions the time frame of the completion for the renovation to condominiums in this building with only 6-units involved. She would also like staff to investigate the continued use of the basement as a church use over the next 3 years while the conversion is taking place.

Ald. Rainey motioned to hold this item in Committee, seconded by Ald. Tisdahl. The vote was 8-0 in favor of the motion.

(P3) Ordinance 91-O-05 – Extending Moratorium on Issuance of Building Permits on Central from Bennett to Marcy
Ald. Rainey moved approval, seconded by Ald. Moran.

Ald. Wollin asked staff how long will these extensions be allowed to go on and where does the Plan Commission stand on this issue and the time frame for bringing it before
the P&D Committee. Ms. Jackson responded that the Plan Commission will meet this week on Wednesday and this item is on their agenda. She said in confidence on behalf of the Plan Commission position in light of if this moratorium is extended, that they will review this issue and finalize their recommendation as soon as possible and present before the Committee within the next few meetings. Mr. Wolinski informed the Committee that of the 4 projects that started on West Central Street within the last year, only one of those projects is currently underway. That project is on the old Brown’s Chicken site for a condominium development. He noted that the other 3 projects, which were proposed but were caught in some phase of the approval stage, have gone dormant and have not proceeded. He stated to the best of his knowledge, there is no one who has approached the City with plans in the West Central Street to build in the moratorium area at this time. Ald. Moran concurred.

The vote was 8-0 in favor of the motion.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

(PD1) Inclusionary Housing Policy
Ms. Carroll approached the Committee and explained rather than bring forth ordinances at this time, she felt it important to first present this discussion paper first since this is such an important housing topic. She said also that this discussion paper summarizes staff’s ideas and what we feel is appropriate for Inclusionary housing in Evanston. She thought it would be good for the Committee to chew on this information for awhile and give staff their reaction and tell us what direction to proceed. Ms. Carroll informed the Committee that she has been having discussions with Robin Snyderman-Pratt and some of her counterparts, and internal discussions with staff members: James Wolinski, Dennis Marino, and Donna Spicuzza. She directed attention memorandum from the Housing Commission regarding their review and comments of this discussion paper at their July 21, 2005 meeting, which states their support and encouragement after years of working on this topic. She noted that as it points out under the Housing Characteristics paragraph on page 1, it shows significant inflation in the housing sale prices over the past several years and it is becoming harder and harder for people to be able to afford to live at the median income level within the community. She said that the Housing Commission came up with a series of recommendations, which staff added on to. For example, the Housing Commission recommended a range of 10-20% set-aside for affordable housing depending on the size of the development. Staff is recommending that they only look at planned developments with 25 units or greater, or the smaller development which they are suggesting a set-aside of 10% of which 5% could be donated on-site and 5% off-site contribution of the developers choice. Ms. Carroll noted that their policy does not address rental housing at this time; only owner-occupied housing. She believes that in discussions with staff that it was felt that the rental market does not increase significantly as the owner-occupied so there is not as great an urgency to include in the Inclusionary housing policy at this time. Also she said a significant percentage of homes or units that were affordable are more in the rental market versus owner-occupied, which Mr. Marino added that approximately 32% of households in the rental market were paying more than 35% of their income per housing and it was 20% of owner-occupied were paying more
than 35%. Ms. Carroll continued that what the Housing Commission had recommended was working with 80% of area median income; however staff is suggesting 80-100% of Evanston area median income, which would make it more affordable for the workforce of the community such as firefighters and police officers, etc. The Housing Commission also suggested of a much longer restriction period, which staff suggests a maximum of 15 years and they have not fully developed the formula to go with this concept. She noted that staff did concur with the housing provider continuing to work with not-for-profit organizations in the City to purchase some of the affordable units. Ms. Carroll concluded that basically they are here tonight to see if the Committee first want to have such a policy, if so, secondly does the Committee wish for staff to further explore some concepts with the development community. She said that staff would also like to work with the not-for-profit organizations that have been working with the affordable housing market and including their input. Mr. Marino said that Ms. Carroll has covered the major issues, but he would like to point out on page 4, there is a breakdown of qualifying income to affordable housing sale price and the housing expense to income ratio. He noted that at 70% of median, what is being reached at this level at $43,771 is approximately the entry level salary for a teacher at Evanston Township High School and the entry level for firefighters and police officers is approximately $48,000 or around 80% of median. This gives some idea of the range in salaries in the workforce and they would like to look at the salary range of the workforce at the two hospitals as well. He noted that the affordable sales price in this chart is based on new construction and what a household of 4 would be able to afford at 33-34% housing expense to income ratio. He said that this is basically a program concept so there are several different iterations that can be done. Chairman Bernstein said that they still need to determine what methodology they are going to use to subsidy to buy those prices down to the affordable sales price. Ms. Carroll suggested that the subsidy could either come from a developer or by means of the developer making a payment-in-lieu-of up to 5%.

Ald. Rainey stated that she would like a report from staff regarding the extent to which the banks participate in affordable housing, specifically beginning with the Evanston Mortgage Corporation. She does not really understand how this program works, how it is funded or the process in which to apply for this program. The reason she asks about the role that the banks have in providing funds for affordable housing is because she received a call from the Federal Reserve Bank doing an interview that said they were selecting elected officials to find out what were banks doing in the community reinvestment act. She noted that the City is asking for developers to participate so she feels it is appropriate to have the banks participate as much as possible.

Ald. Tisdahl said that she is very interested in trying to provide housing for Evanston’s workforce. She recalled that it was pointed out in this report that there are people throughout the State who would love to have affordable housing. She questions how they can do this just limited to Evanston workforce and how this would be legally written. Ms. Carroll responded that she was told by the City’s Legal staff that they can write this up as a preference but can not make an outright limitation from her understanding. Ms. Szymanski added that a preference is far more defensible than an outright limitation. She recalled that the case law from the United States Supreme Court on “Residents Only”
legislation and goals, although she is very well aware this is housing and that affordable housing is a local matter, and the thrust of the matter is State Legislation. She said that the United States Supreme Court case is always in the back of her mind and it is very much disfavoring, limiting government type benefits to residents. Therefore, she believes they would be on firm ground if established this as a precedent for Evanston residents. Ms. Carroll added that it is suggested to have certain residency or work time period requirements included such as a 1 year minimum before you can apply for First Time Homebuyers Program.

Ald. Tisdahl asked if staff has had the opportunity to talk to the two hospitals about possibly participating and contributing in funding for affordable housing. Ms. Carroll responded that they have not extended out that far yet because staff felt that it would be premature at this time until City Council has the chance to review this discussion paper and give further direction on this concept before reaching out to other organizations. Ms. Spicuzza added that in terms of local preferences, that there has been discussion on the consideration of extending qualification to people who have grown up in Evanston or attended school here.

Ms. Robin Snyderman-Pratt, Chair of the Housing Commission, said that the Housing Commission had a chance to review this discussion paper at their July 21st meeting and she would like to share a few overall impressions of this document and related questions that the Committee has brought up. First of all, she said that it is very satisfying for them to see this proposal that has been 3 years in the work, come forward and that the work of the Task Force and the Commission was well summarized in this report and transformed into staff’s own words. She feels that this report is very responsive to the recommendations of the City’s Corporation Counsel and also to the Committee’s request not to see the City giving too much away. She stated that this proposal is only for people who are asking for something from the City, in terms of a variance or a bonus and in exchange for that, there is this requirement for an affordable housing provision. She noted that this is not necessarily tapping any sort of trust fund because certainly City’s with much more expensive housing markets have even more aggressive set aside policies. Therefore, she pointed out that this proposal does not have the depth of what the Task Force and Housing Commission originally proposed but they do believe this is a good start. She recalled that when they first began this mission 3 years ago, several Council members said they wanted an affordable housing policy but need one that is appropriate and works for Evanston. Ms. Pratt gave her support behind this proposal and that it is worth building on. Although they have not had formal hearings with the development community, the Task Force, which Ald. Bernstein and former Ald. Kent sat on, did include both private sector members of the development community and Mr. Richard Koenig of Housing Opportunity Development Corp. Therefore, this effort was not designed in a vacuum by a bunch of advocates with no input from the development community.

Ms. Pratt summarized that their main concerns with this was first, as Ms. Carroll referenced, the restriction period which they feel 15-years is too short. The Commission’s opinion is in view of the fact of knowing how the market in Evanston is
escalating and what the opportunities are and the demand for providing affordable housing. She extended this awareness from their research around the country that the Task Force conducted and reviewing other policies that have worked in other areas. For example, in Montgomery County that was the first area to administer an affordable housing policy, is that the restriction period ends faster than expected and all of sudden they were in a worse predicament in the end. Ms. Pratt noted that this is an issue that has escalated to the State level and Evanston is not alone in looking at this and there are a number of legal tools that they can explore, which is on the Housing Commission’s agenda for their next meeting.

Ms. Pratt pointed out another issue that was referenced was the difference between looking at Evanston’s media and the statistical media of the Chicago area. In her opinion, she feels this is very useful to see this crying demand in terms of Evanston, however when it comes down to crafting a policy and you look at the consideration of participation by the banks, whose programs focus on the statistical metropolitan areas, this City is different because the Evanston numbers are not calculated by household size as the metropolitan statistics are. She further explained the State’s evaluation process, which she pointed out that the numbers are not that different. However they will receive a “bigger bank for the buck” if they use the broader median.

Ms. Pratt informed the Committee that another topic the Housing Commission discussed that they hear a lot from the non-profit developers, is how hard it is to get any rental housing. Therefore, the Housing Commission would like to see this eventually be extended to the rental market. She suggested one way would be use some of the houses purchased by the non-profit sector for renovation as rental property.

Ms. Pratt concluded that the Housing Commission remains available to keep trying to refine this concept and proposed policy at the direction of this Committee.

Ald. Wollin agreed that this concept is a positive and good beginning to start with and acknowledged that it has been a priority concern on everyone’s agenda for some time. She hopes that this beginning will continue to proceed with the inclusion of condo conversions, rental properties, and even with tear downs. She raised her concern with the 15-year restricted period and the possibility of having multiple owners. She used for example, if someone owned the property for 13-years then sold to another eligible purchaser who owned the property for another 2-years, she questions who the second owner would benefit from this sale or if after 2 years, are they allowed to sell the property for market value? She feels this is an important issue that needs to be addressed and clarified in the policy. Ald. Wollin also asked what the set-aside means for the developer who is not willing to give 10% of the building for affordable housing. If the developer chose the option of payment-in-lieu-of, will this payment be based on the worth of the entire development or 10% of the selling price per unit? Mr. Marino responded that it would be based on 10% of the number of units and the going rate for price of those units. He clarified that this is only the concept according to what has been discussed and recommended for this discussion paper. He said that this formula can be further defined upon a formal dialogue with the development community. Ald. Wollin agreed and noted
that the City has made some arrangements with developments that have come before them, however in comparison to this proposal, those arrangements seem minuscule, though important nevertheless. Ald. Wollin suggested the consideration of having some special guidelines for the Special Housing Funds and the disbursement of those funds. Ms. Carroll assured that when those funds are involved, all guidelines and qualification requirements will have to be met by any applicant before disbursement is made.

Ald. Moran expressed his support for this concept of Inclusionary housing and the need to proceed on providing affordable housing if the City is to retain its diversity, which is very important for this community. He stressed that one of Evanston’s strengths is its diverse population and he would not want to see this advantageous diminish. He elaborated that this diversity applies to seniors and long time residents that have lived in this community for 30, 40, or some even 50+ years and have run out of the economic ability to afford to stay here. He is very concerned with the fact that even those who qualify to purchase under the affordable housing guidelines, if they will be able to afford to contain the cost of housing expenses to remain in Evanston.

Ald. Moran further pointed out that the City has to be careful in consideration of the payment-in-lieu-of option provided to developers and their choices in where they request to allocate those funds or provide for affordable housing units. He says this because the off-site contributions could all end up being requested to be located in certain areas of the City when this should be a City-wide responsibility for affordable housing. He would like to see some control over even distribution towards any such contributions to providing affordable housing. Ald. Moran also wanted to express his support for inclusion of the tear down tax proposal in the future, which would be beneficial in this community.

Ald. Rainey asked staff, in reference to past discussions, what Highland Park has in place as far as their Inclusionary Housing Policy and providing affordable housing and the options provided to developers for payment-in-lieu-of. She would like to see further information on who these programs are working for in those communities as far as income, workforce or residency requirements are involved. Her opinion is that in looking at the comparison of Highland Park and even other North Shore communities, such as Lake Forest, it would be helpful in considering the needs of the Evanston community, which is clearly more diverse. Her point being that if a program works for such north shore communities, then assuredly there is a definite need and a possible policy that will fit Evanston’s uniqueness. It will just take more creativity.

Ald. Rainey also stated that another one of her concerns is the need to consider the effect that the time constraints could have under the affordability regulations for a growing family that may need to move to larger accommodations and if they will be negatively effected in any way by the 15-year restriction. She feels this restriction period needs to be reviewed further on how it could affect the homeowner in other ways besides the resale control. Chairman Bernstein reminded that it is also relevant the realization of the benefits that families receive when qualifying for affordable housing and what they are obtaining in the long run. Ms. Pratt responded that this particular issue has been a big
topic of discussion with the Housing Commission and there are a number of situations out there that allow for families to benefit from the equity over a period of time. However, there is a need to give back to the City and for the City to have some control over this appreciation since Housing Funds were used to subsidize the cost.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste stated that he feels they need to put in place a policy that concentrates on the existing affordable housing that the City has. He noted that there is a large population of homeowners in Evanston that would not be able to afford the purchase of their homes today. He said that the housing market has gone out of control and he would like to see some assistance provided for current homeowners if needed for different means.

Ald. Tisdahl does not feel Highland Park or Lake Forest ordinance have anything to do with the Evanston community and should not be used as a comparison in her opinion. From experience, she grew up in Lake Forest, and it is a much less diverse community with the majority of its residents living within a similar income group whereas Evanston is much more diverse all the way such as the people, income levels, economic environment, etc.

Ald. Wynne said that she is pleased with this proposal because it practically eliminates the tool box of zoning variance trade-off’s that existed when this matter first came about. She was under the impression that the Task Force was incorporating some of this into the policy to work with as a negotiating tool but is very impressed that they worked this out of the policy. Ms. Carroll responded that she was under the impression that the Council preferred to draw away from making it available for developers to have that option of using certain zoning variances as a means for trade-off. That is why they have focused the attention on the trade-off for the options under payment-in-lieu-of.

The Committee agreed that staff and the Housing Commission could begin to look at including the condominium conversions into this policy. Ald. Wollin suggested that more consideration should be given to helping senior citizens such as maybe offering tax incentives or credits. She also suggested offering some type of assistance on living arrangements to any senior citizen who might consider donating their property to the affordable housing cause.

Mr. Marino said that he would provide a matrix of current affordable housing activity in Evanston. The Committee members agreed that such a report would be very helpful.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacqueline E. Brownlee