MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right. Let's everyone relax. We have another project. We want to give them as much courtesy as we gave this one. Special use for a major variation for religious institution and private education institution at 303 Dodge, otherwise known as JRC. I'm going to ask you, please you must be quiet. These people have been working for years on this so let's give them the respect that they deserve.

Good evening.

MR. WEINBERGER: Good evening. Seth Weinberger, 649 Michigan Avenue in Evanston. Good evening. My name is Seth Weinberger. I'm the co-chair of the building committee of the Jewish Reconstructionist Congregation, 303 Dodge, and we are here before you tonight because of the proposed reconstruction of our building of which this is the latest computer image of what the architects have planned. The architects are Ross, Barney, and Jankowski, the same firm that did the Levy Center across the street. Michael Ross is here with us tonight as well as Allen Saposnik is our president. I'm going to be brief, but if you have questions I'll be happy
to answer them.

The existing building, I think almost all of you have been in at one point or another for one of our services, it's a 50-year-old building. JRC has been in existence for 40 years. We have 450 member families. Our membership has been flat for the last about decade. We are not growing, we are not shrinking. Religious involvement in this town is pretty much shrinking, but we've maintained an even size over these years. But the building, the existing building that we're in hasn't met our needs for at least a decade. We've basically just outgrown it. And on top of that the building is deteriorating in a number of pretty important ways right now. So we have to do something. It doesn't meet our needs because we don't have enough classroom space for the size school that we have. We also have a good size early childhood program, and right now it's in a cramped basement space. It just doesn't meet the qualities of church preschool in some of the other preschools we know in this town. The sanctuary is too small for a number of our bar/bat mitzvahs, and if would ever need to double them, then it's way too small. Some of our larger services it's too small for. We do not hold our high holiday services, our larger services in our own space, nor will we under the new space. The high holiday services tend to get everyone involved, and it can be as many as 1,000 people. And we made a decision early on that we couldn't afford to build a space that would accommodate that. So even under the new scheme, we would continue to hold our high holiday services in the First United Church.

The last piece of the inadequacy of the building is the social hall. For those who have been in there, it's in the basement. There are poles everywhere, almost no natural lighting, like a nine foot ceiling. It's just not suitable for social space at all. We've managed to make this building work for many years, should have done something earlier, but once it started deteriorating physically then we have to make a decision.

We explored a number of alternatives around Evanston. There are a couple of different sites available that proved to be inadequate or challenging for any number of reasons, many of them had difficult parking problems for us, others just difficult sites for us. We looked outside of Evanston, but we would prefer to stay in Evanston; about 40, 50 percent of our membership is in Evanston. We've been an Evanston institution all this time. We'd like to stay that way. So we did the last thing that we wanted to do which is basically proposed to tear down the building that we're in and start over and build one up. And we asked Ross, Barney, and Jankowski to both consider the Levy Center across the street
and come up with something that was compatible with that and also compatible with the neighborhood and could meet our program the way we run it now without any increase in membership proposed or expected, just to run it the way we run it. And it was a challenge for them. They basically determined on their own that we needed about a 40,000 square feet, and, you know, the most we felt that we could design that would be compatible with the space is the plan here. It's about 30,000. Just to highlight, you have the plans, I think, with you, but it's a fairly simple scheme. It's a box, and the first floor where you enter is the administrative offices and a small chapel and the preschool program, which is going to be very nice sort of segregated part of the back of the building that will be very open and should be really great for preschool space. You go up this main staircase, it's visible from outside the street, and you get into the second floor, and that's an entirely our religious school floor. So they have their own space, eight classrooms and the library, and then you go up one more flight and that is largely one area which is our sanctuary social [haul|hall], one space that you can subdivide so that you can have sanctuary on one side, social hall on another, or you can open it up and have a larger sanctuary space.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Seth, one moment. Alderman Moran?

ALDERMAN MORAN: Seth, what is the perspective that we're looking at? Is that the south?

MR. WEINBERGER: It's from Mulford, so looking north, yes, the south elevation.

We held two town hall meetings with the neighbors, Alderman Rainey has been very helpful in engaging the community in this. We have had no concerns expressed by the neighbors, a lot of positive comments from the neighbors. As you read from the record, the only issue that has been raised by the neighbors is that they would like to have the alley paved that goes from Mulford up to, I think it's Kirk. And as we stated in the record, we're willing to pay our share of that if the neighbors do want to pave. Other than that, you know, we've enjoyed excellent relations with the neighbors in the years that we've been there.

There are two issues that have come up at the zoning hearing, and they're addressed on the record, but let me just discuss them briefly: One is height and the other is parking. In terms of height we're constrained by a small space. We need to build on grade because, as you're aware
maybe from part of the things on the Levy Center, although it's not the exact same conditions, the soil is not good in this spot and it would get costly to build a building that we need of our size below grade. We are only having twelve foot height, fairly modest heights for two of our three floors, but the third floor of the sanctuary floor needs to be high enough to have sort of a proper, any other way of saying it, but religious experience for the space, and even just architecturally proportionate experience in something as wide as this and as deep as this it has to have a certain height. And it's going to be 17 feet which is shorter than our smaller room now. It's really as low as it can be. But recognizing that height is an issue here, I think the architects did something extremely clever in terms of giving us that height, but not having the impact as much of that height on the neighborhood by putting the sanctuary on the third floor to begin with. We don't need to have that height across the entire length of the floor. We only have it on two-thirds of the floor because the other part of the floor is the reception area that doesn't need the height, the kitchen doesn't need the height, some other, you know, bathrooms don't need the height. So it's just the sanctuary itself that has that height. So they created a clear story which, in this plan, you can only see actually this little piece of white over here. I think you can see it from other of your plans. That is really designed to be almost floating. It's going to be either white or off-white. It's mostly glass, and so it won't be visible, I don't think, from when you're on Mulford. It would probably be visible as you go up and down Dodge, but it doesn't give you the same height as if the entire building was that height.

The other issue that has been raised is parking. And really one of the main reasons we decided to stay here as opposed to finding another site in Evanston is that this is one of the few areas in Evanston where parking is just not as large an issue as it is almost everywhere else in this town. The reason for that is that, you know, the Levy Center and the park across the street creates a lot of parking opportunities right on Dodge, and then there's quite a bit, you know, across the street is our parking lot and then the el tracks. So there's parking on the south on Dodge, and then the single-family homes that are around there, many of them either have parking lots or driveways and there's very little dense housing there. So we've had no trouble even when we've had 300, 400 people come to a large bar mitzvah parking right in the neighborhood. There is the Levy Center lot across street, and we had originally talked to them about getting a parking agreement; frankly, we've never used that even though that's -- I've never imagined anyone actually parking there. It's just not
necessary. And, as I said, we don't anticipate conditions changing after we do this building. We don't anticipate a large membership, but even if we did, it really wouldn't change the parking situation because our biggest parking need is on a Saturday morning for a bar mitzvah or bat mitzvah, and that's a family event. It's not a congregational event. So, you know, if the congregation goes up by 10 percent, it's not going to increase the size of anyone's bar mitzvah really. It'll be about the same size. So I don't expect parking to be any different after this building is done than it is now.

The only other thing I want to highlight, and, again, it's on the record, we're very proud of it, is that this is going to be a LEED certified building. It's a value of our congregation to be environmentally friendly, and we have an environmental committee that's been in existence long before this building was contemplated. It has been working very hard. We got a grant from the Illinois Environmental Action Council to study this and get the most LEEDs points for those of you who are familiar with the LEEDs process.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Wasn't that over 100,000? How much was the grant?

MR. WEINBERGER: $105,000 grant.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: It was a serious grant.

MR. WEINBERGER: For this. We are shooting for one of the two highest levels of leads, either gold or platinum; platinum is going to be a stretch, gold we are very confident about. If that is achieved, we will be the first gold synagogue in the world, and I believe it will be the first sort of nonprofit gold building in Evanston. So we're quite excited about it. I know our alderman is. And I think the community will be very excited about this. Frankly, I, you know, we believe this is improving the quality of the community and how it's going to look. This is one of the gateways into Evanston coming up Dodge, and we think it's going to be a beautiful addition.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Thank you very much. Let me ask, are there any people here in opposition to this project?

(No response.)

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Committee, questions?
ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Move approval.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Second.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right. It's been moved that we introduce this. All those in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Any opposed? Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. WEINBERGER: Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: It's an excellent project, a gorgeous presentation.

MR. WEINBERGER: Thank you. We want to publically thank the staff that has been excellent throughout this entire process and works very hard and is very knowledgeable. Thank you.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: We always say good project are easy to work with.

(Which were all the proceedings had.)
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RE: 38-O-06
1613 CHURCH STREET

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: We're going to get started. We're very sorry we're late, but we have a lot of things going on. We have a couple of important issues, all of them are important, but long issues on our agenda tonight. We have the planned development for 1613 Church Street and we have the JRC at 303 Dodge. Both those items are going to be heard tonight in addition to the energy conservation code and the affordable housing demolition tax amendment. We are going to get to all four. So what we're going to do is we are going to have a presentation from Mr. Kihm and his people for the Hines townhouses, as I call them, at 1613 Church, and I think that will go about 40 minutes. How do you all feel about that.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I'll believe you.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right. And I know Mr. Kihm wants to keep it to 40 minutes also. And then we'll give 303 Dodge at least a half hour. So we'll begin now with planned development for 1613 Church Street which is Ordinance 38-O-06.
MR. MURRAY: Good evening, Madam Chairman. My name is James Murray. I'm here on behalf of Cyrus Homes and the Cyrus Homes Hines LLC.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I think we're going to have a hearing here.

(Witness sworn.)

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Can I just get some clarification at this point of order:

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Yes.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Are we going to review the records? Are we going to deliberate on records, or it seems to me that we have all of the transcripts at our disposal at this point.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Jean-Baptiste, we do have all of the transcripts. And if you would like to propose and we'll discuss among ourselves if you would like to proceed as a meeting versus a hearing, I'd be glad to consider that.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Well, I know in the case of the Mather if we considered the transcripts, we considered the transcripts as the record as opposed to reopening up the presentation as would have happened before the plan commission. And so what we did, we gave each side time to do a major closing statement at which time they were able to present a summary of all the issues.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: That worked well, didn't it?

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Yes. And then as opposed to having presentation, cross-examination, then presentation, cross-examination, rebuttal, rebuttal.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Jean-Baptiste, I get your point. Let's hear what others feel about this, okay.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: I second.
MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Wynne, did you
have something to say about that?

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I'm curious to -- I wasn't here at that Mather meeting, but I did hear that it went very smoothly. But I'm curious to hear what people, the people who have come from the neighborhood, to hear what they have to say about this, whether -- if they understand what's being proposed.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: One thing I want to know is are the rules out there for conducting these meetings?

MS. SZYMANSKI: I would have to --

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: That was one thing we agreed we would always have out on the table the method of conduct. Excuse us, Mr. Murray.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Alderman Rainey, in response to Alderman Wynne's intervention, I'm not proposing that we do not hear the neighbors.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I didn't think that you were.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: I'm saying that a hearing, we have two ways that we can proceed: One is to have a hearing de novo where we hear all of the evidence presented again, or we have a meeting where we ask questions at which time proponents and opponents can put forth their clarifications or whatever. But ultimately, regardless of what we do, if we just have a discussion of the evidence that's already presented, then the proponents will still be able to give an overview of their position, so the argument and the opponents will be able to make their arguments. So I think hopefully that clarifies for people what that process would go by.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: One thing I hope we do not do, and that is take up all the time planning how we're going to proceed. So let's be really careful about that.

Alderman Wynne, I actually talked to several members of the opponents' team, so to speak, the neighbors, who I asked will you be presenting any new information. And I think for the most part the ones I asked the questions said no, that they would be commenting on the record.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Then that's fine with me.
MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And I don't want to engage the audience right now, so I don't know how we're going to find that out. Let me just ask you, is there a person from the opponents who can represent the group?

MS. STAFFORD: Yes. I'm Joan STAFFORD, 1618 Wesley.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Could you comment on that for us, each having a certain amount of time and then we can question either side, or are you going to present new information?

MS. STAFFORD: Well, I think it really depends on how you respond to our first information. Because it's the position of the, of our group, that the Planning Commission's findings of fact were defective.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: But you're going to talk about those findings?

MS. STAFFORD: We'll talk about those findings. And I think that would be our first thing is we'd talk about the defectiveness of the findings.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: That's on the record.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Okay.

MS. STAFFORD: And then after that people -- but there is one piece of additional evidence which relates to the traffic matter, but other than that there's nothing.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Well then we can just do that part, right?

MS. SZYMANSKI: Yes, Madam Chair. When it comes to new evidence that witness will have to be sworn and be subject to cross-examination by the opposition. If comments, as have been said, are limited the record that is in the nature of argument that does not trigger Clarin.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: So, Mr. Murray, you have 20 minutes.

MR. MURRAY: I have twelve minutes?

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Twenty.
MR. MURRAY: Everyone is probably familiar with the Hines site. It's a parcel of property on Church Street that is about 70,000 feet in dimensions, in area, and has about 274 feet of frontage along Church Street itself. The Cyrus/Hines LLC proposes to construct on that site which is in the heart of the I2 industrial district 41 townhomes and a grouping of open space within, providing 84 some parking places at a level which would be considered in the marketplace as midline price ranges between 370 and $400,000. The proposal was first presented to the community at large by virtue of several, let's call them, town type meetings that were conducted in the immediate vicinity and dealt with the people that lived within 1,000 feet of the site. They started back in April and May of 2005 and continued up and through August/September. We presented our proposal for the townhome development to the plan commission in January and February. There were some observations that were made that were critical of our design and layout, and we modified in response to the criticism of the Plan Commission to the current proposal which will be explained in detail by David SCHMITT, the development architect.

In addition, we would hope that you would be kind enough to listen to Mr. Kihm, who is a member of the development team, from the point of view of the financial aspects of this particular proposal and the benefits to be derived both in terms of social benefit and architectural and planning benefit for the City. From my point of view, I was going to summarize some of the elements within the other expertise that was presented to the plan commission. It is suggested that there will be approximately a population of 94 persons, clearly on the industrial site there is no one residing at the present time. And in the request we requested that the property be rezoned to an R5 residential district to accommodate the townhome development style. We believe that there is very little requirement for a site in the I district at the current time which is merely an acre and a half, most industrial sites that are requiring substantial additional area. We think that the proposal for townhouse development is a very nice and neat transition between the Ridge Historic District to the east and the west side TIF district to the west, both being residential in character and that the townhome fits in as a -- as more or less a bridge both in terms of economics as well as social; and these units are intended to target the market of a two-income family with or without children that desire to have something other than the condominium that has been so significantly developed in the last five or six years. In overall use, we believe that the tax benefits to the City are really
substantial. There will be a throw-off of surplus taxation to the City in a modest amount, to the school districts 65 and 202 in the neighborhood of 35,000 and 63,000. There will be a one-time transfer tax that the City will benefit from of 162,000, and perhaps most significant of all will be some $3,500,000 that will be added to the -- or returned to the TIF financing that is not being requested for this development but rather represents the incremental financing over the current taxation on this property at $53,000 which will be something in excess of $355,000 annually. And in the 23 years that will add up to that $3,500,000.

I would like at this moment to introduce David SCHMITT to present to you the physical characteristics of the buildings, layout, and the site for your review.

MR. SCHMITT: Good evening. My name is David SCHMITT. I'm the architect for Church Street Village. As Jim Murray indicated, in January we made our initial presentation to the planning and development commission, and based on comments and suggestions at that meeting we made a number of, I think, important changes to the overall development. First we consolidated the project. We had eight buildings, and we decided that consolidating the development into three buildings would allow us to do some really important things. First, it [aloud|allowed] us to increase the amount of green space for the project, and very importantly it [aloud|allowed] us to consolidate the green space into basically a public yard, a public commons that was at the very heart of the project and which could be shared by over two-thirds of the units in the development. We took to heart their concern about visually breaking up the building, so we created a number of setbacks basically stepping back the buildings by two feet every two units or so which visually breaks up the overall size of the building. We created a one-way traffic pattern through -- around the building which gave us more convenient access to all of the garage spaces, and I think the most important thing that we did with this consolidation was allow for a private yard for each and every unit and then a shared public yard which could be a part of basically every unit's use, and then the opportunity for the use of the public park directly across the street. So we have a number of outdoor opportunities for use and recreation.

And then based on the suggestions, again, at the planning commission, we enhanced the architecture to, again, visually break up the buildings. This is the Church Street elevation, and I think it represents the character that will carry throughout the entire development. We're going to use three different brick colors, again, to break up the
apparent size of the buildings, and we're stepping back the units, stepping forward and back the units, again, to break up the apparent massing of the units. Based on comments we increased the slope of the roof so that there would be a more residential character to the building, and we added an additional dormer to each of the units in the attic, again, to break up the massing of the roof and to lend a more architectural character, a more residential character to the buildings. We added detail to each unit by enhancing the architectural detail through the use of brick solder courses, limestone detailing and enhancing the detailing of the entrances so we have a stronger impact at the unit entries. And I think I'll keep it brief.

MR. MURRAY: Landscape materials around central green, would you address those, please?

MR. SCHMITT: Yes. We tried to, to get the most use out of the green, we're trying to locate trees that will both allow for privacy and for the opportunity to look into the greens. So by staggering the trees, we're allowing the views into the units to be restricted from other units and yet we're allowing the views into the commons to be maximized.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Wynne? Your question can't wait?
ALDERMAN WYNNE: Should I -- may I ask him a question.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Go ahead.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I wanted to ask you, I read through the all of the transcripts, and I was trying to understand. This is helpful to have you pointing these things out. When you said every unit has a private yard, could you show us where that is?

MR. SCHMITT: Yes. At most of the units, the private yard is at the front, and at these units it's at the rear.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: And what's the dimension of the private yard, for instance, on the western edge, on that angle.

MR. SCHMITT: At this it's approximately eight by twenty.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: What is?
MR. SCHMITT: It varies by the unit.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: What's the dimension along Church Street?

MR. SCHMITT: The smallest yard is about 10 by 20 and the larger is 12 by 20.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: And then the last L-shaped portion, where is -- where are their private --

MR. SCHMITT: Again, at the front of the units and the larger is also about 12 by 20 and the smaller 10 by 20.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Then how are their private yards, the one in the L shape, how are they separated from that common greenscape space.

MR. SCHMITT: They're separated by the sidewalk and by wrought iron low fences at each of the units.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Okay. I understand. That's the Rich Daley run of events that we're discussing.

MR. SCHMITT: I'm not sure about that.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: They were discussed in the transcript.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: When you say low, what do you mean by low? Do you mean like a three foot?

MR. SCHMITT: I think it's four to five feet. Probably four feet. I can't remember the exact dimension.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could the audience see some of the pictures?

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Well, we need to get through this, but they'll be available for you to see. I mean they'll put them out. Continue.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: That's all the questions I had.

MR. MURRAY: Thank you.

MR. SCHMITT: I guess I will point out that this
is a unique development in that there are no contiguous residential development adjacent to it. We're surrounded by basically light industrial sites. The closest development is across the street and across the street from the park, so there are no contiguous residential adjacencies.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Is Mr. Kihm next?

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Kihm?

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: If you could -- are you going to use these boards for your presentation?

MR. KIHM: I don't need to.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Could you put them back so people can see them. They're going to put them in the back.

MR. KIHM: Good evening. I'm very happy to be with you. This project has been a long time coming and has not just been the last year and a half. It actually started about seven or eight years ago in my townhouse, and I live on the corner of Church and Ridge in a townhouse development we built there. And we had a dinner party, and Allen Olsen and his wife were there, and we're sitting around and we're talking about -- he's asking me, well, why can't you build something in this neighborhood that my staff and my faculty can afford to live in. Because they all are moving out of town. And I said, you know, that's something I'd really like to do, but I don't know if there is a place that's available for me to do something like that. So then you fast forward to about a year and a half ago, and we start hearing about some of the things that ACDC (ph.) is doing and some of the other groups in regard to the TIF district, and in then this property came to our attention. And we got involved with it, and Hines was selling off a group of their facilities, and this was one of them. And so we were approached by a broker and asked if we'd be interested, and we had said we'd certainly look into it. And we got excited about the possibility of doing something here. At that time it felt like a bit of a pioneering situation, but it looked like something that was a really viable project or could be. And there was some real, you know, some real considerations with it at the time. You're sitting right next to industrial sites as well as up against the Onyx site.

So we looked long and hard at it. And I know we've been accused of paying too much for this property, but I have been in the real estate business in this town all my
life basically, and we started negotiating with Hines and we couldn't really come to a price. And so between the brokers I said let's do this. Let's go out and visit the Hines people. They're out in Buffalo Grove now. So we went out there and sat down with Ed Hines and his group and we started telling him what our idea was and what we wanted to do, and they got very excited. They got excited about the fact that here they're going to leave the area, but they could leave kind of a legacy behind. We're two old-time Evanston firms, Cyrus Homes and Hines Lumber could do something that would be a real plus for the neighborhood and really give a jump-start to the whole TIF and the whole entrance to the TIF on going west. So we decided to form a partnership at that time, and it's worked out very, very well; and we've gone through this process, we had a good time at the plan commission, we revised our plans. I think it really worked to be a better plan. So these commissions can work. So we felt very good about that. And as far as a lot of the other objections we're hearing and things like this about traffic and all, I live on Church Street. I'm not looking to put a whole lot more traffic on Church Street, because I have to get out of my driveway too every morning. But I don't really feel that this will be anything but a positive process and a positive addition to our community and really get things going and really kind of set a standard for that community. We're going to build a quality project. That's all we build. It'll be a project that I would be glad to live in myself. I live in projects I build and I would live in this one, as I'm sure anyone else in this community could feel comfortable about doing. Where our pricing is, we maintain it since the time we started, is to keep it at a moderate level that would be available to young professional people that would be working at the high schools or perhaps in some type of city position; probably two-income families. You need approximately $70,000 household income to afford one of these units, and that seems to be very available to a good element of -- a good segment of the population in our community which were not currently being served by the housing stock. And I think that's about all I have to say. We're very excited, and we're ready to get going.

MR. MURRAY: The project can be done within profit margins for your lending institutions as well as profitably for yourself.

MR. KIHLM: Yes, yes. We hope. Prices keep going up, fees keep going up.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Could you state the question because nobody --
MR. KIHM: He asked if we could maintain a significant profit margin in this project. I think we're showing around 11 percent profit which is kind of on the skinny side when it comes to the banks and all; but, again, I think it's -- it's not totally -- we're not giving these away, but it's a little bit of a labor of love for two old-time Evanston cops that want to leave a mark in their community.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Thank you very much.

Okay. We're going to go to the opponents now. I believe I counted 25 names on this list. I don't mean any disrespect, but I don't believe we'll get to everyone. So, Miss Stafford, do you want to -- you're first on the list. And so why don't you come forward. You have 20 minutes for all 20 names.

MS. STAFFORD: We'll do the best we can.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Could you introduce yourself.

MS. STAFFORD: I'm Joan Stafford. I've lived at 1618 Wesley Avenue since the fall of 1967, and have been involved in the community activities in the Dewey Community area during the entire time since that time. I was housing chairman for the Dewey Community Conference. I worked against having rooming houses with people who -- students where we were having destruction of our properties. I worked very hard for open housing in Evanston, Marched with Delores Holmes in the marches every night on open housing, worked for the -- worked as a task for the metropolitan opening communities, worked for the low income housing and for the scattered site low income housing which I'm still proud of. I came back to Evanston having been in Mexico for the last three years and was still proud to see well maintained an asset to our community.

We have a group of petitions that have been signed by all of the -- not all, but many, many of our neighbors, and I would ask Mary McWilliams to present those petitions. The people who gathered the signatures on those petitions are all here. I'm sure you do not want to hear from all of them, but they all signed up just in case, so that to verify that these are signatures that were gathered by the people who are here and there are -- Mary, maybe you can come over so it could be on the record. Mrs. Mary McWilliams, my beloved neighbor from 1606 Wesley.

MS. McWILLIAMS: I'm Mary McWilliams. I live at 1606 Wesley. We celebrated our 30th year in the house, so we
are long-time Evanstonians. We did gather petitions. We have 77 signatures, and, as Joan said, the petition gatherers are here and can attest that they did gather these signatures. So we'd like to put these into the record.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Is the petition long or could you tell us what it says?

MS. McWILLIAMS: It is long. "We the residents and property owners of the neighborhood surrounding the 1613 Church Street property respectfully petition the planning and development committee of the city of Evanston -- of the Evanston city council to deny the application to rezone that property to R5 in order to construct 41 townhouses as a planned development on the 1.6 acre property for the following reasons:
And there are five reasons which it does not meet the rezoning, does not meet the legal standards for a zoning amendment, city council should plan according to the TIF ordinance, should plan for proper rezoning and residential uses, redevelopment of the entire property, portion of the parcel rather than just a piece of it. The proposed 41-unit development has too little green space, the projected traffic levels are unrealistic, and the proposed development does not promote its stated goal of providing moderate income housing when the units are priced from $360,000 a low of 360,000. And that is the petition. We will submit a copy of the petition as well as the names.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Mr. Murray, I'm sure you don't object to including that into the minutes.

MR. MURRAY: I might object, but I don't think that's going to take us very far, and I haven't seen these petitions so I really don't know.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Either have we.

MR. MURRAY: Yes, ma'am.

MS. McWILLIAMS: Do I hand them to you?

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Should we give them to Mr. Murray.

MS. SZYMANSKI: Yes.

MS. STAFFORD: As Mary indicated, they were much more -- there's much more detailed reasoning.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And you'll tell us about
some of that I'm sure.

MS. STAFFORD: Yes, we will. I have -- the second thing I would like to just call your attention to is that we do have a large number of people here, and I think it would be helpful if it did not -- if you'd not take it as an imposition as to how many of the people here are supporting and how many are opposing so that you can just have an indication that since obviously they're not all going to have a chance to speak, so if I ask or if you could ask you that they raise their hands, those who are opposed to this proposal, and then we can have the ones who are in favor of it.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Let the record show there are about 25 --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can we have a count?

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: If you want to count for us and then let us know, that will be fine, but we don't want to take from Miss Stafford's time.

MS. STAFFORD: This evening through our -- we differ within our group as to what the appropriate zoning is. We are unanimous in our position that the R5 zoning is inappropriate and that Mr. Murray's statement at the one of the hearings which is in the record --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Twenty-nine.

MS. STAFFORD: -- that fact that they were looking for is additional variances which would be the equivalent of what would be permitted in the R6 zone makes the proposal particularly burdensome to our community. Our community is made up, as the zoning map shows, of R1, R2, and R3 directly across the street. Within a clear shot of this proposed building are little houses on Florence Avenue, the 1600 block of Florence Avenue which is zoned R3, behind on Ashland are houses that are zoned R2. And along Church are houses that are zoned R1 moving up toward the historic neighborhood which, as you know, lies on either side on Wesley, some on Ashland, and then forward on to Asbury. But the neighborhood itself, as I say, where there's a mixture and then across the berm in the area along Darrow, that area is zoned R4. In other words, in contrast to what was said by Mr. Kihm and his testimony and by Mr. Murray and his presentation, there is nowhere anywhere, anywhere near which is R5 except across the far side of Emerson; and that property, during the TIF discussions, during the neighborhood planning discussions, that
property was a matter of concern to all of the members of the - - who worked on those studies and became a matter of concern to the Council because the Council, in fact, passed an ordinance to halt R5 construction in the fifth ward where that's located. Why? Because, in fact, that area is full of houses that are identical to the houses on Darrow and the houses on Florence: Small single-family and two-family homes which cannot support this kind of development -- or, rather, it's exploitive and it drives people out. And so you have now that interesting new category of R4A which is required to or is suggested as the proper zoning in a place where the predominant housing is one- and two-family houses. And we, of course, in the R4 area along Darrow and along the R3 area down Florence and all places to the south along Dewey and Darrow, and on the houses on the Ashland which are R2, and then the houses along Church which are R1. R5, is our very strong feeling, R5 is not appropriate. So this evening the witnesses which whom we propose to hear from briefly are first one who would say that the -- or a group who would make the following points. That the proposed development is incompatible with the neighborhood, and, in fact, would set out not only a zoning precedent, but a pattern for what would be done on the adjacent industrial properties. And I draw your attention to the transcript again in which Ms. Height and Mr. Kihm and Mr. Murray repeatedly talked not just about this property, as Mr. Schmitt has done this evening, but talked about this being a Vanguard essentially for all the adjoining industrial properties, that this is an opening of a Church Street corridor, it's a Vanguard, it's a first step for development of all this. There's a possibility that there will be development with housing going to $700,000. All of that is exactly what we, in our group, are concerned about. We do not feel that that's what should happen, and I'd like to at this moment call on Greg Williams to, in answer to Mr. Schmitt, to call on Greg Williams, if I may -- does it make sense -- I mean if you want me to run through the whole thing, Miss Rainey.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I'm sorry. Fine. You can call --

MS. STAFFORD: I think we'll get through.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: You have 20 minutes. You're in charge of it.

MS. STAFFORD: Could you come over here, Mr. Williams. And Greg Williams who is an architect, and specifically addressing yourself to the point of what is the -- what is with the predictions which were given in the record on
the record of what is going to happen on these additional properties, what is the impact of this particular development on those additional properties?

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Well, this project and the fact that we're here tonight is really a textbook case of the reason that we should not be here. The TIF district is supposed to have a comprehensive plan to consider the whole district so that you do not have to consider a single site by itself, because when you consider a single site by itself, you're impacting other sites without any knowledge of what might happen in the future. And this is a perfect example. It's really a terrible site. Might have been a good site for a lumber yard, but it's a terrible site by itself, and the plan is testimony to that. I think -- I'm off track here, but what Joan has asked me to talk to is some of the features of the plan with regard to other areas of the project or the area. As I said, this is really quite a difficult site. As an architect you would hate to see anybody come in with this. It's very deep and narrow. It's this berm, you know, which is an eyesore, high tension lines, Onyx right across from it. And so what they have done is created this 350 foot long wall at the berm and then have buildings facing each other. And what that does is they've actually recreated a berm at the other side. So this adjacent property has, you know, automatically, you know, right before the start, and we'll be here next year talking about this piece of property. It has a wall that just has all garages facing it. And so what would you do on that site? There's really not much you can do. But one thing you can do, you would have to do, is you'd just put the same thing. So you have buildings facing each other back to back, other wall on Church Street. This is not Church Street Village, this is Church Street City, and this is a consequence of piecemeal development. This site would be restrained by what's happening on this initial site. This is the reason that you would, you know, should not develop any particular site without a comprehensive plan for the whole district. I mean really, you know, the street grid probably should go through here. I mean they are having to build their own streets, their own sewers, their own retention, you know. How many units are -- does it take to pay for all of that?

MS. STAFFORD: Could you show what the affect would be of this particular development, just the development that they are intending, what the effect that would be upon the adjoining houses in the neighborhood?
MR. WILLIAMS: I think there's been some kind of loose play with the term compatible, and I thought visually here again it would be helpful to people. In fact, there are houses that are, if not directly contiguous, really pretty close. This is a house 40 feet away on the corner of Florence and Church, not my favorite color, but that's what people do. It's a very typical house for that street, essentially a Chicago farm house. The very smallest Chicago house, smallest Chicago lot is 21 feet wide. All of these units inside are only 19 feet --

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Sir, I'm afraid that you're not coming over.

MR. WILLIAMS: I'm sorry. And this other house that I have pictured here is the house, the small house is directly adjacent next to Cahill. So these are the two closest houses to this project. And what I'd like to show is instead of the project building by itself, you know, what these houses are next to the building on Church Street which that does not look like compatible to me in [anyway|any way], not the architectural image and certainly not the size. And just as a further interest, this is, in fact, what the building at the berm is, 350 feet long, and, again, next to those houses, and just maybe you can [how old|hold] that, This is a little awkward, but in case -- people don't really understand scale, and I know a lot of people don't -- This is kind of a last minute addition. This city hall, the building we're in, that building is longer, bigger in length than city hall. This city hall was built as a high school; and so what would you have, in effect, you know, essentially put in a high school or community college in this neighborhood of single family buildings.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Miss Stafford, you have about four minutes.

MS. STAFFORD: Four? I don't think we can do it. In addition to the physical scale, we also want to emphasize that we think that the Plan Commission's findings of fact were defective. And if you would like me to I will go to that point, if I've got the pieces of paper I need, I hope. It is our position that the Planning Commission's findings of fact were defective, and that, therefore, this cannot go forward in the current situation that's in; and certainly you cannot, you should not just accept their recommendation without further -- without further discussion. On February 8 they presented their revised version, and, therefore, we were able to give our testimony with regard to this. And we objected to the planned
development for the reasons we've indicated that it was -- that it was too dense, that it was -- that it -- physically it was too imposing upon the neighborhood, and I might emphasize that by having its front right on the street only eight feet to ten feet away from the street, it creates a whole new wall of very long building. That first building is 156 feet wide and creates this building. It is spot zoning. The purposes of R5, as you find them in your own ordinance, the purposes of R5 are not consistent with this neighborhood. It talks about placing it in a neighborhood -- infilling a neighborhood which already has multi-family housing. Now, I know that they have an intention to put multi-family housing in other parts of the area, but it is not there now. And so that if you look beyond, if as we do all agree that this needs to be redeveloped and that it is important to do it with planning, that when you look at that, there's no way that R5, a single zone of R5, there is nothing as dense again Ridge Avenue and the canal as what is proposed for this piece of property. So that is one of the things.

Now, the zoning -- I mean the Plan Commission did not consider a critical factor which was that they should have looked at whether R5 zoning was appropriate with the surrounding residential neighborhood. And the City, when it did its zoning analysis which is also part of your record, should have done the analysis as to whether the R5 zone requested was, in fact, compatible with the surrounding residential district within 1,000 feet. And the fact is that they did not do that. As you will see on all the documents where they meet the zoning analysis by the City, they did, and this -- I'm not saying this about the SPAARC which raised all the same questions that we did, we are doing, but the zoning analysis by the City is defective because it never asks the question is R5 appropriate for this district. It only says we assume R5 and then we will do our analysis based on R5. Well, what does that do for the developer? It gives him R5 as a given, and then he asks for, in fact, the variances from that which are the variances that Mr. Murray accurately described as variances for an R6 district. And I think that's at Page 54. Anyway, that's -- There is a defect in their findings on that. There's a defect because they made an -- or there is no evidence to support it because they made a finding that this was consistent with the TIF. But what the TIF calls for is no piecemeal construction but planning for the whole area. In fact, they say that what was wrong with that whole area is that there was no planning; and, therefore, you have incompatible uses, but there's no planning in this. The Planning Commission acknowledged that the zoning amendment has to be consistent with the overall character of the neighborhood, but then they
looked only west to confirm that and then said that they could -- that it was a good transition to the R2 to the east. Well, R5, and this is my old zoning amendment committee, has -- surface, has never been considered as a good transition to going into an R2 neighborhood.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Joan, can you wind it up?

MS. Stafford: I'm hurrying breathlessly. They said that the, as I say, that would have no negative effect and that it was a good transition. Plan Commission ran through the remaining required findings about traffic in hour figures which we will give to you do not support their conclusions about the traffic. They then made the extraordinary finding that the height and bulk and scale of the plan of the community was in conformance with the intent of the Zoning Ordinance, and that is just contradicted by the zoning ordinance, by the planned unit development ordinance, by the Comprehensive General Plan, and by the TIF. And they also skipped through the variances requested by the developer even under the dense R5 zoning that the project required. They revealed no -- they have no specific findings supporting a recommendation to grant variances as to setback and as front yard fence which is very offensive to our neighborhood. We haven't got front yard fences. Front yard fences are supposed to be three feet behind the front, and this is -- so not only do you have a looming 41 and a half foot building, but then you also have a fence inside which creates something which we have never had in our wonderful neighborhood that we all love that goes from the north to the south across Church Street and has been for all these many years economically integrated, has been -- multi ethnic, multi racial, multi kinds of houses because we all have our -- all these houses came before zoning. So we have everything in our neighborhood, low income, moderate income, very expensive houses, and we have that. And so that for them to just not notice that what this plan does is to create a gated community right in the middle of an area, which has always been outward looking, and this is inward looking.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I have to cut you off. You've exceeded your 20 minutes. Before we get into our discussion and questions, I'm going to ask the committee if they believe we need a special meeting, not an all-night special meeting, but before our next council meeting. Because I don't want to delay this project at all. I'm hoping we can get on a roll with reviewing projects, but I do think this one is going to take a little more time than just the next ten minutes. And I -- Alderman Wynne, is there a parking committee
meeting the night of our economic development meeting?

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Yes. We have the 22nd, you mean.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Yes.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Yes. We do have a parking committee meeting. Were you anticipating trying to meet that night? We didn't have the last parking committee meeting because I believe we had another special meeting that night.

MS. STAFFORD: Alderman?

ALDERMAN WYNNE: March 22, is that what you're thinking of, Alderman Rainey?

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I was thinking about that.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: What about the 23rd.

ALDERMAN HANSEN: Alderman Rainey, I have a town hall meeting that night on the 23rd.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Are we allergic to Fridays?

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I am, yes. How about Thursday the 16th?

ALDERMAN HOLMES: That's our regular town hall meeting for the fifth ward.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: No. We're not meeting Friday nights. I'm not meeting Friday night.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: If, Alderman Rainey, if --

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: April 4.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Could we start our economic development meeting at 8:30 maybe, Wednesday the 22nd?

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Do we know what the agenda looks like for economic development?

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Is Judy Aiello here?
ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Can we look at the --
MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Do people agree that we
need a meeting, another meeting.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: We're not going to
finish in a half hour.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I want to get to 303
Dodge. They missed four ZBA meetings because of quorum issues.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I would agree that we should,
that we should schedule a special meeting, if we can, so that
we don't have to wait for the next council meeting and that we
not rush this this evening. And I certainly think we should
get to 303 Dodge.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: I would like to give the
neighbors more time to speak, and so I would favor a special
meeting.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And the applicant. I'm
sure the applicant has more to say.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: The applicant too.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: You don't need to come to
the special meeting. So we agree on a special meeting. We
don't have -- we agree that we need to do this, but we don't
know how we can. We can't do it -- what about the 16th?

ALDERMAN HOLMES: That's my meeting.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I think if there is some
way we can fit this in next Wednesday night.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: What about March 21, Tuesday?

ALDERMAN HOLMES: That's elections.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: What is the 20th? Wait.
Monday the 20th.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: There's almost nothing on the
agenda. It shouldn't last that long.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Is it an a.m. meeting?
ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: So could we meet at 7:30.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Could we meet at 5:30 for P & D?


ALDERMAN HOLMES: What's wrong with the 15th?

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: That's fine with me.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Can we do --

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Can we do the 15th, Wednesday the 15th?

MS. JACKSON: That's a plan commission hearing.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: What if we did the city March 20 at 7:30 or 7:45, because then whoever wanted to attend -- city manager Julia Carroll. She has a question.

MS. CARROLL: Why don't you tell them, Judy, what's on EEC. She thinks that we can start at 8:30, if that's what you want to do on the 22nd, but it would make you go -- some of you would go from 6:00 o'clock until maybe 10:00 o'clock.

MS. AIELLO: I think we can accomplish that, start at 8:30.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: What time is the parking?

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Usually run from 6:00 to 7:30, and we didn't have a meeting last week, last month. We can do it.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Could you meet at 5:30?

ALDERMAN WYNNE: 6:00 is really, because we have a lot of members who get there at 6:00 because they're coming from work.

MS. CARROLL: Could do you it in an hour?

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I think we can do it in an hour. I haven't seen the agenda. We have a number of items that I
know have been pending.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Why don't we do it on the 20th.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I think the 20th is a great day.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: The 20th. Okay. What time do we want to get started? 6:30?

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I think we should do it early, that way Alderman Wollin won't miss much.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: 5:30.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: So if we start at 5:30, P&D at 5:30, we can do it.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: There are a lot of people who --

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: We started tonight at 5:30 at administration and public works. It's what we have to do to accommodate everyone. If you want the council -- we can just finish up tonight or we can meet on Monday at 5:30 and go from 5:30 to 7:00 and give everyone a fair open hearing, and you'll have plenty of time to do whatever additional research. It either has to be that or you can see we have no other way to do this. Many of us have been here at meetings since 5:30 tonight. How many agree that 5:30 on Monday the 20th is okay?

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Alderman Rainey, is there a problem with doing it at 7:30?

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Because of the city --

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Which starts at 7:00.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: But we don't want Alderman Wollin to miss everything.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I don't -- I wouldn't suggest that.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And Alderman Tisdahl.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I could do 5:30. I just think that 5:30 is sometimes difficult.
MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: It's difficult for all of us. We have to be here at 5:30 every other Monday night. It's very difficult. It's very difficult.

MS. STAFFORD: Could I just ask a question. If we appear at 5:30 on that Monday, there will be some people who will be coming from work and they may not sign in before they -- can they sign in after they get here?

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Of course. We're very easy on that.

MS. STAFFORD: And I have a second question which is that we do have a series of points, I mean certainly the plan commission one I will give to you this evening, but if you would like the other ones --

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: We'll not have time for you to do that tonight.

MS. STAFFORD: I was going to hand them to you.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Absolutely.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Absolutely. That way we will have read them. All right. We're going to have -- now we'll have about 15 minutes for the committee to discuss and ask questions, whatever you want. First Alderman Tisdahl?

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Mr. Kihm, have Evanston high school teachers, since that was the group you were originally appealing to, have they expressed interest in buying these?

MR. KIHM: We've been reluctant to put out a lot of information to these people until we were approved. We thought that was a little pushy, but we have -- we have gotten a lot of calls from people that are waiting for the information to be forthcoming. I know that District 65 union leader is ready. She was going to have a meeting last week with all the information. The 202 people, again, we're waiting until we have approval before we start doing any kind of marketing materials. It would just be foolish.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Because if the people are interested, that solves some of the traffic problem because they would be walking.

MR. KIHM: They would be walking to school,
MR. MURRAY: Just for what it's worth, there is really no traffic problem. The level of service remains the same on these roadways with or without this project. That's what the Gewalt Hamilton report indicates.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Can I just ask. If that is your position, it seems to me it's worthwhile coming up here and explaining what that is; what it is and reiterate that. I mean --

MR. MURRAY: I'd be pleased to do that now or later.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: There's a statement made and there's a question. It seems to me --

MR. KIHM: I think there are a couple of things like this. We did have a traffic study, and they did measure traffic, and we're going from three curb cuts on this particular property down to one which is, again; beneficial. But they surveyed traffic and there's a lot of traffic coming in on Hines early in the morning with the various contractors and all of this. They're saying in the rush hour periods we'll have five to 20 cars coming in and out of that facility with the townhomes, and that represents about a 1 percent impact on the traffic that's currently going up and down the street. I know we had, just an anecdotal, we had a meeting one morning with one of the aldermen out there during the rush hour and we just kind of watched the traffic for 20 minutes, and it didn't seem to be anything that wasn't achievable. And, again, I live on Church Street. I know what the traffic is like on Church Street, and it is something that can be handled.

MR. MURRAY: And, specifically, Alderman, the level of service was measured at Level B, and with one vehicle moving in or out of the property every three minutes, the level of B service on Church Street is maintained without impact.

MR. KIHM: I would just like to make one comment regarding the zoning. We did ask for an R5 zoning, but really what we're asking for is a planned unit development. And in order to get that, you have to ask for a zoning that it fits in.

THE WITNESS: What we're really looking for, and I mentioned this. I'll refer to it as an R4.2. All we're looking for as far as density goes in this R5 zone is 58...
percent of what's allowed there, not -- we're not maxing out at all the number of units. So it's really, in the words of zoning it would be an R.42, and we don't have any designs on the rest of the property in that neighborhood. That's not what we're about.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Excuse me for one moment. Ladies and gentlemen that are coming in, this is a planning and development meeting. If you're here for the council meeting, it won't be starting for about a half hour or so. If you would prefer to sit out in the lobby where it's more comfortable, that's fine. If not, feel free to take a seat here.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste, I think Miss Stafford wants to answer a question. Do you mind if she does?

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: No. I just asked for whether there's some clarification. Because Mr. Murray had answered from his chair, so I was going to say, you know, bring it forward.

MS. STAFFORD: Well, with regard to the question about the traffic, we have done two studies of the traffic. We note that traffic study that is in the [pact|packet] that you have was done in August of 2005.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Are you getting ready to give us some new information?

MS. STAFFORD: I'm answering the question --

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: You're talking about a study you've conducted. Is it new information?

MS. STAFFORD: That is new information.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I'm going to ask you, for the sake of expedience, could you [how old|hold] that information to our special meeting and then we'll expect to hear from you then.

MS. STAFFORD: Then the only comment with regard to the traffic is that it is of note that a traffic study was done in August of 2005 which is not a month when the traffic contains either the high school traffic or even as much traffic as it does during other periods such as last week. Then with regard to zoning, Mr. Kihm describing it as 4.2, with regard to that, he is talking only about the density. He is not talking about the fact that buildings are asking for variances which
are equivalent, as Mr. Murray testified to an R6, the setback, the length, the lack of side yards, all kinds of things which make it planned unit development require 6 feet of landscaping on both sides. That's not there. So with regard to his calling it 4.2, I think that you should understand that he's -- it's only 4.2 as to the number of people who'd be living there.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Any more questions right now? Are we all in -- alderman? I'm sorry. Alderman Hansen? I had you on my list.

ALDERMAN HANSEN: Thank you. I wanted to clarify. I think Mr. Kihm had stated that it was in terms of a salary, in terms of a year for someone to afford did you say it was 70,000?

MR. KIHM: Approximately $70,000 for income for a family, yes.

ALDERMAN HANSEN: And in terms of your development, has there been any type of consideration in regards to a type of affordable housing contribution?

MR. KIHM: We've been talking with Mr. Wolinski about this ever since we started this project about using some of the buy down of the money to the city to make it affordable for four to five units that would be available for the buy-down situation, yes.

ALDERMAN HANSEN: When you're talking about that, you're talking about the program that we have in terms of first-time owner?

MR. KIHM: Correct.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: But what are you going to do about the contribution?

MR. KIHM: I think what we propose to do, and we've been trying to do during this whole time, and we actually started out was to make it what we're making it, a moderately-priced housing that is a full-sized. We're not trying to scale it down to try to sneak in some smaller units like you might be able to do in a condominium or something like that.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: So you're considering yourself exempt from making --
MR. KIHM: I'm not considering ourselves exempt.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I'm trying to put it in a way that we all know what we're talking about. The form of housing your providing you're considering to be in the affordable range; so, therefore, you don't have to do the contribution and --

MR. KIHM: Yes, yes.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Wynne?

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Can you give me the dimension of a unit? I read through the transcript, but I didn't see that. How wide are the units?

MR. MURRAY: Twenty feet.

MR. SCHMITT: Nineteen and a half feet.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: What's the depth?

MR. SCHMITT: They vary from 30 to 35 feet, approximately 30 to 35 feet.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And they're three stories?

MR. SCHMITT: Three stories.

MR. MURRAY: So about 1800 to 2,000 feet, square feet.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I guess one of my questions, and I don't know whether I should hold this, Alderman Rainey, is this was discussed a lot at the plan commission was, and it's been raised here tonight, about why R5. And I think that's a really legitimate question, because we're going from industrial to residential so we can at this point choose. And my understanding is that the land owner is participating in this development with you. There was a lot of reference to the Dubin property, negative reference to the Dubin project which is in the third ward, and I understand why that became so sense. And I'd like to make it clear on the record for like the umpteenth time that the City Council never voted on that. That project was built as of right. So we didn't have a choice. They came in with that. So but what drove the density on that was the land price. And when Dominick's decided to
jack up the price on Mr. Dubin, he added 30 more townhouses to that site. But I don't know that I see a land owner who's getting greedy who's out in San Francisco whose headquarters are out in San Francisco here. So my question is why -- I don't understand the why the R5 issue?

MR. KIHM: There are a couple of questions there.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Why shouldn't it be R4 or R3.8? I mean here we have a blank slate, you know, on Chicago Avenue. And so that's my question. I really want to understand that.

MR. KIHM: Well, I think the situation was we started with a product type that we wanted to put here and a market that we saw and we tried to make it fit in this particular project. And we're not overpaying for this property. I think there's a very good -- the plan commission did a good analysis of what we paid for this property. We paid a very fair rate. And if we only paid half, let's say we somehow I got -- we got Hines to say, well, let's just pay half of it. We're paying, I think it's $42,000 a unit, somewhere in that range. If we want to pay $22,000 a unit, it would not significantly impact the prices. But we paid them a fair price, and actually below what they wanted. And what the broker, way below what the broker was going to get. So, again, I think we know values in this community and we know what is a reasonable price; and again, we started out with a price range we wanted to get to and with a level of quality because we had people talking to us, well, why don't you build some at 200,000 and others at 700,00, which didn't make any sense at all. What we're trying to do is build a quality project. It's one project that will kind of get -- what we want to do is kind of establish the standard for construction there, which I think is important, because you can get a lot of real tacky construction, and this is going to be well built it'll be very --

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I'm not questioning your quality. But, quite frankly, I don't understand what you just said. That if the land value, that if the land value was half of what is it, why wouldn't you choose to put a fewer number of units and get what I think my vision and most people's vision is of a townhouse which has -- it has green space around it, how -- I've been here for eight years and I don't understand what you're saying by why the land price -- if the land price were half that why you would not be able to put fewer high-quality units with more green space on it.
MR. KIHM: I think what, again, the price -- we had to pay them a fair price because there were other people looking at this. We weren't the only people out there.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Right. But it was zoned I whatever, industrial. And what drives so much of our density in Evanston that these, the land price is based on what people speculate they can get out of us in the plan commission. If I'm incorrect about that, then why, if you -- your example was if you paid half the price you would still build it as dense as this. Why would you do that other than to make more money for yourself?

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: What are the other factors?

MR. KIHM: I think there are some factors in the size of townhomes and things like that that you want to do. I live in a townhome on Ridge. We don't have green space all around. I have a small back yard. It's a little larger than these, but by my townhouses sell for twice as much money.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: But that's not answering my question.

MR. KIHM: What I'm saying is -- it's focussed on the product, not so much the -- the product and the price. I think that's what I'm trying to say. It's not the number.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: The product costs you "X" to build. You pay "Y" for the land, right; then on top of that you have 20 townhouses versus 42 townhouses. I mean if you paid less for the land so your "Y" value is lower, then why wouldn't you be able to build fewer townhouses?

MR. KIHM: You could probably -- you could build fewer townhouses if that's what you chose to do, but I think what we wanted to do was --

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Okay. You just -- so when you said before then doesn't make sense.

MR. KIHM: I'm agreeing with you. You could build fewer; actually, we had more originally. We have cut it back from several townhomes.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Could we continue this; and in the meantime for our special meeting, I mean this is an
issue for several of us, I believe. Could you give us some kind of written explanation.

MR. KIHMH: About the economics of it?

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Of how this works for you.

MR. KIHMH: Absolutely.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I really -- I need that.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I need it, too. It's easier to see it. We've read about it, but we didn't see the numbers.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Should we look at to a pro forma?

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: An explanation of --

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I think a pro forma, but also someone who does not necessarily read pro formas every single day. Something that they could understand that explains the statements that you just made.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And the different scenarios, I think, too.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: About that very issue.

MR. KIHMH: Sure.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay. Could we wind this down.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I'll hold the rest of my questions.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: On Monday the 20th at 5:30 we're going to meet for a special meeting to continue this case.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Could I ask for one thing. I have another copy. I know I've read the Canal/Green Bay Road/Church area study report.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: The neighborhood plan.
ALDERMAN TISDAHL: I need another copy.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right. Arlova Jackson has a comment to make. Do you need to do this?

MS. JACKSON: Briefly. I passed out some additional materials this evening. I found a correction to the Ordinance that was in the packets on Page 4. Section 4A should be changed to reflect the site development allowance to impervious surface area. In the Ordinance it says lot coverage which is incorrect.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And you'll give us.

MS. JACKSON: You actually -- it's gone down from what was proposed initially.

MR. MURRAY: There may be other such items connecting the reality to the ordinance, and I would propose to make that information available to Miss Szymanski in the interim period as well.

MS. SZYMANSKI: Please copy Miss Jackson.

MR. MURRAY: Of course.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And where is the petition I gave you?

MS. CARROLL: I have it.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Just wanted to make sure we knew where it was.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay. Thank you and you'll be there on 5:30 on next Monday. That way it will allow for us to move on and get more information. Does anybody -- Do people want to introduce this tonight or not and then bring it back to the committee?

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: We might as well introduce it next time.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: After we had a chance to discuss it. Sir?
MR. WILLIAMS: If I can ask one question of other information. Is there any information available about which is -- which aspects of the project are public versus private versus the street, water, the sewer, the storm?

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Can you put that in writing and get it to us, we'll get you the answer.

MR. WILLIAMS: It has a big impact.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right. No problem.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: They need to get it to -

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Can you do that after meeting. Next item --

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Alderman Rainey, can we direct him to bring it to Arlova Jackson.

MADAM CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Give it to us in writing then Arlova will give us the information.

(At which time the hearing was continued to March 20, 2006.)
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