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RE: ZPC 05-01-PD, CHURCH AND DARROW
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: We're going to begin. The first item on our agenda is the minutes such as they are from the April 4th special meeting. Can I have a motion to at least acknowledge these.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All those in favor say aye. (CHORUS OF AYE.)

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Any opposed? Here is the plan for Darrow Corners. The committee needs an opportunity to discuss this project, and what I'm going to do is, Alderman Jean-Baptiste was called away on an urgent ward matter, and what we are going to do is sum it up, the applicant is going to get 15 minutes, the opponents are going to get 15 minutes, and then we are going to move on to the committee to discuss this and make a determination which way we're going to go.

As you all know after those 15 minutes, the committee will ask you questions if they have any. So don't worry about getting certain issues answered. You'll have an opportunity to talk then. So who is here for HODC for Darrow Corners, for the developer? Then while the applicant is making their presentation, the opponent should decide how they want to use their 15 minutes. Maybe you can decide amongst yourselves or first come, first serve. It's up to you.

MR. KOENIG: Good evening. I'm Richard Koenig, K-O-E-N-I-G. I'm the director of the Housing Development Opportunity Corporation, and I think that we have gone through --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I think, Richard, we are not going to observe Kleren, but I think we are going to swear you in just for the record.

(WITNESS SWORN.)

MR. KOENIG: Last time we were here we had an opportunity to, I guess two times ago, go through the proposal and kind of sum up the information with what the proposal of the process was. As the Committee knows, we worked on this proposal for about three years with the Evanston Development Corporation to really come up with a plan that would fit with the neighborhood. So over months and months of meetings we came up with a proposal that fits in with the current zoning. It provides an opportunity for people to have a decent, affordable place to live, and this wasn't necessarily a first choice of a project, but it was the opportunity that met the fiscal reality that we are experiencing on the site. The land is expensive. To build any building at all, that's a high quality building, is expensive, and the needs are so extensive as the community knows, you'll be discussing the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, that there's a need for housing units. There is a need for over 1,000 units over the next four years. This proposal is one small drop in the bucket. You may have
seen the transcript. You may have read a lot of information from the proposal. I think what's really important about this proposal to me, this isn't something that's trying to be imposed on the community. This is really a proposal that came from meeting with community members. It meets a lot of goals of the neighborhood plan. It doesn't meet every single goal, but I don't think any plan could meet every single goal. We have put together the type of proposal that we believe the neighbors will be proud of in years to come if the building gets up and built. People will look at this as a great asset for the community. Look at it for the turning point for the improvement of the neighborhood, for the improvement of the corner and to really give, to really be the kick off, the beacon of hope for getting started and doing redevelopment there on the west side. This as one small proposal, so it's a lot to put that kind of burden on this one small deal, but it really creates that opportunity. It is not something that's going to bring crime to the neighborhood. It's not something that's going to bring additional problems. Getting it built is hard enough. But really making the proposal is absolutely the most important thing, and that's really what we have to concentrate on. Who is going to live there, how they are going to live there and making sure that we take care to do that. So we are absolutely dedicated to working with the community to do that, to do the right kind of management, to do the right kind of screening and to really make this something that everyone even though today it meets their needs, in the long run it would be something they are very proud of.

We've gone over the facts. I'm happy to answer any types of questions that you have. But I think that we have said everything that we can say at this point. We are happy to go through the proposal more, if you want more detail. I distributed pictures of some of our community rooms. I showed some of the recent numbers so you can kind of see how those numbers work, and I can go through those in as much detail as you would like, but it's important to note that this building is going to be privately owned. It's not publicly owned. It's not public housing. It's a deal that is not going to create more problems in a neighborhood that is experiencing some stresses. It's not like putting thousand of units together all in one place and warehousing people that are poor all together. This is exactly the opposite of that. This is creating hope, creating opportunity, and making what's now not an asset to the neighborhood something that could be really, really valuable. So I thank you for your time. I thank you for your thoughtful consideration and am happy to answer whatever questions you guys come up with.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: We're not going to do that now though. Okay?

Anybody else in support of the project? It's
about seven more minutes. Okay? Yes, go ahead, you have to come up and get sworn in.

Tell us your name and address.


(WITNESS SWORN.)

MS. HURWUICH: I'm standing here as a private citizen. I'm also standing here as a member of the Evanston Housing Commission. As a member of the Housing Commission, I would like to tell you that we, the Housing Commission, gives full support of this project. It represents everything that the Housing Commission is intending to do in providing for affordable housing for our citizens.

As a private citizen, I am here to tell you that I was a renter in Evanston for many, many, many years, and I worked for a city agency for that length of time. And I can't tell you the frustration that I had as an employee of the City as a City agency to not be able to live in Evanston if I needed to buy someplace, if I had to move. The apartment that I lived in at the time was very low rent. It was kept as a low rent building so that it wouldn't have a heavy turnover. In that respect, we had, in my building which was 15 units, we had long-term residents. It was a family unit. It was wonderful. We got along exceedingly well. Everybody took care of their property, and they were very happy to be there in that community. It was their home. So that point addresses the issue that some of the opponents of this project have, that there are no stakeholders in the development that is proposed. So I would like to tell you that as a renter, we felt that we were stakeholders in the area.

Also I wanted to mention that the frustration of not being able to afford to live in the community in which I lived with the salary I was making as an employee of a City agency -- I'm reiterating. I know I mentioned this before -- but it was untold. It was very, very frustrating to me. So this, again, this proposal addresses that option for people who would like, who would like to remain in the City who do not make a lot of money to live in good housing, good safe housing. So I fully on two sides of the coin, both hats, I want to offer my strong approval for this proposal.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Anybody else? We'll save your five minutes in case you want to rebut something that the others say. Anybody from the opponent's side wish to take their 15 minutes?

MR. SUTTON: Carlis Sutton, 1821 Darrow Avenue.

(WITNESS SWORN.)

MR. SUTTON: As a stakeholder on Darrow, I feel this development will cause irreparable harm to the property values and quality of life of members of my community. I request four things from the members of the Planning and
Development Committee. One, accept the recommendation of the Plan Commission. I remind you that not one member of the Commission voted to approve this particular development. Two, support the Democratic process of the community of citizens who have worked both so hard to develop the West End Plan and General Comprehensive Plan. Three, review that the City staff that recommends this plan did not recommend it. The original application did not qualify for the necessary variances that it requested. Four, support the intent of our neighbors to have a quality, well planned development in our community. Don't impose a project of such density that is architecturally incompatible to any other existing structure in our neighborhood. Don't place so much emphasis of our criticism of this one particular plan development so you can see our sincere interest in providing both affordable and low income housing for those who really need it. We want what you want; a plan development that's right for the people who live and work in the neighborhood, as all of our time and efforts have been in vain.

In conclusion, please do not ignore our request for fairness. Do not relegate our concerns of aldermanic comradery at the cost of the established public policy of the West End Plan. Do the right thing. Don't mess the opportunity to support the findings of City staff, the Plan Commission, the members who were charged by you to make this determination. Thank you.

MR. YOUNG: John Young, on behalf of the Community Alliance. Since the last meeting we have, we wanted to be sure that we had responded to all the questions that the Aldermen asked. Alderman Jean-Baptiste asked whether the developer's cooperation with the neighborhood, and we had sent, our members had sent you an E-mail indicating that although the developer had certainly worked with ECDC, the surrounding neighbors had understood that there would be retail on the ground level, at the sidewalk level, and that there would be some home ownership all along. When they found out that that was not the case, why that was when their objections began, and that is why their objections are now so strong.

There were also questions about John and Muffy Leinwebre's renting practices, and we wanted it to be understood that he has, there have never been any charges that he discriminated in his policies and that indeed the Strange Lofts, he does rent to minorities. Has a minority renter there now, and that apparently he had a tenant at a restaurant who had not paid rent for something like six months, and I don't think that he had been evicted, but there were certainly problems with that tenant and the problem had nothing to do with John Leinwebre. We had also checked into the Cleveland Housing Network which was brought up at the last meeting as an example of the kind of housing that was being proposed here.
But there are several ways in which that is not the case at all. The Cleveland Housing Network, they are leased. Their lease purchase-program consists solely of single family homes, and one of their major goals is the disbursal of property, and so they have only very, the lowest density type of scattered site housing. So the two programs are not comparable at all.

Finally, one of the matters which the Plan Commission based their findings on were the undesirability of concentrating 27 low income families in a neighborhood which is already one of the lowest income neighborhoods in Evanston. In the last 40 years one of the major findings about low income and affordable housing has been the undesirability of concentrating low income housing in one building and in one neighborhood. And the literature is just overwhelming on that. It seems to be one of the most accepted premises in the whole housing field that low density, scattered site housing for low income people is the only thing that can be counted on consistently to work. That the problems when you have concentrated low income family has never been successfully done except where you have a specific organization that actually has people living, you know, in the facility which therefore becomes a major stakeholder. The Gâteaux case has been, the Chicago Gâteaux case, a federal court case, has been used all over the country, and the findings on that became so clear and so severe that not only did HUD policy become not to have more concentration of low income housing but they actually demolished what they had so that they could substitute low density scattered site public housing for it.

MS. MCAULEY: My name is Muffy Mcauley. I live at 830 Madison, and have the building at 1715 Church Street. M-C-A-U-L-E-Y.

(WITNESS SWORN.)

MS. MCAULEY: I just very briefly want to say that I appreciate your listening to us. I hope that you are hearing us. These are, you, know, very emotional issues. You all had a chance to read the transcript. I simply want to emphasize, number one, that I think that the process needs to be respected. It's been lengthy. We all have so much time invested, and I just can't emphasize enough that I think that that process needs to have the respect of this body.

The second thing that I want to say is I have heard almost everybody say, including a large number of those who have spoken in favor of this project, that of course homeownership would be preferable. I've heard Bennet Johnson say that. I've heard Ron Keshack say that. I've heard Alderman Delores Holmes say that. We have asked for time. This project caught those of us who live and work in the immediate area quite by a surprise, and all we are asking for is time to explore the possibilities of modifications. I have seen projects come before this body on so many occasions where
the developers have made, one, two, three, four concessions where it is really a process of incorporating the needs and the desires of the neighbors. The immediate neighbors of this proposed project are desperate for you to give us time to simply explore the options. We had some great meetings between the first Plan Commission hearing. I'm sorry that I missed last week's meeting, and if we are given the opportunity, we will work together. We can all join hands, and we can with your help come out of this a united community behind a project that everyone can back. So please give us the time to get that important work done. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: You have five more minutes.

Five more minutes for the opponents. Seeing nobody interested in speaking, let's move on. Richard, do you want to sum up anything? Do you have anything to say before we go to our discussion?

MR. KOENIG: I would very, very briefly like to address some of the issues that Mr. Young brought up. They are new information that has recently been provided to the Council, and it was information that I believe was provided over the weekend. Unfortunately the information provided by Mr. Young who is not an expert in the affordable house industry is incorrect at the least. The information he provided is absolutely misleading, and studies that he talks about actually support the idea of exactly this type of development. The idea of the Gâteaux case, and in case the Council is interested in learning more about that, we actually have an attorney tonight who is the person in charge of overseeing the Gâteaux case in Chicago in the area here with us tonight in the vent that you would like to discuss that any further. But this is exactly the type of development that would be favored under that particular case. The studies which were cited to support the idea that scattered site does not mean single family. It means small buildings. Small buildings exactly like this one. It means creating this type of opportunity. The Cleveland Housing Network is actually for people who are much, much lower income than this, and they are in a very different area where it is not built out, where you can get single family lots for a dollar. It's simply a different type of market. So the road block, the ideas, the hints that you are trying, they are trying to put into your minds to say why can't you do this some other way, I know you've seen numbers that could be built here. Those numbers have nothing to do with the facts we put together with a proposal that we worked on very hard and we went through the neighbors, and we have time and time again how exactly something like this can be built, how this meets the requirements of doing scattered site, doing small buildings like this, and is exactly the type of process that needed to be gone through. We did present to -- I presented to the Community Alliance in November. So it has been mere nearly six
months since there has been time to try to make some proposed changes to the proposal, recommend suggestions. We all get very sophisticated over time, we have gotten more indepth over the proposal. The reason hasn't changed because of the proposal. It's still a good proposal today. We are willing to discuss in a reasonable, rational way any possible, realistic ideas as to how to make this a better proposal. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I'll give you a few minutes if you speed it up. We've got to get to this. Are you going to make a presentation or rebut?

I would appreciate you make a presentation because. You are not entitled to rebut.

MR. LEINWEBRE: John Leinwebre, L-E-I-N-W-E-B-R-E.

(WITNESS SWORN.)

MR. LEINWEBRE: I think we have covered the issues extensively about inadequate parking, absence of commercial space, but the major issue I think remains ownership versus rental, and if you will just indulge me for a moment for the public record, I've given you documents related to that phenomenon. If we look at the 15-year rental as rent to own as a purchase of the unit, over the course of the first 15 years of ownership the tenant will pay $156,000 in rent towards that ownership. Then at the end of the 15 years, they will owe $150,000 for the unit. So the ultimate price of the unit that they will be buying will be $306,000. In addition to that, they will have a mortgage going forward for another 30 years that they will be paying for over time. The interest of the mortgage will put the price of the unit to $450,000 by the time they own the unit 45 years later, as opposed to ownership today, which is the counterproposal that can be done, can be built. In that case the purchase price using the developers's suggestion of $150,000 for the cost of the unit, they would in fact with the assisting of housing funds of $30,000, 20 percent down payment, they would have a debt of $120,000. Using today's amortization at 7 percent, amortized over 30 years, they would be paying about $800 a month. Assuming a rental begins at $700 a month for a two bedroom unit. At the end of 15 years they will be paying $1,000 -- 6 percent -- about three percent per year which is what we've heard as the progression of the increase. Therefore, the average rental they have will be $980 per month. Once again, they could be could pay principle and interest on an owned unit today at $800 a month. After 15 years instead of having paid $306,000 for this two bedroom unit, instead after 15 years they will have paid in principle $31,200, they will have appreciated at 3 percent a year. Affordable housing is allowed in Evanston based on the project that we gone to appreciate at 15 percent a year. After 15 years it will have appreciated $80,700 to a value of 15
years of $233,700. As a result of the $31,000, that they've paid in equity money over the time, at the end of 15 years instead of just now purchasing the unit, having paid $156,000 and now having $150,000 purchase price to pay for a total of $306,000 after 15 years. Instead they will have $145,000 in equity. To me this is by far and in a way the most compelling argument as to what is appropriate in that site what is appropriate if in fact we want to help our citizens. If in fact we want to entitle everybody to live the American dream, which is home ownership, it's Frank Campras' "It's A Wonderful Life." It's George Bailey's, everybody is entitled to a couple decent rooms and a bath. It's not Potter's Field for the next 15 years in the hope that some day 15 years down the road they might actually own this unit for $306,000 at that time. I think we have to give this an opportunity. It is definitely to create ownership. We've done it with other units in this particular neighborhood which people have been put in three bedroom, 2500 square foot, three bedroom, three bath units for $175,000. This could be done. It's very doable. We have a meeting tomorrow with banking concerns to put the agenda together today, allow our neighbors to live the American dream, don't put them in a rental for the next 15 years.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Gregg?
MR. GRAINES: Gregg Graines for the applicant. We'd like to have a minute to respond to, a couple minutes to respond to Mr. Leinwebre's comments. We don't believe that any other use of the project is relevant to this case.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Greg, is this the response?
MR. GRAINES: No.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Then cut it off if you want to give a response. Three minutes, not a second more, and only because this is my last chairmanship. If I had to be here in two more weeks, you wouldn't be getting this.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Go ahead. I said you could do this and that's all. Do not anybody ask for any more opportunities. It's over.

MR. KOENIG: I'll respond specifically to three points that were made by Mr. Leinwebre. One is, that in order to come up with the down payment, a family would need to currently have $20,000, which is unrealistic for someone to have to buy a unit at this price.

Second of all, this would, a proposal such as proposed would require substantial funding from the City of Evanston. Our proposal has absolutely no request at all to the City of Evanston. In addition, the monthly costs for what was suggested by Mr. Leinwebre does not include the real estate taxes, insurance and other units where we have included those costs built into our proposal. The problem looking at something that has -- an alternative proposal should not be considered because there's no control of the land. We have
never talked about with them about doing anything like that. So to put forward an alternative, that's alternative is insulting to us that could probably be. It's our land, our control. We are proposing something that I think would be a great asset to the community as opposed to something that's more pie in the sky. This is reality. We have the financing. It doesn't cost the City to create this great asset.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: That's all. All public testimony is over. I'm going to turn this over to the committee. The item before us is a planned development request for 1708, 1710 and 1801, 1805 Church called Darrow Corners, and we're being requested to approve this as a planned development in opposition to the Plan Commission and staff's recommendation. So let's have a discussion. We've little opportunity to do this. Alderman Holmes?

ALDERMAN HOLMES: Thank you, Alderman Rainey. You know, I guess it would be easy to look away and take the easy way out in order to avoid conflict or to gain acceptance about this proposal. But this proposal was worked on for months. We have spent hours working, looking, trying to figure out something to bring some balance to our community. I'm very concerned about the rapid growth. I know that there are many, going to be many other kinds of proposals that will come forward. I think that this is a way that we can provide for those whose incomes -- and I want to stress incomes are between $20,000 and $50,000, well $40,000 a year. Darrow Corners is not even by the widest stretch of your imagination a concentration of poverty. And I'm very insulted by that because these are people who would be working, who will earn salaries, who have a right to decent, affordable housing. They are folks just like me. So I've said in another meeting that I worked for 27 years in a social service agency and never made the median income of Evanston, and I think I'm a decent person and I think I would be eligible now as a retired person, and with the $300 we get every two weeks from the City, would be able to live in this "project," as you want to call it. I would hope that the Council would look at the merits of the project and not the way it's being painted. And I know this is really sad for me for those of my constituents who are opposed to this, there's been criticism about some of the neighbors who live in the immediate area who have not come out and spoken. You know who they are. They are your neighbors. You saw their names on petitions. You know who they are. It's unfair to have people fighting like this. It pains me to have that kind of conflict on the very first project, the first development in the Fifth Ward in, I don't know, ten however many years it's been since 1930 Ridge was done. And that there was conflict with that. I would hope that you would look, as I said, at the merits of the project. This proposal, that has had input. It is not in conflict with The Neighborhood Plan. I sat with many
of you through those years developing that and feel very confident that it's something that is worthwhile to the family that can live in Evanston who work here, who are extraordinary people making an income that doesn't allow them to remain in our City. So I am in support of this project, and I ask that you do the same.

CHAIRMAN RAINNEY: Alderman Bernstein?

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I would like to support this project uncategorically, but I have some real questions. The first of which is, you know, we're confronted with groups of neighbors all the time for every project, but there is a real distinction here. The group that now confronts us is not reacting to what's here. They have been proactive in this area for the last four years, and I think as I read the dialogue in the transcript between Bennet Johnson and Chairman Al Hunter, there have been ongoing conversations for many years. Apparently six months ago HODC came up with this plan, and now this is the only plan. Delores, you are absolutely right. I'm sorry there's consternation about the first plan, but the question to me is the process. The question is, are we going to disregard the work that you contributed to over these many years in favor of something that may be great project, and I want to give kudos to Richard because there isn't anyone who does what he does better, and I'm convinced of that in terms of developing. I am, however, not convinced that his strength is in management or that his strength is in selection of tenants. And I think we have evidence in this community, 319 Dempster is one of their developments, which is on the verge of becoming named the nuisance property by our police department. To me that's not good management. I've had conversations with people in the village of Wilmette and Skokie about similar kinds of projects that have been managed by this group. So those are my primary concerns.

The fact of the 15 year to own to me is very remote, and absent a commitment, and not only a commitment but a methodology, where the people in that unit are counseled about how to get their credit up, counseled about how to save money, counseled about how to procure mortgages, this is an intensive kind of program, and if you are not going to do it, I don't know how many of these 15 residents are going to do it on their own quite honestly. And I just believe that, you know, this is the first and the most important. Perhaps this is something that the City should get involved in. You know, we talk about affordable housing, well, this is a location. You know, I've gotten some grief about changing the plan for the Hines development. This was the first that came down and now it's in derogation of the Neighborhood Plan. To me the geometry and the geography of that plan warranted it. That was a terrible lot. This is a very developable lot. I know it's
got Mr. Mathew's problems from the old days as a gas station. It's probably got subsoil problems and there's going to be development questions and problems, but I think that in light and in fairness to the community -- and this was the concern to me, and, again, I never count heads because if I counted heads, my votes would have been substantially different my nine years on this Council -- but I do count what I perceive as reasons and rationals. And in this case, again, the neighbors that have come forward, and I know there are people that are proponents of this plan -- and I also know proponents are seldom coming out to say, yes, I like it, it's customary to say, no, I don't like it -- so I understand the vocality and presence of the people that are proposed to the plan, but the Plan Commission was frustrated by the fact that their work was taken for granted. In my opinion that's how I read the transcript, and I really believe that it was.

We talked about retail in the first floor, and this project because of the financing, there cannot be retail on the first floor. We talked about home ownership. Leasing to own is wonderful, but, again, absent the quality of the counseling that must be here on a regular basis, I don't know if we're ever going to see that. Fifteen years, I know it's a blink of an eye, but to me it's a very long time if you are talking about somebody planning for the future. I don't know if they want to wait that long. I don't know if I want to wait that long. I think we do need shareholders. I think that there can be renters. There could be owners, but I do think there is something about home ownership. There is something about the manner in which people treat their own property that they may not treat another's property. You and I have had a conversation. If there is nobody on-site all the time this "community room," I just can't conceive what it might become. A 1200 square foot open space that's open to the members of the community and open to the residents that's not monitored in some way. I am not told about any monitoring of this space. That scares me to death. I mean, if we are talking about an area that's at risk and that's what we're talking about, I'm concerned about the fact that it's just an opening for a negative environment notwithstanding who lives in the building. And I'm not trying to put down poor people, and we're trying to accommodate everybody in this community. And I understand that the Fifth Ward is the only place, even though it's probably no longer affordable any way, it's the only possibly affordable location. But for many, many reasons I'm just very concerned about this project. I think that Mr. Leinwebre who has put forth a plan, I absolutely agree. It's easy for somebody to put forth the plan when you don't have the property under control. But I don't want to see the work of the Plan Commission and the members of the community that came up with a plan -- you know, we do this for a reason. We just sat for a
strategic plan. If you are going to follow a plan that you've created in good will over time, then you've got to, you can't really just step back and say we'll get the next one. I think the preeminent -- this is the most important.

So if I had to vote tonight, I would have to be voting against it, and I don't want to vote against affordable housing. We do need affordable housing, but I've heard that Richard could, he'd like time to discuss alternate proposals. The opponents would like time to determine whether or not ownership is a reality. It may not be. You know, I don't know. If it's a requirement of $20,000 down payment, that may not be a reality. But I know that the banks in this community have given leadership service to serving this community and this might just be a method and a time where we can gather together. We have some funds available in the City. We are trying to generate funds. We are trying to generate revenue. Well, to the extent that we can subsidize and have people own property in this area, I think we'd be better off. That's not to say there wouldn't be an exclusion of all rental problems or all rental to own, but at this point in time I'm just getting a bad sense.

Everybody says the community is for this. I see a large part of the community that has been here from before day one who is not in favor of this. I don't know if their fears are rational, but I know that their perception has become the reality. And I'm willing to take time to see if we can work out any other alternative. If in fact we can't, then we can always come back to a program like this, a modified program or maybe this program, but I would ask this Council to hold this.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Excuse me. You are not moving to hold this at this moment before there's discussion?
ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: No, no.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Because I'm not going to entertain that motion.
ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: I'm going to ask later, after discussion, I'm going to ask that this be held so that there are opportunities to determine whether or not we can do better. If we can't do better, then I will say let's do this. And I had a conversation at the end of the last meeting with Bennet Johnson who told me that the responsibility of management was going to be taken by ECDC. Well, I want to hear how they are going to do that. That's a volunteer organization. I want to know what's in place. I want to know what they perceive as being the methodology by which they can go to bring these folks up so they can eventually reach home ownership. I haven't heard any of that.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Wollin?
ALDERMAN WOLLIN: I did some research on low income housing tax credits to see where in fact they've been
successful after I read Mr. Young's memo about Cleveland being single family. I found rental units that have been successful using this form of financing in San Francisco, California, Long Beach, Washington State; Arlington, Virginia; San Jose; Trenton, New Jersey; Oklahoma; Washington County and Pennsylvania; North Carolina; Durham, North Carolina; Houston, Texas; and Cambridge, Massachusetts. As well as Reno, Nevada. It is a tried and true federal tax credit financing that has been very successful. Some small groups and some large. There was one that just amazed me, which is like 800 units, which is in Cambridge. They bought 850 units between 1995 and 2003 using this form of financing. So I have no doubt that this, that the financing can be successful. Just because we haven't done it here in Evanston, doesn't mean we can't be the first ones in Illinois to do it. It is basically money that does not have to be repaid, which is pretty, no matter how generous your bank is, that's pretty astounding. So that's one thing I want the Council to know. That this has worked in other places. And I've spoken to some of the people at the National League of Cities that have confirmed that.

Secondly, I have to admit that I also was offended at the Plan Commission, and I was there that evening when Chairman Hunter talked about a concentration of poverty. People making $40,000 a year, maybe it's because I come from the humble profession of teaching, there are many, many years of my life when I never made $40,000 a year, and I think that had nothing to do with the quality of citizenship and the contributions that I made to my community. So I don't consider this to be a concentration of poverty. It is 27 units.

Secondly, the comparison to 319 Dempster, which is in my ward and I've been there many times, is, I don't think, viable. We are talking about in many cases single residences. People that have emotional and physical problems that were also kind of inherited by HODC when they took over the property and rehabbed it. We are not talking about the same situation at Darrow Corners. We are talking about families moving in who have limited incomes, and you know, so I think the comparison just isn't there. The nuisance problem is a nuisance problem. It's from slamming doors and shouting too loud. It has nothing to do with crime, per se, and the police have acknowledged that. In fact, that some of the residents needs to be trained about who to contact if they have problems within the facility. It's entirely different. It's an entirely different scenario than building affordable housing which this community does need, and I think that we have more than enough evidence to say that this is in fact the kind of housing that needs to be there and present and available and in that option. No one is forced to live here, so people will be applying. They will be screened. I do think I'm going to address all your points right away because I may not get the
microphone back again.

I think the concept of the community room is a very viable one. I looked at some of these other projects which had some kind of computer labs and classes and community projects that they talked about in this one as well. I do think it has to be monitored, and I am not exactly sure -- I know they talked about hiring a full-time manager adding to their staff, and how much attention is given to this location, I'm not sure, but I do think that this is a concern that has to be addressed. And I would expect HODC to address that. But the very fact that this is in the west side of town, which we have long neglected, I think definitely fits our needs, our attention, our address, and our support, and I would be willing to vote for it even tonight.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Tisdahl?

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Thank you, Alderman Rainey. I agree with Alderman Bernstein. I would very much like to postpone this. And the reasons are as follows:

The neighbors who have spoken for this project have been wonderful and convincing and as have the affordable housing advocates, but the neighbors who have spoken against it also have a very real commitment to building affordable housing in their neighborhood. Many years ago I came packaged for affordable housing scattered site units in my neighborhood and there was not unanimity of opinion that that was a good thing. And we've had them in small, scattered sites, and it's been wonderful. It met all my criteria of good neighbors. They run good car pools. That's what I needed, and that's what I've done. But I believe that the problems of parking is real in all neighborhoods. The problems of commercial space versus this empty space bothers me. And there have been unanimity on a mixed development with some 20,000 to 40,000, and I completely agree with Alderman Holmes and Alderman Wollin that $20,000 to $40,000 is not poverty. My son right now makes $20,000, and I think he is a terrific guy. However, there has been agreement on mixed development, and I don't think this group is that far away in position from one another. We have taken time in many other instances to try to things out with neighbors who are in conflict. And I find both groups sincere in their commitment to affordable housing, and think we should take some time and see. I feel that the financing is controlling this development and that that's where it veered off from and agreed to development on the part of the majority of the neighbors to this split when the financing took control and dictated the terms.

So I would very much like to take some time to see if something else could be done, and I am likely to support the project if there are no alternatives. But I would certainly like to explore alternatives first.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Hansen?
ALDERMAN HANSEN: This one has been a hard one for me from reading the transcripts and listening to HODC make their presentation and ECDC as well as listening to the opponents.

First, I first want to say in reading it and talking to Alderman Holmes, that I too was insulted when I heard of this idea or this notion of a concentration of poverty. What I think is disgusting is that good friends of mine who have good jobs tell me that they would love to move out of their apartments in the City of Chicago or wherever they are, and would love to move to Evanston but they can't afford it. That to me is disgusting. I am for affordable housing. I have some problems with this project.

The biggest one is there has been no compromise. I have sat here for P&D for less than a year now and every project that comes through that has some opposition, the opposition and the presenters take the time and come to a real compromise, and I haven't seen that here. What I've seen is because of the financing it has to be 15 years of rental. What I've seen is because of the financing there cannot be any retail, because of the financing it has to be 60 percent or below the median income. Because of the financing. And I don't think that's real for the neighbors, and I don't think that's a compromise.

I have a couple of other issues. We talked about parking and the way the parking is going to look. If I know anything, I know criminal law, and I had a real problem when hearing what this parking situation was going to be like, and then part of the solution was this gate and this fence. So now you are going to put this 27 unit affordable housing on this lot and then you are going to gate it off. What is that going to look like to these neighbors that live right there? What is it going to look like to people who are driving down Church Street? It is going to look like a closed off community.

I asked some questions last week based on what I looked up in the records regarding the Cleveland Housing Network. What about job training? I have no doubt that HODC is good about home buying counseling, but what about job training? What about counseling these people as Alderman Bernstein mentioned about keeping jobs and managing money. I didn't hear any of that. And I think that is a huge component into making this home ownership for people 15 years down the road.

I also had a problem with the management. I think someone needs to be there to answer some concerns about the people who rent these homes. I know that I asked that question last week, if you all remember, is ECDC going to be there Monday through Friday, 9:00 to 5:00? No, they are not going to be, because they don't have a staff person that can be there Monday through Friday, 9:00 to 5:00. We talked about
what a mixed condo and rental over could you put retail. There is absolutely a transcript in the Plan Commission. I think
there was one of the Commissioners asked could you add another
floor to accommodate retail and on the bottom we could do that,
but the financing wouldn't allow us to do that; we are not
asking for any money from the City of Evanston. There were
some real possibilities that Richard acknowledged in the Plan
Commission transcripts that there are possibilities. So there
are still possibilities, and I don't think that it's been
reached yet. I don't think all of the alternatives have been
explored. I talked about compromise. If you all remember when
the Mather was here and we had many meetings regarding the
Mather, all the opponents came up to us and said, I don't have
a problem with senior housing. I am not against senior
housing. And what happened, we took the time and a compromise
was worked out and Mather is going to put this beautiful
project at Davis and Hinman. And that's what I'm hearing
tonight from the opposition. We are not against affordable
housing. We are not against affordable housing. Give us time
to work out a compromise. I don't think that time has been
given yet. So I would be willing to give the opposition and
HODC and ECDC time to work out a compromise because I think
there is a real one out there.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Moran?
ALDERMAN MORAN: There's been some expression of
concern that the rent to own portion of this project calls for
15 years, but it's been almost 15 years since I sat in a goal
setting session with other members of this Council who said at
that point in time that revitalization of the west side was the
number one goal of the City Council, and it is now that we have
projects being proposed for the Church Street area where there
is the first instance of a concrete proposal for action.
Action, not a plan, not a discussion, not an aspiration, but a
proposal for action.

I went to many of the neighborhood meetings and I
listened, and there was a lot of good work done there. And I'm
a believer and a supporter and I voted for the Neighborhood
Plan as proposed and adopted and, yes, it suggested the
incorporation of commercial properties within other residential
projects was a worthy goal, and I share that. I share that
feeling. But that doesn't mean that on every single property
along the way that was discussed in relation to that
Neighborhood Plan was guaranteed to have a commercial space in
it. And in point of fact if people look at the development
world in a realistic life, they will understand that, yes,
there will be commercial spaces throughout this area, but there
will not necessarily be a commercial space in every single
building, and it's not somewhat to me is a very difficult
ability to guarantee that there's going to be a commercial
space in every building that will go up there is elusive goal.
It's a good aspiration, but it's an elusive goal, and it's not going to be guaranteed and it's not certain. And people need to be flexible so that the plan can ultimately be translated into action. Yes, there are compromises that need to be made, but sometimes compromises are necessary. If this were to be considered a compromise of the Neighborhood Plan, then I think it should be looked at that way, as a compromise, as a way to move forward.

The Plan Commission discussion discussed the fact that when you add residents to an area, they give life to commercial enterprises in that area. This is a project that will add residents to this area. There are many other opportunities for redevelopment in this area where there can be commercial space, and if this development goes in, you'll have 27 new family units who can patronize those commercial developments. So it shouldn't be looked at as antithetical to the notion of commercial interest. It can support commercial interests. I do not for a second accept the suggestion that renters as residents are somehow lesser citizens. When one thinks of the tens of thousands of people who start their lives in Evanston as renters, one understands that to be a renter is to aspire to higher positions that ultimately you will be able to own a home. I certainly in my family were part of that.

My daughter and my son-in-law who live in Evanston will rent. They will ultimately build. It will take them time. They will be able to buy a home in Evanston. Renters are not bad. They can be stakeholders. In a rent to own situation, you are a stakeholder. The suggestion that the Gâteaux decision speaks against this project is a misbegotten notion. BPI, businessmen and professionals and public interests were responsible. Alexander Polokoff was responsible for the Gâteaux decision. They are firmly behind this project. This is not a concentration of poverty. It's for people who make between $15,000 and $50,000. As the executive director of BPI has pointed out, many people with vouchers have make no more than $10,000, and people in the larger projects that were ultimately condemned by the Gâteaux decision, Robert Taylor homes, the Cabrini Greens, the Altgeld Gardens, the Horner Homes were much poorer than the target population for this. This site is a derelict site. It's probably a contaminated site. We have a developer that's committed to clean up the site. By the Plan Commission member said that this is a very nice building, good design, good idea, but somehow fell away. I'd like to quickly address the tripping points for the Plan Commission, and I will say to them, I have great respect for the Plan Commission. They work very hard. They do their level best. I agree with them many times. Sometimes I just plain disagree.

They had three problems. They said this is a concentration of poverty. They said that there was no
commercial development, and they mentioned the parking. I've already addressed the concentration of poverty. Again, I say over the course of time there will be commercial development in this area. I am firmly committed to what I think other members of this Council are committed to, and I know it will happen.

As to the parking situation, the rules would normally require 42 parking spaces. Here 30 are being offered. There are 27 units in this proposed building. Keep in mind that these are low income families. They will probably not have more than one-car per unit. I think that's probably a reasonable assessment of the demand for parking spaces for this building. You know, our Zoning Ordinance calls for a larger parking space per unit number, but in this particular circumstance, I think 30 spaces probably will work. I have great confidence in HODC. I have great confidence in ECDC. I think they can run this project and they can do it well. Richard's group have done the hard work. They have gained control of this site. They have put together a great plan. They have come up with a plan to finance it. I think to tell them, you know, go away and come back to us when another plan is problematic. It's problematic to me. I guess I can say with absolute assurance that there can be no better plan. I know these are good people, are very good what they do. They are very intelligent. Richard is very forthright telling us this is the way they found to make this project happen, and I can't say -- I am not a real estate guy -- I can't say that there's absolutely no other plan that will work. I do know. I've got somebody here who is ready to go, who is taking a risk by proposing a plan. That really for me is the realization of a dream which is to begin to get this corridor that we've all worked on. We worked a lot last year to create the TIF here, and it's time to go on.

I say what would people say of us if we went out and got a bunch of proposals none of which allowed people to rent? What would people be saying to us if they came here, long time residents of this area, why don't we have a project that allows people who can't afford to buy a single family home or can't afford to buy a condominium? Right now the only thing we can do is rent. And if we have no outlet for somebody who is in that position, what are we saying to this community? I think the answer to the question is not very favorable, and I think that people would think less of us, less of us if we were not to support and promote rental property in the area.

I will go back, I'll conclude by referring to the statement that was given by Officer Williams, a member of our police department, who said that she was a member of the family, fifth generation Evanstonian, who works on the police department, undergoes hazardous duty every day for all of us, and she would like to bring her family to Evanston and she can't. She lives in Lake County. She can't even get into Cook
County. But I'll tell you what, I think she is the kind of person that we should promote projects for who would have an opportunity, and you know, it works for me that if somebody is in the police department, somebody's family has been here for decades and decades and decades and they can't get through the door anymore for housing, then there's something wrong and we should take a step here tonight and do something right. That would be to vote for this project.

CHAIRMAN RAINNEY: Thank you, Alderman Moran. First of all, we really can't vote for the project tonight because we have no ordinance. We are just recommending the project for staff to develop an ordinance. In the meantime, I'd like to say a few words.

I remember 15 years ago where the vision for Church and Dodge and Howard Street was being thought up in our mind's eye, and I find it very, very interesting that tonight on our agenda we not only have a project at Church and Dodge, but we have a 221 unit apartment building in the 400 block of Howard Street. So things have come together. It's taken us a long time, but we've gotten some action finally.

I'm a founding mother of the Tenants' Organization of Evanston. I have the warmest spot in my heart for tenants. I was always a tenant. I helped write the Landlord Tenant Ordinance that we now have. I was a major player in the Condominium Moratorium in the City of Evanston. I have absolutely nothing against tenants. In fact, the City of Evanston and I have to disagree with you on this one point, Alderman Moran, it has a very healthy inventory of rental housing of all ranges, and so to even imply that in the neighborhood of Church and Darrow affordable housing is in some way problematic, every single neighbor in that neighborhood that I have heard speak lives in what you would call affordable housing. It's the most affordable housing in that wards and in my ward. In the entire City. As a matter of fact, the building that you see on the agenda tonight at 415 Howard Street is being built in the poorest census block in the entire City of Evanston. The number one poorest census block, and I fought to have this a rental building. I fought. I know it's going to be converted eventually, but I fought to have this market rate rental, and because of that, it has been a long, hard road to hough. It's not easy.

On the other hand, the kind of financing, and I'm going to address Alderman Wollin, the kind of financing for this project is probably the least Creative financing you can find. At our last meeting I you praised this project for being so creative. I think that it's not creative, and that's one of the big problems I have with it. Tax credit is about the only way you can do affordable, low income rental. So it's not surprising you found that all over the country. It's very hard to get financing for market rate rental in this country. Very
difficult. In fact, I think I remember a number that we were
given several years ago that in this, in the 1990's in the
County of Cook, only 10,000 rental units of any kind were added
to the inventory. Fortunately, we have a lot of rental in
Evanston, and so I don't think we are short rental housing. We
might be short affordable housing, but I don't think we are
short housing.

What is it that I like this about this project? I like that about this project that it has no commercial on the
first floor because I think commercial on the first floor on a
block that has all vacant commercial storefronts makes no sense
whatsoever. And I would be concerned about the nature of
commercial that would go in there. I certainly don't want to
see another convenience store where rolling papers, cigarettes
and lottery tickets are the big sellers. Every time you have
retail in that strip there, you are going to have some hanging
out. So I fought it on Howard Street. No commercial on the
first floor. There's plenty of commercial, established
commercial. Let's not compete with that. So I don't have any
problem with that. I do have a problem with the community
room, and Alderman Holmes and I have talked, that if this
building is built, wouldn't it be great to have a City of
Evanston Public Library outpost there, and I think she liked
that idea. And so maybe we can look at that. So that's a
change that we could make in the upcoming weeks. I think that
creativity is the key here, and I don't think the tenant needs
$20,000 as a down payment. We have people in this town who are
able to get affordable units and housing for down payments that
are subsidize. Tonight on our agenda we have an industrial
revenue bond capacity that we are going to retain. Close to $3
million. That can be used for housing. And we have talked
about that in the past, Using it for affordable housing or
housing development. So I would really like to see that.

I don't like about this project the management
plans, the janitorial plans. I don't believe that because you
are going to fill a building with poor people, you are going to
have trouble, but I believe that if you are going to fill a
building with people and not have exquisite management plans,
you are going to have trouble. That's a big problem for me. I
think the janitorial issue is key. Key. And we have too many
rental properties aren't well maintained, and I think that the
most important thing that could come out of these discussions
and work sessions could be quality janitorial placement in this
building. It's got to be. You cannot take a building that you
are saying in 15 years you are going to sell units, if you
don't maintain it in impeccable fashion. I think you could put
in a building, the worst kind of people in the world, the very
dregs of society, and if you had excellent management and
quality janitorial, you could actually run a good building. I
believe that. I think it's very hard, very hard, but I think
you could do that. So just because there are families who are making under $50,000 a year does not scare me. And I don't think it should scare anybody else, but I think the management of this property and the janitorial and the lack of management plan and the lack of any plans that we have seen in writing, that's what scares me. I would much prefer to see owner occupied units here. Much prefer. And I know it could be done. I know that we have enough financial institutions in this town where we could get a combination, a consortium put together so that the risk was low for each individual institution, and we could really do something that would make all the newspapers. I mean, it would be really impressive. And I would love to see that. But I think what we should do is form some kind of a subcommittee of a couple Alderman, couple of neighbors and a couple of developer types and see what we could work out. Does anybody think that would be a good idea? We might come up with the same building but with some improvements. Alderman Jean-Baptiste, you are next.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Thank you, Alderman Rainey. You know, I'm glad to be part of this Council because we have expressed the same perspective on the issue of the humanity of individuals who happen to not have that much money. I have for some time been real picky about issues of using "at risk," "underprivileged," "disadvantaged." Those labels we throw on ourselves. We throw on other people because of lack of money. We throw on children of these people. I've heard people talk about underprivileged and disadvantaged about, you know, preschool kids. You know, we sort of create this kind of product and we develop policies and we develop kinds of methodologies about these people so then even the people themselves who are poor begin to see themselves as lesser than. And a lot of the talk that we've heard in opposition to this project from some of the neighbors have been reflective of the kind of attitude that you better have more police on the corners, we have got to avoid prostitution. I talked about the group of folks who don't have money and suddenly we are talking about all kinds of wretchedness of the earth, and I think that we have to stop believing the hype and start directing our attention to understanding that the best among us have come from the least. Because most of the people who have money, are chasing money. Those who are in the trenches trying to struggle to change things, who have brought about changes are usually those who do not have and who see the need for greater equity in society.

My family, my mother barely had an eighth grade education and raised six of us. When we first came to the Chicago area, my mother, stepfather and six kids, we lived with my uncle who had five children. Almost anybody who came in that time, because we came from an immigrant background,
everybody spun out and were able to do for themselves and went beyond their particular economic status at that time. My mother went and worked at Omight (phonetic) factory, and my father swept floors at the hospitals, local hospitals and cut grass at Kendall college. Well, they bought a condo in Florida and retired there. My mother is the only one amongst all of us who always has some reserve to be able to share with us. So poverty is not an indicator as to the character of the person.

Now, my particular style for people who have worked for me is I like to compromise. I like to work through issues. And I am not ward centric. On the Mather issue, many of us came out of our wards and we worked on trying to hammer out a compromise. I wanted to try to see if we could get some kind of compromise in this situation. I don't know what it would look like, but I was the one who advocated for John Leinwebre and Muffy to put forth something; you said that it can be done differently, then put forth something that can be done differently. But, you know, practice is the criteria of truth. It's what you do. We can't say in the idealism what can be. One, you have a land owner who has gone out and gotten the financing, has put forth a plan before all of us to consider, and so we may wish to do something differently. But we have got to be able to show whether that is really doable, feasible and it meets the objectives of affordable housing, and to the extent that you can make that happen, then you print that in a concrete way. And I'm suggesting that. So far I think we know, we have been in this discussion about by the third way for the last two months and a half, and I've not heard the third way although. I'm open to compromise, further discussion. I'm open to the proposal that's being put forth by members of the Council to let's wait. If you want to wait, are you talking about waiting 30 days? I'm willing to wait 30 days. If somebody has something different, better to offer, if there are some ways to tweak the project, maybe the gate is not appropriate, maybe whatever is physical site in terms of the protection of the parking, maybe that's not appropriate. Maybe, you know, the issue of management needs to be further elaborated. Maybe a commitment, maybe some commitment over a period of time for a janitor to live on the premises or whatever. I'm not sure. I'm open to discuss the compromise. And when we talk about management, people, ECDC is not a management company. You know, I think that the developer and all of us, we are lucky to have a group of activists who are ready to support, to work hard to try to advocate and work things forward, but we shouldn't be disparaging the project because there's some group of activists out there who might have a desk in the place, who may be willing to assist in trying to organize neighbors and train youth in job training and job placement. ECDC is not a management company and shouldn't be considered as such. It is not on them that the
burden should rest. We have a plan before us, and I think that we should wait. Those of who advocate that there should be more compromise should not wait for Delores to be the only one who steps out there to try to compromise. We should get in the mix and gauge the neighbors and try to figure out how we make things work. And so if we can find another solution, a better solution, a better project, then let's do that. But I don't think we can substitute a non-project for something that's there already. We can make this one better. And if we don't like the design we've been sent-- we've sent Roszack back to do major things. So we've been used to saying, no, come back, do something different, supporting the thrust but demanding that there be some changes. So I'm not afraid of doing that. But I am concerned that we don't throw away the baby with the bath water because ultimately I believe we are going to have a win-win in that location. We will have an affordable development there. We didn't have that before. We will have more of the community talking about concrete application of the notion of affordable housing, and we will have the opportunity to participate, to observe, you know, a process in place, a model that can work for our community. I think that the community, those who are opposed have legitimate concerns, but I think we need to sit around the table and try to make things happen.

The fact that you have some renters across the street from you, that doesn't mean that your property value is going to go down. The fact that you have concentration of people, that doesn't mean that, you know, your property is going down. I think as Alderman Rainey stated, we have to make sure that the development, the management is in place and it's strong and it delivers what it says it will deliver. Ownership is something that I thought would be the best thing. But that's not the plan that we have. We sort of have to cross that bridge when we get to it. That's not what we have before us. We have a specific plan, whether or not it is totally consistent with the West Side Plan, I mean, if the City had the capital to implement the entire plan, then we wouldn't need developers. The City doesn't have the funds to do that. So we have to take the developers as they come before us and try to see how they can work within a plan, and where there is no plan to balance the pluses and minuses to try to move processes forward. So I think that what we are generally saying is that we support going forward. The support is contingent upon some more discussion, more discussion. I think we have to give ourselves a specific time limit. We cannot open the door for something that's indefinite, that doesn't come back with any kind of results and we throw up our hands and we give up on it. I hope that the neighborhood will stay together, will work together because there are a lot, there is a lot of work to do. The TIF has just been passed a year ago, People. Funds will
begin to be generated into the TIF. There's infrastructural work to be done. There are a lot of other issues to be addressed. For us to be successful, we have to find a way to work together, even though we may have some differences. So to the extent that we can get the creativity of Leinwebre around the table with the resourcefulness of HODC, to the extent that we can get Carlis and other neighbors to come and say, okay, here is a way we can maximize the safety in the neighborhood, to the extent that we could get others involved to discuss a process, to the extent that the Community Alliance, the ECDC, can participate in assisting and screening those who would be renters, I think we can have an alliance that would work together to move the process forward. And, you know, unless we have something else that totally transplants this, the reality then is I think we have to take a look at the project that we have in front of us and we have to try to find a way to make it work.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: First of all, Alderman Jean-Baptiste with well to continue to ask for other ways to do this is one thing, but there's no real vehicle set up right now for people who have other ideas to get it discussed in a formal way which is why I suggested a subcommittee of sorts of a few Alderman, a few HODC people and a few of the opposition so that we could come together with ideas and then bring back here to us what has transpired. I have to say you gave a beautiful speech, but I have to talk to the issue of ECDC being a screening body.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: ECDC is not the only --
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: When I think of the way to do this project, and believe me I've screened a lot of people and managed a lot of buildings, good ones and bad ones, some real bad ones, but the important thing is to have high quality, professional, neutral management. People who are paid to do that. Not people who -- I mean, it's important not to have any way that people can be challenged, and it's very important, but I think that's something that needs to be talked about in another setting away from this committee in a subcommittee. So I'm going to make a motion that we form a subcommittee, the numbers of which we'll need to work out. Maybe three, three and three, and to go forward with this project, and at no later than 30 days bring it back for a presentation to the Council so that we can then move forward and have our staff present us with an ordinance. I mean, we've got to move forward.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Can I suggest that we move introduction and hold it in committee?
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: We don't have anything to introduce.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: We don't have an ordinance?
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: We can't do that. We have to
get it designed. We have to get the ordinance.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: You are talking about the ordinance itself we have to write?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: That our staff is going to do. They don't have the information to do an ordinance because the ordinance, there aren't the votes to get this thing in ordinance form.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: What I'm suggesting is, I think what you are proposing is to look to open the door to look at many different projects as possible --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: No, I'm not really doing that.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Tell me what you are doing.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I really, truly believe in the statement that you made on this corner there is going to be an affordable housing project. Absolutely. An affordable housing development without a doubt. What it's going to look like right at this moment, I don't know. I believe that Housing Opportunity Development Corporation must be the developer because they do that best. That's what I believe. And I'm not going to support commercial on the first floor. But the other variations, you know, they are all there.

ALDERMAN MORAN: Alderman Rainey, we have three planned developments. I guess two are -- I see what you are saying. We do have this on the Council agenda for introduction. Item E-2, it's for introduction.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: They are going to work on that. Should I make a motion?

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Can I make a clarification on this introduction business first?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: We need an ordinance.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Could you get legal to tell us.

MR. WOLINSKI: There's no ordinance, Mr. Baptiste, because there was negative recommendation from the Plan Commission.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Why is it on the agenda for introduction?

MR. WOLINSKI: To accept a negative recommendation.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Which we are not going to do.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: So it shouldn't have been for introduction.

CITY MANAGER: It should have been on the agenda. It should have said for action because when you have a denial, you have to either agree with the denial or turn that denial down.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Well, I would accept a motion to reject the denial, but --

ALDERMAN MORAN: So moved.
ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Second.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: By saying that we don't accept the packet --

ALDERMAN MORAN: I move that we reject the denial.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: I second that.

CHAIRMAN HUNTER: All those in favor say aye.

(CHORUS OF AYES.)

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Now, can we move on? I believe the only way to do this, I will tell you right now, I find it extremely time consuming, having just been through the Mather project, to meet with this group and that group. We could meet for 80 hours a week with everybody telling us what their idea is. I would like to establish a formal process so that we have no issues with violating the Open Meetings Act. We can have the meetings all here. No problem. If you don't want to do that, just tell me, we'll move on. We'll have staff put together an ordinance, and I guarantee you, it will be a big disappointment if we go forward with the development as it stands right now. That's what I believe having heard everybody tonight, and I have listened very carefully.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: So you are asking for three volunteers, is that what you are doing?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Yes, that's what I'm asking for and the establishment of a subcommittee.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: And anybody else who might want to come to the meetings?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Oh, absolutely, oh, sure. Alderman Holmes, I think you definitely should be on that community. You've got to be.

ALDERMAN HOLMES: Okay.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Tisdahl, would you like to be on the committee? Alderman Jean-Baptiste?

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Sure.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All those in favor of them being on a subcommittee say aye.

(CHORUS OF AYE.)

None opposed. I would suggest that you all then --

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Can I ask if Alderman Hansen would participate in that only because she had some specific, you know, tweaks that --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I think she would be very special. Alderman Hansen, would you be on the committee?

ALDERMAN HANSEN: Sure.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Now, I want warn you a committee of 40 is not going to work. So with the neighbors I think three and three, four and four, whatever.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: City manager?

CITY MANAGER: I just wanted to ask if we are
going to have a subcommittee that we have staff present so when we are writing the ordinance we know what your discussion has been.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All the meetings will be here, so everything is posted in the elevator. So I think you should now do your hold over until the subcommittee does its work.
ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: I would move to hold this for 30 days until the action of the subcommittee.
ALDERMAN TISDHAL: Second.
ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Can I get a date certain though? We have said 30 days. I would like to take a --
ALDERMAN WOLLIN: May 22 would be just a few days over 30 days.
ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: May 22nd.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: May 22nd is a council meeting.
ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: And, Alderman Rainey, it's clear as to who we should get in touch with as the proponents, HODC. You know, may I ask, if Carlis, would you be the person that we on the committee communicate with to make sure that you know your voices are heard?
MR. SUTTON: I will. Community Alliance, it will be their decision. I can't commit myself.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: We are not going to do this here. Let me give some direction. Will the opponents in the next three days notify Alderman Holmes of those people you are going to have sitting on the committee. Anybody can attend but three sitting on the committee.
MS. JANUARY: Can we have four?
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Three and three. You have four.
You know what, I'm going to ask you to try and behave today. Okay.
Hearing no other discussion, we are moving on to the next item.
(Whereupon the hearing was continued sine die.)
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Next item on our agenda is 2617 Prairie. If you are not in, excuse me -- Leinwebres, all of you, would you please have your conversation outside. Carlis.

MR. REIFMAN: Alderman Rainey, Alderman Tisdahl, good evening, Alderman Wollin. For the record, David Reifman from DLA Piper Rudnik representing the petitioner on this matter. I'm going turn it over to the petitioner to make his presentation. It is from a C2 to a B2 a neighborhood friendly change. The only item of relief is 2.0 to 2.5. The one thing I'd like to say is we have reviewed the ordinance, and what we believe it is fairly implied that there is a special use to be granted for a project larger than 20,000, if it's acceptable, we would ask Corporation Council to expressly note that.
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CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I will do that materially voluntarily. Alderman will address very specific issues, brief issues.

Are there any opponents to this project present who wish to speak?

MR. WOLINSKI: What's your question?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Why don't we just have the --

MR. TICUS: I'm sorry, we are having technical difficulties with that. With your approval, I'll go through very briefly the project. The developers are Evanston Prairie, LLC made up of James Ticus, myself, J. Hawk DDI, LLC, which is Jack Crocker who is present tonight and his wife Paulee Hawkins. I won't bore you with the details of our team unless you would like to hear them. You stop me --

(WITNESS SWORN.)

MR. TICUS: James Ticus T-I-C-U-S. The property that you have in front of you tonight is 2607 through 2617 Prairie. It's presently occupied by Duxler Auto Repair. It's a through-lot that runs from Greenbay to Prairie, and it would be easier if we had -- we are proposing a subdivision of that lot. We propose to subdivide this lot basically by sectioning it. There's the view from Prairie. That's the view from Greenbay Road. This is the lot. And we propose to -- this is Greenbay, Prairie -- we would subdivide the lot. And our development would be placed on this portion of the lot once those three lots are consolidated. Duxler Auto would remain on this section and remain in business on an ongoing concern. It would be reduced in size. This portion of his building would come down. This small two-story building would come down, and our development would be on that lot.

The next slide please. The process is that we'd subdivide it as I mentioned, rezone it as you heard from C2 to B2, and the plan development hopefully would be approved. This is how the subdivision would end up with the development. This is the footprint of our property. These are the basics of the proposed development. This column is as of right. This is what we are proposing. The site area is 313,590. We are asking for 13 units. We are asking for a minimal increase in FAR from 2.2 to 2.5 which is approximately 616 square feet. We are meeting height restrictions, and we are meeting the parking requirements.

We are going to turn this over to the architects quickly. I think you are very concerned with that, but this is an elevation showing the new property. This is the building with -- you may know Prairie Joe's Restaurant on the corner --

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: That will being gone?

MR. TICUS: No, that build is probably standing in front of it. That building will stay, and the purpose, and the architects will do a better job than I will -- this building, this new building will be matching in a lot of ways
the existing Prairie Joe's building. Fenestration, cornice lines, height, retail along the front. We view this as a continuation of Central Street, particularly because if you know Prairie Avenue there, it's not a 90 degree angle, and you can view this from a number of places on Central Street. There is what the architects and we have called a rear building. So this is three stories, the rear building is four stories and is set back anywhere from, if I'm remembering correctly, 9 feet to 19 feet. So there would be a patio and a four-story building behind it. Extensive landscaping both on our property, on the parkway. And Ryan Kettlecamp will go into that.

Next slide, please. I'm not going to bore you with this. You've had the transcript. We feel we meet all of the goals of the Comprehensive Plan of Evanston, and really the most important thing to me is this transit oriented developments, and this is exactly that. It's not high density. It's 13 units. It's higher densities. It's a block from the Metra. It's about three-quarters of a mile from the el. And according to the Urban Land Institute, same issues, we feel we meet all of those, and it is truly smart growth and good development. Good for Evanston.

I'm going to turn this over now to Jack Murchie, our architect, who will go through the architecture.

(WITNESS SWORN.)

MR. MURCHIE: My name is a Jack Murchie. I'm an architect with SMNGA Architects in Chicago. We can go to the next slide. This is the building on the northeast corner of Central and Prairie. The thing that's important here, what we see is as the richness of this combination of ground level store front and residences overhead. We are using this as the theme for the primary elevation of our property. You can see this portion of the building is up to here. So our idea is to continue the store front both in the material, which is natural stone and glass, emphasizing the store front quality of the large open glass expanses on the lower level and also brick masonry above that which would continue as Jim Ticus said, the cornice line at the top of the third floor would continue all the way to the end of our property. The fourth floor which you could barely see at the forward end, actually is set back, but also recedes from Prairie as it goes north. This is a close-up view showing the pedestrian orientation that we see that extends the 100 feet or so beyond this building and the parkway plantings. Jim talked about this again, this emphasizes the cornice line that we're following and the set back of the taller building behind. That setback is about 12 feet at the south end, and I think at the very north end 23 feet away from the front property line. Again, the pedestrian orientation that we have, awnings, glass, stone, brick, masonry above. We will have brick masonry around the entire building east, north and west elevations.
This is the south view of this. It shows the way the setback is on the part of the four-story portion with the corner cut-outs of the volume to reduce the scale. This shows the sight line from a person standing across on the west side of Prairie looking up. It shows the third floor cornice line here and the setback of the fourth floor. On our first floor plan we have parking, we have retail in front, which continues, the store front all the way up to the entrance to the building. We have moved the entrance, the parking entrance to the north end of the site. The second floor, there are I think eight, two bedroom and five, three bedroom apartments in the building. One apartment on each floor faces east. All the others are oriented either east and north and/or east and west through so looking west.

This is the north floor showing the setback at the top floor with an outdoor terrace, which will be landscaped above the cornice line on the third floor. There will be landscaped terraces above facing Prairie. This is a compilation of the entire assembly.

Any questions about that?

(WITNESS SWORN.)

MR. KETTLEKAMP: Ryan Kettlekamp of Kettlekamp & Kettlekamp, 1000 Main here in Evanston. The green opportunities on this project are significant. You can see that the parkway gardens here coming from the neighborhood to Central Street, I will call them green gateways from the neighborhood to the Central Street shopping district. Can you go to the previous perspective, Jack?

These are the green opportunities, green parkways, green north buffer, green across the back of the building between the building and Duxlers, and green up on the roof top terraces. What I want to point out and primarily what I want to indicate, the majority of the trees on Central Street are not doing well. Significant steps are being taken to make sure these three trees strive. Preserving the large existing tree that's located on the property, it's one thing to put in green landscaping. It's another thing to make sure that they are going to be maintained. The maintenance that occurs on the public area will be retained as an assessment of the building, will be retained by the condominium association.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: There is a sprinkler?

MR. KETTLEKAMP: That's the other thing.

Landscaping in Evanston typically fails because it's not watered. There is a sprinkler system as a component of all green areas of this site.

CHAIRMAN RAINELY: Thank you. Could I just ask our attorney a question. Would it be feasible or would it be legal to include in this ordinance a requirement that the landscaping be maintained by the association?

MS. SZYMANSKI: The landscaping?
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All of it. One of the things that's so beautiful about this project, in addition to the building, is the landscaping. If in two years it's all dead --

MS. SZYMANSKI: We do have a landscape plan standard language.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: But for residential building?
MS. SZYMANSKI: We do.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right.
MR. TICUS: Was that question answered for you?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Yes. If you could just keep going.

MR. TICUS: Traffic, I'm not going to do tonight. It is there. We have a traffic study that shows it's not impacted negatively.

That's traffic. Keep going, please.

Public benefits. These are taken almost directly from the ordinance. It's, you know, attractive design which compliments the neighborhood and existing architecture. We have Lenet & Company's impact study which shows positive benefit to all the relevant taxing bodies. We are replacing an incompatible use. Right now it's C2. That's a zoning anomaly because it's been Duxler or some form of auto service company. We are eliminating through-lot. Right now people are coming through from Greenbay. Neighbors are not happy with that. That will be impossible. And, lastly, we just want to talk briefly about a donation.

During our P&D process, the idea of a contribution to affordable housing contribution was mentioned to Evanston or a needy Evanston preschool, and a contribution to upgrading water service on Prairie area will be raised. We are developers. We are also residents, and we are sensitive and understand those concepts and needs of the community and we are open to a proportional donation.

Bearing in mind the size of our project, the public benefits mentioned earlier and the modest request of a 2.0 to 2.5 increase in FAR or 616 feet, Evanston Prairie proposes a contribution of $15,000 or a little over $1,000 a unit to benefit the City Council's choice of needs, whether that's affordable housing, a preschool in need, improvement of the infrastructure on the street on Prairie or any other benefit you think is appropriate.

CHAIRMAN HUNTER: Alderman Jean-Baptiste.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: I just wanted to put on the record that we do also have a Youth Training and Employment Fund, so when we are discussing the options, I would and I think tonight we hopefully will launch that and hopefully get some donors that we had for the Canine unit.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: But you are not commenting on their contribution?

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: I am saying that it
should one of the options.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Well, he said to whatever our choice is.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: I want to make sure that we are conscious that's one of our choices.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Could you explain further the upgrading of the water. The upgrading of the water I thought you were doing that as part of your proposal.

MR. TICUS: We've been told that there is a four-inch water main in Prairie and that there are plans to upgrade that, that the City has already made those plans. We don't know when. Certainly not from time our for our development. So it looks like we would have to upgrade that from a four-inch to a six-inch water service to Central Street, and you know, we proposed that this $15,000 go toward that if that's what the City Council chooses.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: That would be $15,000, but you sort of need to do that any way.

MR. TICUS: It does have to be done, that's correct. To me the City also is going to do that at some point. So whatever we contribute to that would be a tax savings.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Could we ask our public works director why that couldn't be done? When is that scheduled? Is that scheduled for 2006. If it is scheduled for 2006 --

MR. TICUS: I didn't get the impression that it was any time that soon.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Did you get the impression that it was in the next couple of years or, what, or the next ten years.

MR. TICUS: That's the impression I got, I don't know if it's two years or ten years but --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right. Any other questions anybody? I certainly wouldn't support the $15,000 going to fix the water main.

Alderman Holmes? And then, oh, no, wait, I'm sorry, Alderman Bernstein first and then Alderman Holmes.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Where is Duxler going to put their overflow cars? You are removing those south bays?

MR. TICUS: We are reducing five bays, and I don't know the exact square footage, but they have provided a parking plan which has been approved by the City.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Because I was out there and there were cars parked out all in around west of Duxler. So they are going to have sufficient space not to put them on the street?

MR. TICUS: They will, and that's been approved by City already.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Alderman Holmes and Alderman Wollin. I would remind you it's 9:00 o'clock.
ALDERMAN HOLMES: I want to comment on the generous $15,000, but I see it as two separate issues in terms of the water main. I would think that if you are going to do your development, you would have to do it, and if it's not in the City's schedule for a few years down the line, unless you want to wait on the project, and I don't think you do, that that would really be the responsibility of the developer. David is here. Do you want to respond, David?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Wollin, you are next.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: I do want to have the answer to the water main first. Maybe I can do that first and then ask another question.

MR. LYONS: I don't have a good answer right now. I can get you the cost and the timing but what I'm hearing is it's three years away in our plan.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: What we are asking you is what is the time frame for our plan?

MR. LYONS: I do not know off the top of my head.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: You do know it's not this year or next?

MR. LYONS: I do not believe it's this year or next.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And why would we be replacing it?

MR. LYONS: We replace all four-inch to eight-inch, whatever the hydraulic study requires.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And would the main right now be insufficient to service this building?

MR. LYONS: That's my understanding. The main would not be sufficient.

MR. TICUS: That's true. That's what we understand also.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Well, I have a question then, would there be a, would there be a way that because we don't have it budgeted that they proceed? This obviously isn't a huge expense, right? When I say huge, it's not $50,000?

MR. TICUS: I think it's in that realm.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: If they were to do it and then when the time comes in our capital improvement budget, could we reimburse them?

CITY MANAGER: One suggestion I would have is that you make the developer pay for this now and then have a recapture agreement, and if other developments come along and need that upgraded service or something like that, that's done all the time. And I don't think we have to solve that tonight, but we can talk internally and give a recommendation back to you before the action on this ordinance in two weeks.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: By recapture you mean other developers supporting --

CITY MANAGER: That would benefit from the
increase in this water main.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: What's the likelihood of that?
CITY MANAGER: You do that.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I'm just thinking what is to develop? It may be Duxler.
ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: It's Greenbay -- I think that's a very uncertain term for further development. You are talking down an existing residential street. The likelihood to recapture that is fairly nil. In an open area it might make sense. I don't know that it's proportional share in the future --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: As I point out, I don't think this is part of this plan development, so I think what we should do is move forward and then there would be could be some negotiations with our staff about what this issue is and how we could resolve it because I would certainly encourage the developer to go forward.
CITY MANAGER: But we need to get the developers to start paying for these improvements.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Yes, we do.
ALDERMAN WOLLIN: My question is, miniscule. In the parking area, is there parking for the retail that you are putting in?
MR. TICUS: Well, there are 23 spots, and we haven't, as you are probably aware, the first 2000 square feet is exempt for parking. There's no requirement for us to dedicate any of the parking to retail. We don't. The answer to that is, I don't know how the parking will fall out, whether it will go all toward the residential or one or two will be designated to the retail or even the retail owner.
ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Are these going to be condos, retail condo?
MR. TICUS: More than likely they will be retail condos.
ALDERMAN WOLLIN: So it wouldn't be unreasonable for them to expect one parking spot inside. I mean, I know this area, you can't park there. It's impossible. So I did read where you are going to add a couple spaces by closing that curb cut, but I mean parking is a valuable asset in that community.
MR. TICUS: All I can say is that we're meeting all of the requirements from the City for B2 for parking, and that it's likely that some would go to retail, but it just depends on the demand of both the retail condominium buyer and the residential condominium buyer.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Moran.
ALDERMAN MORAN: On your building back --
MR. TICUS: The rear portion of the building?
ALDERMAN MORAN: The rear portion. I was going through and I couldn't really pick up from the materials, and
maybe it's just that I wasn't looking in the right place, but what kind of facade is that?

MR. TICUS: It will be brick masonry along with the glass of course. A little more glass than the front building, but all masonry. Does that answer your question?

ALDERMAN MORAN: Masonry?

MR. TICUS: Brick. We have not chosen colors and we do view it as a different shade at least than the front building, but it will be brick. It will be brick. The whole building will be brick, except for the glass, of course, the windows.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Tisdahl?

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Thank you, Alderman Rainey. It might help that it be said, since it's been my ward, Duxler has been an excellent business and a very good neighbor. However, people have not complained about Duxler, but when they heard about this project, we had a neighborhood meeting, and everyone was thrilled because having a transition between Duxler and the residential area was thought to be a terrific idea. And there will be no job loss. I asked about that. Duxler is opening branches elsewhere and none of the people currently employed will lose their jobs. So there are only two neighbors that I know of, there's never a consensus, who are concerned. Legitimately because they will have somewhat less light in their homes, in their apartments, but the building is the same height as the height would be if we didn't change the zoning and you could build to that height either way. So I support the project and the neighbors have asked me sort of angrily, everyone hates construction, but when will it start. It hasn't started so I feel I should get into a bull dozer and get out there.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Well, would you like to start by making a motion?

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: I move at 9:10, I don't mean to cut off discussion, but I move that we introduce this tonight. I move approval.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: As amended including the $15,000 contribution?

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: As amended with the staff discussion about the water main and I talked to Ms. Szymanski earlier today about the landscaping also, but since Alderman Wynne is not here, and I had counted on her, she's always very good about writing in that the brick will be the brick that is proposed and that the architecture will be what we see before us tonight.

MS. SZYMANSKI: And also, Madam Chair, with the inclusion of that 20,000 square feet.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And this is a map amendment also. Is there a second?

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: I second it.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Wollin seconded it. And, Ms. Szymanski, you will bring this corrected version back to us? Actually we don't need this back in committee. You can bring it to Council.

MS. SZYMANSKI: I have a question on the landscape plan. Over the years we've done the long form approach which has the plans or requirements that the condominium association or entity form management of the development replace plantings at the earliest planting season. If it fails to do so there is a penalty, the mandatory plan penalty. Is that the scope of the landscape plan you wish or --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I think that's what we need.
ALDERMAN TISDAHL: That would be excellent.
MS. SZYMANSKI: It would be $15,000 would be devoted to the --
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: The choice of the Council. We'll decide. Contribution to probably affordable housing funding or Alderman Jean-Baptiste's favorite charity.
ALDERMAN TISDAHL: We can split it.
MS. SZYMANSKI: I think we need to have some direction.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Could we give it to you?
ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Could we make it 50-50? I propose the 50 percent go to the Youth Initiative and 50 percent to the Affordable Housing Fund.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: To the Youth Fund?
ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: It's part of the Strategic Plan.
ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Thank you. City Youth Fund.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All those in favor of the recommendation by Alderman Tisdahl to recommend this plan development and map amendment say aye.
(CHORUS OF AYE.)
Any opposed? We will get a clean copy of this ordinance in our packet for our next meeting.
MR. REIFMAN: A point about the landscaping. I want to be sure this is clear. It will be the homeowner association that will be responsible --
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Yes, not the developer. You won't be anywhere near around.
MS. SZYMANSKI: We have standard language.
ALDERMAN WOLLIN: We know where to find you.
MR. REIFMAN: Right. Thank you all very much.
(End of proceedings.)