Planning & Development Committee  
Minutes of June 12, 2006  
Council Chambers – 6:30 p.m.  
Evanston Civic Center


Alderman Absent: M. Wynne

Staff Present: J. Wolinski, J. Carroll, K. Cox, R. Lookis, D. Spicuzza, E. Szymanski, J. Brownlee

Presiding Official: Alderman Rainey

DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chair Rainey called the meeting to order at 6:55 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 22, 2006

Ald. Bernstein moved approval of the May 22, 2006 minutes, seconded by Ald. Wollin. The vote was unanimously approved 8-0.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

Chair Rainey changed the order of the agenda to address items (P6) first.

(P6) Resolution 38-R-06 – Designating the Portion of Lee Street Between Elmwood Avenue and Maple Avenue with the Honorary Name, “Rev. Hardist E. Lane Way”

Ald. Bernstein moved approval of Resolution 38-R-06, seconded by Ald. Holmes. With no further comments or concerns to address, the vote was 8-0 in favor of the motion.

Chair Rainey resumed back to the regular order of the agenda.

(P1) Ordinance 72-O-06 – Special Use Request for a Type 2 Restaurant at 1633-35 Orrington Avenue

THIS ITEM WAS TRANSCRIBED BY COURT REPORTER LEGRAND REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE KLAEREN RULES. PLEASE REFER TO THE TRANSCRIPT.

Vote: Ald. Bernstein moved approval. The motion was seconded and the vote was unanimously approved 8-0.

(P2) Ordinance 69-O-06 – Special Use for a Religious Institution at 2004-2010 Emerson

THIS ITEM WAS TRANSCRIBED BY COURT REPORTER LEGRAND REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE KLAEREN RULES. PLEASE REFER TO THE TRANSCRIPT.
Vote: Ald. Holmes moved approval, seconded by Ald. Tisdahl. The vote was 8-0 in favor of the motion.

(P3) Planned Development 1881 Oak Avenue – Plan Commission Recommendation to Deny
THIS ITEM WAS TRANSCRIBED BY COURT REPORTER LEGRAND REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE KLAEREN RULES. PLEASE REFER TO THE TRANSCRIPT.

Vote: Ald. Jean-Baptiste moved to reject the Plan Commission’s recommendation for denial. Ald. Bernstein seconded the motion and the vote was 8-0 in favor.

(P4) Ordinance 27-0-06 – Inclusionary Housing Ordinance
THIS ITEM WAS TRANSCRIBED BY COURT REPORTER LEGRAND REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE KLAEREN RULES. PLEASE REFER TO THE ATTACHED TRANSCRIPT.

This item was held in Committee.

(P5) Resolution 39-R-06 – Water Treatment Facility Municipal Exemption
Ald. Bernstein moved approval, seconded by Ald. Moran. Ms. Regina Lookis addressed Ald. Tisdahl concerns with the landscaping and the view of the building from the street. She assured that the existing façade will remain and all revisions to the building will not disturb the present landscaping. The vote was 8-0 in favor of the motion.

(P7) Request for Sidewalk Cafes for Type 1 Restaurants
The three type 1 restaurants requesting sidewalk café are Lou Malnatti’s at 1850 Sherman Avenue, Cosi Restaurant at 1740 Sherman Avenue, and Prairie Joe’s at 1921 Central Street.

Ald. Bernstein moved approval of all three requests, seconded by Ald. Tisdahl.

Ald. Wollin felt the width of the sidewalk was too narrow for one of the restaurants. Mr. Wolinski assured that a minimum of 5 feet clearance is required for sidewalk cafes. There were several concerns mentioned regarding Lou Malnatti’s proximity to residents that will be directly effected, especially those that live almost directly above the restaurant. The Committee agreed with the direction written in the ordinance that the sell of liquor for the outside café must seize at 9:00 p.m. in order for the café to close no later than 10:00 p.m.

Ms. Rosemary Powers of 1866 Sherman and Ms. Joan Heckman of 1856 Sherman (both Sherman Garden residents), expressed their concerns with noise and street traffic due to the closeness of their units to the restaurant. They both request that the 10:00 shut down rule be followed to the maximum. Also would like to see Police presence and enforcement of the noise and closing rules. The vote was 8-0 in favor of the motion.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacqueline E. Brownlee
CITY OF EVANSTON
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

CASE NO.: P6

RE: Resolution 38-R-06 – Designating the Portion of Lee Street Between Elmwood Avenue and Maple Avenue with the Honorary Name, “Rev. Hardist E. Lane Way”.

Consideration of the proposed Resolution 38-R-06 by which the City Council would accept the recommendation of the Citizens’ Advisory Committee on Public Place Names to designate the portion of Lee Street between Elmwood Avenue and Maple Avenue with the Honorary Name, “Rev. Hardist E. Lane Way.”

Transcribed Report of Proceedings of a public hearing on the above captioned matter, held April 12, 2006 at the Village Hall of Evanston, 2100 Ridge Avenue, 2nd Floor, Evanston, Illinois, at 6:52 p.m. and presided over by A. Rainey, Chair.
PRESENT:

A. RAINNEY, Chair     L. JEAN-BAPTISTE
S. BERNSTEIN     M. WYNNE
E. TISDAHL     D. HOLMES
E. MORAN     A. HANSEN
C. WOLLIN

STAFF:

J. WOLINSKI
J. BROWNLEE
E. SZYMANSKI
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: This is the Planning and Development Committee. And the first item on our agenda is the meeting minutes from May 22nd.

Could I have a motion to approve them? Are there any changes in the discussion?

Hearing none, all those in favor say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Any opposed?

We're going to make one change which will really not affect too much the length of the meeting, and that is, I'm going to ask that we move P6 to first. And that is Reverend Hardist Lane Way.

So could I have a motion to introduce this resolution?

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: I would move to introduce this resolution tonight.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I mean, move approval.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Move approval of this resolution for tonight.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Thank you.

FEMALE: I would second.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right. Are there any people on our sign up sheet who signed up to speak to
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this matter?

    Anyone on the committee who wishes to discuss this?

    Hearing none. All those in favor of recommending to the Council that we designate a portion of Lee Street between Elmwood Avenue and Maple Avenue with the Honorary name Reverend Hardist E. Lane Way.

    (A chorus of ayes.)

    CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right. Thank you. Congratulations to Reverend Lane.
CITY OF EVANSTON  
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

CASE NO.: P1

RE: Ordinance 72-0-06 – Special Use Request for a Type 2 Restaurant at 1633-35 Orrington Avenue.

Consideration of a Zoning Board of Appeals recommendation to grant a special use for a Type 2 restaurant. The applicant proposed to operate a Pomegranate Restaurant at the subject property.

Transcribed Report of Proceedings of a public hearing on the above captioned matter, held June 12, 2006 at the Village Hall of Evanston, 2100 Ridge Avenue, 2nd Floor, Evanston, Illinois, at 6:52 p.m. and presided over by A. Rainey, Chair.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay, the first item on our regular agenda is Ordinance 72-0-06, which is a special use request for Type 2 Restaurant at 163335 Orrington Avenue.

Can I have a motion to recommend introduction?

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Yes, I do.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right. Any discussion?

Alderman Bernstein.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Yes, I just had a brief conversation with the proprietor and the zoning board, somebody started talking in terms of first the type of landlord that was here and whether this gentleman was going to have a problem creating and running his building because of the landlord.

I thought the questions were really inappropriate.

FEMALE VOICE: I did too.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: One other thing that's inappropriate is for the zoning, that we should not put lease amounts. They should be sanitized.

Off applications. That's nobody's business what the people are paying for their rent and property.

And there was, they raised another concern
with respect to an abundance of smells in the particular area, but they never inquired as to this gentleman, how we was going to dissipate smells from his establishment or even what he was creating in his establishment. What he was preparing.

I mean I talked to him tonight and I, it's going to be sort of a hybrid. You're going to order at a counter and then they're going to deliver it to you on reasonable plates.

Middle Eastern food, I'm sure it's going to be wonderful. I'll move approval.

But I think the Zoning Board really, they have the power to make inquiry with respect to cumulative effect of special use, as it relates to smells, as it relates to traffic, as it relates to anything.

And I think they, hopefully in the future, they'll take advantage of that ability.

But I bid you do well. Do business. That's all we care about. Keep it clean and keep doing it.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: You know, I thought this was a, I couldn't agree with you more about the behavior of the Zoning Board on this matter. The commentary.

And I think it just speaks so loudly to the
need for our Zoning Board to be briefed. I mean it appears as though things are being dumped on them and they sort of make things up.

It sounds like they had no idea about the relationship between the restauranteur and the owner of the building. I mean, they're partners.

And the line of questioning was very strange.

Alderman Wollin?

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Yes, thank you very much.

I was delighted with the litter plan and the pick up.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Are you sure your thing is on? Is it on?

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: I was delighted with the litter plan, thank you. And the dumpster pick up.

However, I did notice in parking, and I haven't met the owners. But that they mentioned the library parking lot and Whole Foods as the parking for their restaurant.

And as a former president of the Library Board, I would like to say the library parking lot is not for restauranteurs. And I believe Whole Foods likes to keep their parking lot for their customers.
So they, I believe, that it's a, there is a lot of pedestrian pet traffic and I don't see that as a problem, but I'd rather not see those two institutions listed as parking for their restaurant.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: You think maybe they meant the parking behind the library? People usually call that the library parking lot?

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Oh, the surface parking lot on, I hope so.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Thank you.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: I hope so.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Anybody else? Hearing none, oh, Mr. Wolinsky.

MR. WOLINSKY: Madam Chair, we do have a number of new members on the Zoning Board and I will make sure that the feelings of the Planning and Development Committee are stated to the Zoning Board members.

In deference to them, I think that some of the board members have heard the criticisms from Planning and Development that too many Type 2 restaurants are just being passed through without much examination or questioning.

So perhaps they've gone too far in one
direction, but I'll leave it at that.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: -- didn't ask any questions.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Yes, that wasn't it really. I just think that they need a briefing of some kind. And I know they're new and they seem to be really trying to do a good job.

Okay. Next item is special use for a religious institution --

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: Did we vote on --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Oh, did we?

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: No, we didn't.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All those in, I'm sorry. All those in favor of introducing Ordinance 72-0-06 to the Council, say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Any opposed? Thank you, Alderman Sean Baptiste.
CITY OF EVANSTON

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

CASE NO.:  P2

RE:  Ordinance 69-0-06 – Special Use for a Religious Institution at 2004-2010 Emerson. Consideration of a Zoning Board of Appeals recommendation to approve a new religious institution for New Hope CME Church.

Transcribed Report of Proceedings of a public hearing on the above captioned matter, held June 12, 2006 at the Village Hall of Evanston, 2100 Ridge Avenue, 2nd Floor, Evanston, Illinois, at 6:52 p.m. and presided over by A. Rainey, Chair.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Ordinance 69-0-06, a special use for religious institution at 200410 Emerson. This has to do with the Zoning Board of Appeal's recommendation to approve a new religious institution for New Hope CME Church.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: I move approval.

FEMALE VOICE: Second.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Discussion?

No discussion? Alderman, I mean, Mr. Wolinsky?

MR. WOLINSKY: In your packets there is a staff recommendation to not approve this special use. The staff's position is stated in the memoranda, primarily due to a lack of parking.

We felt that the setbacks were not sufficient and that there were issues as far as materials and whatnot in the building as well.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Could you just briefly tell us what the materials are that you objected to?

MR. WOLINSKY: To the best of my knowledge and Mr. Torvik is here who is the architect, but he was talking about modular panels on the exterior.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Are they always bad? I mean,
I've seen some --

MR. WOLINSKY: We felt at Site Plan at least that, you know, either a brick facade or some type of masonry would be appropriate on Emerson Street than modular panels.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Wollin?

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: That was one of my questions as well. Because there was an interesting vocabulary word, which I'm not going to try to pronounce.

But cementeous or something panels. And I didn't know if that meant cement panels or if they were some other material.

Because it is, it does, and I noticed that the site plan talked about the lack of windows. I also heard some concerns about parking when I drove by yesterday.

I know there are a lot of churches in the area, there's one directly across the street from this proposal.

And so that was you know, and I realize that ten spots is more than none, which is what exists now. But I don't, and I, because I went to church myself, by the time I got there, people were gone.
So I don't know what the cumulative effect there is, on a Sunday morning of having four churches in the same neighborhood, all of which were you know, all of which have I'm sure constituency. So, I understanding the parking concern.

And then I had one other question, as long as I have the microphone. That was on page of the transcript, page 48.

And this is exactly what we were talking about before. On 48 it says, well, if it's unused and unoccupied, the special use ceases to be used as a church for a period of twelve months. Then someone would have to start from the beginning, they would lose their status basically, which is what we talked about for fast food.

But on the next page, on 49, it says, special use runs with the land, which is what we were told.

So is that correct that the special use runs with the land?

MR. WOLINSKY: If I may, Madam Chair?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Yes, please.

MR. WOLINSKY: Yes, let me correct a statement that it's in the transcript by Ms. Jackson. And this...
has arisen in other areas as well.

Nonconforming structures and nonconforming uses have a twelve month abandonment period in our zoning ordinance where that if you have a nonconforming or a nonconforming structure, if the use is abandoned for more than twelve months, the use must be applied for.

Under our special use regulations, we do not have an abandonment clause. So that the special use does run with the land.

So and, so the twelve month, as far as the special use goes, it's not germane.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: So, and I, it seemed, are there opponents to this?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Wait, wait. Do we know? We're going to get into discussion.

Alderman Tisdahl, are you finished Alderman Wollin?

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Tisdahl.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: The New Hope Church is already on Emerson, it's simply moving. And it seems to me that the new building will be more attractive than
the current building.

   And therefore, I support this project.

   Also, the parking is not going to be any worse than it is now, since they're already in that area.

   CHAIRMAN RAINEY: They're going to have ten more spaces than they have right now, so.

   ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Yeah.

   CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right. Alderman Holmes.

   ALDERMAN HOLMES: Yeah, I was just going to comment that they're actually adding more parking because you're taking ten cars off of the street that would be on the street now.

   A New Hope is one block west of the current location. So part of those four churches that Alderman Wollin referred to in the area, would be the current church.

   And I'm wondering, Alderman Rainey, if we could ask the architect if he could address the materials.

   CHAIRMAN RAINEY: The materials, that's fine, yes.

   And there are several people signed up here. And as soon as we get into a little more discussion, I'm
going to call on you to see if you signed up to speak or just to show your support.

So, Mr. Torvik, is that the name? Is he here?

MR. TORVIK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Would you like to tell us a little something about the materials? Can you go over there? Because we're being recorded. Well, we're not, at the podium.

FEMALE VOICE: Madam Chair, would you have the Witness sworn, please?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Oh, okay. Where is our Court Reporter?

FEMALE VOICE: In the back.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Oh. Okay.

MR. TORVIK: Should I get my drawings?

MALE VOICE: Hold on a second.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right. Can you --

Whereupon,

JAMES TORVIK,

Called as a witness herein, after having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows.

COURT REPORTER: Could you please state and spell your name for the record?
MR. TORVIK: My name is James Torvik. My last name is T like Tom, o-r, V like Victor, i-k.
I live in Evanston at 212 Dempster Street and I've been retained as the architect for the New Hope Christian Methodist Church.
I have my drawings over there, but I think you all perhaps have the drawings as well. But I'd be happy to get mine if you'd like.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: We have line drawings. I, we don't have renderings.
So if you have a rendering, that might be helpful.

No, we have those, yeah.

MR. TORVIK: We don't have real fancy drawings for this project.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Well, we have those, yeah.

MR. TORVIK: Is it okay if I stand here and show them to you?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I guess.

MR. TORVIK: This is the facade which runs on Emerson Street.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Mr. Torvik, could you just stick to what are the materials, like what's this made
of, what's that made of?

MR. TORVIK: These, the little squares --
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Uh-huh.

MR. TORVIK: -- are the cementicious panels that are mentioned in the discussion.

This red ribbon along the top are stained glass windows. And these panels, the vertical panels are cementicious panels as well.

So this is glass over here at the entry.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And what is the, is that the steeple? Or the bell tower?

MR. TORVIK: It's the same materials.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Same. And what is that material? I think that's the thing we're having trouble with.

MR. TORVIK: It's a modular panel that is basically bolted onto the substructure, if you will. And it's a long lasting, well wearing material.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And what color is it?

MR. TORVIK: Gray.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Gray. It doesn't look like cement block, does it?

MR. TORVIK: No.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: No. Okay. I mean that sounds good to me.

I like the red glass.

MR. WOLINSKY: To be clear --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: What?

MR. WOLINSKY: To be clear, we use cementicious paneling on one of our affordable housing projects, the one on Darrell, at 1816 Darrell. It resembles vinyl siding.

MR. TORVIK: We could talk about that all night long.

MR. WOLINSKY: Yeah, okay.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Is it controversial or a matter of taste?

MR. TORVIK: It's a matter of taste. And I guess, I try to do good work wherever I work and I think my track record in Evanston is pretty strong.

So I'm going to make the very best out of this building as I possibly can.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Thank you very much. Thank you.

Do any members of the Council want to say
anything else? I'd like to ask people if they wish to speak or just show their support.

We have several people here who, Reverend Linda Jordan is here, are you here to speak, Reverend Jordan?

REVEREND JORDAN: I'm here to speak.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay. The next person is Tommy Robinson and Ken Brown. And if you all are here and you wish to speak, could you please all go up so we can have.

Does she need to be sworn in?

FEMALE VOICE: She should be.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Are you Mary?

FEMALE VOICE: -- we were going to but this time, didn't get around to it.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Should we swear, let me ask our lawyer here.

MS. SZYMANSKI: Madam Chair, if the witnesses are merely going to summarize the record and present no new evidence, then there is no need to swear the witnesses.

If there is any concern that the Committee may have that new information may come in, then swearing the
witnesses is advisable.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: These are supporters of the church, so I don't think they're going to tell us anything new. They're going to tell us how sweet it is.

Okay, Reverend, could you just give us your name and your address so we could have it on the record.

REVEREND JORDAN: Reverend Linda A. Jordan. My address, my home address you want?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Uh-huh.

REVEREND JORDAN: 2808 North Sherman Boulevard, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay. All right, go ahead.

REVEREND JORDAN: Okay. What I wanted to say about the parking is that most of our congregants live in the area. We don't have a commuter church where people are coming in from other areas.

The people there are vested in the community. Our church is a historic church, so it's not like it's a new church. And the land that we purchased, was unavailable all these years. The family did not want to sell it for personal reasons. They really wanted to sell it to someone like a church.

And so it's been vacant for about 40 years.
And so it's been an eyesore there in this grand gateway that we're talking about, coming into the Evanston area.

We want to be able to move our church to this land that has been sitting vacant so that we can expand the edifice so that it could accommodate the things that we want to do for the community.

The computer lab, the safe place for the children before and after school, the community. We canvassed the community and the residents are interested in this kind of community service to the area.

Now, we sold the property 2027 Church Street and that went back on the tax rolls. And we're also planning on selling the old church site that we have now to a private investor. So that that will go back on the tax rolls also.

And that, we're anticipating that whatever is done there is going to help with the redevelopment and enhance the beautification of that community.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Thank you very much.

REVEREND JORDAN: I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Sir could you give your name and address please?
MR. BROWN: My name is Kenneth Brown and I'm the Chairman of the Trustee Board at New Hope CME Church.

Our Pastor has covered most of, I mean, what was to be said. But I think there hasn't been a new Church in Evanston out there for a long time. For like, I say, I think our new church is going to beautify the west side.

So therefore, I mean, I mean we going to be able to do things that most churches hasn't done. So, but if we are given this opportunity, then I'm going to say, you're going to see a beautiful extras out there. Because I've seen all the pictures of it and I know it's going to be. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Thank you very much.

Okay, I take it Mr. Robinson is not here? Tommy Robinson is not here to speak, so we'll just move on.

All right. Thank you very much. Any other comments?

We have motion on the floor to move introduction. All those in favor, say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)
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CHAIRMAN RAINHEY: Any opposed? Thank you very much.
CITY OF EVANSTON

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

CASE NO.: P3

RE: Planned Development – 1881 Oak Avenue – Plan Commission Recommendation to Deny. Consideration of the Plan Commission recommendation to deny the planned development at 1881 Oak Avenue, a proposed 18-story, 165 residential unit building with 247 space parking garage.

Transcribed Report of Proceedings of a public hearing on the above captioned matter, held June 12, 2006 at the Village Hall of Evanston, 2100 Ridge Avenue, 2nd Floor, Evanston, Illinois, at 6:52 p.m. and presided over by A. Rainey, Chair.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay. Next item is 1881 Oak Avenue. The Plan Commission has made a recommendation and sent a recommendation to us to deny this project. Which is a planned development at 1881 Oak Avenue. 18 story, 165 residential unit building with 247 space parking garage.

Just for the record, that's a motion to introduce.

Just for the record, I heard from several community members tonight that we were either going to approve or deny this project. But really, what we're doing here tonight is we're either accepting or rejecting the recommendation the Plan Commission, is that correct?

MS. SZYMANSKI: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Madam Lawyer, okay. And then based on our decision, for example, if we reject the Plan Commission's recommendation, then --

MS. SZYMANSKI: Then an ordinance would be required to grant the approval. The staff would require two weeks to prepare such an ordinance. It would then be on the Planning and Development Committee's agenda at its next meeting for discussion and possibly
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introduction.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay. Thank you. Just wanted to clarify some comments I heard.

Alderman Jean Baptiste.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: I move rejection of the Plan Commission's recommendation.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay. Is there a second?

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Second.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay. Any discussion?

Okay. You're ten, nine, eight, hearing none? Hearing none. All those in favor of rejecting the Plan Commission's recommendation to deny, say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Any opposed? Okay. Moving right along, good night.

I don't see there's any point in any further discussion on this.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: You got a public wants to speak --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Yes, the public wants to speak. Let me see my list. I didn't see, oh, there was, I beg your pardon, there were. I'm just thinking when this comes back to us
as a planned development, would that not be the time for us to thrash out this project?

I mean, because I have some issues with the project. I just am not in favor of rejecting it. So.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: I don't know what the neighbors want --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right, well, we'll maybe this will help us in going forward, so former Alderman Paden is on the list to speak.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: Alderman.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Yes.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: Alderman Rainey.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Yes.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: We voted to --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Reject.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: -- to reject that.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: The plan.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: And if we are now voting --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: No, we are not.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: -- considering any introduction of anything, I think then it's time for discussion. If we're not, then we are to wait until.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: We really aren't in the
position to discuss anything tonight.

But to be fair to people who came, we always try to let people speak.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: But I'm trying to understand --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And but it's just important --

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: -- process.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: -- that, right. I mean, we're not going to do any discussion tonight. But I do want people who took the time to come out to speak. And besides, an ordinance is going to be presented to us, and so --

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: I understand.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: -- this will be their opportunity for input.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: But what I'm suggesting then, if we will entertain any discussion, and if the proponents came to discuss, to present their views, then let them make their presentation if we're going to entertain anything.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Well --

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: The vote would be --
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Yeah.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: We would leave the record, you know, totally one sided at this particular point in time, if we just hear --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I'm sorry, but --

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: -- the opponents.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Well, we're going to entertain anybody who wants to come up to the podium to speak.

But there's not going to be any formal discussion about the, about the plan commit, about the planned development ordinance which will be on our agenda in two weeks.

So if Mr. Reefman would like to speak at the podium for a few minutes, I mean, he's going to be allowed to do that.

Do you have something to add?

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: Just before --

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Could I ask Counsel a question?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: You know what? Alderman Bernstein go ahead. And then we're going to stop this, okay?
ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: I would like to ask Ellen, do we need to create standards, or is that the next time?

MS. Szymanski: Part of the ordinance that will come back to you will contain standards proposed for your discussion by staff.

And I will advise you at this time, that your approval will require six Aldermanic votes because there are, I think it's starting to certain site development allowances.

DAVE REIFMAN: I just have a question of clarification, Madam Chairman.

We do have a presentation regarding certain key elements of the project. Is that something you want to defer until the next meeting?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I think we should defer it.

DAVE REIFMAN: Then I would ask that perhaps that all discussion be deferred, because we would like an opportunity to present the attributes of the project before the opportunity to object to those --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I'm going to, I'm going to decide that we had an issue before us tonight to accept or reject the Plan Commission's recommendation.
Counsel had an opportunity, the Committee had an opportunity to discuss that, everybody seemed to be of the same mind, we voted to reject that recommendation.

I am giving citizens an opportunity to make a few comments before we go forward to the next agenda item.

At our next meeting, we will have an ordinance that is a planned development ordinance for 1880 Oak. And then everybody can come back and you know.

Alderman Paden. Welcome.

ALDERMAN PADEN: My name is Betty Burns Paden. I live at 1122 Emerson Street.

I'm in support of having building in the area since the city has torn down the whole area. And hardly anybody is there.

But I'm asking for you to reject an 18 story building. And 18 story building is not in conformity with the neighborhood. And what's happening is, is you're making me live downtown Evanston. And maybe downtown Chicago, the way we're going.

So we're saying no high rise that big. The zoning said that it should be 10 to 12, no eight to ten
stories because that's the way the neighborhood is.

I think what's happening is this 18 story building is overshadowing the area. I own four pieces of property in that block. One on the east side, no one on the south side and three on the north side.

And we're asking, we're saying that there is not enough space for the 18 stories, and not enough space for so many condominiums.

And I think what's happening is they're pushing us out. And apparently, we pushing and pushing and pushing out more and more as the years go on.

20 years it's been since a research park pushed us out and I think we need to build up on it. But I don't think that we need to build 18 story place.

And last time we were here, and maybe you weren't here, but the developer is discussing it's going to drive the property values up. Which is not exciting because that just means I pay more taxes. Then if I pay more taxes, then I won't be able to live there. And my tenants won't be able to live there.

So I have brought today for you petitions that have been signed by the people that live in the area. The people that work in the area. And the people that
come to do business in the area.

And we had more petitions than this, but since this was like a very short, fast time, I brought this. And this is 117 people are objecting to an 18 story building at 1881 Oak.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Can you old those and bring the rest of them when we deal with the planned development.

ALDERMAN PADEN: No.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay.

ALDERMAN PADEN: Well, the reason is I'm not sure I'll be here in two weeks.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay.

ALDERMAN PADEN: So I'd like to hand them in now --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay.

ALDERMAN PADEN: And then with the rest of them that are still out there, I'll send them in two weeks.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay.

ALDERMAN PADEN: How does that sound?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right. Just so you know, that it's in two weeks.

ALDERMAN PADEN: Well, just send them down
together. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All Right. Thank you, Betty.

I believe the name is Reverend Robert Thomas is here? Yes. Reverend Thomas.

REVEREND THOMAS: Madam Chair, members of the Committee. I'm Reverend Robert Thomas. I reside at 1001 Emerson.

I'm reading a letter prepared by Pastor Oscar Crier. I really would prefer to defer to your earlier statement, since we're already have chosen to go forward one way proceeding.

It's kind of you know, I have no idea how to sign up. But to proceed, when you've already said we want to move discussion to another two weeks later, would be the main thing.

Pastor Crier --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Would you be able to come back?

REVEREND THOMAS: Well, I won't be able to, Pastor Crier should be able to come back at that time too.

I was here just to support for the project.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay.
REVEREND THOMAS: And I believe that the letter, yes. So you do have the letter?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Yes, we do.

REVEREND THOMAS: Yes, okay.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Thank you very much. Mr. Wolinsky, should I give these to you --

MR. WOLINSKY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: -- for copying so that we all get a copy.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: Plus I would think that the proponents would need to get a copy so that they --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Yeah, the staff will take care of all that. Absolutely. Absolutely.

Okay. Hearing no other discussion, we're going to move on to the next agenda item. Thank you.
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CHAIRMAN RAINEY: The next item on our agenda is inclusionary housing which is ordinance 27-0-06. The new information we have here is the report of the developer's meeting which, I thought was pretty interesting.

Were there any Aldermen at that meeting?
FEMALE VOICE: Yes.
MALE VOICE: I was there.
FEMALE VOICE: Alderman Wynn was there as well.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay. All right. Okay. So what's the pleasure of the Committee on this?
ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Before --
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Bernstein?
ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: See, Mr. King.
MR. KING: Yes.
ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: I see a lot of suits.
MR. KING: Yes, sir.
ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: I recall my days as a zoning lawyer when I would assemble a big payroll of people and I'm wondering if they would like to go forward tonight with some of their presentation.

I mean, we're talking in terms of costs. And
I don't know what --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: We don't have an ordinance, Alderman Jean Baptiste, I mean, Alderman Bernstein.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: All right.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: We don't have, we don't have an ordinance.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Okay. I just --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I'm mean, we could have had a two hour discussion on whether or not to deny, to accept the denial or not. But we didn't.

We don't have an ordinance before us. And there evidently was no debate as to whether or not we had any issues with the Plan Commission's denial.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: But --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I would think, when you were a lawyer doing this kind of thing, you would have been very grateful to have had that decision made.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Depends.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Maybe not. Maybe not.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: You know, the Chair did indicate some difference of opinion with respect to the project proposed.

And that you know, in light of the fact that
they've got all these folks assembled, I'm wondering if they could give us some of it so that you could vent your opinions tonight, if that's possible.

I think it might help us clarify an ordinance that we're going to vote on in two weeks.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: We don't have the ordinance. The ordinance will come from the presentation. I mean if the Committee wants to do that, fine.

I'm not prepared to participate in it, but I think we need to do it like we do with everybody. I mean we don't do this with everybody.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Why don't we have a discussion --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Well, you know, I was really prepared, Alderman Moran? He hasn't spoken.

ALDERMAN MORAN: I think just as a point of order, we don't have anything on our agenda right now to entertain.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Okay.

ALDERMAN MORAN: It's been disposed of.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: It has been disposed of. And I appreciate your coming but there was really.

The issue was whether or not to accept or
reject the Plan Commission's denial.

MALE VOICE: Thank you.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Okay. Moving right along.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: So unfortunately, the inclusionary housing ordinance was on the floor and --

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Sorry, I apologize, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: -- disrupted here.

Anybody have any comments about this? Anybody want to report on the meeting with the developers?

Alderman Moran, you were there right?

ALDERMAN MORAN: Yes, I was thank you.

The first thing I would like to do is move approval generally for an ordinance. But obviously we have some, we have some other issues that need to be decided before we have a complete ordinance.

And I don't, maybe legal counsel can give me some notion on how to proceed with those two tasks.

MS. SZYMANSKI: What I would suggest, Alderman, is that we go through the ordinance. There are a lot of blank spaces, a lot of items for discussion that I responded to, that other staff responded to.

I think you need to decide those before --
ALDERMAN MORAN: Okay.

MS. SZYMANSKI: -- before you go forward with a, even with a straw vote.

ALDERMAN MORAN: That makes sense.

CHAIRMAN RAINNEY: Okay.

ALDERMAN MORAN: If I can, then Madam Chairman, I would like to address --

CHAIRMAN RAINNEY: These?

ALDERMAN MORAN: -- the items.

On the agenda item summary, there are what's referred to as main changes that are highlighted. With respect to the general requirement of changing it from 10 percent to 15 percent, set aside, I would advocate for that particular change. And suggest that it be adopted.

For the affordability period. And I think this provision is on page 7 of the draft that we have. And I would move that amongst the options that are presented, I would move that the affordability period be in perpetuity or as long as --

CHAIRMAN RAINNEY: Alderman Moran, just one second.

ALDERMAN MORAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: You did move the afford ability, or the 10 percent to 15 percent --
ALDERMAN MORAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Was there a second?
ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Second.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I mean are you doing this?
ALDERMAN MORAN: Take votes.
FEMALE VOICE: It was seconded.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right. Are we, you want to discuss these individually --
ALDERMAN MORAN: Well, I mean we can vote on them individually. That's fine.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Well, if we're going to vote on them individually --
ALDERMAN MORAN: That way we should discuss them.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: -- shouldn't we discuss them?
ALDERMAN MORAN: Sure.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Individually? Okay. So. All right, so let's start with the 10 to 15 percent increase. Okay.
ALDERMAN MORAN: I move approval.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Do you want to argue?

ALDERMAN MORAN: I think that it's the right thing to do. I think that afford ability is going to be a very serious issue. Here it already is in my estimation.

And I would simply advocate that we be more inclusive with respect to this particular criterion. And try to create as many affordable housing units as we can.

So I think the notion of being more aggressive in terms of the percentage of set aside units is the right one. And I would suggest that we adopt it.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And what, and it's, for how many units? I mean, what portion of units in the building would that be for those in television land?

ALDERMAN MORAN: 15 percent.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I know, but of how many, what's the threshold?

ALDERMAN MORAN: 25.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay. Anything else? Anybody else want to comment? Alderman Tisdahl?

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Thank you, Alderman Rainey. And one of the things the developer said at
the meeting, that is contrast between our community and others where this has, where these ordinances have worked, is that where we lack a tool box, since Alderman Wynn isn't here, I can say that word.

And since we're not giving any help to the developer in terms of -- parking or greater density, it's conceivable that this ordinance will not work the same way in our community, that it has worked in the communities that have a tool box.

And with interest rates rising, developers are thinking twice about all of their projects.

I strongly support Alderman Rainey, your concept of a referendum and a steady stream of income. I am afraid that if, certainly if we raise this to 15 percent, that we can discourage development.

I think there is some signs that development is already being discouraged in this community.

And I am worried that this will send developers to other communities where they will either have an inclusionary ordinance with a tool box to make it acceptable or it won't have an inclusionary ordinance.

So I'd like a steady stream of income and not
one that interest rates will eventually cut off.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: What, were there specific comments about the time period or was that an after the fact?

I mean, I would imagine they were more concerned about --

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: I don't recall --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I mean the time period really should be the issue we deal with last because you can't have a time period if you don't have units set aside, so.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: No, I do not recall much discussion at all of that time period.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay. Go ahead.

ALDERMAN MORAN: I was just going to comment on that point.

If I'm not mistaken, I think I recall there were a couple of comments. And I think they generally ran towards the longer periods.

The sense being that if we were going to create an inventory of affordable housing, why would you do it and not keep it, not try to preserve it for as long a period of time as we could.
So I don't, I mean, I don't think there was much of a division of approach from the developers to what a lot of the discussion has been here.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Wollin?

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Yeah, I was going to say on page 3 of the developer comments, under expanded city programmatic role needed.

They did talk about the fact that the 15, the bottom one, the bottom bullet of that middle section. A 15 year term, afford ability period was too short considering how difficult it was to produce these units and to find qualified buyers.

And that once we went through all that, it was, and Mr. Roszak commented on his problems in finding tenants or homeowner, buyers for his affordable units.

That it would be you know, foolish to make it that short a time period. That they wanted, if they're going to go through all this work, they wanted it to be longer.

MR. WOLINSKY: One of the issues I think that we've not looked at and perhaps we should, in the discussions concerning inclusionary housing.

Is that I think the Council is in agreement
that the plan development process is the route that would be the vehicle for inclusionary housing. 25 units or more would require inclusionary housing.

Some of the thoughts that I have on this is, I think the thinking right now from the development community is that they look at the underlying zoning. They look at what a planned development allowance can give them and then they consider the site development allowances as a given or as a right.

So that can add sometimes an additional 40 feet to a building or it can add certainly a number of units.

So one of the things that I've been thinking about is that to go this route, is that perhaps there should be an increased amount of percentage. If in other words, if you're going to do the underlying zoning.

If you're in a B-3 district, your underlying zoning allows you to go 85 feet, you're putting residential or your putting business on the first floor, you're putting residential above, up to 85 feet.

With that comes four floors of parking. If it's, as long as it's required parking. However, so
that gives you 125 feet.

Now, if the developer wants the additional site development allowances, which can allow you an additional 40 feet and can also allow you an additional number of units --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: You mean under a planned development?

MR. WOLINSKY: -- under a planned development. Then perhaps the requirement for inclusionary housing or required affordable housing goes up some percentage, as you go up. As you continue to go up.

And then if the developer wishes to, for instance, say it's 10 percent if you're complying with the underlying zoning. It's 15 percent if, or 12 and a half percent, something like that, if you want to proceed with the granting of site development allowances.

And if you want to exceed the site development allowances, as we have seen in a number of cases, that the percentage goes up again. So maybe that would be 15, 18, 20 percent.

So that, what would give the developer a way to, and give the city a way to regulate, perhaps, some
of the issues we have with height in this community, and
density that the developer, if he's going to go to these
extremes, he's going to pay for it in the terms of
affordable housing.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: Isn't that, you know, the
tool box we visited?

MALE VOICE: It is.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: But Alderman Wynn's not
here --

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: So we can talk about it.

So.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I didn't say that, so --

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: You said the tool box.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: That's disrespectful.

But there, I mean, she certainly has a point, you
know. However, the developers have a point too. I
mean, if you want them to give us something, don't we
have to give back something?

Alderman Bernstein.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: All right. The threshold
question here I guess is, if we have 25 units as of
rights, do we have affordable housing? -- mandated in
that instance to come forward with 15 percent or
whatever of that 25 units.

To the extent that we have a planned unit development, which all I guess, all 25 units are going to be, but if they're not asking for anything additional. If they're not trying to invade that next plateau, then there's an issue.

I mean that's what I think what we have to decide initially. If we want affordable housing, it has to impact the first and the second.

The tool box comes in in that area between as of right zoning and the planned unit development extensions.

I think your idea is a good one if we can work it. But then I think you're talking about, I'll speak for Alderman Wynn who is not here tonight, at the top of my lungs, about increased height.

If you're talking about adding an incremental height requirement or allowance for the PUD and then an additional one, you know, that's something that we have to talk to the community about.

I mean, that really proposes some tall buildings. And then there's a question of trade off of those high dense buildings as opposed to affordable
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housing.

And I mean I think that we have to talk in terms of what we want. We've been talking for three years. I don't know what we want. I mean, I don't, you know I think that's an important thing.

But there are tool boxes. And I think what the developers, and I wasn't there unfortunately, I couldn't attend. But I think they want definite numbers, they want to know what it's going to cost them to build in Evanston.

So to the extent that we can provide that, let's do that.

Enhance, but the bonus is in effect, take our discretion away from us, from the as of right, to the PUD. If they're going to go, come in and ask for the allowances up to the mandates of the PUD, the ceiling of the PUD, then what are we providing for them?

Then they can see exactly what it's going to cost them, what the set asides, if any, are going to be, and then they know what their bottom line is going to be. Then make a decision whether or not to go forward with the project.

If we're going to allow them to go yet again
and above --.

That's what Melissa was objecting to. You know way back when, I mentioned the fact that maybe our zoning ordinance is out of whack. With respect to what's as of right now. And maybe we should pare it back so that we can in fact afford this greater latitude there.

But, I don't know, I mean, it just --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: But that's a while coming, I think.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Well, I don't know. I mean, that's what we have to decide.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Mr. Wolinsky?

MR. WOLINSKY: If I can just respond to Alderman Bernstein.

In, and I understand what you're saying, it's really the tool box issue is one that the housing task force discussed and was not favored by the Planning and Development Committee over the past several years.

However, I would point out that these site development allowances have been granted anyways. By the council on a number projects. And we have gotten not a whole lot in return.
ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Right.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay. Alderman Wollin then Alderman Moran. She beat you.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: The other thing that I'm concerned about and I hope that we can grapple with, is that we've been getting, because we have nothing in writing, we've been getting a certain amount per unit from developers toward the mayor's affordable housing fund.

I have no idea, and it may just be me, how that, where that money is kept, how it is spent, what kinds of criteria are used before it's allocated. And I think that we have no strategic plan on how to do that.

I agree that sometimes the suggestions that have been made about rehabbing two flats or rehabbing houses that could be made into affordable housing. That may be a very good use of that money.

I don't know who is actually handing, you know, handling the store there. And I don't know if we have a plan for how it's going to be handled and how it's going to be doled out and who makes those decisions. Is it the housing commission?

You know, I think the mayor is giving her name
to it, but I don't think that she's personally you know, in charge of deciding.

And so, you know, I think I got the clear impression from their discussion as well, that they kind of like to know what's happening to this and how it's being handled.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And we've asked that question. We've asked that question. And I think it's really up to the --

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: To who?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I have asked it several times.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: I mean, to whom? To the --
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I have asked it in the Council setting, so to our staff.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: All right.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: But we need to set a policy. I mean that's all part of this inclusionary housing thing.

That's what I would like to see us do is to attack the current housing stock as opposed to worrying about all these new buildings.

I don't know if too many families would want
to live on the 18th floor or the 16th floor or the 12th floor for that matter.

   It's you know, it's not family friendly downtown. I don't care what developer's say, it's not.

   And so there are plenty of houses on the market in our town with some sort of subsidy could be made affordable. And it seems just economically very efficient.

   And it, you know, anyway. Alderman Moran and then Alderman Jean-Baptiste.

   ALDERMAN MORAN: On this score, I mean, the fact of the matter is the plan development is not only a tool box, it's like a steamer trunk. Some of the projects that are on our agenda tonight are like a triple steamer trunk.

   So, I'm not sure I get this tool box thing because we have tool boxes that show up you know, regularly. And we welcome them regularly.

   So, I don't really understand the notion that we don't make concessions you know, for developments. And I think Jim's point is a significant one. A lot of these times we give a lot away and we don't ask for anything in return.
So you know, I would say that if affordable housing a value that we want to express and articulate, we need to get into the plan development ordinance, the fact that affordable housing is one of the public benefits that will be looked upon favorably.

And that as people come forward and ask us for these allowances, that we get something back. And I think that something, it could be other things as well, but one of the things should be affordable housing.

And, I, you know, I think over the course of time we can have a more precise discussion of what the tool, what tools will go in the tool box.

You know, there is several things that we can do. Expedited review, waiver of fees, some of this stuff. And I think, you know, again the developers are saying well, you know, how are you going to help us.

And I think one of the ways that we can express a desire that has an economic dimension to it, is to move along the review of their plans or to waive fees or perhaps to do other things. Including all the things that we do in planned developments right now, which is to give allowances for you know, in excess of the underlying zoning.
So I think you know, what we really need to do, I don't think we have to get jump up on this. I think all of this is inherent in the scheme that's being offered here.

And I think that our step, our first step is to start developing these criteria. And I, in my point being that the 15 percent is a stronger expression of value than the 10 percent.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Well, let me ask you a question.

ALDERMAN MORAN: No.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: How do you respond to the Roszak issue that he did that and he couldn't get anybody in those units?

ALDERMAN MORAN: Well, you know, part of what --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: They were either in, and what the developer said I thought was interesting because we've seen the same thing with our rehab program.

People either made too much money or too little money. You know. He couldn't get the people --

ALDERMAN MORAN: Well, that's a hard question to answer in some respects because --
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: It totally goes to setting aside 15 percent of units in a building.

ALDERMAN MORAN: I'm not so, I'm not convinced that that's the case.

Roszak was sort of the test tube baby on this thing. You know, he was going to make the offer to do this and it didn't work well.

But we have, you know, we've received materials that suggest that set aside programs have been very successful in many, many other municipalities around the country.

You know, we've had studies and reports on Montgomery County, Maryland where I think they had like 3,600 new units of affordable housing. There are any number of markets where having it set aside has worked very well.

I think that we have to refine our techniques and maybe look at things like tool boxes and so and so forth, to ensure that the program works.

But I don't think it does as much good to say well, you know, there might be a problem and rather than thinking about how we refine the process, we just said well, don't have a set aside.
I think we need to make an expression of a desire to generate new affordable housing units. And then I think we need to, I mean, this is going to be a process that's going to go on for a time. I mean this isn't going to be the end of it, when we adopt this inclusionary zoning ordinance.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Jean-Baptiste, you're next.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: My overall reading of where we stand is that we've had no policy at all on housing, zoning or otherwise. We've, I would think that the trend that we are in right now is probably ten years old.

When I came on to the Council in 2001. Sherman Plaza was the project that we were all wrestling with. And we gave back a whole bunch of money because we were always concerned that this particular project would fail.

And then as we got you know, as we went into other projects that were you know, not as weak and we were not as concerned because they were not at the center of town, we became a little more, a little harder in terms of the give to some of the developers. Roszak
was one in question.

So I think that we've sort of approached all of this spontaneously. But yet, and still we have a whole bunch of concerns that we talk about every year. When it's budget time, we talk about the need for, we project the kind of revenue that we'll get from housing.

When we talk about property tax, we talk bout the fact that the more units, new units we have, the more, the more spread out our obligations as existing homeowners.

And of course, the affordable housing issues has been something that we decided you know, as we went along, and it has gotten very little priority from us.

What I would think is that Alderman Rainey's comment that we are to focus on our existing housing stock to make them more affordable, to make that stock more affordable. That's a good idea, but I don't know an application, how that would work.

I mean, if you have a boarded up piece of property --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I'm not talking about a boarded up property.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: Well, I'm saying --
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I'm talking about the three houses on my block that are for sale, they are all borderline affordable, but not quite.

But if we had a subsidy to buyers, three wonderful families could be in --

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: That would be a good idea. Subsidies to the buyers --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: That's what I'm talking about.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: Because that way you don't depress the market value for those neighbors.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: No, no, no, absolutely not.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: So I support that. But I don't think that's incompatible with asking developers to set aside a percentage of their units for affordable, for the affordable consumers.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: As long as you would permit for them to make a payment in lieu of setting aside --

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: Well, that's what I'm saying --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Because we need cash --

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: -- to advance this.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: We need cash to subsidize
ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: I mean I don't think we can be stuck. We need to advance this.

And so what I would suggest, Alderman Moran, is that we stay at the 10 percent, we do a payment in lieu of, and we move this ordinance and we pass it.

Because we've had a lot of debate over this issue. We have people on different, you know, parts of the you know, the whole spectrum. And we've not moved it forward aggressively.

So I would suggest that we try to incorporate even some language in there that talk about the city engaging in creating a subsidy for new homeowners from the city, who are, who live in the City of Evanston or work in the City of Evanston, to be able to buy homes in the various neighborhoods throughout the city on top of what we have here.

And I would also suggest that we stop treating the tool box as if it's a bad word. Because you know, that way we will remain spontaneous. We know that we have policy interests at play. We know that there's certain things that we want. But get caught up project by project, ward by ward, you know.
And it's unfair, really because when you know, the process goes on, then it depends on how much work we do with one another to try to get a particular project moved. As opposed to a policy or a general thrust dictating where we need to go.

And if we can debate that policy and come up with it, then if it's, if the majority votes that that is a policy, then that's the policy.

And any Alderman who is in the minority, they're going to have to follow that in its application.

So I would move at this point, I don't even know where we at really. Because we were talking about the 10 to 15 percent.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: We have a motion on the floor, we have a motion, do you want to know where we are?

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: We have 10 to 15 percent.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: We have a motion on the floor to increase the general requirement from 10 to 15 percent set aside.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: All right. Okay. So then, let's try to, but I think if we take a piece meal, though. I mean, can we get a package, that you can join
and everybody else can join and we can have something going.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: We have a list of people here.

We have Alderman Bernstein, then Alderman Wollin and then Alderman Moran again.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Yeah. I think that Alderman Rainey's suggestion of a referendum to add 1 percent to the revenue transfer to be placed into a fund in part will address some of that rehab kind of money.

Clearly we're talking about subsidies and we're talking about who is going to do the subsidizing. Right now, we're trying to get deeply into the developer's pocket as we can.

But the reality is that it's going to slow development. I don't think that's, that can be stopped. I think if you have this, unless we can give them something to offset some of those costs. They're not going to come in and be altruistic.

Roszak is not a good example of why this thing failed. Because as I recall, Roszak's numbers, instead of 175,000 single unit, we're talking about, he was talking about $300,000 with kind of a two prong subsidy.
And at the end of the day, the homeowner, prospective homeowner had to come in with $100,000 or something ludicrous. Nobody could do that.

I mean the, it was less than the market rate for the other city projects, but it wasn't affordable housing. So that's not a good model to look at.

I think that you know, this goes along, it has to go hand in hand with zoning. And we have to make definitive statements with respect to what's allowed, and what we're going to give for what's not allowed. I mean what we're going to expect in return for what's not allowed.

And that's all we can do. Will it slow development? Yeah, I think so. Although Highland Park claims not to have been slowed, maybe they weren't looking at it.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: But then you've got to ask them how many units did they produce.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Well, see, I mean, the reality is that nine years ago when there was no development in this community, we were racing outside begging people to come into our town.

You know and we would, I mean, I don't know if
this is something I think we gave away the store, but we certainly changed the appearance of the City of Evanston.

And you know, it's a mixed blessing. All development is a mixed blessing. But now we're in a circumstance where some of us feel that there might be a saturation point having been reached already.

So would I like to take over some of these houses to subsidize good people who can just, with a little bit of help, make it? Absolutely.

That's one way though. I mean, so we have to, there has to be a tool box.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: But Alderman Bernstein, if we do slow development with this, then the affordable housing project isn't produced, right?

I mean, it's really, it's a very serious situation. If we can prove the development would be the slowed, then the affordable units will not be generated.

So, I mean, I think we need to really look at the payment in lieu, a reasonable payment in lieu to generate money so that we can generate people buying houses.

The number of units we're going to generate,
even with a 15 percent set aside, is so minuscule in the scheme of things. And the number of people who are going to want the families to live in these tall buildings, I don't know who they are.

Anyway, are you finished because Alderman Wollin.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Just you know, we talked about this, I think we when talked in terms of the whole task force. We came back to the Council and it was the prior Council I think even.

The payment in lieu seemed to be the most acceptable to everybody. Set aside. And I don't know if it's $63,000 a unit, because that really has, we have to give something to defer that kind of price.

But I think the payment in lieu is the easiest thing to do. But then we have to have a methodology to use that money to subsidize for the benefit of people who want to be affordable.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: But everybody is talking about the number of for sale signs up in the neighborhood. I mean, people are moving up and people are moving out.

We have th product for people to buy. But
they just can't afford it. They need a little help. They need a little help.

All right. Next is Alderman Wollin. Well, I've got a couple of things.

First of all Highland Park and Wilmette, there's a lot of their affordable housing by building housing for the elderly. You know, we already have a lot of housing for the elderly in town. So that wasn't.

It wasn't, I don't want to say it was an easy option, but certainly it was a different kind of an option than we're talking about.

Roszak, Roszak dealt with CIF Center for Independent Futures was people who were looking for units for their adult children who may be slightly developmentally disabled, so that they could live independent lifestyles as adults.

So some of that money was coming from trust funds, it was a very complicated project to put together. I think he did nine successfully and he had 12 or something left over, that he came back to us and then asked about.

But I think the intention for that particular project was very noble. And I you know, and I certainly
admire the work that went in, both on the realtor's part as well as the organizational part.

And I do think that we have to look at, we've got to start putting these policies down in writing.

So, you know, one of the things the developer said is there is no clear, we don't have any clear idea what's expected. And development is slowing down by itself.

It's not that we're going to put this affordable percentage on all of a sudden, we're going to see that housing isn't being built as much anymore, condos aren't being built.

The very nature of the marketplace is slowing down. We're running out of space, their construction costs are escalating. And they're saying we've got a very small margin as it is.

So you're asking us to give up that small margin by giving contributions to affordable housing.

I mean it's a very complicated picture. But all those pieces kind of work together.

And I, you know the feeling that I got from sitting there listening to the developers and the other Aldermen can comment. I was sitting next to Alderman
Wynn when they kept mentioning tool box and she was okay, she was handling it all right.

But I do think --

MALE VOICE: Poor Alderman Wynn.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I know.

FEMALE VOICE: That will teach her not to take off.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: There is a certain amount of you know, flexibility that we have to have. But I am not, I mean, I'm not willing to give enormous height away for affordable housing.

You know, and so, and I've, as you can imagine in the first ward, there's been a lot of chatter about some of these proposals that are flying out there in the wind.

You know, I have said these are things that have to be evaluated very carefully. And I'm not ready to say well, if you give us you know this much money per unit, you can go as high as you want to. That's not my position.

And so I think we don't want to do that either. We have to somehow find a reasonable you know, policy here that we can implement and stick to it. And
say it's very, then once you have a policy you can say, well, that's our policy.

You know, it is an individual, it's not a whim. This is the way we're going to do it. And I would really like to see that happen.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay. Alderman Moran and then Alderman Tisdahl.

ALDERMAN MORAN: I really would like to get an inclusionary zoning ordinance. And if we, if sticking at 10 percent makes people comfortable enough to vote on inclusionary zoning ordinance, I'll support it.

I'd, obviously, I've already stated my own preference, but I think we need an ordinance. We need criteria, we need to get going.

I think that the notion that development will slow, I think when you look at the successes or lack thereof around the country and different markets. Ultimately, it comes down to the state of the economy much more than anything that we ever say about affordable housing.

If the economy goes into the tank, you're right. We won't have affordable housing, we won't have any other building either. I mean when John Buck came,
that was the only building that was built between here and Milwaukee for I think for about 15 years. It didn't have anything to do with affordable housing, it was where the economy was.

So I think we need to kind of move away from the notion of this is going to kill development. I think what we have to understand is if market forces will be at play and they're going to dictate to a very, very large degree how much building there will be or won't be.

But to get the full slate, I mean, I will go for 10 percent. I think for the affordable period, I think we should, even the developers recognize the notion, why create this housing, create this inventory and then let it get away.

The distribution in attributes. Now, this version has the interior sizes and finishes should be the same. I don't understand that. The external I can understand because you don't really want anybody to feel that from you know, a global perspective a drive-by perspective, that somehow you're being shuffled off to some substandard unit in a development.

But on the other hand, I think that it's not
key to a good solid affordable housing program to say, you know, if the guy down at the end of the hall gets granite countertops, that the affordable unit should, just has to have granite countertops.

I don't, I think that's a good give back. I think the people who are looking for affordable housing are not looking for a granite countertop. They're looking for a place to live.

So if they get a linoleum floor as opposed to a cherry wood floor, I don't see that as bad. I see it as a home. That a family that couldn't get a home otherwise, will have one. It may not have the luxe finish, but that's okay, that's okay. If it allows them to get a home.

So I would suggest that change. That the interior finishes can have a differential.

The payment in lieu of, if it was ever clear at the development meeting, if we don't insist that they pay the amount for, an amount that is the cost for an affordable unit, nobody, I mean nobody will ever build an inclusion, an included affordable, an they said it loud and clear. And why would they say otherwise?

If you make it $63,000, which isn't enough to
build an affordable unit, they're going to pay that. Why would they build a unit that will cost maybe between 100 and $150,000 if they can be 60, you know, pay 63 and e done with it.

The difference is, goes right to their bottom line. So I think that we have to ask them to pay a fee in lieu of, that will reflect the cost of an affordable unit.

And I think that, and they said over and over again at this meeting, they talked about density bonuses.

And Cheryl, I understand your position. But to just say that we can contemplate a density bonus, doesn't mean that you're going to say to someone, you know, you're going to build a skyscraper instead of a low rise or a mid rise.

But they're looking, they're definitely looking for something from us that gives them a platform upon which they can build. And I think we need to consider those things.

So I think the fee in lieu of payments, you know, I think the 50 percent at least on site is critical. I think the amount should reflect the cost of
an affordable unit.

I also agree with you, Alderman Rainey, that I think you know, whether it's rehabs or you know, down payment subsidies or something are things that we should do.

I think this inclusionary zoning policy is complementary to those things. It's not exclusive of them.

We can do all of those things. I don't see why we wouldn't do all of those things. But this is one way of approaching it. Where with new construction, we can get affordable units in town.

So that would be my package. My package would be 10 percent in perpetuity or as long as allowed by law. Internal finishes can differ. External finishes should be the same.

Payment of fee in lieu, we should insist that at least 50 percent of the units go on site and then it's their option on the fee in lieu. And in relation to the amount of the fee in lieu, I think we should ask for a payment that reflects the cost of affordable unit. And that would be my motion.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Wait, wait, wait. There's
already a motion on the floor. So you've to amend --

ALDERMAN MORAN: I'll amend my original motion to reflect what I just stated.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right. Alderman Tisdahl, you're next.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: I could support a 10 percent requirement for any project over 25 units that required zoning variances. I mean most of them do and that would not mean Alderman Wollin, that we automatically granted the zoning variances.

But if we did grant the zoning variances, then they would know that they had to give us the units.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And --

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: But I think that gets us around the tool box because if we're going to grant the zoning variance anyway, then the developer is getting something and we're getting something.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Well, but I don't know why the variance, why we're so stuck on height.

What if they want parking relief. What if they want --

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Fine any variance.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Any variance. That's going
to set back, I mean, that's going to get to be big issues.

This ordinance also includes rental housing. And it's going to require that we also add condominium conversations.

To me, it is affordable housing suicide to include those two. To be, I think it's going to reduce the number, it's going to reduce the number of affordable, it's going to reduce the opportunities for affordable housing just by adding the requirement of on site.

I think what we need in this town is cash. We need cash so that we can develop a program to help people buy family homes in family neighborhoods. That's what we need. We don't need people with three kids moving into the 15th floor of some highrise.

Anyway, I feel so strongly about that. We're going to be forced into the conversation issue which is just, it's deadly in terms of affordable housing, in terms of conversation. Deadly.

So who's next? Alderman Wollin, you're next on the list.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Can't we have different, I
mean, can't there be a different ordinance that deals with condo conversation?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: It's going to come.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Or is something different that deals with, it doesn't all have to be in this one.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: No, it isn't in this one.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Okay. All right.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: The rental is going to be.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Right.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: But the condo, but if we pass this, we are required because of the --

MS. SZYMANSKI: My memorandum refers to and discusses in depth the equal protection concerns raised by regulating one type of housing and not regulating another type. When the overall purpose of an inclusionary housing ordinance is to provide affordable housing across the board.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: But we can have different ordinances that address those other --

MS. SZYMANSKI: Yes, you can.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: -- areas. Okay. And my other question to Alderman Moran, is when you say 50, so if 10 percent had to be on site, if 10 percent had to be
affordable and 50 percent of that 10 percent had to be on site. You tell me what you're going to do with Kendall?

CHAIRMAN RAINNEY: Kendall should be treated no differently --

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: I agree.

CHAIRMAN RAINNEY: -- than any other 25 unit zoning.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: If those houses are going to be million dollar houses --

CHAIRMAN RAINNEY: That's too bad.

MALE VOICE: The proposal is 24 units.

CHAIRMAN RAINNEY: So it goes up, it's under the, it's still a planned unit development.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: So you see, when you look at a --

CHAIRMAN RAINNEY: I'm tying up a very important point.

Why should a project like Kendall be excluded? Why?

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: It shouldn't.

CHAIRMAN RAINNEY: Why should it be excluded?

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: I don't think it should be
excluded.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Well, that's what I'm saying.
ALDERMAN WOLLIN: I'm just saying --
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: If they build 24 units, they're excluded. Unless they are a planned developer.
ALDERMAN WOLLIN: They are a planned developer.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Then I think, well, but this, the threshold is 25 units.
ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Oh, I see. Okay.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: No, it will be excluded because the threshold for affordable housing is 25 units.
ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Okay.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Jean-Baptiste?
ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: All of this discussion is tantamount to filibustering the thing. We need, if people have amendments, we need to offer them so that we can try to move to have the inclusionary housing that we need applied to whatever type housing that we need.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Jean-Baptiste, I wish, I've asked you this in private, and I'm going to ask you this in public.

Do not feel threatened by debate, by people
who feel differently than you do about something. It is very important that we be allowed to express our deep concerns about these different kinds of issues.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And I think it doesn't hurt the issue at all for us to feel free to discuss this.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: What I'm suggesting.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: It is no filibuster.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: I have --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: It is no filibuster.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: I had the floor.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Well, you had the floor because I called on you.

ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

What I'm suggesting is that there is a proposal, there's a motion on the floor for 10 percent set aside, afford ability and perpetuity, for different attributes to be put in affordable units, and for payment in lieu for at least 50 percent of the units.

So it seems to me that if we have a concern that certain types of housing should be excluded, we should move to exclude them. You know to try to see if
we could get this thing going.

    CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right.

    ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: Because we've been talking about it for the last four, five years.

    CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right, thank you.

    ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: So that's what I'm suggesting.

    CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I'd like to make an amendment to the, an amendment to Alderman Moran's, and that is to create a threshold of ten units. Any development of ten units will be subject to the affordable housing requirements.

    Would you accept that as an amendment to your?

    ALDERMAN MORAN: I have some concern about that because I think to some degree, the suggestion of a larger number of units is predicated upon the notion that you develop some economies in a larger project.

    And I think as we fold down, you know, the lower it goes, the less advantage you have in the economies of a larger structure. And a larger number of units where the costs that are inherent in including affordable housing can be spread.

    You know, if you go to town --
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: So we want to protect the Smithfields and expensive developments --

ALDERMAN MORAN: Oh, no, no, no, no. Not at all, not at all.

What I'm saying is that I think if you bring the number down to a relatively small number, then you're really going to run into a situation where it could be literally an impediment to the initiation of projects for affordable housing.

And I think the lower you make it, the tougher it's going to be.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okey doke. All right. I think we're going to bring this to an end.

Would anybody like to call a question?

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Could I ask one question?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Go ahead.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Ms. Szymanski, if we pass this, then we have to pass a condo conversion and a rental unit ordinance. Do we have to pass one that has the same requirements as this? Does it have to be similar? What -- if any?

MS. SZYMANSKI: The recommendation, based upon my evaluation of the equal protection and constitutional
law, is that the standards be substantially the same across the board. There is room, depending upon the circumstances, if sufficient data can justify differences, then you can regulate differently. And insofar as what those differences would be, for example, in a condominium conversion ordinance, until standards are proposed and compared to any which may be enacted in this ordinance, 27-0-06, I can't give you an opinion as to whether or not there is substantial similarity that's constitutionally sufficient. As a general proposition, there is room to maneuver.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Well, I would really suggest that it is sort of flying by the seat of our pants to ask us to approve this ordinance without seeing those ordinances. And I don't know what those are going to look like. But if I support this, then I have to support -- if you support this, then you automatically have to support the following two ordinances because it would be a violation of equal protection not to. So, that's a real concern of mine.

The question has been called and --

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Alderman Rainey?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Jean-Baptiste.
ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: On this particular issue that we're speaking about, I think the fear is unfounded. You have already stated, Alderman Rainey, that condo conversions in the City of Evanston provide affordable housing. Okay, so there is justification to not try to establish a separate ordinance governing condo conversions. And to me, you know, you've got --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Ms. Szymanski I hope is listening to you.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: And those issues are usually addressed on the basis of challenges. I mean, you can't develop law in an obstruction. We are talking about an affordable housing policy. We already have a trend of affordability among the condos. It doesn't mean that all of them are affordable. And in terms of the rental market, it's all over the place.

So, I don't think we can, you know, really determine that you achieve affordability by insisting that all of the rental units that you create have to be within a certain range or a certain percentage of them have to be within a certain range because you already achieved that by the supply that you have. So, we are talking about new construction, trying to make sure that
we are not developing strictly luxury housing to serve a certain part of our population. I think we need to move forward with this Inclusionary Housing Policy and if we have to cross a bridge which somebody bringing an action on this issue, we have to respond to it. But I don't think we need to, you know, immobilize ourselves because there's a looming possibility of another issue on the horizon.

And plus, our attorney has said, there's room, you know, she thinks that we can, you know, handle ourselves on this issue.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay. City Manager?

MS. CARROLL: I just want to clarify. People are talking about a second ordinance for rental. This ordinance covers owner and rental.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: It includes the rental.

MS. CARROLL: I just want to make sure everybody is clear on that.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: One has to be for conversion.

MS. CARROLL: For condos, that's correct.

Okay.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: For conversions because this
is for condos pretty much.

MS. CARROLL: Condo conversions, you're correct. Yes. I just want to make sure that we were all on the right page here.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: This is for rentals. And I just want to say that I have always said that as long as we include rentals, I will never vote for this ordinance no matter how acceptable some of the provisions are for condos.

So, I'm going to call the roll I think for this one because I think we need to go on the record. Alderman Wollin, do you mind being first? I'm just going down --

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: I don't mind. Yes, I'm --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Wait, wait.

MS. SZYMANSKI: Madam Chair?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Yes.

MS. SZYMANSKI: Are we just beginning with these items as a beginning? There are still other items outstanding in the ordinance that need to be decided.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Well, I think these are amendments that Alderman Moran would like to see in the ordinance. Correct, Alderman Moran?
ALDERMAN MORAN: Yes.

MS. SZYMANSKI: It's a beginning with the understanding that there are still things to be discussed.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Yes. Have you agreed to reduce the 15 to 10?

ALDERMAN MORAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay, all right. So, it's with that understanding. Alderman Wollin?

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Jean-Baptiste?

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Bernstein.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Aye.


ALDERMAN HOLMES: Aye.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Moran.

ALDERMAN MORAN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Tisdahl.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Aye.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Hansen.

ALDERMAN HANSEN: Aye.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: It's 7 to 1. The amendment is passed. Okay, let's go back to the whole ordinance. Any further discussion?

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Do we need to set, do we set -- Alderman Rainey, do we set a fee for, you know, like we talked about $63,000. Was that --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: No, we do not. Whatever is in there is what's in there.

ALDERMAN MORAN: The price, no, no, I said it should be the price of an affordable unit. That was the motion.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay. We have a chart of incomes and affordability.

ALDERMAN MORAN: Yes, right.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Do we want to use that?

MR. WOLINSKY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay. Could you direct us to that, Mr. Wolinsky? Here we go. Let's see. I found the rental one. I don't see it in here. I think that needs to be in here.

There is a provision on page 15 for initial rents for affordable rental dwelling units. But --

ALDERMAN MORAN: On pages 12 and 13 --
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Yes, but the chart is in here.

ALDERMAN MORAN: Yes. Jim, we had in prior submissions a matrix where we had a formula that gave us the cost of an affordable unit. And it would be the inclusion of that matrix that is the subject of my motion.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: That would be in our next --

MR. WOLINSKY: That would be an exhibit attached to the ordinance.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay. But we'll see that by our next meeting, right? What?

MS. SZYMANSKI: I didn't have that matrix with me and I just wanted to make sure that the, what the committee is adopting is suitable to put in here, that it is a flat fee to produce the affordable dwelling unit.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: No, because an affordable dwelling unit depends on the number of people in a family and their corresponding income. Does it not? I mean, a two-bedroom unit for a mother and a child is going to be a different price than a four-bedroom with a family of three. So, I mean, it's all going to be
different.

MS. SZYMANSKI: But how do you know the size of the family that's going to occupy the unit?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Now, you don't but we're going to have to have some kind of listing of family members and incomes. That will determine the price -- it will determine the number of people, it will determine the number of units, I mean, it will determine the affordability. Income and family size is what will determine the price of the unit.

So, a two-bedroom being purchased -- are we going to control who can purchase what? Can a family of two purchase a three-bedroom unit because they'd like to have a room for an office? I mean, how are we doing that? Is that, you know, there's a lot of talk in this ordinance about who is going to administer this. I mean, the developers don't want to administer this. So, are we going to hire a department to administer this? City Manager?

MS. CARROLL: Just to clarify, Alderman Moran, I don't believe we have ever given you a matrix that had affordable information other than a flat fee calculation. That's --
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: For the number of family members and the --

MS. CARROLL: Well, I don't, I just checked with Donna. I don't think we actually have that in particular. What we need to do I think is come up with a flat fee amount. We could put something together but I don't think we've given you anything specific, I don't recall that. So --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: It's in here for rents.

MS. CARROLL: For rents, yes. But for owner occupied, I don't think we had something. I think we were talking about a flat dollar fee.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Yes.

ALDERMAN MORAN: I know that in several of the submissions that we have had, there has been, we've worked on a calculation.

MS. CARROLL: There was a per square footage formula that EPI had recommended, like $125 a square foot times two-thirds, blah-blah-blah, times the number of square feet --

ALDERMAN MORAN: Right. Right, that's the matrix that I'm referencing.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. That formula we can put
back in there. But I didn't recall a specific chart like you were talking about, so, okay.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: So, when will we see that? Okay. And would that be an addendum or could that be part of the ordinance?

MS. SZYMANSKI: It needs to be in the ordinance itself as a chart.

MS. CARROLL: So, would it substitute for the top of page 13 where we have the $63,000?

ALDERMAN MORAN: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: I do think we have to have some dates in there because --

MS. SZYMANSKI: We do.

MS. CARROLL: Obviously affordability changes as the economy changes.

ALDERMAN MORAN: Or you can, I think the 13 -- have it subject to review each year.

MS. SZYMANSKI: By April 1.

MS. CARROLL: By April 1st, right.

ALDERMAN MORAN: So, you just keep that.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: You know, I think that there are issues here and I'm really not trying to throw a wrench into this, but there are issues here about how
this is going to be administered, who is going to watch the store. Can a family of two buy a three-bedroom because they need an office space, you know, and still make it affordable? Are we going to control the number of family members that are allowed to purchase an affordable unit? I mean, I think that's a very important thing.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: I think we will have to.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: But that's got to be in the ordinance. I mean, that's got to be, we've got to know what that is. I would think you would want to know what that is.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Can we make that suggestion though in a specific way?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Holmes?

ALDERMAN HOLMES: But then also, Alderman Rainey, then we have to really define what we mean by affordable because when we started talking about people renting a three-bedroom because they need an office space, then are we not looking at the medium income families rather than, you know, families, the working class.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Well, who are we looking at? I don't know.

ALDERMAN HOLMES: Are we going to -- I think we need to really define what we --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I don't think we're talking about people lower than 80 percent of median, are we? No, we're not. So, we're not talking about --

ALDERMAN HOLMES: We're not talking about working class people. I understand that.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: No, we're not.

ALDERMAN HOLMES: That's very clear to me.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: As I recall, our ordinance is 100 percent of median.

ALDERMAN HOLMES: For rental, yes. So, we're not talking about working class.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: What are we talking about?

MS. SZYMANSKI: Wait, wait. Page 13.5.7.10(3) does refer to --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: The rentals.

MS. SZYMANSKI: Those are affordable owner occupied.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Now, where?
MS. SZYMANSKI: I'm on page 13.5.7.10(a)(3), and that does refer to a certain percentage of lower than a hundred percent. There was, the original ordinance had 80 percent and there was discussion the last time the committee reviewed this about dropping that to 70. So, that is one thing that needs to be, among the things that need to be decided is whether it's going to be 80 or 70. Or some other figure.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I thought that applied to the rental. Okay, you're right. It says purchase --

MS. SZYMANSKI: It is in the the rental.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Why wouldn't we say to purchase or rent? I mean, does it have the separate thing about rent?

MS. SPICUZZA: Alderman Rainey, can I clarify?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Yes, please do.

MS. SPICUZZA: On page 13, that number 3, they would still be eligible to people up to 80 percent. But in order for the prices to be affordable, they'd be priced based on a calculation of somebody earning 70 percent of median. So, that's why that was changed.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And also, let's say there are, let's say that the unit, that the building requires
three affordable units? Or let's say four to make it easy.

MS. SPICUZZA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Then that would, of course if it was three how would we handle this? But if there were four --

MS. SPICUZZA: Usually, I guess around that --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: If there were four affordable units in the building, if we required that, 25 percent or one unit of the affordable dwelling units shall be priced so as to be affordable to households earning 80 percent or 70 percent of the median income. So, one unit of the four would be for somebody who is a little poorer than the other three people.

MS. SPICUZZA: Right. Anybody up to 80 percent of median could quality to purchase that.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And it could be another person who is 80 percent.

MS. SPICUZZA: Right.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I mean, if there was, you know, it wouldn't have to be held for somebody under that. Okay. But that's not, I mean, that really is restrictive, you know, this one, because it's only one
unit. The building has four set asides but only one unit is set aside for somebody under 80 percent. Wow.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: It's not exactly like we're --

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: We're not giving it away.
ALDERMAN WOLLIN: We're not giving it away.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: This is really going to solve the problem. Okay. So, where are we? We need to see, I think there are things in this ordinance that some of us aren't really familiar with or understanding.

Alderman Moran, clarify.

ALDERMAN MORAN: Ellen, would you point out the specific provisions that we need to supplement so that we can walk through those?

MS. SZYMANSKI: Let's start from the beginning here.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Wait, say that, say your question again?

ALDERMAN MORAN: Ellen has already told us, Ellen has told us that there are several points that we need to fill in. I'm asking her to point them out, those that we haven't covered yet.

MS. SZYMANSKI: On page 8, Alderman Moran in a
previous meeting, you had asked for information on a community land trust.

ALDERMAN MORAN: Yes.

MS. SZYMANSKI: That should be community land trust is the underlying, it's the second paragraph at the top. I provided the definition of it and it has a purpose in holding property on behalf of the city for affordable housing purposes. And without any specific direction from the Committee, I couldn't go any further than to tell you what it was so that if it is a point of interest for further discussion at a later date perhaps, just to get, if the Committee has decided or is to get this ordinance through without a detailed discussion of a community land trust, at least you know that it is there, something to be explored and ask for additional information on.

ALDERMAN MORAN: Then I would move that we include this provision as it gives us one more strategy potentially and we can work out the details later.

MS. SZYMANSKI: And I think later on that's telegraphed through here. We --

ALDERMAN MORAN: Conform that throughout?

MS. SZYMANSKI: It comes up later in the
ordinance. But the desire, you're thinking now is to include this?

ALDERMAN MORAN: Yes.

MS. SZYMANSKI: And then flesh it out later on as we get to it?

ALDERMAN MORAN: Yes.

MS. SZYMANSKI: Housing provider, also on page 8, is a similar piece of information that you could ask for, also relates to a different means of holding the property.

ALDERMAN MORAN: Yes. I would move that that be incorporated as well.

CHAIRMAN RAINNEY: What page is this?

MS. SZYMANSKI: Also on page 8.

CHAIRMAN RAINNEY: Oh, the same.

MS. SZYMANSKI: Same page, underlying definition. Okay. And then page 9, I think there was a change in the relevant household. That came from Ms. Spicuzza. If there's any information she needs to provide on that, I'd ask her to do it.

ALDERMAN MORAN: I'd move adoption of that change.

MS. SZYMANSKI: Of the revision?
ALDERMAN MORAN: Yes, the revision. I think it's consistent with our prior discussions.

MS. SZYMANSKI: Then on page 13, back to 5.7.10(a)(3) --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Wait, you skipped. Can I ask about something?

MS. SZYMANSKI: Oh, sure.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I mean, this is something that I don't quite understand. But while we're going through this page by page --

MS. SZYMANSKI: Yes?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: What is the requirement for rental housing that is provided offsite?

MS. SZYMANSKI: Ms. Spicuzza, can you address that?

MS. SPICUZZA: I believe it's the same as for ownership. I don't think it's --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: But where does it say that?

MS. SPICUZZA: Let me check. Again, it would be under the general requirement on page 9. That covers both owner and rental.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right. It says total units shall be affordable, at least 50 percent of the
affordable units. All right. But how to calculate, okay, but how do we calculate the offsite contribution? In order words, in lieu of contribution for a rental unit offsite? How is that calculated?

MS. SPICUZZA: I would imagine that should be --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: You can't imagine.

MS. SPICUZZA: Well, I'm thinking that it's true that it probably doesn't specify that, and it should.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: See, I think we don't have an ordinance ready for introduction. I mean, I know it sounds like I'm trying to hold up the works but that's got to be in here. If it's going to include rental, it's got to be in here.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste?

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Thank you, Alderman Rainey.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Wait, unless she's not finished and --

MS. SPICUZZA: No.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: You know what I would suggest? That we separate the rental from, you know,
the new construction. I think we're clearer on the new construction, and try to work through whatever it is that we need to work through for the rental. Because if it's not set aside specifically as to, if it's not clarified as to how we handle the option that is granted to the developer, it seems to me that, you know, we need to resolve that. Because otherwise, then, you know, that action is not fair, it's not clear. We don't know how to proceed on it. Because I think the thrust principally was, I mean, how many new rental developments do we have other than the one that's going up at Howard? And that's already in the --

CHAIRMAN RAINNEY: It doesn't apply.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: We anticipate that that's the trend, it has been one out of how many?

CHAIRMAN RAINNEY: Well, we had 19-30 and then we have this. And there's nothing more important than rental housing. I mean, I think it's much more important than new high rise condos.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: There is no rental in --

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: There is no what?

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: There is no rental in the --
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ALDERMAN MORAN: Well, it strikes me that, I mean, Alderman Rainey has raised this one point and I would assume that, Donna, you can come up with a suggested section that would address that issue?

MS. SPICUZZA: Yes.

ALDERMAN MORAN: So, I think, you know, to move it along, if there aren't any other differentials between rental and owner occupied, I would think we can still move this ordinance and we can certainly get an update from Donna for the next meeting on that one point.

MS. SPICUZZA: I think because -- oh, I'm sorry. Because that was a flat fee before, it would apply equally to rental or ownership. So, I imagine we have to just look at that since the suggestion now is to make it, you know, the cost of an affordable unit that would be sold.

ALDERMAN MORAN: Right.

MS. SPICUZZA: So, we would look at that and figure out how to determine it for rental.

ALDERMAN MORAN: I would think it would be very similar to that --

MS. SPICUZZA: Yes.
ALDERMAN MORAN: To that formula. Because if we were going to have it offsite, again you're referencing the cost of the unit.

MS. SPICUZZA: Right.

ALDERMAN MORAN: But I think it could be converted to rental probably pretty easily.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: So, it would be the cost of the subsidy offsite, I mean, it wouldn't be the cost of constructing the unit as it would be in the condo.

ALDERMAN MORAN: I don't know why. I mean, why wouldn't it be the same for both?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: How would we apply the money generated from that? Would it have to be strictly earmarked for only rentals?

ALDERMAN MORAN: It's a possibility.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Well, I think we need to zero in on this.

ALDERMAN MORAN: Let's, yes, I agree.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I mean, I would think it would have to be.

ALDERMAN MORAN: I agree.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And so, any money that we generated from owner occupied units would have to be for
purchase, for subsidizing buyers or subsidizing, which I think is a big waste of money, subsidizing affordable housing developers. And if we could just subsidize buyers for current housing, it would be so much more economical but --

ALDERMAN MORAN: Anything else, Ellen?

MS. SZYMANSKI: Let's see here.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: What about the business of not for profits being allowed to buy the affordable housing units?

ALDERMAN MORAN: That's been taken care of.

Page 14.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: That aces out your average family right up the bat because affordable housing, not for profits can much more afford buying these units. I think that is a mistake to include in here. Let not for profits buy market rate housing.

We want young families to be able to buy these units. You get these not for profits being allowed to go in and wholesale buy, they have lots of money, buy these units. You take them right off the market and ace out all the families.

ALDERMAN MORAN: They can only get up to 33
percent.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: I don't think they should be able to get any. I think they should have to buy in the market like everybody else.

ALDERMAN MORAN: And also, but I think this is consistent with what you're saying, Alderman Rainey, they may have a pool of funds that will exceed the average, you know, young family or senior citizen family.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: You can't judge that. They are not being subject to the same means test as the family, you know, down the block that's coming in to apply to purchase a house.

ALDERMAN MORAN: The point being that if the not for profit has excess funds, those funds can be put to this use by in essence providing an even further subsidy to the family that would rent from them because --

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: There is no way to apply a means test to a not for profit. And we are going to apply a means test to every applicant for affordable housing who is a family.

ALDERMAN MORAN: You know, the not for profits
that I am aware of are in the business of providing affordable housing to families.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: For a very specific dollar.

No, no, well, it depends on the definition of family which I know is very flexible. But I'm not talking, you know what I'm talking -- I'm talking about the average family with children. That is not who the not for profits are providing housing for. They are not providing housing for those families. And they are going to suck up every single opportunity they have to buy one of these units. And there is no means test for them, and I think it gives them an unfair advantage and aces out average 80 percent of income families. One hundred percent that will happen.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Who do not for profits provide housing for?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: They provide housing for mentally ill. They provide housing for disabled people. They provide housing for their family members who have a variety of different issues. That's, I mean, they can afford, for example, housing opportunities for the mentally ill, could go into any neighborhood in this town and buy buildings. I mean, they have that kind of
money. They've done it numerous times in my ward. I don't think we have to give them a leg up on buying affordable housing units. And I'm not just singling them out but I'm most familiar with them.

ALDERMAN MORAN: Well, you also have like Reba Place, that's open.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Reba Place does not need our, they don't need us. Reba Place is very, you know, we take care of them in all sorts of ways.

ALDERMAN MORAN: They do good work.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Very recently we gave them $600,000. We do, and that's why we take care of them. I don't see Reba Place buying a unit on the 12th floor of some condominium.

ALDERMAN MORAN: And how do you know? I mean, why not?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Because they don't need to. They don't need to. They're into other kinds of things.

ALDERMAN MORAN: Then that debunks your theory that not for profits are just going to vacuum sweep all of these units which they can't because it's limited to one-third.
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Oh, I think they are. Well, I think they're going to buy every one-third option that they have. I think that's a big mistake.

I know we're more interested in the concept of the affordable housing ordinance being passed as opposed to really what is it going to do. Is it going to be effective? Is it going to serve the people we want it to serve? And I think the answer is absolutely not. And I think it's going to be a nightmare to administer because of the way we're handling it. And I think it's a big mistake the way we're going about it.

ALDERMAN MORAN: Well, I move to approve that Section B at the bottom of 14.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay. I'm going to give us five more minutes. We have several other items on our agenda to deal with and then we have a Council meeting.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Is there anything else --

MS. SZYMANSKI: I don't think we settled the, on 5.10(a)(3), the 70 percent or 80 percent that's page 14. Did we decide 70 or 80 percent?

ALDERMAN MORAN: What's the recommendation, Donna?

MS. SPICUZZA: It should be 70 percent meaning
that it's priced so as to be affordable to somebody at 70 percent. But anybody up to 80 percent of income is eligible. So, that's where the confusion is. It's just talking about how you price it which was, you know, if you're going to have it available to people up to 80 percent of median, you want people who are at 79 percent or 78 percent to be able to afford it. So, it's just talking about pricing it at a level based on 70 percent of median.

ALDERMAN MORAN: And that would be accomplished with the suggestion that you've got in this copy.

MS. SPICUZZA: Correct. Changing it to 70, yes.

ALDERMAN MORAN: So, I would move that as well.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And how does that interact or coincide with number 1 on page 11? Alderman Bernstein?

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: This appears to be no way to do business. We've previously passed some proposed amendments. I would move to hold this, have Ellen and Donna get together and bring us back an ordinance that
we can reflect on other than in open forum like this when everybody is talking about different things at different times. And I think we have to address the administration and I think we just have to get something definitive on paper so we can vote on it. Because I don't know what all the proposals are other than what we've passed earlier.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And Alderman Bernstein, I would also add to your request that we include the provision of subsidizing buyers for currently available housing with the money that is going to be paid in lieu of providing onsite units.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: -- for those funds should be included.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Alderman Tisdahl?

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: I very much absolutely, totally agree with Alderman Bernstein.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: So, is that a second?

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: That is a second.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right. So, it's been held to our next meeting. And I would suggest people who have questions, and I promise to participate, that we will contact Ellen with our concerns.
ALDERMAN MORAN: And the next version you bring back will contain the provisions that were approved tonight.

MS. SZYMANSKI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Absolutely.

MS. SZYMANSKI: There is one other thing that I want to call to your attention, and it dovetails to I think what Alderman Bernstein and others have said tonight, as Alderman Rainey also. Page 18, if you'll go to the top where it has that paragraph 3? This does refer to an Inclusionary Housing Trust Fund for the -- if there is a unit sold for foreclosure, any proceeds that are left over are going into the Inclusionary Housing Trust Fund. In addition, in the beginning of the ordinance, in the definitions, there is a reference to Inclusionary Housing Trust Fund.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And we did that because --

MS. SZYMANSKI: The Mayor's Special Housing Fund.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Right.

MS. SZYMANSKI: I'm calling this to your attention now to tell you that we need to create the Inclusionary Housing Trust Fund which will address the
concerns that you've had tonight which I'll summarize in terms of money management.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: But I thought, I did think that the Inclusionary Housing Trust Fund had already been established. No? In the law department?

MS. SZYMANSKI: No.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: Okay, all right. Okay. You're right, it does. And with that though, we need the program that will administer and, you know -- Alderman Jean-Baptiste?

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: What is the median income at this point in time? In the City of Evanston?

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: For how many people?

MS. SPICUZZA: For?

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Let's make it a household, yes, of four.

MS. SPICUZZA: Household of four would be around $78,000.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Per year?

MS. SPICUZZA: Yes.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. So, Alderman Holmes had asked whether or not working class people, I would think, you know --
CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All those poor folks are going to be held exempt.

ALDERMAN HOLMES: They're not going to be here.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: So, it seems to me as we come back, the payment in lieu, we need to start thinking of the application of that to subsidize those who may be at the 50 percent or 60 percent, you know, median income so that, you know, we throw a wide net to be able to include those people who mostly need who are still in Evanston -- so, if you come back with some language, maybe we could have some discussions about that aspect. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: And also, if you feel that you need to clarify even more your concern, call.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: I'll call.

CHAIRMAN RAINEY: All right. Thank you, Committee.
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CHAIRMAN RAINETY: Next item is Resolution 39-R-06 which is the need for a municipal exemption for our water treatment facility for renovation.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: I move approval.

ALDERMAN MORAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN RAINETY: Any discussion on that?

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Yes. What is it going to look like from the street? Will the landscaping obscure it where it's --

CHAIRMAN RAINETY: They'll be beautiful.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: It will be beautiful?

CHAIRMAN RAINETY: Can you come tell us about that?

(Whereupon, the hearing on the above-entitled cause was concluded at 8:55 p.m.)