

Presiding Official: Alderman Jean-Baptiste

DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chair Jean-Baptiste called the meeting to order at 6:55 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MEETING MINUTES OF DECEMBER 11, 2006

The minutes were approved unanimously with a vote of 9-0.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

(P1) Planned Development 1700-1722 Central Street - Recommended Denial from the Plan Commission

In summary:
John Burke spoke on behalf of the Public Works staff memorandum dated January 8, 2007 regarding the alley width.

A presentation from the “Friends of Central Street and Central Street Neighbors” was given along with a handout. The representative speaker of the group was Mr. Harvey Dershin. Other members of the group that spoke were: Ms. Mary Rozinski who raised several concerns with the inconsistency in staff’s zoning analysis, Mr. Richard Wright responded to staff’s memorandum and opinion on the alley width.

Committee deliberation followed citizen comments. Ald. Tisdahl motioned to reject the Plan Commission’s recommendation, seconded by Ald. Wynne. The vote was 7 in favor and 2 voting nay (Moran and Holmes). Chair Jean-Baptiste directed staff to draft an ordinance supporting the proposed project before the Committee this evening for the January 22, 2007 P&D Committee meeting.

(PUBLIC HEARING)

(P2) Application Appealing the Preservation Commission’s Denial of Certificate of Appropriateness for the Demolition of the Evanston Landmark at 1722 Central Street

The attorney for the applicant, Mr. Gregg Graines of DLA Piper Law Firm, requested an extension of 45-days to coincide with the planned development proposal. Ald. Wynne motioned
to grant the request for a 45-day extension, seconded by Ald. Wollin. The vote was 9-0 in favor of the motion.

(P3) Ordinance 117-O-06 – Amendment to the Preservation Ordinance
Mr. Wolinski explained that this is a staff recommendation to amend the appropriate section of the Preservation Ordinance to make the Planning and Development Committee the receiving and final decision-making body on applications to appeal denials of Certificates of Appropriateness by the Preservation Commission. Ald. Wollin noted that one of the concerns of the Preservation Commission is that City Council could change from presently being all nine aldermen to a decreasing number in the future. Therefore Ald. Wollin motioned to amend the ordinance to state with all nine aldermen being present on the Planning and Development Committee. Ald. Wynne seconded the motion to amend the ordinance and the vote was 9-0 in favor of the motion. Ald. Wollin moved to approve Ordinance 117-O-06 as amended, seconded by Ald. Wynne. The vote was 9-0 in favor of the motion.

(P4) Plat of Subdivision – 1408 Brown Avenue
Mr. Wolinski explained to the Committee that this subdivision request is from the owner, Mr. Chuck Pettius. He noted that the subdivided lots meets and exceeds the allowable square footage. Staff recommends approval of this request. Ald. Wynne moved approval, seconded by Ald. Holmes. The vote was 9-0 in favor of the motion.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

(PD1) Community Development & Permit Process Re-engineering
Assistant City Manager, Ms. Judy Aiello summarized the Community Development Department Reorganization since the Virchow, Krause and Company (VK) evaluation of the City’s development and permit process. The VK report recommendation were threefold: 1. Virchow Krause Recommendation, which outlines their proposal for re-engineering the permit process with project management and improving the effectiveness between reviewing bodies and staff, 2. the recommendation for technology improvement which brought on the proposed ACCELA software upgrade that is under review for implementation. VK’s third recommendation was for a Organization Restructuring which would result in a more seamless Community Development Department. Mr. Wolinski walked the P&D Committee through the Organization Chart. He pointed out that Community Development previously consisted of four divisions and will now be reorganized into three divisions. The new division being the combination of the Building and Zoning divisions which will be headed by Ms. Carolyn Brzezinski. He said VK’s recommendation for reorganization was to form a “1-stop shop” process for each application and planned development. He noted that the Zoning Division was split up where the Zoning Officers report directly to the Project Manager’s. The Project Team Manager will be Mr. Walter Hallen (introduced to the Committee), the second Project Manager will be Ms. Jill Chambers (currently working on the ACCELA team), and third Project Manager being Mr. Dean Mosca. The Zoning Planner will manage all the Planned Developments and Zoning Board of Appeals. Ald. Wynne asked how the Legal Department will interact into all of this. Mr. Wolinski responded that the Zoning Planner will still work closely and coordinate with the Department’s attorney, Mr. Ken Cox.

Ald. Rainey stated that she feels the map of the application process is more important and not exactly the reorganization of the department. She noted that the biggest complaint and delay is going through the Plan Commission and Zoning Board process with the customary inclusion of
the Preservation Commission review as well. She feels that this is not specifically a staff problem however she does see a real need to consider a new structure for the Commission and Board process. Ms. Aiello assured her that staff has taken this situation seriously into consideration and have reviewed this with the VK representatives as well and will be included in the next phase. She informed the Committee that staff is expecting to come back before the Committee with the next phase for presentation in February. Ms. Ann Dienner made a suggestion that the problem with communication between Committee’s and Boards be reviewed as well because there is constant overlapping that could be avoided. The City Manager acknowledged Ms. Dienner’s request.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacqueline E. Brownlee
Consideration of a recommendation from the Plan Commission to deny the planned development proposal for 1700-1722 Central Street.

Transcribed Report of Proceedings of a public hearing on the above captioned matter, held January 8, 2007 at the Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, 2nd Floor, Evanston, Illinois, at 6:45 p.m. and presided over by L. Jean-Baptiste, Chair.

PRESENT:

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

STAFF:

J. WOLINSKI
J. BROWNLEE
CHAIRMAN JEAN BAPTISTE: Good evening everybody. Welcome to the meeting of the Planning & Development Committee of January 8th, 2007.

We are relocating to a larger room due to the large number of people attending.

(The P&D meeting was moved to a larger room.)

CHAIRMAN JEAN BAPTISTE: Mr. Burke, you can proceed.

MR. BURKE: -- Typically, we design and construct about 8 to 10 alleys a year throughout the City. And generally, our two-way alleys are designed between 15 and 18 feet wide.

The final design width of the alley is often limited to the amount of right of way that is available to us in determining that. In the last ten years, we've had 85 public alleys designed and constructed. And out of those 85 alleys, 56 of them had been 15 feet wide. That's 65 percent. Generally, we have received very positive responses from the residents and the people on those alleys. Again, we worked with them through that design process.

In fact, the trend in recent years is that the
residents have been seeking slower moving traffic through narrower alleys. When operational complaints are received by the City, it's generally the wider alleys that we have the complaints on where there is speeding traffic or cut-throughs, by and large. As we understand it, again, this would allow for a 16-foot wide alley in place of a 13-and-a-half-foot alley that has pinch points along it for the utility poles because they will be under-grounding the overheads.

Now, virtually all the current motorists that drive down the alley have to pull over onto the aprons of driveways or into the parking area to allow motorists going in the other direction to pass them. With a 16-foot alley, it would provide a significant improvement to maneuvering especially around the garage points, and the majority of the traffic would be able to pass each other at a very slow speed.

Staff as we've stated in previous memos finds that the 16-foot width alley is appropriate, or I should say acceptable. However, if the property owners along the alley were to seek an even wider alley, if this was our design process and they were looking for a wider alley, in this case if the development is unable to
provide that additional width, a one-way alley would be
our next option to work with them on. And so, that's
where we -- did you want to --

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Alderman Wollin? Do
you have a question?

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: I have a couple of
questions. One is I notice your memo says that they
will be burying the utilities. Is that, I drove down
that alley this afternoon. Is that all the utility
poles that are in the alley will be --

MR. BURKE: I believe everything we're talking
about on the widening is just along the frontage of the
building is my understanding.

MR. CROCKER: That's my understanding as well.

MR. BURKE: The property line for the
development.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Because there is a pole
further down. Okay, so that's a question mark. There
are also speed bumps in that alley. Now, is that, are
you considering putting those in if it's approved?

MR. CROCKER: It will remain.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: It will remain with speed
bumps. And then there's a huge tree stump on the south
side of the alley. Is that being earmarked for removal I'm hoping?

MR. BURKE: I did see it removed but I don't know if it's, I think it's private property.

MR. CROCKER: The tree is removed but I don't know if it's going to be --

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Well, the stump, yes, the stump is huge.

MR. BURKE: It hasn't been stumped, yes. I don't know the answer to that.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: It looks like it's half and half at least. And then there is another large tree further west on the alley. That will remain?

MR. CROCKER: Yes.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Alderman Tisdahl.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Mr. Crocker can answer, but I did talk with him about removing what --

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Do you have your mike --

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Yes, it's on.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay, all right.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Hold on, better?
CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Yes.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Okay. I did talk with Mr. Crocker about removing one of the other pinch points, the worst of the other pinch points in the alley. And he said that he would provide up to $8,000 to bury that line.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: And which pinch point was that? Because people were talking about --

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: It's in the other part of the alley, not directly in front of the property, the 1700 to 1722 Central. It's further down the alley.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: All right. Okay, I don't see any more lights. So, thank you very much for the clarification. Mr. Harvey Dershin? And can you tell us your name, title if you have a relationship to the group, and your address, sir?

MR. DERSHIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: For the court reporter.

MR. DERSHIN: Yes, my name is Harvey Dershin. I live at 2606 Hartzell Street in Evanston. And I'm speaking on behalf of a group of people from the neighborhood who have been concerned about these issues.
And we call ourselves variously The Friends of Central Street, the Central Street Neighbors. A lot of them are here this evening. If you'd just maybe stand up so we know who you are? Good.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Would somebody hit the lights back there or something to help us out?

MR. DERSHIN: First of all, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen for giving us the time to do this.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: He may need to be able to read, not all -- yes.

MR. DERSHIN: Okay, thank you.

The group that I've been working with and the group I represent is made up of people from all ends of Central Street, from one end to the other. And we are people who have become concerned with the buildings on Central Street because they have now begun to impact on our lives and our environment. And, you know, I'd like to recognize first of all the work of the Plan Commission in hearing people speak and hearing all of the input and taking that input into account, doing things about it, and responding if you will to some of the needs of the community. I would also like to say
that we are certainly endorsing the Plan Commission's
action to reject this proposal.

Also, I'd like to recognize the work of the
developers as well. I know this is not easy. I've been
on the other side of this question before trying to
build buildings in Lincoln Park. So, I know how
difficult it can be and how difficult communities can
be. But we think we have a reasonable case here and
we'd like to just page through it quickly.

This group as I said has been around for a
little bit of time. And we have representation all up
and down Central Street where we live, where I live. I
live at the 2600 block, not anywhere near this property,
a half a dozen blocks away from the property, but very
concerned about what's happening with Central Street and
where it's going.

Okay. Now, and I've heard a lot of the
commentary at the Plan Commission meetings about zoning
and standards and laws and setbacks and all the rest of
that stuff and I realize how important that is. But
what we wanted to do with these few minutes was to step
back from these details and try to put this decision
into some kind of context, into a larger context. And
if you will, I'm going to try to do that.

See, we have three parties who are in this game. One party of course is the Council and you have an obligation to improve the neighborhoods and I would imagine help the City's tax base. The developers are here as businessmen and we respect that, you know, to make money as much as they possibly can from this activity. And we as residents have our own needs and our own requirements, and that is to protect our environment, to protect our quality of life and to protect our investments. And we are very serious about that.

We think that the current proposal doesn't do any of those things. It doesn't improve the neighborhood. It doesn't increase the tax base. It doesn't preserve or improve the environment. It's not going to improve our quality of life. And it won't increase, and in fact we think it will threaten the value of our property.

All right. Now, we've seen a lot of buildings going up along Central Street, some of them almost overnight. I have one of them virtually in my backyard, you know, this five-story condominium replacing a
building that was three stories before. There are many
other structures. I have some pictures which are sort
of interesting to show. Bob, could you go to the
pictures? Thank you.

This is, this picture by the way is a view of
Central Street from Jim Hughes' bedroom window. Jim,
raise your hand, where are you, Jim? Jim Hughes'
bedroom window. This is a view of my property on
Hartzell Street.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Can we have an address?
MR. DERSHIN: Sorry?
ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Mr. Hughes' address?
MR. DERSHIN: Jim?
ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Where does he live?
MR. HUGHES: 2518.
MR. DERSHIN: Right. Here is 2606. This is
what curb appeal looks like when you have a five-story
neighbor in your backyard. And this is the building we
used to have before that, and this fellow sort of popped
up overnight and it was startling. And we were
disorganized and we couldn't do anything about it. Bob?
And then we've seen other buildings come along
Central Street. Here is one that somehow, you know,
manages to be built over the curb with about, well over the sidewalk with about a seven-foot clearance to the curb. Here's another one that's lumbering, hanging over the sidewalk like some big monster. This, by the way, this is an interesting one. This is the alley behind the, I think the Brown's Chicken construction. It's been blocked for three years with construction.

And this is sort of historical. This is what buildings used to look like on Central Street. That's what they look like now. The one that is proposed is even bigger than that. And this frightens us. Bob?

Okay. Now, we think that the Council and the Plan Commission has acted appropriately and wisely in dealing with this issue. We now have modified our zoning regulations for the western part of Central Street. We understand there's been a proposal to modify the zoning on the east part of Central Street. And there is a plan to have a comprehensive look at the whole length of Central Street and we absolutely endorse this. We think it's the right thing to do, and we feel that will give us a chance to have input into the whole process.

All right. Well, we think that this
particular building is a step backwards. It's a transitional event. You know, it's kind of sneaking through the way the zoning is and the way the zoning is going to be. And as a matter of fact, you know, it doesn't meet the current B-2 Zoning. It's not going to meet the B-1A Zoning should that get approved. It's sort of not fish or fowl, it's not one thing or another. And if you'd flip the slide, Bob?

When a project comes through that's not here, quite here and not quite there, what you end up with is the worst of all possible worlds. So, what have we got? We have a residential development, you know, maximizing the number of units which, I mean, anybody in his right mind would do that because it's just good business. But what happens is it pushes out, you know, the street level development and the possibility for business development at street level and the taxes and other revenues that might come with that. Also, the high density of units pushes the building clear up against the alley line and we know that's going to, we know the kinds of problems that will make and I'll show you a little picture on that in just a second.

This is, we took a couple of Honda automobiles
and we put them in the alley this morning and took some
pictures just to see what it would look like if we could
get two of them by each other. You really can't do
that, you know, unless you're, you know, you're
practically up on top of this fence over here and, you
know, you're riding in the rubbish on the other side of
the building. So, it's very, very tight, it's very,
very tight. And what's going to happen is we have eight
family homes, you know, along that street right now.
Well, you're going to put in 50 units and businesses,
you're going to have ten times as much traffic in that
alley. And we think it's going to be a problem. Bob?
Okay. So, what we're looking at is a building
that's going to be out of conformance with the existing
zoning and with the proposed new zoning. And we're
going to have that for a century or more. It's going to
be with us forever. That's a long time.
Now, and we think if someone is going to build
something of this scope and of this magnitude, I have no
problem with it, but we think if someone does that it
should be done with an eye towards what the overall
Central Street plan is so we don't have more of this
piecemealing, more of this tearing off of bits and
pieces of property and making everybody unhappy. We think something that is being built in this should fit in to the overall concept, not be just another thing. Something different.

Okay. I want to speak a moment just about quality of life and property values. You know, I lived in this community 32 years. When I first came here, Central Street was not so hot. In fact, it was a bit of a dump. And then gradually, because of the introduction of new properties, mostly new businesses, it became attractive.

We saw all kinds of interesting businesses from high end to low end and elegant to funky come into Central Street, and all of a sudden Central Street is very hot. People want to go there. People come to Central Street from surrounding communities for a cup of coffee, for a restaurant, to buy something. And of course, if you walk down Central Street, the variety of the facades and the different businesses there give you that feeling almost of an English high street, you know. Well, this has had a spillover on the communities. What that's meant is, gee, we have this wonderful neighborhood right there. You can walk to it.
It's right close to us. It's helped our property values. It's helped our own properties be more desirable. And frankly, it's improved our quality of life and we love it. And we'd like to see more of it.

But we don't see that. You know, this building frankly, I've seen sort of the latest design, one could just pick that building up out of Lincoln Park and just drop it into Evanston and it's going to be another big, massive structure taking up a lot of street space. That's not going to draw people to Central Street. It doesn't add anything unique to Central Street, the thing that's made Central Street so special, this uniqueness, it's not going to add to that. And you know, we think it won't make the community more desirable. Okay, one more.

In terms of tax base, we've had our own real estate people look at this and they estimate maybe $700,000 a year gross revenue in taxes. That's $10 a person in Evanston. You know, that's not going to change the face of the world, and that's without deducting the expenses that will come about to support this thing because we have to deal with schools and safety and infrastructure and sanitation and other
things like that. My guess is when you put all those
numbers together, this thing is going to be awash in
terms of the tax base.

There's a hidden cost here as well, and we
have to be sensitive to that because when we had a five-
story building appear on our backyard, all of a sudden
we had people looking at our bedroom windows, you know.
We went out and we, like many others on our street,
grew out and invested tens of thousands of dollars in
landscaping to put up big trees. You walk up and down
Hartzell Street, you'll see big trees up there now to
protect us. Who pays for that? I did. My neighbors
did. Okay?

And we've heard also that this is somehow a
blighted area. Well, again, I've been in this area for
32 years. I never thought of this as a blighted area
until all the restaurants and businesses got kicked out
over the last few months. Now it does look like a
blighted area. But you know what, I'm sure there are
plenty of ideas and plenty of opportunities for
developing this area.

And this is not a one shot deal. There are
other ways, there are other avenues, there are
alternatives. In fact, we did a little research on a building that's about a half a block away that is currently listed for sale at 40 percent more than it was purchased for three years. This doesn't sound like a blighted area to me.

Okay. So, just to close, again thank you for your time. We want, we'd like to urge you as a group to affirm the Plan Commission's rejection of this proposal. Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Thank you. At this time, Council will have an opportunity to deliberate. I don't know, since there were some new information presented, if you want to have a quick five-minutes to respond, Developer? If you do, you can. Yes, if you can. You have five minutes, okay?

MR. HORNE: My name is Bob Horne. I'm one of the co-developers on this project. And all I wanted to say, I mean, well, a couple of things. One, I'd probably refute a couple of the comments on the tax revenue. I think we scrubbed that number pretty hard in terms of what we presented and are very confident in that number. So, if everyone wanted to sit down and
analyze tax revenues, I think we'd be very comfortable stating that this project has a very strong economic tax base.

But I think what we wanted to just mention is that we have, subsequent to our last meeting with P&D, a follow up meeting that our alderman put together with the abutting neighbors. And so, we've had further discussion. She might be able to talk about it further but I just wanted you to know that we have continued to meet with neighbors, to try and understand how the concerns of the alley and the width of the alley, et cetera, you know, how we could address those and where the concerns were and could alternative plans be done to, you know, address those concerns.

So, we've continued to make efforts subsequent to these meetings to meet with the neighbors that are most affected by this project. And you know, and I think, you know, Alderman Tisdahl can talk about that as well. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. We're going to close the comments.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Other people who want to talk?
CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Yes, but I had asked people, people had signed up and I thought that Mr. Dershin did the presentation for the Save Central Street Group. And last week, we had a number of people speak. So, right now, we're going to have the Council deliberate on this particular issue.

MS. ROSINSKI: May I say one thing. I requested --

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Did you sign up? You signed up and, okay. Okay, she was out -- I beg your pardon?

MS. ROSINSKI: I think that --

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. You did sign up and when I asked who will, you know, give their spot, you were not in the room or something.

MS. ROSINSKI: I was right there --

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: She was standing behind somebody.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Oh, okay. Then go on to the podium, okay? You have five minutes.

MS. ROSINSKI: Alderman, would we be able to address the new memo on the 16-foot alley?

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: I thought that,
didn't --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, he didn't.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: He didn't? Okay.

All right, well, you want to do that? We'll have one person do that then. Okay?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Alderman, excuse me.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: What?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Point of clarification --

signed up have already spoken at the last meeting. So, if you're going to allow people --

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: That's fine. This alley clarification that our Staff offered, I'm giving the group an opportunity to just respond to that.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just that issue.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: So, she indicated that she doesn't need five minutes and we have one person identified to respond to the alley objection or further clarification. So, we'll do that. Okay, go ahead, ma'am.

MS. ROSINSKI: My name is Mary Rosinski. My issue does pertain to the alley, and I know when they talk about the 15-foot alley I would just like to point out that if that is true, I question, I think there has
to be some real verification because between the paved
part in the building, there's really only six inches or
eight inches right now. So, just, I think we're talking
about inches on a huge project which is absurd.

But my other question regarding the alley is
the confusion from Staff. I think you're seeing a lot
and lot of frustration. You look at the faces in here.
This isn't even half the people who are frustrated with
the City and the Staff and the lack of accurate
information and the confusion that's coming forward.
And the feeling that if we're going to make a decision,
it really has to be based on accurate information and
everyone has to go by the same rules and we all have to
understand the same rules. And I've been getting
different answers.

In the zoning analysis on this property, in
the zoning analysis for the building at 1722, it says
that the residential rear setback is ten feet abutting a
residential district. I did talk to Frank. He says the
alley is a district line, et cetera, et cetera, whatever
that would be. But on two other projects, that one that
was passed at the 2953 and the other one that's in front
of you or has just passed today 25 abutting up to a
residential district, it says that it goes by the B-2 standards which is 15 feet abutting a residential district.

So, you have the residents running around like they're crazy trying to understand the zoning and we got two different zoning analysis requirements for the same situation. And I think before any decision goes forward, someone has to say what is abutting, where is the district, is it abutting a district line or is it not, and is it 10 feet or is it 15 feet? That's, and so, here is your zoning breakdown, here is the two. And I don't know who to leave them with of the ones that are not with -- I'm sorry, these ones are the ones that say it's 15 feet and then 1722 says it's 10 feet.

And I think there is a real procedural problem going on with the City right now. And I think there is a feeling of residents that there is a push to either because there is too much going on at the City but things aren't coming down accurately and that needs to be addressed. So, who do I leave this with?

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: I ask our Director of Community Development to respond to that.

MS. ROSINSKI: Sure.
Chairman Jean-Baptiste: It is under his provision. But if you have a document, you can bring it forward.

Ms. Rosinski: Sure. These are the zoning analyses from the City.

Mr. Wolinski: Mary, can I ask you, what was the date of the zoning analysis that you're referring to?

Ms. Rosinski: Well, you know what, I'll have to go over here. One of them is 825 which I believe is in front of you right now, 825 Chicago Avenue. Is that in front of you guys?

Alderman Bernstein: What are you asking about?

Mr. Wolinski: Yes, I'm confused. Are we talking about 1700 Central or are we talking about 825 Chicago?

Ms. Rosinski: Well, what I'm saying is that 1700 Central is in front of your right now and that says it's 10 feet abutting a residential district for the rear yard setback which is the alley. And the reason that's important is because we need clearance back there.
But on two other zoning analyses, one that is already done is Renal Care building which had the same requirements in your zoning book abutting a residential district. The Renal Care building said it had to be 15 feet. And the zoning analysis for 825 Chicago Avenue says 15 feet abutting a residential district.

So, my question is why did these two say 15 and can, you know, go with your zoning guide --

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: But the zoning analysis that you received regarding this project said --

MS. ROSINSKI: Ten feet. And it also didn't say --

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Ten feet. So, that's what you've been --

MS. ROSINSKI: Yes, so, what I'm saying is that it becomes misleading because in the alley, neighbors think that they're getting a deal when actually the building should be 15 feet away, I mean, an extra five feet away from them.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Can you just clarify, you could bring that, we'll let our Director of Development clarify our zoning regulations.
MS. ROSINSKI: Yes. And then the other thing that I think is really misleading is that all the papers and articles we see is that the developer has met the concerns of the neighbors. But it was only after six months of the residents pointing out to Staff that the zoning notification that was sent out regarding this project was short two loading berths in a business district. And so, you didn't even get the neighbors' concern on all the petitions that were signed regarding the loading berths because we didn't think it was our responsibility to double check the work of the City. It wasn't our job to understand that as we go through it.

And in fact, the zoning analysis in front of you right now still does not have the loading berth I believe. I think it's mentioned in there, the developer has mentioned that it's not in there. But there were supposed to be three. And as of November 6th, it still was only listed at two. And this has been in discussion for over a year. So, it's very upsetting.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. We'll let our Director of Development respond to that and then we'll take the next speaker.

MR. WOLINSKI: The setback requirement for the
rear yard on this project is ten feet. I don't have the
ZA's in front of me for the other two projects so I
really can't comment on them at this time. I'm looking
at the analysis that Mary has brought up which is dated
November 3rd, 2006 and this states concerning the
loading docks that the proposed retail commercial space
requires two additional loading berths, that none have
been provided.

There was an error in the initial analysis a
number of months ago about the number of loading berths.
That was corrected and that was corrected in front of
the Plan Commission so that the Commissioners would know
the requirement. I think that --

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: What was the error
and what correction did you offer?

MR. WOLINSKI: The number of loading berths
required I believe we had was one when it should have
been three. But that was clarified in front of the Plan
Commission.

I would suggest that under the planned
development process, while setbacks and certainly
variations are important to the overall project, that
the reason you apply for a planned development not only
because it's mandatory in Evanston but because you're trying to fit the project into a site. And one of the issues that we've dealt with on this project and I've had discussion with Alderman Tisdahl as had members of my staff is that we were very concerned about the width of the sidewalk on Central Street. We wanted to provide the maximum amount of sidewalk on Central Street that could be provided. So, that pushes the building, if you will, in this case back to the south. Of course you push the building back to the south and you start encroaching in to the required rear lot line.

There was also the issue brought up that the retail and the initial plans was not deep enough. So, the developer, I think there were some 20 feet in the initial proposal, so the developer made changes and lengthened those to a 40-foot depth in retail which we felt we could get a greater variety and a more attractive retail for that site. Doing that also creates problems for the interior parking and also affects the rear lot setback.

So, I think the overall decision on this project and my recommendation to the Council is that we can be concerned certainly with whether it's 10 or 15
feet or things like that, but I think the overall question is, you know, does this building fit in according to the Comprehensive Plan? It does have zoning deficiencies but all planned developments have zoning deficiencies and that's why you apply for a planned development.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. We're not at that point. You're just trying to clarify this specific point.

MR. WOLINSKI: Okay. But I do want to say that Mary is correct on the loading berths. There was a problem with that and has since been corrected.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. The 16-foot alley issue, you still want to clarify, right? We'll give you -- I beg your pardon?

MS. ROSINSKI: We both have the same comment.

MR. WRIGHT: I was going to speak on that.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: You're going to speak on that? You have five minutes again, Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT: Richard Wright at 2603 Hartzell.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Mr. Wright, if you would move the mike a little bit, put the mike over here?
MR. WRIGHT: Richard Wright at 2603 Hartzell.

I want to speak on the alley also. We just got this memo just, you know, about an hour ago I think. And I want to ask you, one thing that Mr. Wolinski said, that he said that the initial depth was 20. It was initially 28 and went 38 instead of 20 to 40. There was an increase, it only went up from about 9,000 to 11,250 which is still only about a quarter of the ground floor space.

And I think he's right to kind of point out what the problem is. The problem is fitting this thing into this site. And that's what affects the alley. It would affect everything because in the attempt to maximize the residential density, they're willing to abuse the B-2 to make this a residential development rather than a business development in a B-2 District. They have tried to squeeze everything without underground parking. Everybody else --

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Are you dealing with the alley clarification?

MR. WRIGHT: I'm dealing with the alley, yes.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Because you did make some comments, we received your email, if you can
clarify.

MR. WRIGHT: Okay. So, they say that they have input from the abutting property owners. The City does --

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Hold on one second.

Alderman Rainey, you wanted to --

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Mr. Wright, I have such great respect for you and I love reading what you write. But I have no idea what you're saying because first of all you're going 5,000 words a minute and you're not really speaking into the mike.

MR. WRIGHT: Okay. I'm sorry, I'll try and --

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Hold the mike.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Slow down. Slow down.

MR. WRIGHT: I'll try and do better. I was worried about five minutes but I'll try and do better.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Don't worry about it. I'll move that we extend. Just slow down because you're just making no sense.

MR. WRIGHT: Yes, thank you. I appreciate it.

It's a matter of, you know, of working with the residents. And I think that, maybe I can start out by saying that the developers did meet with the City Staff,
with the Harrison Street neighbors in Alderman Tisdahl's home on Saturday. And they met, you know, by themselves on the north side of Harrison Street on Sunday. And what they actually called the developer to ask for on Sunday was saying, you know, because the choice they were given frankly at the meeting on Saturday was do you want to be hung or do you want to be shot? You know, do you want it as it is now or do you want to have this diagonal parking in the alley, you know, that was the choice, do you want to be hung or do you want to be shot?

And what they did when they met together, they kind of called the developer and kind of said, instead would you please put all the access to the garage on Eastwood? And the developer, like he has since several months ago, said no, no way. And why? The answer is because the developer could not afford to give up one square foot of space on the ground floor.

The only reason the commercial space is still not adequate, the only reason there's a push in the alley, the only reason they're using handicapped access spots for entry to the waste areas, for entry to the lobby, for entry to the stores so these access areas for
handicap parking are being used for access for waste things, the only reason they're doing all that, they can't afford to give up one square foot of space and make this the massive residential project they want which is more then four times the allowable maximum as of right in the B-2 District. They're above 80,000 as opposed to a 20,000 maximum.

So, what they are doing here, and when the neighbors call, you know, they're saying they're trying to work with the neighbors, when the neighbors called and said can you work with us, put all of this on Eastwood instead, they said no. No way. That's been their answer to almost everything for the last two months.

They have, you know, they talked about, you saw the picture. That picture was taken of an alley where the pavement is 14-foot wide. This will only have two more feet. It didn't show you kind of, imagine farther down the alley, because that 16 feet is going to be from fence to wall, fence to wall, it didn't show you the garbage vehicles. This is 300 feet.

I have a 19-foot alley. A lot of the older persons have 19, 20-foot, you know, even pavement areas
are much wider than that. In my 19-foot alley, I have
to pull over into a garage area to have safe passage.
When it snows, nobody can pass. In snow, it's a one-way
sort of alley.

This is a very narrow alley. If you have a
15-foot SUV and you got a 16-foot alley, how well are
you going to be able to get out when you have a 300-foot
wall across from you? You will not be able to get out.

So, this is a situation where the traffic
ingineers are now finally admitting you have to pass,
even with 16 feet, very slowly, very carefully. And
assuming no more vegetation on the wall, by the way,
they show vegetation on the wall that would take about a
foot and a half of this, no more vegetation on the wall
I assume, you know, from thing to thing. The overall
problem here, and Mr. Ruiz, he had it exactly right, the
overall problem is they're trying to fit something way
too big, way too big for Central Street, way too big for
B-2 zoning, abusing B-2 zoning, and that's why nothing
fits and nothing works. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: The issue before us
is whether or not we will accept the recommendation of
the Plan Commission or deny the, or reject, accept or reject, which by the way if we decide to reject the planned development's proposal, tonight is not the last, you know, time we will hear about this particular project. That means the Council will come back and deliberate further to determine whether to accept the proposal as presented by the developer or to make the necessary modifications as the Council may see as may be proposed by the neighbors. So, the only issue before us right now is whether or not we will accept the recommendation or reject it.

And so, Council -- Alderman Tisdahl?

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Thank you, Alderman Jean-Baptiste. I had two goals when this project was first brought to me.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can't hear you.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: It's on, sorry.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Liz, we're having trouble hearing tonight.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Is it working though?

It's on.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: That I can't say, but for once I have turned it on. I really have. Can you hear
out there? Okay. I can't cut it any closer to my mouth.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Yes, it's good.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Well, I had two goals. One of the goals was to have transparency. I didn't want anyone to be driving down Central Street, you know, nine months from now and see some project going up and go what's going on here. And I wanted to be sure that everybody knew. And I think at least I have achieved that goal. Everybody knows that something is happening on Central Street and I wanted everyone to have a chance to have input and that's worked.

The second goal was I wanted consensus and that's not going to happen at all. There are people who are in favor of the five-story proposed building, there are people who are in favor of this proposal, and there are people who are opposed to it. So, I'll give up on consensus.

But I am opposed to the Plan Commission's recommendation. What they really recommended was that we reject this and go back to the five-story proposal. If you read the Plan Commission transcripts, that's what they said we should be doing.
I do not support the five-story building. And it was a beautiful building, it was well designed. I had a ward meeting so that everybody would know in the ward, flyered the whole ward. More than a hundred people came to hear the developer's presentation. And while, yes, probably 15 or 20 percent liked it, the overall reaction was this visceral one of downtown has come to Central Street. And it was just a feeling that it was canyonization and that it was just too big.

So, with great admiration and respect for the volunteers on the Plan Commission, I do not agree that we should reject this and send the developer back to the Plan Commission with the five-story proposal. That proposal did preserve the historic hundred-year-old house which I love the idea of preserving a worker's house instead of preserving only mansions by the lake. But the cost was too much because it was the only public benefit that the development was going to give because it was very expensive to preserve the house and they needed a fifth story. And the ward felt overwhelmingly that affordable housing was a greater public benefit than preserving the hundred-year-old house.

And for the environmentalists' concerns, there
was very little green space that was part of preserving
the house. There was parking behind it and the
development was built up quite close to the side of the
building. So, we would not have achieved much green
space.

So, I would like to reject the Plan
Commission's recommendation that we reject this proposal
and go back to the five-story. I think we should
consider this proposal. I talked to Alderman Engleman
today. The theaters have been vacant for seven years.
The house has been vacant for at least two. I asked him
during the time he was alderman if he had had any
proposals to develop, and he said yes, some nonprofits
had come to him with various ideas and none of them had
been financially feasible.

That was my experience as well. Two
nonprofits, a children's museum and an arts group came
to me and wanted to buy the property and neither one
could get the funding. Other than that, this is the
only proposal that I have seen. No developer has come
to me and said if you all reject the current proposal,
don't worry I'll have a proposal on your desk the next
morning. I have heard nothing.
So, I am not good at predicting the future but I can say for the present that I have heard absolutely nothing about any other potential development from developers. From citizens, yes. We all love Central Street. We think it's a marvelous area and we think developers should be beating down the doors. But I have not heard any of them actually doing it.

So, I'll walk you through a little of where we are now and how we got there. I was at a block party this summer on Harrison which directly is adjacent to the proposed development. And the neighbors said to me, Liz, is there any reason to try to fight the five stories? Will there be any, will anyone listen? I said absolutely. It's a democracy. You know, go ahead, say what you think and we will listen.

As a result of the neighbors' help, this proposal has been reduced, the height to four stories. There is an increased setback on Central Street. The development is providing 100 percent of the required parking. The retail space has increased. And I would like to say that the neighbors pointed that out, I completely missed that there wasn't enough retail space. It was tremendously helpful and that has been
increased.

The pinch points at the alley abutting 1700 to 1722 are being buried at the developer's expense. And that will make it a slightly better alley. I think it also will be, as you've pointed out, a much more heavily traveled alley.

The density has been decreased. It was at 55 units which is half of what is allowable under our zoning which is yet another reason that I hope everyone will come to Central Street planning and look at our zoning because the idea that a 110 units is acceptable is very difficult for me to imagine. Marge Anderson was completely right at the last meeting, the number of units seems to be a movable target and I don't think that that's all right and I hope the developer will speak to that issue. I don't think we should hear that it's 55, 54, 48, you know, I think we need to know exactly what we're being asked to pass. And I do not recommend voting until we know exactly how many units are being proposed.

I did have a meeting of the people who live on the alley because a great deal has been said about the alley by everybody. But the people who live on the
alley are the ones who are most knowledgeable about the
alley, and they are the ones who are entitled to use the
alley. So, I thought it would be helpful to discuss the
alley with them. And I'd like to thank the City Staff
who came who were marvelous, and the developer came.
And the Fire Chief, Chief Berkowsky, described how they
would fight a fire on the alley and hopefully put that
issue to rest. And John Burke described as he has here
the average alley widths in Evanston.

And I think I'm going to read to you because I
don't want to get it wrong what the Harrison neighbors
said. I have spoken, there are six residents that are
directly behind the project, I spoke on the last two
days with three of them asking how they felt about the
project. I quote: "Not wildly enthusiastic. Do not
oppose it." "This may be the best we can do." "Not in
love with the project. Do not oppose it." "We would
like one more foot for the alley. But on balance, do
not oppose the development."

They all had requested the developer be asked
if all the parking could enter and exit from Eastwood,
and if not, why not. And I hope that will be addressed
by the developer tonight. And another one said I am
more in favor than neutral because the developer has tried to work with us. So, those are direct quotes from three of the six homes that are directly behind the alley.

I think we have to decide tonight about the variances that have been requested. The height variance of three feet is something the developer asked me if it would be all right because the architect needed the three extra feet of height to create an architecturally better building. And I said it would be okay with me to have the extra three feet if he absolutely needed it to make the building significantly architecturally better. I think it's an attractive building. I don't know a great deal about architecture but it's my fault that there are the extra three feet, because I said I thought it would be worth it.

The loading berths I would like John Burke to discuss. He has said that one loading berth is sufficient. I do not know about loading berths. I am relying on his judgment that condos need fewer loading berths than apartments. And I think John needs to speak to that.

That leaves us --
CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Now we can hear you.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Am I shouting now? Is it okay? Okay. That leaves us with two variances. One is the ten-foot setback, and we have to look at the things that we've gained during the negotiation and decide whether to allow that. And the other is the floor area ratio.

So, I have been negotiating on this with the neighbors and with the developers for nine months. And I can tell you, based upon the current zoning, this is the best plan that I have been able to negotiate. And I think that it's reasonable given, I remind you, three vacant properties on half a block to reject the Plan Commission's recommendation and have the City Council seriously discuss and consider the four-story proposal. And I would like to remind you that no developer has come up with any other proposal in the last seven years.

It's been seven years that these two theaters have been vacant. And within the last two years, we added another vacant building, the little house. So, the history of vacancies on that half a block is not good. I think we can do better than that and I think we should consider this proposal.
CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. Liz, we would
need a motion from you.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Well, I would like to hear
from John Burke --

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Let me just say this
issue.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: You want a motion?

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: The issue is whether
we reject or accept.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: I move we reject the Plan
Commission's --

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: And so, we need to
discuss that because once we make a decision, that will
trigger the next step. And rejection means that our
Director of Development and Legal have to provide us
with an ordinance with the particulars so that we can
have some concrete proposal before us to address. So,
we need a motion.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: I move that we reject the
recommendation of the Plan Commission.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Second.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. Any further
discussion on that? Alderman Moran?
ALDERMAN MORAN: In the materials that Mr. Dershin referred to in his PowerPoint presentation, there are photographs, in particular two buildings that they're of historical significance to where we are tonight. One is a photograph --

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Page 9.

ALDERMAN MORAN: It's the ninth page into the materials.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: It's not numbered.

ALDERMAN MORAN: They're not numbered but it's the ninth page. The photograph in the upper left-hand side of that page is a photograph of a building coming right out to the street literally seemingly trying to crawl over the sidewalk and get into the street which has come to be known in the area as the Renal Care building. It's at Central and Central Park, the northeast corner. The building in the upper right side was known back in those days when these were coming forward is the Strange development. The family that was developing it was named Strange.

But both of these developments were originally proposed as four-story developments that were exceedingly beyond anything close to contextual to the
areas that they were going into. And we had quite a
battle, it was sort of behind the scenes, we had quite a
battle with the developers. But ultimately, they both
agreed to bring the developments down by a story so that
they became three-story buildings. But over the course
of time, the buildings became almost iconic in the sense
that they were buildings that people in the neighborhood
felt were not serving us well, that they were kind of
the camel's nose under the tent in terms of what Central
Street could become over the course of time. And that
Central Street was not one that people really wanted.

Subsequent to these developments finally going
up, we began a process to look at rezoning the West
Central commercial district and what transitioned from a
B-2 Commercial District to what is now a B-1A District
which constrains future development to three stories, 40
feet or whichever is less. It got rid of the mandatory
build to lot line which had become a kind of a rallying
point. When you look at the Renal Care building, it's
just pushing people out into the street. So, we got rid
of that and there is a three-foot required setback and
it could be as much as 11 feet on the initiative of the
developers. Moving to the area that we're talking about
tonight, there is currently pending a reference to the
Plan Commission to rezone this area from B-2 to B-1A, on
reference from Alderman Tisdahl. So, I think that what
we accomplished in the West Central commercial district
is something that's looked upon as desirable for this
part of Central Street as well.

Ironically, not much more than three weeks
from tonight, there will be the first meeting in a
several months planning process to look at the future of
Central Street and to try to develop a vision of Central
Street that will be in conformity with the needs of
businesses and residents who live in the area. And
hopefully, it will be a very beneficial effort. But I
do think that it would be important to engage in that
process and to develop that vision before a development
that is as large and as significant as this one goes
forward. And it would be ironic to me that a major
piece in this puzzle would be decided before that
process had even begun although it is about to begin
very soon.

So, I think that we need to step back, take a
look at this. I think that an acceptance of the Plan
Commission's rejection of the proposal is the right
thing to do at this point in time. And I don't say that
because I want the developer to be overly discouraged
because I am very happy that we have good people who are
interested in investing in Central Street. But as
several people have said over the course of various
meetings, this is our future here. We're casting our
lot to an environment that will be preserved for 50, 60,
70, maybe 100 years, and we need to try to get it right.

The clear problem here with talking about
robbing from Peter to pay Paul, the commercial spaces
need to be smaller so that we can get all the parking
that's at ground level in. And we also, the back of the
building pushes out because this is what we have to do
to get however many condominium units there will be in
there. 54 I think was the number that I heard the last
time we were here.

These other developments put much of their
parking underground. That has, we've been told that
that can't be done economically here. But I think that
we have to be concerned. And I understand Alderman
Tisdahl's concern but I think there's, just very quickly
as an aside, I think there are some reasons why seven
years have gone by. The owner of the theater properties
CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Alderman Moran, I'm going to give you one minute, okay? Just so we can --

ALDERMAN MORAN: Okay. Has been receiving rent from Sony for a long time, so he has not been motivated to market the property aggressively. Central Street is looked upon as an attractive place. I do think that we need to get it right. I expect that this developer can get it right. I believe that he can. I know he has the wherewithal to do that. And if he can't get it right, then we should find somebody, and I'm confident that we can, who will get it right.

So, I think what we need to do is step back, take a deep breath. I appreciate everything that Alderman Tisdahl has done. She's worked very hard. I salute her for doing that. I would ask all of us though to not take the course of anything is better than this and surrender to a proposal that isn't the right proposal, at least not yet. Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: There are no more lights. And so, there has been a motion on the floor to reject the Plan Commission's recommendation. It was
seconded. All those in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Opposed?

(Some nays.)

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. So, we have two nays and seven ayes. So, we need to then get an ordinance written up and that will be part of our for discussion at the next P&D meeting. And at that time, we can work on trying to figure out how best we can move forward with this project. Okay? Do we need a motion to get an ordinance? We don't need to do that, that's automatic, right? Okay, great. That's the direction.

MR. WOLINSKI: Alderman Jean-Baptiste?

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Yes?

MR. WOLINSKI: May I ask a question? In the drafting of the ordinance, typically what happens and this is when there's a denial from the Plan Commission so there is no ordinance at this time, Staff will basically go with the developer's proposal and prepare the ordinance in that light. Is that the way you would like it done? Is there any --

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: We need to do it as we usually do it and we need to get this information out.
to the objectors as quickly as possible so they could prepare to give some feedback. It's a new discussion.

MR. WOLINSKI: Okay.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. All right.

Alderman Rainey?

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Yes. I would like to make a special request on behalf of all the trees in the world. Will you please not reduplicate this information? Only give me new information. For example, the new ordinance, I don't need new copies of all of this or the transcripts that we got.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. So, I'm certain that everybody understands, but for purposes of clarification, let me just repeat what just happened. The Committee has decided to reject the Plan Commission's proposal that we deny this development all together. That means that the City Staff will prepare an ordinance for the Committee to consider and to deliberate over.

Now, that means that we opened the door because we need to hear from, because we will be thinking in a different way. At issue will be whether or not we will approve the planned development that is
proposed or whether we'll make some modifications or
what have you to move the process forward. Okay? So,
that's where we are.

MS. ROSINSKI: -- of all the variances?

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: That is, the
proposal, the latest proposal is what we will consider.
Okay? The proposal that was rejected is what we will
consider because we voted to deny the rejection.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's the 48-unit
proposal then?

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Hold on one second.

MS. ROSINSKI: -- I'm sorry. In the last, in
the packages that I received, there is -- has 48 units
and it has 51 units. And then -- as a resident, I guess
-- what's going on?

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. The same way
you knew what was going on when the project was proposed
to the Plan Commission, the Plan Commission deliberated
over the four-story project. That is what will come
before us, okay, in its complete form, that particular
proposal.

ALDERMAN RAINHEY: Point of order, Mr.

Chairman. Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Yes, yes.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: If we need to have our Legal Department, we've got like 12 lawyers, come forth and explain this, let's do it. This is no different than any other planned development that we've overruled the Plan Commission.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: That's fine. That's what we're trying to make the people understand.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: I know but --

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: We are, we will consider what was before the Plan Commission, that's what we will consider. Okay? So, that's where we are.

All right. Our next Planning & Development -- hold on one second. I didn't recognize you, okay, could you wait a minute please? Alderman Wynne?

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Alderman Tisdahl raised a number of issues for the Staff. And I think before we close the discussion on this this evening, we should hear from the Staff regarding those issues that she raised.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: But let me say this, can we get a response from the Staff in writing along
with the proposed planned development that we will be
considering? In that way, we will be able to see the
totality of the package, because the specific response
right now will not necessarily move us forward in terms
of the issue that is before us. I mean, that's my
sense.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Well, I'd like to see if
that's acceptable to Alderman Tisdahl. If the Staff has
a ready answer tonight, I think it would be useful to
hear it at this session.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: What is your
perception of what are the issues that need to be
clarified?

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Well, I think, Alderman
Tisdahl, didn't you raise the issue about the alley with
Mr. Burke? That was one of your issues.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: I did raise the issue of
the alley with Mr. Burke and I raised the loading,
really the main issue that's outstanding is the loading
docks.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: And you raised the entrance
and also the number of units.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: And the number of units.
Well, that's for the developer.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. The alley, what do you need to know about the alley?

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Alderman Tisdahl, would it be acceptable to you to hear about this in writing or do you want to hear from the Staff now?

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Well, the alley issue, they have resolved --

ALDERMAN WYNNE: You're comfortable with the alley issue.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: They have written this which I think, I hope it's available to the public otherwise you can have my copy.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: And then the other issue that you raised was the loading berth.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: The loading docks and John Burke has an answer, and I think it would be a good idea if he gave it in front of everybody so everybody could be on the same page and know what the response is to the loading dock issue.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: And what are the other issues?

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I think those were the two
that she raised.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: The two, okay. So, the alley is --

ALDERMAN WYNNE: And then, for the developer the issue is the number of units.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Number of units that will be proposed, okay. Go ahead, John.

MR. BURKE: A slight variation on the loading dock. The berth is for the larger vehicles, that's off Eastwood. There is an existing loading area off Central that we would recommend retaining. We had recommended to the Plan Commission that it go to the Parking Committee to be reviewed. But there would be a need for smaller vehicles. You're going to have FedEx trucks, you're going to have delivery trucks and so forth at the front.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: You're talking about the on-street loading?

MR. BURKE: Right, correct.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Designated loading area, okay.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Well, it would be important to note that it would have to be written in to the
ordinance that the trucks would have to be the smaller
variety for the condos. They couldn't have the huge
ones, so that needs to go into the ordinance.

MR. WOLINSKI: I think that was the proposal
from the developer that it would be.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Yes, it was but it needs to
go into the ordinance.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. Developer,
would you like to clarify the number of units that are
being proposed?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: The number before the
Plan Commission was 48 and they rejected it if that's
your --

ALDERMAN RAINEY: See, the developer is the
one to respond.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes, but if that's your
practice, it was 48 when the Plan Commission rejected
it.

MR. CROCKER: Our position on the number of
units is first and foremost that whatever the number of
units, the parking will be met and we will not seek any
variance. The number of units has fluctuated and I will
acknowledge that. It is fluctuating a little bit
because the market is changing and we're trying to best deliver units that are going to be well received in the marketplace.

We are not changing the parking count, but for example, if you have two three-bedroom units, that requires four cars. And if you have two one-bedrooms and a two-bedroom, that also requires four cars. And that's where this little bit of variation has been coming from. And it doesn't increase the parking and it will not translate into us seeking a variance on parking.

I think that we are prepared to say and would like to say that absolutely and unequivocally there will not be more than 54 units. And whatever the number of units, it will meet the parking requirement.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. Committee, let me suggest that the last proposal before the Plan Commission was 48 units. That's the proposal we expect. And if you want to, you know, make any other suggestions, you could, you know, make that suggestion. But we want the proposal that was before the Plan Commission, okay? That was the last proposal that was rejected, right? That's what the Director of
Development indicated to me.

See, that's why -- we're merging too many issues. At issue is whether we reject or accept. We rejected. The next step is that we get an ordinance from our Staff to consider. That ordinance needs to be the ordinance, it needs to reflect the proposal that was before the Plan Commission, okay? And that's where we're at. And if there are any variations that we need to think about, we'll think about it at the time that the proposal is submitted to us. And if somebody has any additional suggestions, we'll consider them. But that's the process.

MR. CROCKER: At the Plan Commission, we had requested 51 units on our second go-around. So, I think 51 is what's in the record. If you want to leave it at that, and then proceed from there.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: We'll see what was proposed, what was rejected, and that's how we want to --

MR. CROCKER: 51 units.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: And we'll recheck the records to see what is reflected on that.

MR. CROCKER: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay, all right.

Okay, so we're on to the next item on the agenda. Thank you very much for your concerns and diligence, Central Street Neighbors.

ALDERMAN MORAN: Alderman Jean-Baptiste?

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Yes?

ALDERMAN MORAN: There's one other, in this point, there's a discussion of the required parking. And I was at a Plan Commission meeting, at least one where there was a discussion about a restaurant that would go into this building, specifically on the corner of Eastwood and Central Street. And in recent meetings, I have heard reference from the developer that there is no restaurant in the building. And although I don't know this for a fact, I believe that that could have a significant influence in terms of what the required parking is for here.

So, in other words, the discussion is that the hitherto planned restaurant which is like the worst kept secret around Central Street is not in this project for purposes of required parking spaces. So, I think as part of, you know, the Developer-Staff discussion in relation to this ordinance that's going to come forward,
that we find out what the uses are, and if there is
going to be a restaurant in there, that the parking
should be consistent with that use.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. And we expect
that the ordinance will reflect exactly what the
proposal is. Okay? Thank you.

MR. WOLINSKI: Alderman, can I?

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Yes.

MR. WOLINSKI: In response to Alderman Moran's
point, typically what happens in a development when
you're unsure of what the uses are going to be, and a
restaurant use is more intense of course than a retail
store say for instance, there is in the zoning ordinance
in several of the districts and the B district is
included, that the first 2,000 square feet of a use do
not count against the parking. And historically,
virtually every one that has built in Evanston has
looked at their most intense use and asked for the
waiver or the bonus on that 2,000 square feet.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: You know what, we're
going to cross that bridge when we get there. We're not
there, okay? All right. Thank you. We're at P2 now.

Thank you very much for your attention to
this.

(Whereupon, the hearing in the above-titled cause was concluded at 7:55 p.m.)
CITY OF EVANSTON

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

CASE NO.: P2

RE: APPLICATION APPEALING THE PRESERVATION COMMISSION'S
DENIAL OF CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR THE
DEMOLITION OF THE EVANSTON LANDMARK AT 1722 CENTRAL

STREET. Consideration of the application appealing the
Preservation Commission's denial of a Certificate of
Appropriateness (COA) for demolition of the Evanston
Landmark at 1722 Central Street.

Transcribed Report of Proceedings of a public
hearing on the above captioned matter, held January 8,
2007 at the Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue,
2nd Floor, Evanston, Illinois, at 6:45 p.m. and presided
over by L. Jean-Baptiste, Chair.

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

STAFF:
J. WOLINSKI
J. BROWNLEE
CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: P2 is a public hearing. And what is to be considered is the application appealing the Preservation Commission's denial of a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of the Evanston Landmark at 1722 Central Street. And I believe, right, it was held at the last meeting. I don't know how much time we have to consider this. 45 days from -- Mr. Ruiz, can you --

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Are we getting close?

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Can you inform us as to where we are in terms of the time that we have to accept or reject?

MR. RUIZ: You have made the motion to accept the appeal, to hear the appeal.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Right, we accepted the appeal, yes.

MR. RUIZ: And so, you have until January 11 to make a decision.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: We have until January 11th?

MR. RUIZ: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: So, that's three days from now, right? Okay. So, but we can possibly ask for
an extension, right?

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: From the applicant.

MR. RUIZ: The applicant, the practice from the City Council and recommendation from the Legal Department has been that if the applicant were to request an extension, that you would consider that.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. So, is that the Applicant's representative? Okay, go ahead.

MR. GRAINES: Greg Graines, attorney for the Applicant from DLA Piper. On behalf of the Applicant, we'd like to request that the matter of the appealing the Preservation Commission's denial of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of Evanston Landmark at 1722 Central Street be extended for an additional 45-day period so that it can be resolved at the same time as the planned development for 1700-1722 Central Street.

MR. RUIZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Alderman Wynne?

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I move we accept the Applicant's request for a 45-day extension on the Certificate of Appropriateness.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: All those in favor, say aye.
(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay, all right.

MR. GRAINES: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: It's been accepted.

(Whereupon, the hearing in the above-titled cause was continued at 8:10 p.m.)