

**Planning & Development Committee  
Minutes of January 8, 2007  
Council Chambers – 6:30 p.m.  
Evanston Civic Center**

**Alderman Present:** S. Bernstein, A. Hansen, D. Holmes, L. Jean-Baptiste, E. Moran, A. Rainey, E. Tisdahl, C. Wollin, M. Wynne

**Staff Present:** J. Wolinski, J. Aiello, J. Burke, C. Brzezinski, K. Cox, R. Dahal, W. Hallen, H. Hill, D. Jennings, V. Jones, D. Marino, C. Ruiz, R. Russell, D. Spicuzza, J. Brownlee

**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

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

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 Diener 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. Diener's request.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

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

Respectfully submitted,

---

Jacqueline E. Brownlee

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

CITY OF EVANSTON

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

CASE NO.: P1

RE: PLANNED DEVELOPMENT 1700-1722 CENTRAL STREET -  
RECOMMENDED DENIAL FROM THE PLAN COMMISSION.

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

1                   CHAIRMAN JEAN BAPTISTE: Good evening  
2 everybody. Welcome to the meeting of the Planning &  
3 Development Committee of January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2007.

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

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

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

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

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

23                  In fact, the trend in recent years is that the

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

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

18           Staff as we've stated in previous memos finds  
19 that the 16-foot width alley is appropriate, or I should  
20 say acceptable. However, if the property owners along  
21 the alley were to seek an even wider alley, if this was  
22 our design process and they were looking for a wider  
23 alley, in this case if the development is unable to

1 provide that additional width, a one-way alley would be  
2 our next option to work with them on. And so, that's  
3 where we -- did you want to --

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

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

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

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

15 MR. BURKE: The property line for the  
16 development.

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

21 MR. CROCKER: It will remain.

22 ALDERMAN WOLLIN: It will remain with speed  
23 bumps. And then there's a huge tree stump on the south

1 side of the alley. Is that being earmarked for removal  
2 I'm hoping?

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

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

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

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

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

14 MR. CROCKER: Yes.

15 ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Okay, thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Alderman Tisdahl.

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

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

21 ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Yes, it's on.

22 CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay, all right.

23 ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Hold on, better?

1                   CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE:  Yes.

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

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

9                   ALDERMAN TISDAHL:  It's in the other part of  
10 the alley, not directly in front of the property, the  
11 1700 to 1722 Central.  It's further down the alley.

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

17                  MR. DERSHIN:  Yes.

18                  CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE:  For the court  
19 reporter.

20                  MR. DERSHIN:  Yes, my name is Harvey Dershin.  
21 I live at 2606 Hartzell Street in Evanston.  And I'm  
22 speaking on behalf of a group of people from the  
23 neighborhood who have been concerned about these issues.

1 And we call ourselves variously The Friends of Central  
2 Street, the Central Street Neighbors. A lot of them are  
3 here this evening. If you'd just maybe stand up so we  
4 know who you are? Good.

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

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

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

12 MR. DERSHIN: Okay, thank you.

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

1 that we are certainly endorsing the Plan Commission's  
2 action to reject this proposal.

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

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

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

1 if you will, I'm going to try to do that.

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

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

20 All right. Now, we've seen a lot of buildings  
21 going up along Central Street, some of them almost  
22 overnight. I have one of them virtually in my backyard,  
23 you know, this five-story condominium replacing a

1 building that was three stories before. There are many  
2 other structures. I have some pictures which are sort  
3 of interesting to show. Bob, could you go to the  
4 pictures? Thank you.

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

10 ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Can we have an address?

11 MR. DERSHIN: Sorry?

12 ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Mr. Hughes' address?

13 MR. DERSHIN: Jim?

14 ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Where does he live?

15 MR. HUGHES: 2518.

16 MR. DERSHIN: Right. Here is 2606. This is  
17 what curb appeal looks like when you have a five-story  
18 neighbor in your backyard. And this is the building we  
19 used to have before that, and this fellow sort of popped  
20 up overnight and it was startling. And we were  
21 disorganized and we couldn't do anything about it. Bob?

22 And then we've seen other buildings come along  
23 Central Street. Here is one that somehow, you know,

1 manages to be built over the curb with about, well over  
2 the sidewalk with about a seven-foot clearance to the  
3 curb. Here's another one that's lumbering, hanging over  
4 the sidewalk like some big monster. This, by the way,  
5 this is an interesting one. This is the alley behind  
6 the, I think the Brown's Chicken construction. It's  
7 been blocked for three years with construction.

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

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

23           All right. Well, we think that this

1 particular building is a step backwards. It's a  
2 transitional event. You know, it's kind of sneaking  
3 through the way the zoning is and the way the zoning is  
4 going to be. And as a matter of fact, you know, it  
5 doesn't meet the current B-2 Zoning. It's not going to  
6 meet the B-1A Zoning should that get approved. It's  
7 sort of not fish or fowl, it's not one thing or another.

8 And if you'd flip the slide, Bob?

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

23                   This is, we took a couple of Honda automobiles

1 and we put them in the alley this morning and took some  
2 pictures just to see what it would look like if we could  
3 get two of them by each other. You really can't do  
4 that, you know, unless you're, you know, you're  
5 practically up on top of this fence over here and, you  
6 know, you're riding in the rubbish on the other side of  
7 the building. So, it's very, very tight, it's very,  
8 very tight. And what's going to happen is we have eight  
9 family homes, you know, along that street right now.  
10 Well, you're going to put in 50 units and businesses,  
11 you're going to have ten times as much traffic in that  
12 alley. And we think it's going to be a problem. Bob?

13           Okay. So, what we're looking at is a building  
14 that's going to be out of conformance with the existing  
15 zoning and with the proposed new zoning. And we're  
16 going to have that for a century or more. It's going to  
17 be with us forever. That's a long time.

18           Now, and we think if someone is going to build  
19 something of this scope and of this magnitude, I have no  
20 problem with it, but we think if someone does that it  
21 should be done with an eye towards what the overall  
22 Central Street plan is so we don't have more of this  
23 piecemealing, more of this tearing off of bits and

1 pieces of property and making everybody unhappy. We  
2 think something that is being built in this should fit  
3 in to the overall concept, not be just another thing.  
4 Something different.

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

12           We saw all kinds of interesting businesses  
13 from high end to low end and elegant to funky come into  
14 Central Street, and all of a sudden Central Street is  
15 very hot. People want to go there. People come to  
16 Central Street from surrounding communities for a cup of  
17 coffee, for a restaurant, to buy something. And of  
18 course, if you walk down Central Street, the variety of  
19 the facades and the different businesses there give you  
20 that feeling almost of an English high street, you know.

21           Well, this has had a spillover on the  
22 communities. What that's meant is, gee, we have this  
23 wonderful neighborhood right there. You can walk to it.

1 It's right close to us. It's helped our property  
2 values. It's helped our own properties be more  
3 desirable. And frankly, it's improved our quality of  
4 life and we love it. And we'd like to see more of it.

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

16 In terms of tax base, we've had our own real  
17 estate people look at this and they estimate maybe  
18 \$700,000 a year gross revenue in taxes. That's \$10 a  
19 person in Evanston. You know, that's not going to  
20 change the face of the world, and that's without  
21 deducting the expenses that will come about to support  
22 this thing because we have to deal with schools and  
23 safety and infrastructure and sanitation and other

1 things like that. My guess is when you put all those  
2 numbers together, this thing is going to be awash in  
3 terms of the tax base.

4           There's a hidden cost here as well, and we  
5 have to be sensitive to that because when we had a five-  
6 story building appear on our backyard, all of a sudden  
7 we had people looking at our bedroom windows, you know.

8 We went out and we, like many others on our street,  
9 went out and invested tens of thousands of dollars in  
10 landscaping to put up big trees. You walk up and down  
11 Hartzell Street, you'll see big trees up there now to  
12 protect us. Who pays for that? I did. My neighbors  
13 did. Okay?

14           And we've heard also that this is somehow a  
15 blighted area. Well, again, I've been in this area for  
16 32 years. I never thought of this as a blighted area  
17 until all the restaurants and businesses got kicked out  
18 over the last few months. Now it does look like a  
19 blighted area. But you know what, I'm sure there are  
20 plenty of ideas and plenty of opportunities for  
21 developing this area.

22           And this is not a one shot deal. There are  
23 other ways, there are other avenues, there are

1 alternatives. In fact, we did a little research on a  
2 building that's about a half a block away that is  
3 currently listed for sale at 40 percent more than it was  
4 purchased for three years. This doesn't sound like a  
5 blighted area to me.

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

10 (Applause.)

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

17 MR. HORNE: My name is Bob Horne. I'm one of  
18 the co-developers on this project. And all I wanted to  
19 say, I mean, well, a couple of things. One, I'd  
20 probably refute a couple of the comments on the tax  
21 revenue. I think we scrubbed that number pretty hard in  
22 terms of what we presented and are very confident in  
23 that number. So, if everyone wanted to sit down and

1 analyze tax revenues, I think we'd be very comfortable  
2 stating that this project has a very strong economic tax  
3 base.

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

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

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

22           ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Other people who want to  
23 talk?

1           CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Yes, but I had asked  
2 people, people had signed up and I thought that Mr.  
3 Dershin did the presentation for the Save Central Street  
4 Group. And last week, we had a number of people speak.  
5 So, right now, we're going to have the Council  
6 deliberate on this particular issue.

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

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

12          MS. ROSINSKI: I think that --

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

16          MS. ROSINSKI: I was right there --

17          ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: She was standing behind  
18 somebody.

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

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

23          CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: I thought that,

1 didn't --

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, he didn't.

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

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

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Alderman, excuse me.

7 CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: What?

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Point of clarification --  
9 signed up have already spoken at the last meeting. So,  
10 if you're going to allow people --

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

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just that issue.

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

20 MS. ROSINSKI: My name is Mary Rosinski. My  
21 issue does pertain to the alley, and I know when they  
22 talk about the 15-foot alley I would just like to point  
23 out that if that is true, I question, I think there has

1 to be some real verification because between the paved  
2 part in the building, there's really only six inches or  
3 eight inches right now. So, just, I think we're talking  
4 about inches on a huge project which is absurd.

5 But my other question regarding the alley is  
6 the confusion from Staff. I think you're seeing a lot  
7 and lot of frustration. You look at the faces in here.

8 This isn't even half the people who are frustrated with  
9 the City and the Staff and the lack of accurate  
10 information and the confusion that's coming forward.  
11 And the feeling that if we're going to make a decision,  
12 it really has to be based on accurate information and  
13 everyone has to go by the same rules and we all have to  
14 understand the same rules. And I've been getting  
15 different answers.

16 In the zoning analysis on this property, in  
17 the zoning analysis for the building at 1722, it says  
18 that the residential rear setback is ten feet abutting a  
19 residential district. I did talk to Frank. He says the  
20 alley is a district line, et cetera, et cetera, whatever  
21 that would be. But on two other projects, that one that  
22 was passed at the 2953 and the other one that's in front  
23 of you or has just passed today 25 abutting up to a

1 residential district, it says that it goes by the B-2  
2 standards which is 15 feet abutting a residential  
3 district.

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

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

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

23           MS. ROSINSKI: Sure.

1                   CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: It is under his  
2 provision. But if you have a document, you can bring it  
3 forward.

4                   MS. ROSINSKI: Sure. These are the zoning  
5 analyses from the City.

6                   MR. WOLINSKI: Mary, can I ask you, what was  
7 the date of the zoning analysis that you're referring  
8 to?

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

13                  ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: What are you asking  
14 about?

15                  MR. WOLINSKI: Yes, I'm confused. Are we  
16 talking about 1700 Central or are we talking about 825  
17 Chicago?

18                  MS. ROSINSKI: Well, what I'm saying is that  
19 1700 Central is in front of your right now and that says  
20 it's 10 feet abutting a residential district for the  
21 rear yard setback which is the alley. And the reason  
22 that's important is because we need clearance back  
23 there.

1           But on two other zoning analyses, one that is  
2 already done is Renal Care building which had the same  
3 requirements in your zoning book abutting a residential  
4 district. The Renal Care building said it had to be 15  
5 feet. And the zoning analysis for 825 Chicago Avenue  
6 says 15 feet abutting a residential district.

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

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

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

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

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

21           CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Can you just clarify,  
22 you could bring that, we'll let our Director of  
23 Development clarify our zoning regulations.

1           MS. ROSINSKI: Yes. And then the other thing  
2 that I think is really misleading is that all the papers  
3 and articles we see is that the developer has met the  
4 concerns of the neighbors. But it was only after six  
5 months of the residents pointing out to Staff that the  
6 zoning notification that was sent out regarding this  
7 project was short two loading berths in a business  
8 district. And so, you didn't even get the neighbors'  
9 concern on all the petitions that were signed regarding  
10 the loading berths because we didn't think it was our  
11 responsibility to double check the work of the City. It  
12 wasn't our job to understand that as we go through it.

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

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

23           MR. WOLINSKI: The setback requirement for the

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

9           There was an error in the initial analysis a  
10 number of months ago about the number of loading berths.

11       That was corrected and that was corrected in front of  
12 the Plan Commission so that the Commissioners would know  
13 the requirement. I think that --

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

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

20           I would suggest that under the planned  
21 development process, while setbacks and certainly  
22 variations are important to the overall project, that  
23 the reason you apply for a planned development not only

1 because it's mandatory in Evanston but because you're  
2 trying to fit the project into a site. And one of the  
3 issues that we've dealt with on this project and I've  
4 had discussion with Alderman Tisdahl as had members of  
5 my staff is that we were very concerned about the width  
6 of the sidewalk on Central Street. We wanted to provide  
7 the maximum amount of sidewalk on Central Street that  
8 could be provided. So, that pushes the building, if you  
9 will, in this case back to the south. Of course you  
10 push the building back to the south and you start  
11 encroaching in to the required rear lot line.

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

21           So, I think the overall decision on this  
22 project and my recommendation to the Council is that we  
23 can be concerned certainly with whether it's 10 or 15

1 feet or things like that, but I think the overall  
2 question is, you know, does this building fit in  
3 according to the Comprehensive Plan? It does have  
4 zoning deficiencies but all planned developments have  
5 zoning deficiencies and that's why you apply for a  
6 planned development.

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

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

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

16 MS. ROSINSKI: We both have the same comment.

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

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

20 MR. WRIGHT: Richard Wright at 2603 Hartzell.

21 CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Mr. Wright, if you  
22 would move the mike a little bit, put the mike over  
23 here?

1           MR. WRIGHT: Richard Wright at 2603 Hartzell.  
2     I want to speak on the alley also. We just got this  
3     memo just, you know, about an hour ago I think. And I  
4     want to ask you, one thing that Mr. Wolinski said, that  
5     he said that the initial depth was 20. It was initially  
6     28 and went 38 instead of 20 to 40. There was an  
7     increase, it only went up from about 9,000 to 11,250  
8     which is still only about a quarter of the ground floor  
9     space.

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

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

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

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

1 clarify.

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

5 CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Hold on one second.  
6 Alderman Rainey, you wanted to --

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

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

13 CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Hold the mike.

14 ALDERMAN RAINEY: Slow down. Slow down.

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

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

20 MR. WRIGHT: Yes, thank you. I appreciate it.  
21 It's a matter of, you know, of working with the  
22 residents. And I think that, maybe I can start out by  
23 saying that the developers did meet with the City Staff,

1 with the Harrison Street neighbors in Alderman Tisdahl's  
2 home on Saturday. And they met, you know, by themselves  
3 on the north side of Harrison Street on Sunday. And  
4 what they actually called the developer to ask for on  
5 Sunday was saying, you know, because the choice they  
6 were given frankly at the meeting on Saturday was do you  
7 want to be hung or do you want to be shot? You know, do  
8 you want it as it is now or do you want to have this  
9 diagonal parking in the alley, you know, that was the  
10 choice, do you want to be hung or do you want to be  
11 shot?

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

19           The only reason the commercial space is still  
20 not adequate, the only reason there's a push in the  
21 alley, the only reason they're using handicapped access  
22 spots for entry to the waste areas, for entry to the  
23 lobby, for entry to the stores so these access areas for

1 handicap parking are being used for access for waste  
2 things, the only reason they're doing all that, they  
3 can't afford to give up one square foot of space and  
4 make this the massive residential project they want  
5 which is more than four times the allowable maximum as  
6 of right in the B-2 District. They're above 80,000 as  
7 opposed to a 20,000 maximum.

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

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

22           I have a 19-foot alley. A lot of the older  
23 persons have 19, 20-foot, you know, even pavement areas

1 are much wider than that. In my 19-foot alley, I have  
2 to pull over into a garage area to have safe passage.  
3 When it snows, nobody can pass. In snow, it's a one-way  
4 sort of alley.

5 This is a very narrow alley. If you have a  
6 15-foot SUV and you got a 16-foot alley, how well are  
7 you going to be able to get out when you have a 300-foot  
8 wall across from you? You will not be able to get out.

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

21 (Applause.)

22 CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: The issue before us  
23 is whether or not we will accept the recommendation of

1 the Plan Commission or deny the, or reject, accept or  
2 reject, which by the way if we decide to reject the  
3 planned development's proposal, tonight is not the last,  
4 you know, time we will hear about this particular  
5 project. That means the Council will come back and  
6 deliberate further to determine whether to accept the  
7 proposal as presented by the developer or to make the  
8 necessary modifications as the Council may see as may be  
9 proposed by the neighbors. So, the only issue before us  
10 right now is whether or not we will accept the  
11 recommendation or reject it.

12 And so, Council -- Alderman Tisdahl?

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

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can't hear you.

17 ALDERMAN TISDAHL: It's on, sorry.

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

20 CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Is it working though?  
21 It's on.

22 ALDERMAN TISDAHL: That I can't say, but for  
23 once I have turned it on. I really have. Can you hear

1 out there? Okay. I can't cut it any closer to my  
2 mouth.

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

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

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

19 But I am opposed to the Plan Commission's  
20 recommendation. What they really recommended was that  
21 we reject this and go back to the five-story proposal.  
22 If you read the Plan Commission transcripts, that's what  
23 they said we should be doing.

1           I do not support the five-story building. And  
2 it was a beautiful building, it was well designed. I  
3 had a ward meeting so that everybody would know in the  
4 ward, flyered the whole ward. More than a hundred  
5 people came to hear the developer's presentation. And  
6 while, yes, probably 15 or 20 percent liked it, the  
7 overall reaction was this visceral one of downtown has  
8 come to Central Street. And it was just a feeling that  
9 it was canyonization and that it was just too big.

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

23           And for the environmentalists' concerns, there

1 was very little green space that was part of preserving  
2 the house. There was parking behind it and the  
3 development was built up quite close to the side of the  
4 building. So, we would not have achieved much green  
5 space.

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

16           That was my experience as well. Two  
17 nonprofits, a children's museum and an arts group came  
18 to me and wanted to buy the property and neither one  
19 could get the funding. Other than that, this is the  
20 only proposal that I have seen. No developer has come  
21 to me and said if you all reject the current proposal,  
22 don't worry I'll have a proposal on your desk the next  
23 morning. I have heard nothing.

1           So, I am not good at predicting the future but  
2 I can say for the present that I have heard absolutely  
3 nothing about any other potential development from  
4 developers. From citizens, yes. We all love Central  
5 Street. We think it's a marvelous area and we think  
6 developers should be beating down the doors. But I have  
7 not heard any of them actually doing it.

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

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

1 increased.

2           The pinch points at the alley abutting 1700 to  
3 1722 are being buried at the developer's expense. And  
4 that will make it a slightly better alley. I think it  
5 also will be, as you've pointed out, a much more heavily  
6 traveled alley.

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

21           I did have a meeting of the people who live on  
22 the alley because a great deal has been said about the  
23 alley by everybody. But the people who live on the

1 alley are the ones who are most knowledgeable about the  
2 alley, and they are the ones who are entitled to use the  
3 alley. So, I thought it would be helpful to discuss the  
4 alley with them. And I'd like to thank the City Staff  
5 who came who were marvelous, and the developer came.  
6 And the Fire Chief, Chief Berkowsky, described how they  
7 would fight a fire on the alley and hopefully put that  
8 issue to rest. And John Burke described as he has here  
9 the average alley widths in Evanston.

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

20           They all had requested the developer be asked  
21 if all the parking could enter and exit from Eastwood,  
22 and if not, why not. And I hope that will be addressed  
23 by the developer tonight. And another one said I am

1 more in favor than neutral because the developer has  
2 tried to work with us. So, those are direct quotes from  
3 three of the six homes that are directly behind the  
4 alley.

5 I think we have to decide tonight about the  
6 variances that have been requested. The height variance  
7 of three feet is something the developer asked me if it  
8 would be all right because the architect needed the  
9 three extra feet of height to create an architecturally  
10 better building. And I said it would be okay with me to  
11 have the extra three feet if he absolutely needed it to  
12 make the building significantly architecturally better.

13 I think it's an attractive building. I don't know a  
14 great deal about architecture but it's my fault that  
15 there are the extra three feet, because I said I thought  
16 it would be worth it.

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

23 That leaves us --

1                   CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Now we can hear you.

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

8                   So, I have been negotiating on this with the  
9 neighbors and with the developers for nine months. And  
10 I can tell you, based upon the current zoning, this is  
11 the best plan that I have been able to negotiate. And I  
12 think that it's reasonable given, I remind you, three  
13 vacant properties on half a block to reject the Plan  
14 Commission's recommendation and have the City Council  
15 seriously discuss and consider the four-story proposal.

16                   And I would like to remind you that no developer has  
17 come up with any other proposal in the last seven years.

18                   It's been seven years that these two theaters have been  
19 vacant. And within the last two years, we added another  
20 vacant building, the little house. So, the history of  
21 vacancies on that half a block is not good. I think we  
22 can do better than that and I think we should consider  
23 this proposal.

1           CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. Liz, we would  
2 need a motion from you.

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

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

7           ALDERMAN TISDAHL: You want a motion?

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

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

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

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

21          ALDERMAN WYNNE: Second.

22          CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. Any further  
23 discussion on that? Alderman Moran?

1           ALDERMAN MORAN: In the materials that Mr.  
2 Dershin referred to in his PowerPoint presentation,  
3 there are photographs, in particular two buildings that  
4 they're of historical significance to where we are  
5 tonight. One is a photograph --

6           ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Page 9.

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

9           ALDERMAN TISDAHL: It's not numbered.

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

21                 But both of these developments were originally  
22 proposed as four-story developments that were  
23 exceedingly beyond anything close to contextual to the

1 areas that they were going into. And we had quite a  
2 battle, it was sort of behind the scenes, we had quite a  
3 battle with the developers. But ultimately, they both  
4 agreed to bring the developments down by a story so that  
5 they became three-story buildings. But over the course  
6 of time, the buildings became almost iconic in the sense  
7 that they were buildings that people in the neighborhood  
8 felt were not serving us well, that they were kind of  
9 the camel's nose under the tent in terms of what Central  
10 Street could become over the course of time. And that  
11 Central Street was not one that people really wanted.

12           Subsequent to these developments finally going  
13 up, we began a process to look at rezoning the West  
14 Central commercial district and what transitioned from a  
15 B-2 Commercial District to what is now a B-1A District  
16 which constrains future development to three stories, 40  
17 feet or whichever is less. It got rid of the mandatory  
18 build to lot line which had become a kind of a rallying  
19 point. When you look at the Renal Care building, it's  
20 just pushing people out into the street. So, we got rid  
21 of that and there is a three-foot required setback and  
22 it could be as much as 11 feet on the initiative of the  
23 developers. Moving to the area that we're talking about

1 tonight, there is currently pending a reference to the  
2 Plan Commission to rezone this area from B-2 to B-1A, on  
3 reference from Alderman Tisdahl. So, I think that what  
4 we accomplished in the West Central commercial district  
5 is something that's looked upon as desirable for this  
6 part of Central Street as well.

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

21           So, I think that we need to step back, take a  
22 look at this. I think that an acceptance of the Plan  
23 Commission's rejection of the proposal is the right

1 thing to do at this point in time. And I don't say that  
2 because I want the developer to be overly discouraged  
3 because I am very happy that we have good people who are  
4 interested in investing in Central Street. But as  
5 several people have said over the course of various  
6 meetings, this is our future here. We're casting our  
7 lot to an environment that will be preserved for 50, 60,  
8 70, maybe 100 years, and we need to try to get it right.

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

17           These other developments put much of their  
18 parking underground. That has, we've been told that  
19 that can't be done economically here. But I think that  
20 we have to be concerned. And I understand Alderman  
21 Tisdahl's concern but I think there's, just very quickly  
22 as an aside, I think there are some reasons why seven  
23 years have gone by. The owner of the theater properties

1 has been --

2 CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Alderman Moran, I'm  
3 going to give you one minute, okay? Just so we can --

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

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

20 (Applause.)

21 CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: There are no more  
22 lights. And so, there has been a motion on the floor to  
23 reject the Plan Commission's recommendation. It was

1 seconded. All those in favor, say aye.

2 (Chorus of ayes.)

3 CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Opposed?

4 (Some nays.)

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

13 MR. WOLINSKI: Alderman Jean-Baptiste?

14 CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Yes?

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

22 CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: We need to do it as  
23 we usually do it and we need to get this information out

1 to the objectors as quickly as possible so they could  
2 prepare to give some feedback. It's a new discussion.

3 MR. WOLINSKI: Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. All right.  
5 Alderman Rainey?

6 ALDERMAN RAINEY: Yes. I would like to make a  
7 special request on behalf of all the trees in the world.

8 Will you please not reduplicate this information? Only  
9 give me new information. For example, the new  
10 ordinance, I don't need new copies of all of this or the  
11 transcripts that we got.

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

20 Now, that means that we opened the door  
21 because we need to hear from, because we will be  
22 thinking in a different way. At issue will be whether  
23 or not we will approve the planned development that is

1 proposed or whether we'll make some modifications or  
2 what have you to move the process forward. Okay? So,  
3 that's where we are.

4 MS. ROSINSKI: -- of all the variances?

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

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

11 CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Hold on one second.

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

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

22 ALDERMAN RAINEY: Point of order, Mr.  
23 Chairman. Mr. Chairman?

1           CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE:  Yes, yes.

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

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

9           ALDERMAN RAINEY:  I know but --

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

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

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

22          CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE:  But let me say this,  
23 can we get a response from the Staff in writing along

1 with the proposed planned development that we will be  
2 considering? In that way, we will be able to see the  
3 totality of the package, because the specific response  
4 right now will not necessarily move us forward in terms  
5 of the issue that is before us. I mean, that's my  
6 sense.

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

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

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

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

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

23 ALDERMAN TISDAHL: And the number of units.

1 Well, that's for the developer.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

23 ALDERMAN WYNNE: I think those were the two

1 that she raised.

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

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

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

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

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

19 MR. BURKE: Right, correct.

20 ALDERMAN WYNNE: Designated loading area,  
21 okay.

22 ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Well, it would be important  
23 to note that it would have to be written in to the

1 ordinance that the trucks would have to be the smaller  
2 variety for the condos. They couldn't have the huge  
3 ones, so that needs to go into the ordinance.

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

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

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

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

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

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

19 MR. CROCKER: Our position on the number of  
20 units is first and foremost that whatever the number of  
21 units, the parking will be met and we will not seek any  
22 variance. The number of units has fluctuated and I will  
23 acknowledge that. It is fluctuating a little bit

1 because the market is changing and we're trying to best  
2 deliver units that are going to be well received in the  
3 marketplace.

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

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

16           CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. Committee, let  
17 me suggest that the last proposal before the Plan  
18 Commission was 48 units. That's the proposal we expect.

19           And if you want to, you know, make any other  
20 suggestions, you could, you know, make that suggestion.

21           But we want the proposal that was before the Plan  
22 Commission, okay? That was the last proposal that was  
23 rejected, right? That's what the Director of

1 Development indicated to me.

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

13 MR. CROCKER: At the Plan Commission, we had  
14 requested 51 units on our second go-around. So, I think  
15 51 is what's in the record. If you want to leave it at  
16 that, and then proceed from there.

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

20 MR. CROCKER: 51 units.

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

23 MR. CROCKER: Thank you.

1           CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay, all right.  
2 Okay, so we're on to the next item on the agenda. Thank  
3 you very much for your concerns and diligence, Central  
4 Street Neighbors.

5           ALDERMAN MORAN: Alderman Jean-Baptiste?

6           CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Yes?

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

18           So, in other words, the discussion is that the  
19 hitherto planned restaurant which is like the worst kept  
20 secret around Central Street is not in this project for  
21 purposes of required parking spaces. So, I think as  
22 part of, you know, the Developer-Staff discussion in  
23 relation to this ordinance that's going to come forward,

1 that we find out what the uses are, and if there is  
2 going to be a restaurant in there, that the parking  
3 should be consistent with that use.

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

7 MR. WOLINSKI: Alderman, can I?

8 CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Yes.

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

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

23 Thank you very much for your attention to

1 this.

2 (Whereupon, the hearing in the  
3 above-titled cause was  
4 concluded at 7:55 p.m.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

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

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

9           ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Are we getting close?

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

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

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

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

19          CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: We have until January  
20 11th?

21          MR. RUIZ: Yes.

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

1 an extension, right?

2 ALDERMAN TISDAHL: From the applicant.

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

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

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

17 MR. RUIZ: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Alderman Wynne?

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

22 CHAIRMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: All those in favor,  
23 say aye.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

(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.)