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CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Good evening, everyone.
This is a meeting of the Planning & Development Committee to discuss the 708 Church Street development. And we do have a quorum and so we're going to get started.
I'd first like to clear up any misunderstanding about this meeting this evening. This is not just a meeting for citizens comments. I think that might be misleading. We hope to get as many citizens comments in as possible. I want to say to all of you that as a Council we have read, believe it or not, these are the transcripts. We've had lots and lots of information from the Plan Commission. We've received many phone calls, emails, letters. Actually, I had 12 today and that's usually about average.
And what we are going to do is to set aside 90 minutes for citizens comments and I will be moving from pros and cons back and forth so everyone can have an equal amount of time which really, based upon the number that we have, which will be about a minute, just maybe about a few seconds over a minute. We're going to ask those people who are part of the coalition --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: A minute per person?
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: A minute per person. The people who are part of the coalition, I have already asked Mr. Kennedy, we are giving 20 minutes for that presentation and that they would be speaking for those citizens who are part of the coalition. I also have people who signed up on last Monday evening and did not have a chance to speak, that we want to call upon them as well.

We will begin with the presentation from the coalition. After that, the Council will have some comments and questions from the developers, and then we will go into discussion. That's the plan for right now.

When you, as I call the names after the presentation, when you go to the microphone, please state your name and spell it for our court reporter. Speak clearly into the microphone. Okay? All right.

I'm going to ask the court reporter to come forward and I ask everyone who hopes to speak tonight to stand up and raise your right hand so we can swear everyone in at the same time.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. All right. Mr. Kennedy, you want to begin?
MR. KENNEDY: Chairperson Holmes, thank you very much. And thanks for the Committee for allowing us to give a presentation.

I'm representing a group called the Evanston Coalition for Responsible Development. It's a group of sub-organizations that came together not necessarily to say no to the tower but to say yes to good, responsible development. One aspect, a key aspect that I think has been worked through a lot of the discussion and the presentation and the positioning of the developers is the economic benefit to the City for this.

Now, what I've done is I passed out a packet and I just want to briefly go through what's in it. There is a copy of the PowerPoint presentation which you can follow along and take notes. There is a short summary, the front nine pages of the Andersonville study on retail economics in Andersonville, the full copy of that would be available on our website. In fact, all of this material will be available on the website at the end of the meeting.

Next page is the economic impact of the second floor at 708 Church estimating from a survey we did of the sales tax revenue from the first floor of 708, some
assumptions on both the number of tenants as well as the traffic for each one of the 41 offices on the second floor, along with an economic impact of residents of the tower once it's built, all 218 residences. Finally, you have a copy of a spreadsheet which will be in electronic form on our website. This will show net present value equations and also assumptions on the back side. So, that's what's in your packet. Let me get started.

First, some background. This is not about height. This is not about height. This is about tangible benefits to the economy of Evanston and also to the City of Evanston's revenue stream, okay? First, let's talk about the impact to the City's revenue stream, all right?

The developer claims that this development is going to be an economic benefit to the community. There is an outside organization called Kane McKenna that reported, that seemingly backed this up. But if you read carefully what they said is they really didn't talk about the impact on the current economy, in other words, what's being taken away with the development. They also didn't talk about timing issues with regard to the cash coming into the City coffers. So, that's what I wanted
to draw forth.

Okay, now I can't see and read my own notes.

Can somebody turn that back on?

Okay. All right. What we're going to see eventually is a net present value calculation. Now, for those of you that don't understand what that is, it's basically saying that $10 ten years from now is not worth the same as $10 today. And there is an equation and a discount value that basically takes that stream of funds and says, all right, what is the bucket of this investment or this alternative investment that we have or this, whatever stream of funds it is. So, we're going to be looking at key components of the revenue stream, property taxes, store sales, taxes from that, and impact of the second floor tenants and the new residents on the organization, or on the City's budget.

Okay?

Key thing is we did conduct real basic research. We not only went into the tax rolls and pulled up information concerning what has been paid and what other things are due and comparable pieces of property. We also went in and interviewed many of the tenants on the second floor as well as many of the
storefronts. So, there was basic research done in preparing this.

Let's talk about the core assumptions on the tower side. Okay. First place, we're going to take their time line, all right. In the Kane report, there was an example of a time line, and it basically read let's assume that the Council okays this deal by this coming June. Let's also say that it's a whole year of pre-construction issues, final design, getting permits and so on. So, we begin sometime out in June 2009. Construction begins and 3.4 years to complete the project. We're not questioning that, but we all know inevitably with large projects there can be delays. There was delays in Sherman Plaza.

Okay. Property taxes. We're ramping them up the same way Sherman Plaza is being ramped up. Currently, today there are still not condos on the tax rolls. Retail sales, they've cut down from two floors down to one floor, that results in 14,325 feet worth of retail that we're going to assume $300 per square foot. Residential spending, we're going at the high end. We're assuming that each of the units, 218 units, will be spending somewhere in the area of $18,000 in Evanston
each year. This is composed of both lunch, you know, dining out, shopping, groceries and so on. And we even included employee parking for the employees of the stores that are going to be on the first floor.

Okay. Let's talk about the core assumptions on 708. All right. First off, property taxes. We are following the property tax, the actual property tax income to the City as well as the assessed value, and we're on the three-year readjustment rate which is what is standard. The retail survey -- oh, we did our own retail survey. And although we didn't get exact sales tax figures from everyone, in your packet are some assumptions there. It's basically that survey resulted in $381 per square foot. We're going to use $300 a square foot. So, we're going to stay conservative in this projection.

Okay. For those of you that don't know, on the second floor of that building are 41 offices and 120 professionals' names on the directory, okay? And we went and looked at every, you know, we met virtually everybody in there and talked about how many clients do they bring in and how many employees they had. And we're going to, and basically in talking to the property
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manager, they generally have full occupancy.

Unfortunately, right now they're down 20 percent their occupancy rate. Why? Because people have started to move out because they feel that this is an inevitable situation.

The other key thing is that these Class B, or these tenants, professionals, doctors, therapists, whatever, they all want to stay in Evanston. But looking on Bill Smith's Evanston Now web page today, there is a whole blog series on the lack of Class B space in Evanston. So, I'm not sure where these people are going to go.

Okay. Core assumptions from a net present value point of view, we're going to use a discount rate of 6 percent for both the 708 as well as the tower. Now, there is a school of thought that the tower, because there is more risk involved, in other words, we don't know what the stream of funds will be, we don't know if it's going to be timed the same way and so on and so forth, that there should be a higher discount rate there which would obviously decrease the amount of money that the net present value equation is going to present.
We're not doing that. We're going to stay conservative. They've got 6 percent, we got 6 percent, okay? It's extended for 11 years through 2019. The reason for that, I think it coincides with the TIF. And then, again we're going to focus this analysis on the direct income to the City.

Okay. Basically, taking all those and putting them into results, the net cash generated per year, all right, is, the blue line is the 708 Church Street building. Now, this includes, not only property taxes but also the second floor tenants going up for lunch. We made some assumptions there, that's all in your packet. We talked about the parking. Actually, what ends up to be a major economic thrust here is the parking. When you have somewhere between 300 and 400 people coming into that building everyday, they've got to park somewhere. That parking is real revenue to the City.

Now, why is the red line dipping down? Well, when you go to construct a building, what happens? You tear it down. Your tax gets reassessed to undeveloped land. We went to the tax rolls, undeveloped land in this case would be assessed at $425,000. Hence, the
drop for three and a half years in the revenue stream coming from the tower. Then it starts building up but it doesn't shoot up all at once. That's not the case in Sherman Plaza. So, it goes up gradually.

Now, this is interesting. But what is also interesting though is if you include this in the TIF, all right, now, what is a TIF? A TIF says we're going to let you come in, develop this thing, but anything in excess over the base tax that we're receiving today will go to the TIF. So, if you take the perspective of revenue to the City, the TIF is actually hurting the City because it's taking money right out of the pocket of everyone in this room.

Okay. Now, let's look at the net present value. If you look at just pure cash coming into the City, the current existing building has a net present value of somewhere in the area of $3.9 million over the 11 years revenue stream. The proposed tower has one of $2.7 million. If, however, you include the TIF, in other words, the money isn't going to go to the City, it's going to go to the TIF, it's even worse. We're looking at 70 percent less revenue from this parcel of land for the next 11 years if we go with this proposal.
This may be a boost to the TIF District, but it's a terrible disaster to the City's financial situation.

Now, I'm going to give you a quick look. I'm not going to go over this. This is what the model looks like. It's going to be available on the website. There's also assumptions and the formula is in there. You can all take a look at and play with all you want. We've done some sensitivity analysis. You can't really change these numbers and change the outcome too much.

Conclusion. The City is much better off financially staying with the current building. The tower would actually have a net loss to the City revenue.

All right. Now, let's talk about the economic implications to Evanston business. Let's talk about the existing building as an engine for economics, economic climate in Downtown Evanston. The second floor, as I said earlier, houses 120 professionals in 40 somewhat offices. We estimate somewhere between 312 and 394 tenants coming in with another, I'm sorry, clients coming in to see somewhere, on average on a given day, 63 to 68 tenants that are in those offices. A total of 375 to 460 people.
Parking. They have to park somewhere. We made some assumptions. Not everybody drives. We used the factor of 80 percent of the people drive, okay, or 70 to 80 percent. We actually did a high-low equation there. The tenants are not going to pay daily parking, so we gave them monthly parking. And again, only a percentage of those are actually going to park. But as you can see here, there's a lot of revenue each year coming in through the parking from the second floor.

Lunch. 20 percent of the people coming as clients, 10 to 20 percent I should say, go out to lunch. Some percentage of the tenants go out to lunch, somewhere in the area of $150,000 to $400,000.

Shopping. People come to Downtown Evanston. They go to their dentist. They go to their therapist. I got to go to my therapist a lot. And you know, what do they do? They're going to, you know, walk over to Barnes & Noble. They might buy an ice cream cone at Ben & Jerry's, you know, you never know what they're going to do. Anyway, the economic engine, money coming into the City is somewhere in the area of $704,000 to million 94. Okay?

All right. Let's look at, now from what I
understand, the tower proposal is to bring in two
national chain stores because national chain stores are
a wonderful economic boost to a local economy. Well,
guess what? They're not. The existing revenue space,
retail space, is 22,000 square feet. We're going to
assume $300 per square foot. Again, our analysis show
$381, we'll stay conservative. That's $6.6 million in
moneys. Proposed 14,325 feet, $300 a square foot, again
$4.3 million.

Now, there's such a thing out there called a
multiplier. And a multiplier is really how much money
does a given entity churn in the community before it
leaves the community? Okay. Locally owned businesses,
that churn is $179 per square foot, and this has been
proven out through a number of studies. I had lunch
today with a guy that happens to live right here in
Chicago that actually conducted the study in
Andersonville. He's also done one in Austin, Texas and
San Francisco, and he's working on one in Grand Rapids
today. This is a real number.

For a national chain, however, it's $105 a
square foot. Now, you might say, well, why? Well,
there's a lot of reasons for this. The local business
hires local accountants. The local business hires a local lawyer. The local business hires suppliers that are local and not coming in from, you know, some central depot.

Local labor. National chains are very efficient in terms of their labor. So, per square foot, you know, a Barnes & Noble may have eight employees whereas a similar per square foot for a smaller bookstore locally run might have proportionally a lot more. You know, if it was the same square foot, maybe they'd have 10 or 12.

Another key thing, the profits stay in the community. The owner of that store lives in the community, takes more money out when they can, buys a home, does things for the community, and not sending the profits back to the major corporation. Okay? So, that's a really big significant factor. And that's really the basis why we put up the multiplier factors there.

Now, let's take a look at the summary here. First off, you've got on the existing 708 side $900,000 coming in from the professionals on the second floor. That's an average of the range there, if you remember.
Retail sales, 6.6 versus 4.3. Multiplier effect, 3.9 versus 1.4. Ah, the residents are spending money, so there is 3.76. Totals, $11.4 to $9.4 million.

All right. So, over time, with everything stable, this is going to be 17 percent less of an economic engine for this City if we go with this tower. Now, what is not included in this analysis is a disruption to downtown businesses over four years on when they build this thing. What's also not included is the permanent loss, probably the permanent loss of these professionals that are drawing people from all over the North Shore into Evanston. And finally, the long term decline in the unique shops that make Evanston Evanston.

Do we really need a chain store? Do we need a Banana Republic? Heck, if I want to go to a Banana Republic, I know where Old Orchard is. I don't need to go there. You know, I want to go to a small --

(MR. KENNEDY: Okay. Anyway. Conclusion.)

Evanston's economy, the economy not necessarily the City, the economy is going to be better off keeping the existing building. Thank you.

(Applause.)
MR. KENNEDY: Any questions? Any questions?
Okay, thanks.

MR. COURT REPORTER: Your full name, sir?

MR. KENNEDY: Pardon me?

MR. COURT REPORTER: Your name?

MR. KENNEDY: John Kennedy.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: We thank you for -- thank you, Mr. Kennedy for staying within the time limit that you told me. I appreciate that.

I'm going to go back to the meeting of March 10th, the people who signed up that evening to speak, we will take them first. And again, I want to remind you, if someone else has made your comment, will you please just yield that time? A lot of people who would like to speak, so we want to try to get as many of you as we possibly can. And if we can do it in an orderly manner, I think we can do it and I think we can hear exactly what it is that you want to see here.

I want to start with Sue Holbert, I believe it is, and Mary Singh. And if you would just line up and come over and stand on this side. I'm going to call them five at a time. Richard Katz, Jeff Smith, Sari Shapiro, and Oliver -- is that Gould? Oliver Gould.
Are those -- yes, would you please, if you have your cell phone on, we hear them, would you please turn them off or put them on vibrate? We'd appreciate that. One more, Dan -- is that Dorfman? Dorfman. And I believe it's Dr. Nicholas Dumas.

Yes, if you would, it's very difficult for us sometimes to read the writing, if you would print it, it would be much -- yes, it is too late to write but if we have another one. Okay, would you please speak clearly into the microphone, state your name, spell it, and we will try to give you about a minute.

MS. HOLBERT: Thank you. My name is Sue Holbert, H-o-l-b-e-r-t. I live at 400 Main Street in the condominium. Although I don't like the height of the tower and I think that downtown looks real higgledy-piggledy and I think the tower is going to make it look worse. That's not my main concern.

My concerns are financial. Property tax, the property sales in Evanston are down 50 percent over a year ago and they've been declining for nine months. We have currently on the market 612 active listings for condominiums and townhouses. I don't think adding 218 more is going to help. A realtor I know told me that
there are many units that have been taken off the market
because sales are so slow.

I don't, I'm sorry, I don't know the facts on
this. I don't know if this developer is asking for TIF.
But if so, I don't know the Illinois statute either. I
know some state statutes require that it is to address a
blighted neighborhood or a someone in desperate
financial need, and I do not believe this property meets
those criteria. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. SINGH: Hi, my name is Mary Singh. I live
at 1711 Hinman. You spell Singh, S-i-n-g-h.
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Well, it's hard to tell
on --

MS. SINGH: I'm sure it is. I'm so sorry.
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: It's okay.

MS. SINGH: Thank you, Alderman. My point
here is that before 1993 when the current ordinance went
into, was adopted by the City Council, five years were
spent on that ordinance. And during three of those
years, there were meetings several times a month and we
paid a consultant a lot of money for that ordinance.
And then for two years after that, this Committee, the Planning & Development Committee of the Council, discussed it and changed it and the consultant was there. So, a great deal more money went into that. And now, you've just worked very hard to try to keep our taxes from going up. You spent hours and been very passionate about trying to keep our taxes down, trying not to spend extra money. But this past year, you spent money for another consultant, a whole group of consultants to design a new downtown for us. And that new downtown which is still proposed and the old downtown in the present ordinance bear no resemblance to what is being presented here. There is no opportunity to build a building this tall as I read that ordinance. And I just think that if you don't let the people believe that their laws are effective, then they lose faith in the Council, a council that, let me tell you, has done a lot of work to try and help these people. I just thought you should keep that in mind. Thanks.

(MR. KATZ: My name is Richard Katz. I live at)
714 Mulford in the 8th Ward. Am I limited to one minute here?

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Yes, sir.

MR. KATZ: Okay, then I'll be brief. The first point is simply aesthetics. This tower doesn't, in my opinion, fit in the aesthetics of Evanston. To me, Evanston is to Chicago as Long Island is to Manhattan. Evanston is known for its leafy streets, for its gracious homes and for its spaciousness. This is not confluent with that design.

Secondly, at the P&D meeting last week, Focus Development said that the Plan Commission recommended approval of their proposed plan for 708 Church Street that is before you this evening. However, that's a false statement. The Plan Commission by only one vote recommended approval if and only if the developer adhered to specific conditions and made substantial changes to the development.

It's important to note that Mr. Klutznick has refused to adhere to the majority of the conditions set forth by the Plan Commission. I will not go into those. They are on page 140 of the transcribed report of proceedings from the Plan Commission public hearing held...
December 12, 2007.

Based on this, I ask you as a fellow Evanstonian to join me in saying no to this development. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. SMITH: Thank you. Madam Chairman, I prepared these remarks last time when you were allowing people three minutes. This will be less than that. I apologize if it's more than a minute.

This Council Committee is --

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I will remind you.

MR. SMITH: Jeff Smith. This Council Committee is considering the single most important piece of spot zoning in our experience. The name of this Committee is Planning & Development, and the question it confronts tonight is will development in Evanston result from planning or will planning in Downtown Evanston continue to be an afterthought to development?

I'm a proponent of planning because to me Evanston is not just an aggregation of parcels of land available on the open market. In any given year, the majority of Evanstonians do not sell, do not buy, do not move. We live here and we are a community. A community
of any size has a right if not a duty to determine its own destiny. And that destiny is best shaped not by ad hoc serial decisions on spot transactions but by community consensus and collective planning.

Real estate transactions are exciting and lucrative. They fill many pages in our print media and they pay for the banner ads on our online media. But it's for those who live here quietly and those who will follow that we plan rather than yield to temptation or the excitement of the moment.

The ordinance before this Committee explodes planning. Our existing ordinance on planned developments in the downtown states that the Plan Commission shall not recommend approval of, nor shall the City Council adopt a planned development in the downtown districts unless they shall determine based on written findings of fact that the development adheres to certain standards.

General condition 1 of those standards states that each planned development shall be compatible with surrounding development and not be of such a nature in height, bulk or scale as to exercise any influence contrary to the purpose and intent of the Zoning.
Ordinance. General condition 3 requires that each planned development shall be compatible with and implement among other things our Zoning Ordinance, particularly in terms of land use intensity, essential character of the downtown district and neighborhood planning. There is also a requirement of a demographic study as to what population is possible and practical for the neighborhood, because if you don't have a destination, you aren't planning, you're winging it.

Section C of that ordinance limits what height increases you might grant. And even if you find that a planned development meets the above conditions, the maximum --

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Mr. Smith, I'm sorry, I gave you two minutes just because you were from last Monday. But if you could just please wrap it up in the next ten seconds?

MR. SMITH: The applicant hasn't satisfied the burden that should be placed on someone seeking not just to amend our ordinance but to explode it. And what was once called the City of Homes, it doesn't well represent us to erect a tower of units that most of us could never afford, living behind doors upon which we could never
knock. The factors that make the property desirable will still be here tomorrow. The university, the lake, and the train lines aren't going away. The only factor in making this a rush is the window of opportunity to get this Council to allow what the law seemingly doesn't allow before we change our downtown planning.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay, thank you.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. GOULD: Thank you, Madam Chairman. My name is Oliver Gould. I live at 1730 Hinman Avenue. I'm a fortunate occupier of the 1st, Cheryl's, Ward. I have three questions and I hope I can get answers. One, what are the financial backing for the proposed structure? Is it fully funded? Do we have the possibility of having a half-built hulk sitting in the center of our town when the financing doesn't come through as we're seeing today at $2 a share for Bear Stearns for family.

Does this building fit into your old vision of the charm of Evanston? I think that was discussed before.

Last, the question I have is what is the
current status of the occupancy by owners of the new
buildings that have been built very recently in this
community one of which was done by the Klutznick people
who are very fine developers? Now, I don't know if we
can get answers to that tonight or do we have to get
that some other time?

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: We'll have to get back to
you with answers. It may come up in our discussion,
we'll see. But we will try to get back with you.

MR. GOULD: Thank you very much for the
opportunity.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. DORFMAN: My name is Dan Dorfman. I live
at 1232 Hinman Avenue. At the meeting two times ago
when the group was supposed to make the presentation but
wasn't able to, as I was leaving the meeting, I just
happened to be walking behind the group of developers
who were looking at the brochure of the Evanstonians
Concern on Development, sorry, I don't know what the
name exactly is, but it was of great amusement to them,
the name. And clearly they thought that the brochure
was making points that didn't make much sense and they
particularly struck by the lack of talent in the
draftsmanship of the cover illustration which they said
isn't to scale.

Well, there it is. To scale, their own
representation. I just, I look at that and I don't
understand. I don't understand what people are
thinking. That's huge. It stands out.

(Applause.)

MR. DORFMAN: It's going to be visible from
all over the City. Those carefully cropped slides that
we saw last week were very elegant. But I don't think
it all embraced what that, you won't be able to walk
anywhere in this City without that thing in the corner
of your eye towering over this City.

Now, I'm not one of the, I am not an
Evanstonian who has lived here my whole life like the
people who spoke previously. I came here five years
ago. I moved here from California and I chose Evanston
because it was the kind of community I could raise my
family in, walk around, bike around, having relationship
with the merchants in town. This does not represent
that.

We heard that Evanston has to compete with Old
Orchard Mall, that's why we need this kind of a development. Perhaps we have to compete with Old Orchard Mall, we don't have to become Old Orchard Mall.

(Applause.)

MR. DORFMAN: We heard about the connectivity between the development that one of the developers built on Church Station, the other development built at Sherman Plaza, and now we have this. So, apparently the idea really is to displace local merchants like Uncle Dan's and William's Shoes, and Hey Nick Shoes for national chains, and we will be in the middle of Old Orchard Mall.

No, I'm sorry, I don't think you have to build Orchard Mall to complete with Old Orchard Mall. I'm sorry, one more point if I may.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Yes, I was going to say I gave you two minutes like I did Mr. Smith because you were from last Monday, okay.

MR. DORFMAN: Thank you very much. Just one more point if I may. As I understand, part of the justification of projects like this and the building of condominiums is to increase our tax base, that because of various factors, the number of religious institutions
we have at Evanston, the university, that we need a larger tax base.

Now, I kind of understand that, so we have a budget that has to be met. But if I'm understanding this correctly, and I may be wrong, but as I understood the presentation, the increase in taxes that this will bring in, this property in property taxes, will pay for Fountain Square. If it's paying for the renovation of Fountain Square which is desperately needed, that means moneys are not going to be going to the budget of Evanston. They're not going to be going to relieve the services and the budget crunch that we have. So, I don't understand this from the point of view of finances either. Thank you.

(Applause.)

DR. DUNKAS: My name is Dr. Nicholas Dunkas, and I'm a practicing psychiatrist for the past over 40 years in Evanston. And my office is at 708 Church and I occupy a suite which I share with two other psychiatrists, Dr. Paul and Dr. Hsin, and also my daughter who is a social worker, Stella Wilson. I've been living in Evanston for the past over 40 years on Sheridan Road.
Now, we heard a lot about the economic aspects of this, the impact, economic impact on Evanston, et cetera. What I would like to do is to introduce the human factor. Where am I going to go when this building will be demolished, if it will be? What is going to happen to my patients along with the patients of all the other professionals that occupy the building? Where am I going to go really at this stage of my career and what's going to happen to my patients and to the patients of my colleagues?

So, this is my comment. It's very brief. The human aspects of this, where am I going to go? Besides that, the impact upon the parking, the parking and the traffic pattern. If we add all this huge building into the traffic pattern, taking into consideration what I see everyday, a lot of empty space in Evanston as the business has moved to the new offices, all of these considerations.

And I would like to finish with the comment, please repair this Fountain Square, not the building but the Fountain Square itself. It looks atrocious. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you. Okay, now I'm moving to the list of people who signed up tonight. So, we're going to stick now strictly to the one minute, I just want to remind people. I don't want to be rude, I'm not trying to be rude. But we really do want to try to get as many people in as possible.

Would you please, again, line up on the other side? Give your name, spell it. I called her name, she didn't -- did I call her name? I called your name in the beginning.

MS. SHAPIRO: I was late.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Oh, okay. You want to come ahead? Hurry up. Then George Rounds, Al Hunter, is it David -- is that Wicker? I'm sorry. And Shelly Gilchrist. John Kennedy, well, John, we've already had you. Stamata Blanco. Go ahead.

MS. SHAPIRO: My name is Sari Kadison Shapiro -- for 40 years. So, 40 years ago, a lot of really good people moved in. A lot of issues were already -- you mentioned Fountain Square. Once there was a French restaurant on Fountain Square and they had a sidewalk café there. And that's the kind of thing where all of Evanston can really enjoy that. And when there is a
really very tall building, there is a wind happening, whatever, that goes straight down the building and gets people. I mean, anyone who is going down Davis Street and makes a right on Orrington can feel that from the bank building. And this is going to create more of that as I can see.

I'm a designer, and this is a really bad design. And it seems insane to me that on the brink of what could be further meltdown of our finances and the whole real estate market and the stock market, that whoever was in favor of this, you might have changed your mind right now because it's not really a good financial atmosphere to be doing this either. That's all.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. ROUNDS: My name is George Rounds, R-o-u-n-d-s. I live at 2735 Park Place and have been there for 30 years. My letter reads about five minutes so I'll summarize and submit the written letter if I may?

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

MR. ROUNDS: My neighbors all support the creation of a fine plan for the City of Evanston.
However, our exception goes to the 708 Church building block. I've personally spoken with more than 200 residents while they waited to board the Metra in the morning and my survey brings me to two observations. One, only about one percent of those I spoke with support the high-rise invasion. And two, the remaining 99 percent of them, about 3 percent were unaware of the project completely. That's their problem. Another 10 percent believed that it was already a done deal and were resigned to the project, to have this aesthetic and environmental affront to our City.

Of a more precise nature, I request that the Planning & Development Committee review carefully the minority report findings that were prepared by Commissioners Burrus, Nyden and Schuldenfrei on December 19th. I remind the Planning & Development Committee of the qualifications of these three Commissioners, their extensive training and experience, cited in the Minority report, in city planning, consulting, and architecture qualifies them to properly judge the merits of any proposal that comes before this City. I'm not aware of the qualifications of other Commission members.

I also want to take a moment to look at the
resolutions in front of you and note that on page 2, I believe it's 2. Yes, page 2. It says the Commission's findings state the application of the planned development meets the standards of Section 3, 4, 5 of the Zoning Ordinance. That's not true according to the minority report. On page 3, there are five citations where supposedly the plan meets the Commission's requirements. The minority report says it does not.

So, somebody is not looking at this properly or not telling the truth. And I would invite you to look at the minority report very carefully because it does not support what this memorandum says. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

MR. HUNTER: I'm Albert Hunter, 1040 Elmwood Avenue, Evanston. That's H-u-n-t-e-r.

I come before you tonight as Joe Citizen, not as a member of the Plan Commission which I was for six years and one of its former chairs. I heard over the past year the public comments, the presentation of the developers, and it so happened that timing, my term ended two weeks before the vote on this particular
development.

I want to share with you briefly what my vote would have been. In one minute, I cannot give you the benefit of what I hope is some of my expertise relevant to those discussions. I'm more than willing to submit it to the Committee here.

My vote would have been no, in which case there would have been a 4-4 split decision which not have produced a recommendation coming to your body in support of this. I have reasons why I would support the report of the three who voted no for it. In one minute, I can only mention two things that are overarching. One is the public contribution is minimal at best and not commensurate, does not equal the magnitude of the relief and zoning changes requested. There is not a balance there.

Secondly, the economics have been alluded to, so I won't go into that. But also, one of the benefits was the LEED certification. Research has shown and the documentation in the LEED presentation suggests that the most efficient and effective LEED developments are those that have adaptive reuse of existing structures, not the tearing down of the urban renewal to the 50's. It's the
creative adaptive reuse of existing. So, I underscore that.

The economics is, I would suggest, in the economics its a question of timing. I was going to invoke here baseball and comedy where the idea is the timing is what counts, okay. And I would simply suggest that this is not the time for this. The possibility of there being a major vacancy lot in Downtown Evanston as there is now on Central Street and as there is now in Kendall College site would be devastating to the downtown development. Consider that.

Finally, I just want to say the aesthetics, consider the Greeks' notion of the fundamental principle of aesthetics here which is proportion. This is out of proportion.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. UCKER: Good evening. I'm David Ucker, U-c-k-e-r, 2720 Park Place. I just want to reiterate some of the issues that have already been raised in a slightly different context. If you look at the findings and standards of the planned development amendment process, it emphasizes that the applicant bears the
burden to demonstrate that the proposal meets each of the standards that are applicable. The relevant ones pertain to Section 6.3.6.3 which is that site development allowances must have a public benefit. What was enumerated last week as public benefits of this proposal were shocking to me in the absence of real public benefit. The purchase of the Hahn building, for example, was done to preclude competing developments. That wasn't for the public benefit. Enhancement of the retail core is a misrepresentation. This development would reduce the retail core. Taxes paid are required, they're not a public benefit. Opportunity to develop Fountain Square is only an opportunity, that's not a gift. And affordable housing payments are required. That's not an explicit public benefit. The point here is that the requirement of the development is the burden of the developer. The development doesn't happen by default. And therefore, it seems to me incumbent upon the Council to evaluate, sorry, the Plan Commission, to evaluate whether this proposal meets the burden. They don't get a free walk. And from what they've presented, they don't meet the
burden. And therefore, they should not be allowed to do this by default. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MS. BLANOS: Good evening. My name is Stamata Blanos and I live at 1720 Maple. I'm going to comment in regards to the loss of small business and the implication of service with regards to the community. I'm going to give an example of me and another dentist who is at 708 Church.

Recently, we did a project at the high school where we did mouth guards and we donated our service. Our service that we donated was over $40,000 worth of service. Now, we have agreed to work with the high school and provide additional mouth guards which over the years will amount to over hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of service brought on by small businesses like me and another dentist. And we are just two examples of what a small business does for this community. We act quietly and behind the scenes, but we give tremendously to the needs and we care about this community because we see the people on a daily basis.

Now, I have been proposing the need for more office space and so on. And what I have been hearing
from several alderman individuals that if there was a
demand for office space, the developers would build
them. Well, to quote Shakespeare, he said the fault
does not lie within our stars but within ourselves. Our
fault is the fact that we have been reactive to
development and not proactive.

On our City's Comprehensive General Plan, over
ten years ago we were supposed to develop an economic
development strategy, a market setting strategy, a
vision and a direction for our City. As of yet, we are
about to begin and that as of yet has not taken place.
And unfortunately, we need to start focusing on the
future of our City and start focusing as we approach the
21st Century what is best for Evanston. Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: All right. We'll switch up.

Greg Hummel? Greg Hummel, John Macsai, Ron Fleckman,
Irene Gregory, Kathy -- is that Trusdell, I believe it
is? Trusdell. And Emily Guthrie.

MS. GUTHRIE: I'll pass.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Who's passing? Emily?

Okay.

MR. HUMMEL: For the record, Greg Hummel, H-u-
m-m-e-l, a resident of Evanston since 1971. My address is 2240 Central Park.

I speak in favor of the development this evening. I view this as an economic engine for a revitalized and a revitalizing downtown, a logical step in any evolving urban form. Consider Evanston's skyline. State National Bank building, American Plaza, now Rotary International, 1800 Sherman, Attima Development Sherman Plaza.

This new development is appropriate for 708 Church. It will give our Central Business District a center, an apex that will define a skyline visible for many miles today, more tomorrow. This site will complete Evanston's skyline. It will generate substantial tax revenue, principally real estate tax increment in the nearer term. In the longer term, real estate taxes for Evanston, the public schools and other affected taxing jurisdictions.

This tax increment will generate funds that can be used to materially enhance Fountain Square, that open space which also defines the center of our urban core. That space is hallowed ground. It honors those who have fallen in service to our country. Today that...
space desperately needs help. The renovation can occur as a result of the tax increment.

Longer term though and more importantly, it provides revenue that Evanston and the other affected taxing jurisdictions need. Capturing the demand for housing that those choosing to move from single-family housing into urban settings is a valid economic development strategy that Evanston can use. We're landlocked. We don't have developable land. But we have the ability to create high-rise development which will capture shoppers.

The economic analysis shared with you earlier this evening did not do any --

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Mr. Hummel, I'm sorry, that is time.

MR. HUMMEL: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

MR. MACSAI: My name is John Macsai, M-a-c-s-a-i. I live at 2107 Hinman. And I would like to ask you, Madam Chair, a favor. Up until now, opponents spoke. Very few of us are speaking for the project. Could we have at least a little bit more time than one minute? If not, I abide by your decision.
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I have given, just like I just did with Mr. Hummel, I've given people a few minutes, I mean a few seconds over and I want to stick with that so that we can be fair with everyone.

MR. MACSAI: Thank you, Alderman. I am totally aware of the strong opposition to this project. I wouldn't live in Evanston if you would all agree. But almost any time in history a tall building was originally objected to, stirred up emotions, all the way from the dome in Florence to the Eiffel Tower and the Hancock building. I mean, everybody assumed that Michigan Avenue would collapse, businesses would not do well. The tower is being built, that's the end of the world.

As far as the proportion of the building is concerned, I think it's handsome. I think there is one place in this town which can take the heights, that's this center. It's not going to be a Pandora's box. And I can tell you this, that it will not affect adversely the residential low-rise, mid-rise neighborhoods. It has no relation to.

We are talking about a small downtown segment which the new Downtown Plan approves. The -- wonderful,
homey neighborhoods will stay what they are. The benefit will be that in contrast to 1972 when I came to Evanston where it was very unpleasant to walk after dark in downtown, the downtown now is lively. It will be even livelier. It will help businesses, restaurants. It helps our tax bases.

I'm deeply convinced and from the heart plead that you approve this project. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

MS. GREGORY: Good evening. Irene Gregory, 1900 Sherman Avenue. A lot of mental exercise on both sides of the aisle has gone into this. It's amazing.

So, let's suppose we've got the building and look at it. There it is, right in your face. Now, let us look into the future. Look at our economy today on a very slippery slope. With over 600 empty condos and homes, then we're going to have 200 more. What if you don't rent these spaces? I'm talking about the future. What if it stands there as an empty shell of a building?

You know, you could really learn to hate it. And we would probably be the subject of every comedy television. We'd get into the New York papers. We'd be
the laughing stock of the country. And we'd have more
homes to rent because probably all the City officials
who voted for it would have to leave town.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

MR. FLECKMAN: My name is Ron Fleckman, F-l-e-
c-k-m-a-n. I live at 2300 Grant Street in Evanston. It
seems like these days that to be politically correct in
Evanston you must be in opposition to all new proposed
economically viable development. And conversely, to be
politically incorrect in Evanston means that you support
and encourage economically viable development.

For the most part, much of the history of the
public's perception of development in the downtown has
been either the sky is falling or the world is going to
come to an end mentality. Do you all remember the very
catchy bumper stickers about the 'mall-ing' of Evanston
back when the movie theaters were being proposed? Has
the sky fallen or has the world come to an end? I don't
think so.

Has downtown become a mall? Absolutely not.
Has the downtown become a series of canyons? No. Has
there been gridlock? No. Each time a new project
that's proposed, the opposition claims are always the same. It's either too high, too dense, or too out of character with what downtown is or was. In reality, downtown has once again become vital, energetic and a destination point for the North Shore and beyond.

There have been many outcries for the City to manage its changing more effectively. The City's response has been to develop RFP's, receive proposals from some of the most forward-thinking consultants in the Midwest and possibly the country. However, the almost unanimous response for what I think is a very vocal minority has been to oppose the advice of each and every consultant. Each time. What's the point?

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Sorry, Mr. Fleckman, that's time.

MR. FLECKMAN: That's it. Thank you.

MS. TRUSDELL: Hi, I'm Kathy Trusdell, that's T-r-u-s-d-e-l-l. I have lived in Evanston for 26 years and I have worked here for 21 years. And I currently rent space at 708 Church Street. I've been very happy to be there.

I have noticed in my years in Evanston that alarmingly over the past few years with the increased
population, the density, that there are greater and
greater numbers of sirens at all hours of the day. It's
not just a wind tunnel there, it's a siren tunnel right
there where I work that's disruptive to practice, my
practice. There's car alarms going on frequently.
There's people quite loud out on the street. I had one
young person who comes to see me mugged in the daylight
there.

So, you know, I would like to suggest that the
increased density there in Downtown Evanston increases
the stress. And yes, there have been bottlenecks moving
through traffic and with parking and with getting around
there. Just walking is stressful at times because no
matter where you turn you're bumping into someone. So,
I do think that is a loss in the quality of life, that
we are talking about making a choice to sacrifice that
kind of value for a different kind of false economy.

So, I've been working there in that space for
I guess about five years and I probably have about 100
people a month who come into my practice bringing their
resources into the City. Most of the people I've talked
with who rent space at 708 Church Street work in the
evenings and they simply aren't able to come and express
their opinion about this development. And many in fact have given up. They believe it's a done deal. And I myself entertain that belief at times that no matter what seems right for our City and for our people, it doesn't seem to be heard. They continue to push forward.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Ms. Trusdell, that's time.

MS. TRUSDELL: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Chris Steel. Are you Southeast Evanston Association?

MR. ERNST: No, a separate one.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Who is the speaker?

There is no name there.

MR. ERNST: That's me.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay, Chris Steel. Ernst?

Okay. Diane Korling, John Austin, Barb Rakley. And Michael Hendershot. Do you want to come over as well, Michael Hendershot?

MS. STEEL: My name is Christine Steel, S-t-e-e-l. I live at 522 Church but I'm a 34-year resident of Evanston, recently moved to the First Ward and condo.
living.

I am here on behalf of the Downtown Residents Association, the DRA. And I did prepare a longer talk but I will summarize it and I would like to give this, our position paper, for the record.

Our areas of concern are the building heights and the form-based zoning issues, the public benefit bonuses, and the commercial office development issues. Most people have spoken about them. I'll just say my points.

The impact studies on services such as water, sewer, street surface condition and traffic are incomplete. Those that developers offered on wind, traffic and appearance are insufficient proof that the project will not seriously overwhelm the area. The DRA does view the Downtown Business District as a prime economic engine for Evanston and key to the quality of life for downtown resident community.

This project does hold the promise of attracting national and local businesses. However, the promised national chains and higher office rents should add to the economic health of the downtown, not replace economically thriving businesses. The project will
substantially increase the number of residential units while reducing the number of commercial spaces. The DRA would like to see zoning that would include a quantitative measurement that would determine the size of a residential community for the area along with the number and kind of economic ventures needed to support that population and serve the wider community. DRA takes issue with the developer's recent request for three million dollars of TIF funds to help with the cost of renovation, this of the Hahn building. This request suggests that TIF funds will be used to support the developer's claim that the Hahn restoration is added to the benefit list.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you, Ms. Steel, that's it.

MS. STEEL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. ERNST: Good evening. My name is Chris Ernst, E-r-n-s-t. I reside at 1639 Hinman in Evanston. And tonight I'm speaking on behalf of the Southeast Evanston Association. I will try to cut as many paragraphs out as I can and I will definitely give you
the rest for the record.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

MR. ERNST: The Southeast Evanston Association is opposed to the current proposal for the 49-story high-rise at 708 Church. Opposition is based on the impact of the building on downtown at a time when new planning standards are being developed, the extensive zoning changes that are required to accommodate the building's height and scale and the lack of public benefits associated with the project.

In terms of planning, I'll simply read the first paragraph saying the 708 Church development team agrees with and even emphasizes the fact that the project would change the heart of downtown. We don't believe that a project of this magnitude should proceed independently from the current publicly supported downtown planning process.

In terms of zoning, we respectfully disagree with going from a D2 to a D3. I'm not going to read all the facts and figures although I will read some comparisons from the City zoning codes, City zoning files, as far as an FAR where this project is triple that of other projects at 15.77. Sherman Plaza is 4.66.
Church Street Station is at 5.03. Optima Views is at 5.5. The tallest building, this would be 523 feet; Sherman Plaza, 236; Optima Views, 259; and Park Evanston, 218.

Parking, we believe, would be an issue. They are asking for 125 less parking spaces than are required by ordinance. I do want to get through the public benefits, I'll promise to be very quick.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: All right, because I've already given you extra 15 seconds.

MR. ERNST: I appreciate that. As far as traffic concerns, there are actually 600 additional trips instead just the 10 or 25 in the rush hours. I think we should look at 24-hour times.

Public benefits. We're going to use their list, increase of TIF funds. We don't agree that $25 to $30 million is an accurate figure. I'm not going to go any further than that. I'll give you that.

Preservation of the Hahn building, we strongly believe the Hahn building should be preserved. The truth of the matter is it's already protected. When examined closer, the developer's proposed plan to rehabilitate and re-tenant the building is more of a
benefit to the developer's bottom line than to Evanston. In addition to requesting a minimum of three million in TIF funds from the City actually decreasing the amount of TIF they claim to generate, the developer has made plans to remove existing businesses in the building during renovation and re-tenant the building at higher rents.

I'll skip further. Affordable housing.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: That's it, I'm sorry. I gave him the extra time because he does represent an association, not just himself. So, that's why I gave the extra time.

MR. ERNST: I appreciate it. I will give you all a copy.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. AUSTIN: My name is John Austin. I live at 2801 Gerard Avenue in the Evanston part. I'll be very brief.

I'd just like to respond to just a couple of comments that have been made. One of them is about this whole idea of politically correct and politically incorrect. That's not what we're talking about here.
We're talking about the nature of our City. So, I think that that kind of rhetoric is not helpful.

(Applause.)

MR. AUSTIN: The other one, the other issue, the other points I want to address just very briefly are the whole idea of slippery slope. I've heard comments about how, well, you know, every tall building in the country has been objected to at the beginning and, you know, Evanston is already developing. I just want to point out that, yes, people do stop objecting to things 20 years after they're there. That doesn't mean that they like it.

And so, as someone so eloquently said, look at it. And I will stop there and yield the rest of my time.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. KORLING: My name is Diane Korling, K-o-r-l-i-n-g. I live at 1914 Orrington. Some of my best friends are architects. I would like to consider that the three women members, not on account of gender bias, but that the three women members of the Plan Commission are people I would consider some of the City's best
friends. And in keeping with remarks eloquently made by other citizens, I would urge the Council and perhaps even the other four members of the Plan Commission to look sharply at the minority report of the Plan Commission.

I thank you all for your attention tonight and I pass any seconds that I have left to someone who needs them and can be more eloquent and thorough. Look to the records.

(Applause.)

MS. RAKLEY: Good evening. My name is Barbara Rakley, R-a-k-l-e-y, 2506 Grant Street, Evanston. I have been surprised every time I've come before the Plan Commission at how few of the therapists, the hundred or so therapists that tenant the second floor of the 708 building currently have come to speak. And I now understand that it's because they're all working and they're seeing their clients that work during the day.

On the usual public benefits, I'm not going to go through the seven public benefits or purported public benefits that the developer put up on his slide last week. Many people have done that, it would be repetitive. But I would ask you to very carefully
consider the true public benefit found in having 80 or 100 therapists in the heart of our City in affordable office space within walking distance of transportation for clients who do not have cars. And I would ask you to recognize the reality that all of us, I think all of us know someone personally or are someone who has been helped in a very dramatic way by seeing a therapist. And I submit that the presence of the therapist in the affordable housing space is a great deal more of a public benefit than sort of the smoke and mirrors that the developers presented. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

(Appause.)

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Peter Sanchez, William Levine, Dana Riess maybe.

MS. RIESS: Pass.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Kevin Glynn. Is it Susan and Jeffrey, it looks like maybe S-h-a-i-m-a-n, does that sound familiar? Sue Holcrest? Or maybe that's Holbert.

MS. HOLBERT: That's me, that's the same one. I already did it.
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay, thank you. Tina Seastrom and Stephen Russel-Dempsy.

MR. DEMPSY: I'm going to yield my time.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Yes, do you want to go ahead?

MR. SANCHEZ: My name is Peter Sanchez and I live at 2228 Pioneer Road. And first, I'd like to say that I realize that having people speak for one minute might be prudent because of the number of people speaking. But in all fairness, changing rules on the spot like this, many of us had prepared statements, put a lot of effort into it. And as you can see from the applause, there is an overwhelming landslide here in opposition to this building. And I think it is really --

(Applause.)

MR. SANCHEZ: I really think it's unfair to the citizens of Evanston who are willing to give their evenings, who are very busy people leaving spouses and children at home and say you can count for one minute. I never saw anyone say to the consultants or the development team speed it up. We've heard this before.

Okay, hopefully that didn't count.
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Is that your statement? Oh,
ookay.

MR. SANCHEZ: No, no, that's not. I've got
another statement.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay.

MR. SANCHEZ: All right. I spent the weekend
with my wife and daughter for about three hours passing
out those beautiful blue signs that you see right over
there and we approached 50 houses. 30 people were home
during this weekend. Out of those 30 people, 26 of them
took a sign. One person, only one person out of the 30
who were home and talked to us did not even want to talk
about the issue. It was clear they were for it. But
the other 29, not only were for it but half of them
thanked us profusely for what we were doing. And I
suspect that if everybody had a free evening, you'd have
half of Evanston right here, and then you'd have to give
us one second to speak.

And my point, my major point is that at the
beginning when I got involved in this, I wasn't sure
whether we were a small minority, there's this silent
majority out there who loves the tower. Well, I'm
pretty sure now, and tonight I think we can be pretty
sure that Evanston is against this tower. And unless
this is brought before a referendum or unless clear
facts, or unless we have clear facts that this building
is going to be good for the City, it would be absurd to
go against public sentiment and destroy the character of
this City which we all love. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: In case I did not make
myself clear in the beginning, I thought I said that we
have received many, many phone calls, emails. And I
averaged 12 today. So, I want you to know that we do
hear you and, you know, I'm sorry that we have to limit
the time but that's just the way it is. Go ahead, sir.


Pioneer is well represented this evening. My family
moved here in 1962. And I decided to come here and
speak today when I was walking along Church Street over
the weekend and was looking over my shoulder imagining a
49-story tower. It's overwhelming. And I think that
the model gives you the sense of that. You don't have
to use too much imagination. It dwarfs Sherman Plaza.
It's just an enormous thing.
So, I would just, I think what the Council needs to consider is that this is an irreversible decision. I respectfully suggest that the City Council should not sell the sky over Fountain Square to the highest bidder. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. GLYNN: My name is Kevin Glynn, G-l-y-n-n. I live at 2119 Sherman. I am not a native Evanstonian. I have moved here three times for various reasons. And the last time we moved back, we came here deliberately because we like the nature of the downtown because we could walk around. And that's after having lived in five different countries and multiple cities within the US. We chose to move back to Evanston.

No one would ever call me a Luddite of any type. I'm in the high-tech industry. And that building is not a progressive thought. So, I'm not --

(Applause.)

MS. SEASTROM: My name is Tina Seastrom, 800 Hinman. I love Evanston. I don't like seeing it becoming more and more like Chicago. We don't need a new skyscraper.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I want to make sure now.
Sue Holbert, no. And Susan and Jeffrey, no. I just
want to make sure so I'm not passing anyone. Okay.
Butler Adams, Fern Allison, Dick Peach, Stephen Yas.
Joan M. Lane, I believe it is?

    MS. McLANE: McLane.
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: McLane, okay.
    MS. McLANE: I pass.
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Gay Russell-
Dempsey --
    MS. DEMPSEY: I'm here. I'm going to --
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. And Katie Stallcup.
Jeff Smith has already spoken. And Mae McGill.
    MS. McGILL: Mae Jeanne McGill.
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Mae Jeanne McGill. Okay.
MR. ADAMS: I think at this time I'm a little
short. Okay, my name is Butler Adams. I give
architectural tours downtown in Chicago. I have been
following this project and I look at the model right
there and I don't see anything wrong with that building
of its current height. There are already high-rises in
Evanston and building another high-rise will not make
any bit of difference.

    I've heard people here talking about walking
down the street and how much wind there will be or about the sidewalk cafes. Well, New York has plenty of sidewalk cafes and I've never heard about anyone being swept away like Dorothy.

This is Downtown Evanston. It will not stay the same. Downtowns change. You can't have things the same. This is not the Evanston of 1900. This is 2008. This is called progress. I know that some people don't like progress but there is such a thing as progress.

Nothing historic is being destroyed. It's not being built in a historic neighborhood. This will help prevent more suburban sprawl. There is more room to go up than there is to go out. When you sit on something, it spreads out.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Do you live here?

MR. ADAMS: No, I don't. I live in Chicago.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay, go ahead. I didn't --

ALDERMAN: This is really Evanston.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Yes. Go ahead.

MS. ALLISON: Fern Allison, A-l-l-i-s-o-n.

I'm for the tower. The proposed --
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Could you give your address please?

MS. ALLISON: 1129 McDaniel.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay.

MS. ALLISON: The proposed project preserves the existing streetscape vistas. It doesn't impact them at all. It's actually going to, in my opinion, improve the, it's going to replace the non-architecturally interesting buildings that exist in that area right now, and quite honestly, at some times, are an embarrassment.

You talked about the TIF District. The TIF District is going to end, I hear, in about six to seven years. They're saying the building is not going to be ready for another four to five. So, basically, you're going to be only contributing to the TIF for about a year or two, and then all the taxes will be going straight into the City, which needs some money desperately. I am actually really tired of having my taxes raised every year to support a City government that doesn't want to improve and expand its tax base.

Additional retail traffic is needed. I used to have a business in Downtown Evanston. And we need
the traffic, we need the foot traffic. We need the people living down here to spend their money down here. We don't need them going to Chicago to spend their money. We need them staying down here. I think opening up the Century Plaza Theaters, you see how vibrant it is downtown right now.

And I do believe that that building is a great focal point. How better can Evanston say we are in the forefront of thinking. We are innovative and welcoming change. The building's location will not stick out like a sore thumb, but rather be a welcoming beacon.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. PEACH: Good evening. My name is Dick Peach, P-e-a-c-h. I live at 1414 Greenleaf in the absolutely fabulous 4th Ward of the City.

I'm a 62-year resident of the City. I grew up when Evanston was in its heyday downtown when we had Fields and Baskin's and Wieboldt's and all the great stores. We had great businesses here with American Hospital Supply and everything else. It was a great, great time to be in. Unfortunately, I was also here during the early 70's when all of that left and it was
pretty depressing downtown.

We've managed to turn that around with some
great thinking, with some City planning. I know
everyone seems to believe that all of this was done
helter-skelter. But quite frankly, it was all part of a
master plan that was done up back in the 60's and 70's
on how to develop urban transit density around the train
tracks. And I think it's been a great success.

I listened tonight about people telling me
about the economic horror stories that could prevail
here. I'll be honest. I was one of those who bought
those same stories about the movie complex when they
were building that department and I fought against it.

Boy, was I wrong.

I suggest that before we go casting stones on
an economic policy that we have no idea in the world how
it's going to turn out, that we turn our attention to
what we have available to us and take the position we're
in and use it to our good. We want to see a brand new
Fountain Square. Why not make that part of the
development? Why not put that into the hands of the
developer? Why should the City pay for it?

The developer wants to build a tall building,
fine. Make it part of the package, let him build it for us. Let's put the second floor offices back in place. Let's get those back, why do we have to lose the tenants? Why don't we have the buildings there? Why can't we have the best of both worlds? Why do we always have to have, why should it have to be black or white, either or?

Why don't we use our position here to build a better building and get what we need for our City as well as the tax dollars? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. YAS: Good evening. My name is Stephen Yas, 1889 Maple Avenue. I live in the downtown. I have a prepared statement that I'll hand out at the end especially if I don't finish, but I'll try to speak quickly.

Dear Alderman: I am in favor of this project. This letter represents my views as a 30-year resident of Evanston. I have seen much change from absolutely dead downtown where you couldn't even buy underwear to a thriving, bustling, exciting City center that is known throughout the nation as an example of a successful
downtown. As a member of the Plan Commission and
Preservation Commission in the 80's, I remember the
outcry of Downtown II in the 1984 Comprehensive Plan,
then Research Park, then the 'mall-ing' of Evanston that
became the movie theater, Borders, a residential high-
rise, et cetera. Now, we have a fantastic contributor
to the downtown.

We must have a vision for the future.

Residential development in the downtown with retail at
its base is the classic planning model to create a
vibrant downtown. Residential brought the restaurants,
shopping, and a great nightlife we now have in Evanston.

The Focus Development/Klutznick Fisher
Development with Booth Hansen Architects is an
incredible team. We're lucky to have them. If only
Booth Hansen Architects had done the first high-rise
residential tower in Evanston, they would have set the
standard for the other architects to follow.

I reviewed the 708 Church Street project and
offer the following opinions outlined below which I'll
try to say very quickly.

I feel the height of this high-rise building
will not have a negative effect at this specific
location in the center of downtown. The sculptural
effect of the slim, elegant, light and delicate tower of
transparent glass which follows the angular street grid
will be a landmark and campanile of Evanston in concer
with the Piazza San Marco or Fountain Square as it could
be.

People experience high-rise buildings at their
base. The building top adds to the image of Evanston
skyline.

The single tower at the north end of the block
is the best location in Downtown Evanston for a building
of this height. The recent downtown planning exercise
suggests that.

The entire block should be master-planned and
the City must be committed to the entire block.

The project with 216 units is less dense than
the Park Evanston at 283 units and Sherman Plaza across
the street at 253 units. What makes the superb
architecture here for the tower is the small floor plate
which requires --

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: That's time, Mr. Yas, I'm
sorry.

MR. YAS: Okay. I'll just hand out the rest.
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

MR. YAS: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. STALLCUP: Hello, I'm Katie Stallcup. I live at 144 Greenwood Street. I would like to say that Evanston is a democracy as we see tonight. Members of the Council are elected to represent the community members. And I think it's very clear that the majority of the citizens, certainly at this hearing, are very opposed to this development.

Citizens are opposed for a variety of reasons and they are good reasons ranging from negative economic impact as we've heard earlier, negligible public benefits. And in carrying forward the Southeast Evanston Association's points, I'd like to say that we object to the public benefits in addition, the Silver LEED certification, and the enhancement of the retail core and the opportunity to redevelop Fountain Square, we find them all deficient. There is also the stress on public services such as fire.

Most importantly, allowing this development will feed a deep cynicism regarding the law. Citizens need to trust the Council to respect and follow the law.
including the zoning laws and not change the laws just
to benefit individual developers. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. PRINE: My name is Rachel Prine. I live
at 1114 Florence Avenue. I don't have prepared remarks.
I just kind of, someone passed along their position to
me, but I'm one of, it's mainly older people who are
speaking so I thought it might be worthwhile to say that
there are young residents of Evanston that also are
concerned about the changes that the tower development
will create on our everyday lives.

I think, for me, the biggest issue is the loss
of local and diverse retail spaces. And businesses like
William's Shoes are a phenomenal example of customer
service and a unique experience that I don't think any
chain store can replicate. I mean, they have a file of
the shoes I bought since I was 20 years old. And that
means something to me.

Another thing is, that I just wanted to say,
that I was disappointed in the architect's presentation
last Monday with all due respect. I think presenting
the building as a four-story building showing a cropped
height and version really feels insincere to me. And if
you're proud of the building, you should show it as it is and not suggest that it's only four stories, but then if I choose to look up, it becomes 50 stories. I think that's insincere and I'm disappointed. I'm a designer myself and I just, that just left a bad feeling with me. So, one more thing. There is a scale drawing that I created of the tower and it's on the window of William's Shoes if anyone would like to see an accurate scale drawing of it. So, thank you. (Applause.)

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you. Judy Fisk, Rachel Fowler.

MS. FOWLER: I yield.


MS. FISK: Good evening, Council Members. My name is Judy Fisk. I apologize for the sunglasses but I had eye surgery today and still wanted to be here tonight. So, again I apologize for that. I've lived in Evanston, my family has lived here for five generations. I live at 2319 Sherman
Avenue. I also own and operate an independent retail store in the 1000 block of Davis Street that sells pet food, toys, treats and accessories for dogs, cats, birds and rabbits. We'll celebrate our first anniversary next month and I'm proud to say that the enthusiasm expressed for our little store has been really heartwarming.

I'm here tonight to speak in opposition to the 708 Church Street project. I'm not against the development of the site but I firmly believe that for many of the arguments raised by ECRD and SEA and other community organizations, a condo tower at 708 Church, whatever its height, is wrong for this block. An office building on the site is the more appropriate choice to ensure the long-range viability of Downtown Evanston and to ensure that the character-giving small retail stores who take huge risks to come into Evanston, put their dollars on the line to make a contribution to the community, are able to remain and earn a living here and provide you with tax dollars that you so desperately need. Thanks.

(Applause.)

MS. HOFF-HAGENSICK: Hi, my name is Linda Hoff-Hagensick. I live at 1240 Wesley and I've been
here since 1975.

MR. COURT REPORTER: Can you spell your name please?

MS. HOFF-HAGENSICK: Sure. H-o-f-f - H-a-g-e-n-s-i-c-k. And just, it's a privilege to get to say something and I appreciate all the eloquent statements that have gone before me. And I just want to say that in my heart I really feel like that is one ugly building.

I heard the developer's presentation last week and the developer kept repeating it was a beautiful building. And I agree it would be a beautiful building in Manhattan, but it is not a beautiful building in Downtown Evanston. The context is wrong, the proportion is wrong, the height is wrong. Could it worse? Maybe. You know, I thought the fact that it was set in for, you know, that it's set in after four stories, that's probably better than a thick 49-story building. The fact that it's light-colored, you know, but the idea was that it would just kind of fade into the clouds and you would never actually really realize it was there is probably not accurate. That's one point.

And the other point, just in terms of people
who have talked about their own kind of, and I also have
to respectfully disagree with the lady who said that she
didn't think it was a lovely building. The friezes and
the medallions on 708 Church and the Hahn building are
lovely. I just think they're lovely. I think it also
provides a lot of natural light in Downtown Evanston. I
hate the thought of a five-story, worst case scenario,
five-story shadow in Downtown Evanston, so just as far
as the visuals.

But the second thing is, as far as people have
done kind of random polls, my percentages are exactly
what people reported. I got 121 petitions and exactly
120 signatures. Exactly one person was opposed. And
I've just been randomly, you know, not some little cabal
who hates the tower, randomly talking to people. And
really, truly one percent of the people I've randomly
come across favored it. So, thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BARKER: Paul Barker, 815 Oakton Street.

Many of you have seen this before but I wanted to share
with the Plan Commission my redesign of the building
which solves all of the problems in that it maintains
the same capacity but takes care of the height problem. It creates few traffic jam problems.

I would like to see the Plan Commission have the courage to send a clear message to area developers that Evanston is different, that our soul is not for sale, that we value the character of our home over financial temptation, that we cannot be suckered into allowing the rich few to get richer at the expense of the many, and that to us progress doesn't just mean bigger, more, taller. It also means better, smarter, more carefully considered.

And if this grotesque monument to ego and greed is built, I think we'll be the laughing stock of the area because of its disproportionate qualities worth of a few one-liners from Jay Leno. And I urge the Plan Commission to show some class and just say no. Thank you.

(Appause.)

MR. GRAY: City Council Members and fellow citizens, my name is Glenn Gray, 807 Davis Street. I recently re-read the minutes of the Tuesday, March 27th, 2007 closed session of the City Council meeting. The substance of the meeting subsequently became public when
the minutes were released. After reading the minutes, it became obvious to me that the developers, Mr. Anderson and Mr. Klutznick, are the number one reason that their proposal for 708 Church Street should be turned down.

The initial premise of the development was to purchase and tear down the Fountain Square building and redevelop the north and south ends of the block. This was the bait, and the bait sounds pretty good. Nobody would be against redevelopment of a truly embarrassing Fountain Square. Money is in short supply. Here is an opportunity worth exploring. Thus, the infamous meeting took place.

Quote from the minutes, "Tim Anderson said the project is the financial engine that drives the expansion and recreation of Fountain Square into Evanston's civic space." Then, the switch. What happened to the elaborate plans for Fountain Square's redevelopment? What happened to buying Fountain Square building? What happened to the two-story restaurant? What happened to the open civic space?

As of last Monday night, it's all gone. All we have is a possible undefined contribution to Fountain
Square's possible redevelopment sometime in the unknown future. Bait and switch.

In the very same meeting, "Tim Anderson said this will be a LEED certified project. Mr. Booth also said this will be a LEED's building. They will explore wind turbines to generate electricity. Rain water can be absorbed on the roof deck and they hope to make the building carbon neutral." That all sounds great. We all want carbon neutral. And generating electricity. Again, this was just the bait.

We never again heard a mention of carbon neutral or green development or electricity. As of last Monday night, the only thing we heard as a possible public benefit was an attempt to gain Silver LEED certification, the second lowest LEED certification with no guarantee of achieving it, no definite commitment to getting it, and no substantial penalty if they do not. Once again, bait and switch.

During the 708 Church Street process, the Hahn building came into play. Mr. Anderson --

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Sir, that's time.

MR. GRAY: I'll conclude really briefly. In conclusion, and there is much more to the bait and
switch that I will share with you. I don't have copies
but I will give them to you or I will email to all of
you.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

MR. GRAY: In conclusion, besides all the
shortcomings of the 708 Church Street development on its
own merit, and there are many, it's the developers
themselves, Mr. Anderson and Mr. Klutznick's arrogant
and outrageous bait and switch behavior that should
disqualify this project. It's time to cut bait and tell
Mr. Anderson and Mr. Klutznick to go fishing in another
community. Thank you for your attention.

(Applause.)

MS. ESCH: Good evening. My name is Jean
Esch, that's E-s-c-h. Kind of hard on the telephone,
I'll tell you.

Okay. The main thing that I, I'm not prepared
at all, okay. What I would say is that I came to
Evanston in January of 1944 as a young war bride with a
three-month-old baby, stayed with my in-laws in the 1300
block of Darrow Avenue. And that's a long time ago, you
know? Okay. I can remember being 12 years old and
thinking that somebody that was 18 was really old, and
then I look in the mirror and my God, what happened to me?

However, I have long, long had a great affection for our town. Love Evanston. And I sold my house which I had for about 50 years, I sold my house in 2004 and moved into a condo just a block and a half away. And frankly, when I look at our government all over, all the way up to the top, I have told my kids had I not bought the condo, I probably would have left the country, okay, because our government has gone haywire.

And when I look at this relative to a suggestion to put in this kind of very costly project down in Central Evanston, I have a real problem with that. Think about what happens if our recession, and I know that the President is going to give us money to spend and that's going to take care of that if everybody will spend it. That will up our record of where we are in terms of the recession, look better, you know.

But anyhow, what I've thought about is in a costly venture like this, given a recession that turns into what I expect to become a depression, that can be a disaster. It's a disaster for the local where it's located. It's a disaster for the financing people. And
with all those empty spaces, all of the promises of the
great things that will happen from that simply won't
happen.

I think that we have to be a little more
realistic about our economy. Let's face it. We do not
live in a democracy anymore. We live in a corporate
economy. And if you think about it, many of our very
patriotic American corporations have left the country,
gone all over the world in search of cheap labor.

And --

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman, I've given you a
little bit of extra time so I need you --

MS. ESCH: Okay. Well, my main objection to
this, I don't like the looks of it, you know, but I'm
just one of many. I like the town. I've paid my
freight for a long time. I'm willing to keep paying the
freight. But I think that this would be a terrible
error. We have many unoccupied, unsold condos. The
real estate market is not at its healthiest and we still
have about four buildings that are in process. I think
that's something to be concerned about. And --

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

MS. ESCH: That's it.
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Chris Mailing, Jim Marsh, Brian Zucker, Marianne Rembeck, Mark Raymo and Jonathan Perman.

MR. MAILING: Good evening. My name is Chris Mailing. I'm the owner of Turin Bicycle at 1027 Davis Street and owner of the property at the same address. We employ ten people year round and another 20 or so seasonally, many of them Evanston residents.

Turin Bicycle is thrilled to be a part of the Evanston community for many reasons, too many to go in here in one minute. However, I'd like to talk about two of them. Evanston is alive, vibrant and full energy. This is due to the fact that Evanston is constantly reinventing itself, going with what's new, exciting and different. Our growing and vigorous community is the kind of place our customers want to be a part of and enjoy coming to.

Our business needs to grow, and growth in Evanston by many measures is key to maintaining the image and atmosphere of downtown that makes an attractive place for shoppers to visit. Evanston draws people from all over the North Shore and the north side
of Chicago. The vitality of Evanston is paramount to attracting people to downtown. The more retailers, restaurants, offices and residents there are within walking distance of downtown, the more appealing the environment is for all visitors, supporting the growth and strength of the businesses there.

Evanston is well positioned for the future, too, as a suburb close to Chicago with great transportation infrastructure. When we get serious about global warming or when the price of gasoline reaches $10 a gallon, and I don't pretend to know whether that will take ten months or ten years, residences, shops and restaurants gathered together in a downtown environment just like Evanston, close to rail stations, will be immensely popular. Indeed, such livable communities also encourage healthy amounts of natural exercise through walking and bicycling and reduce traffic congestion as unnecessary driving is avoided.

Turin Bicycle eagerly anticipates this new reality. Perhaps obviously we look forward to supporting Evanston's residents as they adjust, whether they walk to the CTA or Metra Stations or ride their
bikes across town or downtown to work or school.
Evanston prides itself on being green. This vision for the future includes housing, office and retail density in Downtown Evanston. The proposed building at 708 Church Street provides urban density consistent with this vision. Whether this building should be 20, 40 or 60 stories tall is a detail I'll leave others to address. However, it would certainly send the wrong message to kill this project.

We need to continue building the vitality and energy of our downtown core. We need to continue to attract shoppers, diners, workers and visitors of all kinds from all over the North Shore and the north side of Chicago. We need to position Evanston well for the energy realities of the coming decade. Thank you.

MR. MARSH: Hi, my name is Jim Marsh. I'm at 821 Brummel in the great 8th. I haven't been living in Evanston for 40 years. I came to Evanston in '98 and I came here because of the community. I knew Evanston from the 80's. I knew the downtown when it was in the 80's. And what I liked about Evanston was seeing the growth of Evanston, seeing the new buildings that were going up.
I remember Sherman Plaza, there was a lot of issue around Sherman Plaza and how awful it was going to be. And as someone who has a lot of clients in Evanston, a lot of clients in Downtown Evanston, and some in the 708 building, I've used Sherman Plaza a lot to park and walk around and visit people. The other thing is that Sherman Plaza is not all chain stores. There's a couple of independents, Lake Side Eye Care and The Rub are two of them.

I think as we see buildings like this go up or visions like this for the future go up, that there will be a progression of organizations coming in and they will support, the market plate of Evanston will support them or not. We're not going to attract a Banana Republic if none of us go to a Banana Republic. They'll try it and they'll leave and then something else will come in there.

I came to speak because I wanted to say that, and I think, I don't know if this is a generational thing and I hope it's not, but this tower doesn't scare me. This doesn't frighten me. This actually, when I see this or when I see something with that particular spot in Evanston being a place that could be a beacon,
I'm very excited about it. I'm very excited about the future of Evanston.

I don't have a dim economic view that we're going to go into a depression. I'm not a Republican either. So, I think that we're in a great place to live. We're in a great place to do business. I have a business here. And I think that encouraging vibrant, lively people to live here is great.

I'd love to see a place where, you know, people with incomes can move in and young people can move in. We've had a lot of expansion of our retirement homes. Let's have some expansion of some decent living space, too. Thank you.

MR. RAYMO: My name is Mark Raymo, R-a-y-m-o. I live on 815 Seward. I have been an Evanston resident for roughly five years. I also work with Verenis Properties, a residential real estate brokerage that I began with a business school colleague roughly a year ago. I am also an active member of the Young Professionals of Evanston Group, a pro business group affiliated with the Evanston Chamber of Commerce.

I recognize that many criticize or may criticize any real estate or residential development at
this point in time as media highlights a credit crisis and excess supply in residential units. Now, while market cycles of supply and demand are real in real estate, the urban planner must not be consumed by transient cyclical adjustments for it's the commission of the urban planner to see trends and to plan long term and to make judgments for tomorrow even when today may present a different picture of reality.

The truth of the Chicago land real estate market is that it's extremely strong at its fundamental core. And while a temporary market cyclical correction may be occurring, it does not justify a stall in residential development for there are still tremendous opportunities around the corner for the Chicago land area and Evanston in particular, opportunities that increase the demand for living space.

I'm thinking specifically about the 2016 Olympic bid, the continued growth of Evanston's academic campuses and the retiring baby boomers valuing the convenience of Evanston over other areas, convenience in terms of lifestyle centers which this development offers, a vibrant downtown area with retail and restaurants within walking distance which this
development offers, and public transit access to Downtown Chicago.

With such opportunities just on the horizon, it's crucial to prepare and plan accordingly to empower and equip Evanston to grow, to change, to develop. Yes, change can be viewed as a threat. But I hope regarding this development project, change would be embraced as opportunity. An opportunity to display Evanston as a community of distinction, and this development allows such a powerful display. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Mr. Brian -- okay.

MR. ZUCKER: Brian Zucker, 807 Davis Street. Resident of Evanston for about five years, six years now. Also an employer in town. President of an economic research firm called Human Capital. We work with post-secondary education throughout the country.

My interest in this project, both personally and professionally, probably stems foremost from the economic impact aspect of it. What I'm most intrigued about is the idea of impact if the end game is sustainability of the Evanston economy, that the end game is not per se growth. We can argue about the aesthetics of the property, those are going to be value
judgments, we will never get anywhere. What we are looking for is a sustainable economic model.

I think the coalition really is to be commended for what appears to be a rock solid piece of analysis, transparent, accessible and rigorous. If those findings can be corroborated and the end game is sustainability, then it is critical that your group really take that seriously under advisement and understand what the implications of those findings are. Even so, they understate the full implication.

One of the most elusive aspects of economic impact is understanding the opportunity cost of doing something else and of understanding the externalities. The externalities have been addressed more here in aesthetic terms than economic terms. Notably we talk about the wind, we talk about the shadows. The fact is you cast a shadow across the street, you're going to depreciate the value of those properties and preclude other development that might take place immediately north. You will destroy the character of the sidewalk cafes immediately across the street. And you will incur an opportunity cost above and beyond the cost benefit analysis presented here.
CHAIRMAN HOLMES: That's time, thank you.

(Appause.)

MS. LEMBECK: Hi, my name is Marianne Lembeck. I'm the owner of William's Shoes at 710 Church, 706 Church. And I also live at 930 Wesley.

My question is to the panel. And my thoughts have been, and I wanted, I don't know if you can answer it now, probably not, but somewhere along if we could have something of assurance in writing that you are really for us and that you're hearing us and that you are representing us, that we've come to many meetings in the Planning & Development. A lot of people who are sitting here also were in those meetings and that was voted 4-3.

I'm hoping as we are like representing ourselves now more for against than for, that you hear us and that we can really trust that you are going to represent us. I don't know how that process, in your mind how that works, how you filter all the information. I would really like to hear how you work that in your minds so that when you come to a vote we really believe that you are for us as well as you're probably for yourselves in your own communities, you know, having
your own vote. Does that make sense? Okay, that's what I got.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Are you --

MS. BURKE: I would like to speak. I was not here to sign up so I wondered if I could have a minute also.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Well, let me give you one minute. You want to come ahead? Well, Jonathan is here. Go ahead. I'm sorry, go ahead. Could you please, your name so I can write it, too?

MS. BURKE: Nancy Burke, B-u-r-k-e. My address, 2206 Wesley. And I'll tell you, I wasn't able to sign up on time. I'm sorry, I was late for three reasons. The first being that I was in my office working at 708 Church. When I finished working, I actually had to make a phone call to a realtor for another kind of hopeless foray into the exploration of finding office space once the 708 Church building is no more.

I can say that I have made probably six months worth of futile phone calls looking for office space of
analogous feeling and price and location. I think that as a psychologist, I have spoken to probably 40 of my colleagues in that building trying to find office space either individually or collectively. And it has not proven at all hopeful to this point. So, I wanted to let you know that.

And I also, my third activity of the evening was kind of taking a straw poll of my colleagues as I was leaving and they were wandering up and down the halls. And most of them were not able to be here tonight because they were working in their offices at 708 Church Street. But I did take my own personal referendum and discovered that there was a hundred percent support for the idea of rethinking this project.

And that made me wonder why, given that this project actually influences probably, impacts upon probably every resident of Evanston in one way or another, why my referendum has to be the only when I could imagine that this is something that every person in Evanston would want to have a say about. And you know, I understand that there are business advantages for me. I think my business would be increased enormously given the upsurge in depression among
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Evanston residents who are feeling helpless and unrepresented.

(Applause.)

MS. BURKE: And the only thing I can think to do is go home and try to calm myself by looking at the night sky, although unfortunately I would be concerned because although I live a mile from Downtown Evanston, the night sky would not be what it has been because I would be seeing this building in my view. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. PERMAN: Good evening, Madam Chairwoman and members of the Planning & Development Committee. I'm Jonathan Perman. I'm the Executive Director of the Evanston Chamber of Commerce.

One of the questions that people often ask is how has downtown development helped the homeowner? In the year 2000, the City's equalized assessed value for all property was about $1.3 billion. In 2005, five years later, it had grown to $2.2 billion, an increase of about $950 million or 74 percent. Of that, almost one billion increase in EAV, the downtown new construction accounted for $250 million or 25 percent of Evanston's total property growth from 2000 to 2005.
In that time, in Downtown Evanston, there was an increase of about 2,200 people in 1,300 units, an increase of about 3 percent of our population. So, an increase of 3 percent of our population generated about $250 million of new EAV. Without the downtown development that's taken place, Evanston would have 25 percent less property value growth in which to generate its taxes.

So, here is an example. Let's say you have a home that's worth $300,000 in the year 2000. By 2005, let's say it's $400,000. What if the City came to you and said that your home in 2005 is now worth 375 not 400,000, 25 percent less? But then suppose the City said we're still going to tax you as if it was really worth $400,000? That's the difference.

The 708 Church proposed project will generate about $70 million in Evanston's EAV. And here is the fallacy with all due respect to my friend John Kennedy of their study. While it's true that $3.3 million in taxes generated from the 708 Church Street project will go into the Washington National TIF, to a certain extent those TIF funds are fungible. And for example, if you look at how the tax increment has been spent in the
Washington National TIF so far, the moneys --

(Comments from the audience.)

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Just a second now, wait just a minute.

MR. PERMAN: I'm almost done, Madam Chairwoman.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Just one second, Mr. Perman.

I tried to be as fair as I can be. When they are representing an organization, he's representing the Chamber, I gave the Southeast Evanston folks more time because they were representing an organization. So, I'm really watching the clock. I am not -- okay, all right. Just go ahead.

MR. PERMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

MR. PERMAN: For example, if you look at how the tax increment has been spent on the Washington National TIF so far, the moneys have been used to pay off bonds for a newly constructed garage. Without the TIF moneys, the general taxpayer would be paying for the new garage which needed to be built because the old one had reached the end of its useful life.

The point is new money is new money and can be
used for projects in the downtown that otherwise would
have to be taken out of the capital funds that the City
must bond for. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you. Okay.

MS. STEFFEN: I'll speak briefly, I'm going to
read this and then submit. I have far more than a
minute to say but I'm not going to.

My name is Bess Steffen and I live at 418
Dempster Street. This is a letter that I've written to
all of you. Steffen, S-t-e-f-f-e-n.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: And let me ask. Were you
here earlier? Did you get sworn in?

MS. STEFFEN: Yes, I did. I came in just at
that time. Thank you.

I'm going to cut this in half so if it sounds
disjointed, I'm sorry, but I will read it. And I
realize I didn't have my glasses, I raced over here, so
excuse me if I make errors.

Our current process established by the staff
and Council to approve building uses in compliance as to
zoning and approval of development is far too focused on
architecture, height, density, parking, materials, and
much less on the context of culture, tradition and the
relationship to overall Evanston architectural landscape. Evanston sense of place is increasingly being eroded by each new architectural element that lacks any reference to the surrounding community context. Our design teams exhibit overly ambitious keenness for design and style, and therefore, overlook where it fits in this community that has a unique history and style of its very own.

The 'oldness' here is often praised and usually appreciated by those who come here as a destination to live, work and play. It's authenticity is increasingly being replicated throughout the country as developers try to recreate our type of community. I offer the Glen community as an example.

Our City, however, is allowing varying, different, and rather mediocre styles of development to overlay our very own established Evanston style while undermining the existing architectural culture. Instead, we should be capitalizing on what we have and improving upon it. This doesn't mean not to include new and innovative architecture in Evanston. It may mean that the ultra modern and hyper innovation should remain on a smaller scale so as not to dominate, and I
underscore dominate, the existent architectural
landscape.

We cannot compete with Chicago in architecture
and we should not try to replicate Chicago in
architectural type. Do we even want to? Are we
striving to be part of Chicago or do we want to offer an
alternative?

If we are to preserve our history and maintain
our difference from the newer suburbs that are
developing around Chicago --

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I'm giving you about a
minute and a half.

MS. STEFFEN: Okay. We must dedicate
ourselves to define and communicate this desire with
developers when they approach the City.

I have just a bit more, it's not long. We
must tell them what we want and proceed from there. If
we are compelled to follow as example parts of Chicago,
I would suggest the concept as model be it the Webster-
Halsted Street area as more in keeping with what fits in
Evanston. It combines retail, residential and
restaurant bar life all within a scale that promotes
foot traffic, sidewalk activity and animation. I have
more but you'll see it, I'll let you read it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: So, we're going to take about a five-minute break and then we'll be right back.

(Off the record.)

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: We want to move into the next portion and I'm going, we've set a time limit tonight. We really hope to be out of here by 9:30 but we'll extend that until 10:00 only because we started late. So, we will not stay past 10:00. We'll get as much done between now and 10:00 o'clock as we possibly can. For those of you who are wondering, it is on the agenda for the 24th, this project is on the agenda for the 24th. Okay? At 6:30 p.m., just so you have that information that you can pass along.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is there time for citizen comment then?

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: There's always time for citizens comments. No? No? Oh, okay. Well, they will always have the possibility of going to the Council, coming to the Council for comments though, right? Okay,
for public comments at the Council. But comments for
the Planning & Development Committee, this is it for
tonight, okay?

Now, we'll move to the portion where the
Council may have comments or questions based upon the
presentation from the developers of the 10th, March 10th
when the presentation was made. In the meantime, there
are two other points I want to make so that we are
clear. On the presentation that was presented by the
Evanston Coalition for Responsible Development, we're
not going to ask the developer to respond to that
tonight but we certainly would like to hear your
response to that at a later date, as well as we are
asking our City Manager if our staff can analyze this so
that we can have some feedback from you for that. Okay?

All right. Council members, anyone? Alderman
Tisdahl.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Thank you. In Evanston,
there are several projects that have been approved by
the Council, condo projects that are not going forward.
There is one in my ward on Central Street that hasn't
pre-sold enough units to get financing, so we have on
Central Street a very, we will have a very nice grassy
area which is all right for Central Street but would be
a disaster downtown. So, I would like to know what
makes your project recession proof? How do you know
that you'll be able to proceed?

MR. FRIEDMAN: I'll let Tim answer that
because I think he's most appropriate. But I would
remind you that as --

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Excuse me. Point of
order, should we have a motion on the floor before we
start this conversation? I mean, what's the Chair's
pleasure with respect to, what are we doing now?

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: We're getting comments or
questions answered from the presentation of the 10th.
That's my pleasure.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Okay, that's fine. I
would, okay, again, okay.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I should also begin by saying
my name is Steve Friedman. I'm an attorney with the law
firm of Applegate & Thorne-Thompson representing the
developer. Before I let Tim answer, I would point you
to our presentation of last week where we discussed the
Plan Commission's conditions approving the, recommending
approval of the development. And unlike one of the
comments you heard this evening, we in fact are fine
with all of them but one of those conditions. And one
of the conditions was that we would not demolish the 708
Church building until there was financing for the
condominium project.

So, I think that doesn't answer the question
about why the project would be successful and I'll let
Tim do that. But just to the question of not having a
vacant lot, I think that's within your control.

MR. ANDERSON: As Steve said, we've already
committed that we wouldn't be tearing down the building
prior to financing being in place which would allow
construction to proceed.

MR. COURT REPORTER: Could I have your name,
sir?

MR. ANDERSON: I'm sorry. Tim Anderson,
President of Focus Development. In terms of being
recession proof, I wouldn't say any business is
necessarily recession proof. We do recognize the
cyclical nature of real estate and that there is a low
right now in real estate. But we also feel that we have
hired many, we work with three primary market
feasibility consultants, and we feel that the pricing of
this product in this location with the amenities that we are providing will be accepted in the marketplace, and that the market will return much stronger in 2009. That is what the consultants we're talking to are telling us and that's our intent.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Rainey?

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Yes. Can you tell us what is, I think this was raised by, I think it was Oliver Gould during the discussion. I think it's an issue that is of concern to all the members of the Council. With respect to Sherman Plaza, do you have any information about the level of ownership and rental?

MR. FRIEDMAN: It's all ownership but --

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, it's all --

ALDERMAN RAINEY: But I mean to what degree --

MR. ANDERSON: What I know about Sherman Plaza right now is, and the condo association could address this more thoroughly, but from what I understand, there are about 35 percent units that are currently being rented. However --

ALDERMAN RAINEY: 35 percent?

MR. ANDERSON: Correct. However, in terms of what I see on the multiple listing as of right now,
there's 12 units in the building that are for sale or roughly 5 percent.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Okay, thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Excuse me, Alderman? I know that, I'm the president of the condo association at 807 Davis Street, and I just want to say that it's a little bit higher than what Tim just spoke of. We have passed a resolution to our -- and we're trying to limit the number of rentals in the building but there are a number of units for sale. But there are more than 35 percent of rentals.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: What, do you know the number, the percentage?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I can give you the exact number tomorrow.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Okay, thank you. You could email it to me.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: That's all I have right now.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Bernstein.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: What are the price points for these units? I don't know that I've ever heard of them.
MR. ANDERSON: The one-bedrooms would be in the low 300's. The average price point in the building would be somewhere around $403 a square foot. Basically they would start about $380, $370 to $380 a square foot and the penthouses being much higher of course. Our pricing structure has been built around what we see existing product currently selling.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Okay. And Tim, while you're up here, with respect to the current and the proposed office if any, I know last week I think Steve mentioned 21,000 is what I wrote in my notes. But I think you're talking about 28,000 combination retail and office. Is that a valid number? And what is the current retail number and, square footage of retail and square footage of office?

MR. ANDERSON: The current plan calls for a retail of about 18,000 square feet and that's the current plan, and there's approximately 20,000 square feet. With our basement, we're about the same because we actually rent storage in the basement of about 20,000 square feet. So, the retail is very close, 18 to 20, 20 being the current existing and 18 being our proposed.

Our plan as it's shown right now after it was
modified to lower the base does not include any office
space on the second floor. There's currently just --
what do you think, there's about 16,000 square feet of
office space? It's about 16 to 18,000 square feet of
second floor office space in the 708 Church Street
building right now.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: I think the number I've
been looking at is 28,000 plus square-foot. That's what
the Plan Commission was talking about. Let me -- does
that, where do we get that number?

MR. ANDERSON: That's 28,000 for the building
or for the --

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: No, no, no, no. For the
retail, I think it says retail and office.

MR. ANDERSON: In the existing building or our
proposed building?

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: I thought it was with
regard to your proposed building. I thought that's what
it was saying.

MR. ANDERSON: No, initially we did go in, on
the initial presentation, we did go in with that amount
of office and retail. There was some second floor
retail and office space, and then there was first floor
retail space.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: All right. So, now it's no longer 28. Your projection is 18 plus some in the basement?

MR. ANDERSON: Correct.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Okay. Thank you. No office space?

MR. ANDERSON: There is no office space in the current plan.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: -- Any other questions or comments?

MR. COURT REPORTER: Ms. Holmes, is your microphone on?

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Oh, I'm sorry. No, it wasn't. I was coughing so I had turned it off.

Alderman Tisdahl?

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Originally, I think, when we first met you had said you would not need any public funds to complete this project. And now you're asking for three million in TIF funds. What happened?

MR. FRIEDMAN: The original development was only the 708 Church Street project property. It still is. The project that's before you is only 708 Church
Street. That's the only rezoning that's before you and
that's we're requesting a planned development for. And
there is no TIF assistance associated with that.

Subsequent to proceeding and filing the
planned development application, the developer has put
the Hahn building under contract. And we've spoken to
the purpose behind that, there are several benefits we
think arise from that. But it is the redevelopment of
that building that would utilize TIF assistance.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: So, this project could go
forward with no TIF assistance?

MR. FRIEDMAN: That's absolutely correct.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: And you would decide about
the Hahn building separately. So, preserving the Hahn
building is not a benefit of this project because it's a
separate --

MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, no, no. It is a benefit
of this project. It is absolutely a benefit of this
project. We feel strongly about that. So, and as I
stated before, we sort of made our point with respect to
that, that it does retain some Class B space. It
retains an Evanston landmark which a competing project
had proposed to do something else to.
So, those are all absolute benefits to the City. And we thought that it helped to make this project less confusing because when we proceeded with the development of 708 Church, there was a competing project that was at least proposed, I'm not sure how far along it got but there was a suggestion that there would be a competing project on the site. And I think the sense of two large developments on that block is not something that we thought was a very good idea and we had the sense that that wasn't something that would receive a very positive response from the City as well.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: That was correct.

MR. FRIEDMAN: So, hence, acquiring the Hahn building for the purpose of ensuring that that doesn't occur. So, to that extent, we believe that that's a benefit. But to answer the question, this project that's in front of you could go forward with absolutely no TIF assistance, and in fact, it is the driver that creates new TIF increment in this district which is expiring.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Bernstein.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Yes, just following up.
Will the restoration of the Hahn building go forward without TIF funds?

MR. FRIEDMAN: No, not --

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Excuse me? No, no, it's a historical -- it could theoretically come in for a certificate of appropriateness. So, you're saying now unless the City gives you TIF funds in the amount of three million dollars, it won't be restored and we won't get that public benefit?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, no, you'll get aspects of the public benefit. There is no question --

(Reaction from the audience.)

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: You know, I'm going to have to ask, excuse me, if you all please, just let's all be respectful of each other. And we can't hear if you make those noises so I would really appreciate it if you would respect the speakers as they're speaking. Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you, Alderman, I appreciate that. There are numerous benefits that result from the developer acquiring the Hahn building and the developer agreeing which is something we've stated in a covenant with the City that there would be
no additional development on the Hahn building site. We would agree to leave it under its current envelope and not affect that. Not only when this competing project that was proposed recently when we proposed a project, but as you know there have been other proposals in the past for the Hahn building to be developed. That will not occur.

I think what Jim was just suggesting when he said that we wouldn't proceed with the full redevelopment of the Hahn building without TIF assistance, that project is not feasible. But the building itself, we would own it. We would continue to operate it and it would remain an Evanston landmark.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Wynne.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Well, I think Alderman Bernstein elaborated on the points I was going to make because I really see these things as two separate entities. And the Hahn building, did any, that other building that was proposed to be built with the columns surrounding the Hahn building, that was going to be a decision by the City Council. So, the City Council actually is going to be protecting the Hahn building. And so, I don't see how our paying you to protect the
building really is a public benefit. I mean, it's up to us or whoever is on the City Council when some other developer comes in with an inappropriate proposal for the Hahn building to make sure that it doesn't happen.

MR. ANDERSON: Can I add something to that? I want to address it because I think one of the goals with the acquisition of the Hahn building wasn't just to prevent another competing project on this block. It was also, by acquiring the Hahn building, it precluded another development opportunity on the block. And it then meant that there was the possibility of creating a consolidated integrated plan for the entire block.

Initially, in the March meeting when we presented the idea of a Fountain Square, we presented it not as a bait and switch but we presented it as an opportunity for a TIF generating element to support a public benefit. Very much like Sherman Plaza supported the expansion and reconstruction of a brand new parking garage. That was the intent in doing that.

Now, by having the Hahn building acquired, we are able to provide a consolidated plan for the entire block because the small footprint of the Fountain Square building does not allow another tall building to be
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built on that location. So, that's why we thought it was really critical.

The other thing I want to note is that we are buying the Hahn building at a developable site price. In other words, a site that could be developed. That's how we're paying for it, not necessarily on the income basis of the current Class B office space, but we are committing to keeping the Class B office space. And besides the TIF increment that we're seeking for restoration and maintaining Class B office space, we are also subsidizing that purchase ourselves to a significant sum.

So, in looking at the economics we would be happy to share with your real estate consultant, you'll see that this is not a quid pro quo where the City gives us TIF and then we're able to keep the Hahn building. We're also making a significant investment of a subsidy in the Hahn building purchase and restoration.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Moran.

ALDERMAN MORAN: I'll pass.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. All right. Alderman Bernstein.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Yes. I see our City
Manager sitting here. I have not seen a pro forma.

Customarily we do. Could you get with the developer and come up with some of these numbers so that we can determine the validity of some of these statements?

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Wollin.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: I was just going to say in our packet for this evening, we have the breakdown of the numbers for the Hahn building under number 10, request for funds.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Do we have anything else for the developer? Alderman Jean-Baptiste.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: I wanted to get your response to the criticism that the condo market in the City of Evanston is already somewhat saturated.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can't hear you.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Yes, thank you. I wanted to get the developer's response to the criticism that the condo market is so saturated that the development of the number of condos that you intend to do will end up sitting vacant. What is your opinion about that kind of perception?

MR. ANDERSON: It was earlier stated that there were about 690 plus condominium or townhome units
on the market right now. I checked before the meeting in the MLS and there's 494 current listed attached dwelling units for sale in Evanston which would be townhomes or condos. Out of that, 164 are new construction to five years old. That's our competition, okay. So, who we're competing against is the new construction to five years old. And that's pretty much what you see in the downtown area in terms of what competition would be for us. And that's about 164 units.

Now, I'm not pretending to represent at all that a developer puts every single listing they have in the MLS. But that gives you an indication of the market. I would say that, again, we feel that the pricing points of our product, the study that we've done with Metro Study, our consultant on the project, and the timing of this project would preclude the idea that we're going to have an empty building without sales.

And the other thing I want to also mention is there was a statement before of what prevents this building from getting half-baked and then stopping, okay. Well, the reality is when you fund and finance a condominium building, you don't fund half of it. You
get financing for the entire development. The bank goes
in and says I want to see the funding for this entire
development. Not unlike a revolving loan, something you
might see in a land development deal.

So, from the get go, we have the entire funds
for completion of the development and the bank is
essentially a partner with the developer to make sure it
gets completed. So, I don't think that's a danger to
have a half-baked building on the property.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: I have a few other
questions.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Go ahead.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: What percentage of
Sherman Plaza is sold?

MR. ANDERSON: Sherman Plaza sold out. It's
been sold out and it's closed out.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: A couple of other
questions. In terms of the discussion of public
benefits, what is it that your organization would do for
Fountain Square?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, what we've spoken to the
Plan Commission about and what I suggested last week was
that we'd like to be a partner with you with respect to
the redevelopment of Fountain Square. Our thought is that considering the fact that early on when there was a thought of doing a project with the City similar to Sherman Plaza where we really would partner with you, we hired a landscape architect and developed plans for Fountain Square. The sense we got was that wouldn't be a process that the City wanted us to undertake as part of this rezoning, but we think that's probably where our services are best used in the planning of a redeveloped Fountain Square. But I think that's something frankly we want to discuss with you and get a sense for what role you would see us provide with respect to a redevelopment of Fountain Square.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: I wanted to also ask you about this fear about the displacement of local businesses. What, have you guys given some thought to that and are you, do you have some --

MR. FRIEDMAN: We have given it thought, yes.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: And maybe you could share with us, I don't recall what you did for the development of Sherman Plaza, whether or not you were involved in that process of accommodating small businesses or businesses that were being displaced.
MR. KLUTZNICK: I'll answer your last question first. With Sherman Plaza, we relocated a number of the businesses. And the City, as it has done in the past successfully, helped in some of those relocations. And I give by example Dave's Italian Kitchen, the Pine Yard. You've had some major development in this town that has had successful relocation of local businesses.

As far as giving it thought, we've done more than give thought to it. We've been meeting with the merchants on the site on numerous occasions. And by example, I know, Marianne is here, I don't know if her husband is here, the Lembecks we've met with numerous times, have proposed certain relocation possibilities and have started to talk about the type of deals that could be done that recognizes what they pay today, what the market is today if you come and they found that out by going out and checking the market and trying to work out something in between. And we've talked to everybody and we would intend to relocate.

The whole question of local, regional and national retailers particularly, I'll speak to that, is one that has been very successful in this town. This town is not made up of just local retailers. You go to
the Barnes & Noble. You go to the Borders. You go to
the Century Theater. You go to North Face. You go to a
lot of stores in this town as well as good local stores.
And Uncle Dan's is a regional store and I know that
they're looking to be relocated right now.
So, my point is that you will not lose good
local merchants in this town. And as we have
collaborated with the City in the past, we will
collaborate with them on this project to help relocate
local merchants.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: So, you've been in
touch with some local businesses. What percentage of
them? I mean, are you --
MR. KLUTZNICK: I've been in touch --

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: You set yourself out
to them as being accessible and available for
discussions? Have you, you know, is there some kind of
process in place for those who are fearful? Because we
heard testimony from a couple of them that they're
looking for alternative space and apparently some of the
tenants have left already. Is it just a few that you've
spoken to or do you have a process?

MR. KLUTZNICK: We have spoken to almost all
of the retailers. And we continue to speak to the
retailers.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. What about the
professionals on the second floor?

MR. KLUTZNICK: We have not spoken to the
professional tenants at this point. We are retaining
professional space in the Hahn building and there may be
some opportunities there at some point with some of the
turnover that will take place in that building.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: All right. I may
have some more questions later.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Wynne.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I have a couple of points.

Tim Anderson, you were mentioning the number of condos
that are currently on the market. But I think you
neglected to mention the development on Maple Avenue
which I believe is, Steve, correct me if I'm wrong, 147
units?

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, I didn't, I just indicated
what was in the MLS.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Right.

MR. ANDERSON: And I said that some of the
developers, like they don't list all their units, you
ALDERMAN WYNNE: Right, except that I think very rapidly before your building comes on the market, that building, the Winter Properties will be on the market. And there are 99 units in my ward at Main and Chicago that will be on the market before your building is on the market. And that's just the two that I am thinking of right now that -- Main and Chicago.

ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Kedzie and Chicago, too.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: And Kedzie and Chicago is also going, about to be sold, too. So, by my calculation, that's another 300, 250 units that will be -- and Green Bay and Emerson, that's right, thank you, are also, I mean, out there. So, to simply say that number, that static tonight, does not really give as good a picture. And that's fine, let me just finish. So, I think that's something that we have to keep in mind.

I'm going to correct Jim. The City paid for the relocation of the Pine Yard and Dave's Italian Kitchen. And it was the City that -- we paid a lot and there was a lot of debate about that. And it was the City, Judy Aiello and the Economic Development staff who
worked with them to relocate them to all of those locations.

And if my memory is also correct, Klutznick had committed to working to fill the old Barnes & Noble space and I'd like a report right now about what's been done about that because that sits there like a blight in the middle of our downtown. And part of the -- and I voted for Sherman Plaza, but part of what we were told was that you would market that space really aggressively and we wouldn't have that shell sitting there for all this time.

MR. KLUTZNICK: Well, let me answer that one first while it's clear. We attempted to remarket that space for the owner of that building who lives in New York. And we even offered to buy that space, buy that building. He would not sell it to us and we've continued to try to buy that building. If we own that building, we could remarket it today.

What he's attempting to do is to try to lease it essentially at this point to one large user. The chances of him finding one large user are not very great. That space could be divided up into lower floor retail space and office space on the second floor that
might solve some of the problems in this town. That
owner is not willing to do that at this point in time.
That is not in our control.

In the process of moving Barnes & Noble, we
took the obligation of the remainder of their lease
which ran through the end of January of this year. And
we continue to pay rent on it and continue to try to
market it but he would not cooperate with what we wanted
to try to do on it. That's the situation with the
Barnes & Noble store, that if we had that building
today, we could fill that building.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Thank you.

MR. KLUTZNICK: And as regards the issue of
the relocations in this town that I did not imply that
the City, matter of fact I said cooperating with the
City as we did with Sherman Plaza, we relocated a number
of people. We obviously don't take credit for Dave's
Italian Kitchen or the Pine Yard. I did mention it
because it's an example of tenants being relocated and
these local people being relocated in this town and not
being lost. And it's a collaborative effort between the
developer and the City that helps maintain those kind of
businesses. That's what I intended. I did not intend
ALDERMAN WYNNE: And I'll add one more fact of clarification. Pine Yard actually closed for at least a year or two. They were gone.

MR. KLUTZNICK: Yes.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: And it was their choice to come back. So, despite the fact that the City worked with them for a long period of time, they actually closed and we're just lucky that they came back.

MR. KLUTZNICK: Well, you know, obviously you know the facts on that, I don't. So, I'm not going to debate that one.

MR. ANDERSON: Do you want me to answer your question about the condo market? Because I don't think, about the depth of the condo market in terms of why our product would be marketable.

First of all, I want to say that we did a market study which took into effect Bob King's project up on Emerson there. And -- right, and also the Main and Chicago project. It was in our market study because those were known projects at the time.

The other thing to note is that when we do a development, we really strive to create market or
product differentiation. And you look at the product
differentiation of our project at this location and
there are some aspects of the project that compete with
product in those locations and there are some aspects of
the project which have much different product which
there isn't competition for. So, that's how we position
it. Similar to Sherman where we have penthouses, lofts
and tower even. It's a variety of product.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Rainey.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: I want to get back to the
relocation issue and to ask if there are any legal
requirements for relocation assistance should this
project be approved.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Not that we're aware of.

That's a private --

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Well, previously, the Dave's
Italian Kitchen and Pine Yard, those were required
relocations. And I don't know if we have anybody on our
staff who is here who was here then who can explain the
difference. Jim, were you in Community Development
then?

MR. WOLINSKI: Yes.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: You were? Okay.
MR. WOLINSKI: Yes. As --

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Did we not own the building?

MR. WOLINSKI: We did.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: We did. So, that made the difference.

MR. WOLINSKI: Yes. And Dave was a renter of that building.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Right, yes. And the Pine Yard also. Yes, so you can't really compare the two relocation issues. Although, have you, do the people that we've heard from who are in 708, do they have long term leases? What is their status?

MR. KLUTZNICK: With regard to the retailers, there are several of them that do have longer term leases as we had with a number of the retailers who were on the Sherman Plaza site as well. So, it's a matter of working with those people. They have no obligation to leave.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Right.

MR. KLUTZNICK: It's a question of whether or not through the desires of the City, the developer, and the merchant, something cooperatively can be done.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: And what about the offices
upstairs?

MR. KLUTZNICK: Offices are shorter term leases.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: But there are leases?

MR. KLUTZNICK: There are leases. And quite frankly, we don't deal with the office tenants as we do with the retail tenants because we don't own those buildings to begin with. Remember, we have contracts on those buildings. So, any time we talk to any tenant, we have to clear it with the current landlord to make sure that we're not interfering in their business.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Right, yes. Okay. One other comment I wanted to make, and that is I know people have a lot of trouble with the concept of TIF's and tax increment financing districts. And somebody mentioned tonight that this certainly isn't a blighted area and, therefore, this building can't possibly be in a TIF.

The problem here or the reality here is that the territory, the geography within which 708 exists is already a TIF. So, there is nothing to preclude, you know, a luxury, anything going in to this location because it's already been designated as a tax increment
financing district.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay, is that it?

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: I have one more.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: You have one more? Okay.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: This is to the architect. We've heard, you know, a lot of criticism of the project because -- the project, context, proportion. Why do you say that this is the right project at this location? And what other comparables, you know, are you looking at?

MR. BOOTH: Well, as I stated before, we approached the design through sort of a form-based exercise. So, we looked, we built a model, a scale model of the downtown and we started with the lowest possible structure which was about the same height as the bank. And we put the program in the site at that height. And it was a very, it was a big, ugly box right in the middle of your downtown. And together with the developers, we started, as I said last time, inching our way up.

And we got to 40, we got to actually 51 stories and I think that, for some reason, 49 sounded better. But the tradeoff is in the setbacks versus the
height. We have almost a 40-foot, it's 37-and-a-half-foot setback on all sides of the tower. So, you have a four-story base which does something with the wind. So, the wind hits that tall building, runs down the face of the building to the ground, it doesn't get to the sidewalk. It's intercepted at the fourth level where it's deflected.

So, in terms of wind and then the vistas at the street level with a four-story base aligning with a lot of the four-story buildings, six-story buildings in the neighborhood, that that becomes a context at the street level experience of the pedestrian. So, you don't see this building, you'll never see this building like this. You'll see it from the ground and you'll be looking like we showed in those photographs where the setback of the tower opened up the vistas. And in the course of, it's called the Vancouver scheme now, Vancouver got into very tall, thin buildings a number of years ago and they built a lot of them in the city. And that's impressed a lot of city planners and architects because of the very fact that the tall, thin, I won't call it a needle, but it's a thin building, is much more of a better urban kind of
building to build a city with. And in this case, it's not a city, we're not building a city. We're just building a small downtown. But it has enough density and excitement with that density to make the downtown dynamic as we've heard several speakers say.

So, in terms of urban design, the thin building setback is preferred as we discovered in our exercise.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: What are some comparables, you know, the same kind of context thing? Kind of product?

MR. BOOTH: Well, I don't know. I mean, this is a very personal thing. I was walking around the Hancock the other day and it's 100 stories. And I was imagining I was in Evanston. And I was saying, well, what, you know, how come this building, is this building, is something happening to me different standing next to the Hancock building as opposed to standing next to the Fourth Presbyterian Church across the street?

So, I actually did that. I went and stood next to the Hancock building. Okay, this is how it feels. I went across the street, stood next to a four-
story church building, here is how it feels. Okay. It
was okay. It wasn't like oh, my God, this thing is
killing me. It was like, oh. And if I needed to know
it was 100 stories high, I had to get back and go like
this which I normally don't do. So, I mean, that's just
a personal experience on this.
ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: So, as a comparable,
you're really talking about any tall building?
MR. BOOTH: Well, I'm talking about the
Hancock as you know has a setback and a plaza.
ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: That has a setback,
any tall building that has a setback is a comparable.
MR. BOOTH: Right.
ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Any other such
projects in any kind of, any comparable city like
Evanston?
MR. BOOTH: I'll have to think. Let me do
some thinking on that.
ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: And what about the
building style?
MR. BOOTH: Because Evanston, as I've said --
ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: What about the
building style, what other styles are you looking at?
What other buildings with the same kind of style --

MR. BOOTH: Well, we've worked on a number of tall buildings and I think the tall building, the best tall buildings are the simple ones, the ones that don't have a lot of gewgaws, that don't have a lot of ins and outs and shifts and different materials that are very simple and elegant. And so, that's really what we're after here, a very simple building.

ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Do you have a, you know, building location to point us to?

MR. BOOTH: Yes, I can get you a number of those. You know, like the Hancock, the Hancock is a very elegant building, it's a very nice building.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Tisdahl.

ALDERMAN TISDAHL: I wanted to respond to the owner of William's Shoes who wanted to know how we felt about her store and retail. And I would be going barefoot in the middle of winter if it wasn't for her store. So, I feel that she's a very important and necessary part of our community.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Wynne.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Mr. Booth, I was going to ask you a question about some of the things that you were
just discussing with Alderman Jean-Baptiste. First, to
follow up and Alderman Jean-Baptiste asked my question,
I would really like an example of another city in which,
relatively small like ours, in which there is a single
building that's double the height of the rest of the
buildings.

MR. BOOTH: Okay, let me --

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I would like to understand
that. And then, the other thing is, when you were
describing how you arrived at this height, the thing
that to me you left out was what is the zoning. Because
to me, I think, that when I would start a project, I'm
not an architect, but when I, I'm a lawyer, but when I
start something to plan it, I try to figure out what are
the rules and regulations governing the parcel or the
project that I am about to undertake? And I didn't hear
you say anything except we took the site and worked our
way up. And to me that ignores the fundamental issue
that we have to tackle here in Evanston and that has
caused most of the times when this chamber has been
completely filled with people where we have a struggle
over our zoning issues.

So, did you consider our zoning when you put
MR. FRIEDMAN: Let me take a stab at that because I think, we did, and the answer is that as you know, any development over 24 units, any development over, what is it, 20,000 square feet, any, requires a planned development. So, this project is a planned development no matter what.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Right.

MR. FRIEDMAN: And I think under the ordinance, the planned development says that we look to public benefits to determine the sort of site development allowances that a developer is looking for. And as we've stated to you, we think that mix is appropriate in this circumstance. But we absolutely looked at the zoning. And the --

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Steve, what you're saying to me then is that we have no zoning?

MR. FRIEDMAN: No.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: That we just have -- no, but because if you looked at the underlying zoning, I want to know how you arrived at such a tall building because what you're saying, what I'm hearing you say is that anything above our PUD limit is a PUD. But there was an
underlying zoning that was part of this.

MR. FRIEDMAN: But I think the City Council
decided a long time ago that planned developments are
what you expect from anyone coming in with a proposal.
I don't believe that there is a project, and we stated
this at the Plan Commission, that could be developed
under current zoning without a planned development on
the site. What would you build? So, I think once
you've sort of set that as basically the required zoning
as a planned development, and the planned development
process says that a developer could achieve site
development allowances if certain public benefits are
proposed.

And as I think I stated last week, when you
look at certainly other projects that have been approved
by this Council under the planned development
guidelines, our public benefits are far in excess of the
public benefits that have been provided for other
projects. So, we are asking for site development
allowances, I understand that, but that's the process by
which we proceeded.

I think Larry could potentially speak again to
the question of once you have that mentality of, okay,
how does one fit the, you know, the units and the
program on this site, then you start to look at issues
of form that I'm frankly not as best to speak to as
Larry is. But we certainly began with an analysis of
the zoning of the City.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: But I'm looking at a floor
area ratio that's triple. Everything else sits around
that. And I don't see how you can triple the floor area
ratio and I wouldn't say that you're tripling the
benefits that we have from Sherman Plaza. So I guess --

MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, we could discuss that
but --

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I mean, my question is --

MR. BOOTH: Well, maybe you can blame me with
the form-based approach and I really bought into it
because I think, as I've said before, this is the one
place where you would have the tallest building. This
should be the tallest building in this location. Across
the street, no. Down the block, no. Here, yes, this is
what you should do.

Now, whether it's 55, 45, you know, you can
fiddle around in that zone somewhere. But it looks the
best there, that height.
ALDERMAN WYNNE: I'm done.

CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. If there are no more questions, then we will adjourn until Monday evening at 6:30.

(Whereupon, the hearing on the above-titled cause was concluded at 10:03 p.m.)