

1 CITY OF EVANSTON  
 2 PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE  
 3 CASE NO.: P1, P2, P3  
 4 RE: REQUEST FOR RENEWAL OF FAMILIES IN TRANSITION  
 5 FUNDING FOR CONNECTIONS FOR THE HOMELESS  
 6 RE: SIDEWALK CAFÉ FOR TYPE 1 RESTAURANT  
 7 RE: ORDINANCE 32-O-08 - PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION  
 8 FOR A MAP AMENDMENT & PLANNED DEVELOPMENT AT 708 CHURCH  
 9 STREET.

10 Transcribed Report of Proceedings of a public  
 11 hearing on the above captioned matter, held April 8,  
 12 2008 at the Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue,  
 13 2nd Floor, Evanston, Illinois, at 7:00 p.m. and presided  
 14 over by D. Holmes, Chair.

15 PRESENT:

- |    |                  |            |
|----|------------------|------------|
| 16 | D. HOLMES, Chair | E. TISDAHL |
| 17 | L. JEAN-BAPTISTE | A. RAINEY  |
| 18 | S. BERNSTEIN     | C. WOLLIN  |
| 19 | E. MORAN         | A. HANSEN  |
| 20 | M. WYNNE         |            |

21 STAFF:

- |    |             |        |
|----|-------------|--------|
| 22 | J. WOLINSKI | K. COX |
| 23 | J. AIELLO   |        |

1           CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Our next item is the  
2 Planned Development at 708 Church. As you know, this  
3 was a request for continuance from the meeting of March  
4 the 24th. And are there any comments, Mr. Wolinski,  
5 before we begin?

6           MR. WOLINSKI: Madam Chair, I think the  
7 developers have a presentation for you tonight.

8           MR. ANDERSON: My name is Tim Anderson, I'm  
9 President of Focus Development. And we appreciate the  
10 opportunity to take the last two weeks since we asked  
11 for the continuance to really look at the project. Our  
12 architects, Booth Hansen, Larry Booth specifically, have  
13 been working very hard to come up with a design of a  
14 reduced height. And we are very excited about the  
15 design that's emerged over this concerted effort. And I  
16 want to review some of the primary facts about the  
17 change from where we were to where we are today.

18           As you can see, the initial proposal was for  
19 49 stories. We have reduced the height of the building  
20 to 38 which represents a 22 percent reduction in height  
21 of the building. The actual height measured by feet is  
22 about a 20 percent reduction.

23           The net area has gone down slightly. We've

1 maintained the area that we need from an economic  
2 perspective, but the overall area has gone down slightly  
3 and there is a corresponding slight reduction in the  
4 FAR. The unit counts have remained the same and the  
5 parking ratios have remained the same.

6           So, I'm going to turn it over now to Larry  
7 Booth to walk through the design and have him give an  
8 overview.

9           MR. BOOTH: Well, we wanted to respond to the  
10 concerns of the people that have testified here. We  
11 also wanted to accomplish the things that we thought  
12 were important for Evanston in the long run. And we  
13 wanted to stick to our guns on form-based design. We  
14 wanted to see the building as a centerpiece that tended  
15 to, that would accomplish the unification of Downtown  
16 Evanston, to pull it together as a cohesive group of  
17 buildings. In other words, to provide a centerpiece for  
18 the downtown.

19           We wanted to maintain the setbacks we talked  
20 about at the ground floor so that, which would  
21 accomplish not only the scale at the ground floor but  
22 the alleviation of wind that would hit the building and  
23 come cascading down to the street. And we wanted to

1 continue the effort to create a capstone building for  
2 Downtown Evanston, a signature building for downtown  
3 because this is the one place in downtown. This is the  
4 center, it will always be the center. So, this is the  
5 one opportunity to put a centerpiece in the downtown.  
6 So, we wanted to accomplish that.

7           At the same time, we wanted to respond to  
8 obviously the concern about the height. And we wanted  
9 the proportion of it to be elegant and noble. And I  
10 think we have done those things and we're very proud of  
11 this. And let me go through and explain what we have.

12           This is a picture of Downtown Evanston as it  
13 is today with no centerpiece. And you can see it has a  
14 number of tall buildings. Now, if we can have the next  
15 one? Whomp, there it is. And it becomes, at the  
16 Fountain Square location, it becomes the element that  
17 pulls the center of downtown together.

18           And what we have done to accomplish this and  
19 maintain the necessary program to make it a financially  
20 viable building is to reduce the 11 stories and take the  
21 index, extend the building at the more or less a little  
22 bit above the midpoint which would index to the existing  
23 buildings around it. So, the building becomes wider

1 from the midpoint down to the base. The base stays the  
2 same, by the way. It's still a four-story base. And  
3 then, the capstone element goes from the midpoint there  
4 up to the point. If we can have the next one please?

5           This is an existing building from Green Bay  
6 Road and Asbury, and here is the new building here in  
7 the skyline. We still want to maintain the light color  
8 and the reflectivity of it so that it doesn't become,  
9 like some of your posters, a big, dark brick, over-  
10 pressing building on the neighborhood. So, we want to  
11 make it delicate, light and reflective. Next please.

12           Here we are at Davis Street and Oak. This is  
13 the building as it's seen there. And this is the bank  
14 building here. So, it would extend, obviously it's  
15 going to be, and we want it to be the tallest building  
16 in Evanston, and we want it to be the tallest building  
17 in Evanston for a long, long time like maybe for 1,000  
18 years. If we could have the next one please?

19           Here is the view from Sherman Avenue. You can  
20 see that this is the bank building. And I don't know  
21 the name of this building. Rotary, okay. And you can  
22 see that the building steps now, it steps from a four-  
23 story base upward to about the midpoint, and then the

1 capstone element is there. So, it still has a  
2 centerpiece look to it. Next please.

3           The ground floor, actually we improved the  
4 ground floor, I think, because we extended the, we got  
5 more retail coming around here. We simplified the plan.

6       This is still the loading dock here. This is the  
7 parking garage entry off of Orrington. This is  
8 Orrington, by the way, Orrington, Church and Sherman.  
9 And then the residential lobby here with elevators that  
10 take you up to the apartments. Next please.

11           Then, at the roof level of the four-story  
12 base, we still have a roof garden. And you can see the  
13 difference here and let me explain what we did. We  
14 extended the shape of the building so the setback on  
15 Orrington is about 20 feet now instead of 37. And part  
16 of the building goes all the way out to the base.  
17 There's about a 50-foot stretch here of the building  
18 going out flush with the base which, from an  
19 architectural standpoint, has some advantage. It  
20 integrates the base with the whole building.

21           So, at that point, it won't be as much of an  
22 abrupt step from a four-story base to a single tower.  
23 This side extends in Orrington a little bit, and then

1 this shape here comes out as more of a triangle, if you  
2 will, that sets up a juxtaposition of a rectilinear base  
3 here with the upper part plane against it. If we can go  
4 to the next one please?

5           And here is the view on Church Street looking  
6 east, the base coming up to the roof garden, a little  
7 bit more sculptural quality in terms of how the taller  
8 element comes into the base but more or less the same  
9 scale relationship of the lower base to the existing  
10 context of the buildings. Next please.

11           Here we are at Orrington this way and Church  
12 going this way. Here is the base, the four-story base  
13 coming across here, the retail, and then at this point,  
14 this one section here, two bays that go all the way up  
15 to the midpoint of the upper component. Next please.

16           Here is Sherman looking south. Again, it  
17 really hasn't changed much. The tower, a little bit of  
18 the tower now comes out with that triangular form that  
19 is still set back though from the face of the base.  
20 Next please.

21           This is September and March, 9:00 o'clock in  
22 the morning. Again, the shadows still fall within the  
23 downtown area. Next please.

1           September and March in the 5:00 p.m. The  
2 shadow doesn't reach any of the residential now at all.  
3 Before, there was a little bit of shadow that hit the  
4 residential. Next please.

5           And then, June, 9:00 a.m., the tower doesn't,  
6 it just, the shadow comes across right here. And next  
7 please. At 5:00 p.m., again the shadow just goes a  
8 block to the east. I think that's it.

9           Oh, yes, there's still the Hahn building. We  
10 still intend to do exactly what we intended to do before  
11 to the Hahn building. So, there is no change there.

12           So, the base, just to reiterate, the base has  
13 not changed. It's still a four-story base relating to  
14 the lower buildings. Now, instead of a single shape, it  
15 has some complexity to it. It has a lower section and  
16 then an upper section. You can argue on that whether  
17 it's a tower, I wouldn't quite call it a tower. I  
18 wouldn't necessarily call it a box. We don't want to  
19 put a box in the middle of Downtown Evanston. You have  
20 some boxes already. We wanted to do something that had  
21 a little architecture to it. So, thank you very much.

22           MR. FRIEDLAND: Good evening. For the record,  
23 my name is Steve Friedland, attorney representing

1 petitioner. We can certainly take any questions you  
2 have to Larry, but what I wanted to just address at the  
3 end or a couple of items, one, somewhat of a question of  
4 procedural process with you. We assume that with this  
5 new design which we're pleased you let us present to you  
6 tonight, we would expect that you'd want to hear from  
7 the general public and get some more public comments.  
8 So, we wanted to get a sense for just timing on that  
9 with you.

10 In addition, while our intent tonight is  
11 really to present this plan that we've worked on for the  
12 last couple of weeks, we certainly understand there's  
13 other issues that were discussed with you at the last  
14 meeting. I think our purpose tonight was really to  
15 present the design. We understand that other issues  
16 such as our public benefits are something that we intend  
17 to address with you. But in this interim period from  
18 the last public meeting to this meeting, we do  
19 understand that the City has hired a real estate  
20 consultant to review the TIF request we have made for  
21 the Hahn building and to generally review the sort of  
22 financial analysis of the project.

23 And I think it would probably be more

1 efficient to have the conversations with respect to  
2 public benefits with you getting the benefit of your  
3 consultant in that regard. You know, I think we  
4 continue to believe that when your consultant looks at  
5 this, the public benefits that we're providing and that  
6 we've stated that we're willing to provide for the  
7 project will be sufficient for the site development  
8 allowances that we're requesting and certainly  
9 appropriate and acceptable to the City.

10           So, that really concludes our presentation.  
11 Again, you're certainly welcome to ask Larry questions  
12 with respect to the design, but we also want to discuss  
13 those other issues as well, the process.

14           CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Right. Before there are any  
15 questions from the Council members, my thought was that  
16 if we heard the presentation tonight, we're certainly  
17 going to have time to digest this new presentation, this  
18 new concept, and that we would, I know our next meeting  
19 is on the 24th -- 28th. 28th, but we do have other  
20 items at that time and I was wondering if the Committee  
21 would consider a special meeting between now and then  
22 that we could discuss -- you want to do it on the 28th?

23           ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: No, we won't get the

1 materials from Marty Stern until the end of April. It  
2 doesn't do us any good.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: To have until after the,  
4 before it goes to the Economic Development Committee.

5 ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Right.

6 ALDERMAN WYNNE: And the public should have  
7 that information.

8 ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Right.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. All right. Alderman  
10 Rainey?

11 ALDERMAN RAINEY: Well, Madam Chairman, I  
12 would very much like to have the special meeting, but  
13 only if we could do something really special at that  
14 meeting, and that is have the committee discuss the  
15 project which is something we really haven't had an  
16 opportunity to do in depth. And only if by the time we  
17 have that meeting we will have had some financial advice  
18 and analysis from the consultant.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Well, because I'm sure that  
20 there will be a lot of public interest as well, I'm  
21 wondering if we could have a meeting before just to take  
22 public comments, because I'm sure there's going to be  
23 quite a number of people who'll want to speak.

1 ALDERMAN RAINEY: Well, then, would you  
2 suggest we sign up for public comment?

3 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: No, no. I'm trying to  
4 figure out -- well, probably, at the rate we're going.

5 ALDERMAN RAINEY: I have no idea.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: But I'm trying to figure out  
7 how we can get it all done.

8 ALDERMAN HANSEN: Chairman Holmes? Chairman  
9 Holmes?

10 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Hansen?

11 ALDERMAN HANSEN: You know, just in case some  
12 out in the public didn't hear, we've asked, based on  
13 some, the numbers that John Kennedy presented last time,  
14 the Council asked for our staff to look into the numbers  
15 and into the economic feasibility of this project. And  
16 we have been told by staff that that analysis is not  
17 going to be complete by April 30th. And I think what  
18 Alderman Bernstein and Alderman Wynne were trying to say  
19 was that we want the public to have the opportunity to  
20 look at that economic analysis as well and comment on  
21 it. So, that's why we're talking about another public  
22 hearing.

23 And so, I think, I don't see how we can do

1 this before April 30th because we're just, if we have a  
2 public hearing before then, the public is going to want  
3 to comment again and we're never going to get to a  
4 discussion.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay.

6 ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: We're going to want to  
7 comment.

8 ALDERMAN HANSEN: Right.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Absolutely. Well, maybe we  
10 can comment, at the same time the public. Alderman  
11 Wynne?

12 ALDERMAN WYNNE: Alderman Hansen said more or  
13 less what I was going to say, Alderman Holmes. My  
14 question to the staff is do we know when, approximately  
15 when Mr. Stern is going to get the information back to  
16 us.

17 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: We think -- Judy can address  
18 that, yes.

19 ALDERMAN WYNNE: I didn't get this  
20 information.

21 MS. AIELLO: Yes. We have not presented the  
22 information, or we have not received the financial  
23 information yet.

1 ALDERMAN WYNNE: From?

2 MS. AIELLO: From the revised plan from the  
3 development team. It's our intent to get it to,  
4 hopefully we'll get it from them this week, get it to  
5 Mr. Stern this week. And then the plan would be to have  
6 his analysis to be in a rather complete state to present  
7 to the EDC on April 30th, and then report back to the  
8 Planning & Development Committee at your next meeting or  
9 your first meeting in May.

10 ALDERMAN WYNNE: I didn't get this  
11 information.

12 MS. AIELLO: I'm sorry.

13 ALDERMAN WYNNE: But I think the critical  
14 thing is we should have the public get the information  
15 when Economic Development gets it so they have an  
16 opportunity to digest it so we're not repeating  
17 ourselves. More or less what Alderman Hansen said. So,  
18 perhaps the next time we can discuss it as P&D is at the  
19 first meeting in May. When?

20 MS. AIELLO: Which would be May 12th.

21 ALDERMAN WYNNE: May 12th, okay.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: May 12th.

23 ALDERMAN WYNNE: So, that gives people about

1 12 days to look over the material.

2 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Right. And we'll make a  
3 special meeting after that if we need it.

4 ALDERMAN WYNNE: Right. Well, I guess that  
5 was my other question was to Mr. Wolinski is do we know  
6 how, at this point, how heavy the agenda will be two  
7 meetings from now?

8 MR. WOLINSKI: I can, I don't know that I can  
9 give you a firm answer. I know that our meeting on the  
10 28th we will be having the ENH Cancer Care Center  
11 addition that is a recommendation from the Zoning Board.  
12 I imagine that will take some time. We also have the  
13 Solar Panel issue on the 28th of April. And there's  
14 also some Zoning Board, there's a Zoning Board denial  
15 and then there's a Zoning Board recommendation on  
16 parking variances also. And I'm also assuming that  
17 we're going to have the 1603 Orrington. Judy, is that  
18 going to be for the 28th, you think?

19 MS. AIELLO: Correct. Correct.

20 ALDERMAN WYNNE: Some of that is probably  
21 going to spill over.

22 MR. WOLINSKI: Yes. So, certainly the meeting  
23 on the 28th is pretty full at this point. And I imagine

1 some of that will spill over to the 12th.

2 ALDERMAN WYNNE: I'd say that we should be  
3 looking at a special meeting sometime in May.

4 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. All right. Alderman  
5 Jean-Baptiste?

6 ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Well, I agree with  
7 everything that's been said. But meanwhile, we have an  
8 hour, and I would think that not everyone really  
9 responds to this kind of project from an economic kind  
10 of standpoint. So, those who are here today who wish to  
11 make comments, I think we should hear them as opposed  
12 to, you know, adjourning at this point.

13 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Alderman Rainey? I  
14 don't think we were, I certainly wasn't suggesting that  
15 we adjourn.

16 ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Rainey?

18 ALDERMAN RAINEY: What is the time line?  
19 Again, I don't have any fear in discussing this project.  
20 And I don't know if there is some effort to delay  
21 discussion of this project, but I think we ought to move  
22 forward. When are you suggesting as Chair, after  
23 Economic Development gets this project, should this

1 Committee meet in a special meeting?

2 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Well, I have a suggestion  
3 that we have a special meeting between now and the 30th  
4 that we can maybe take public comment. But I certainly  
5 do appreciate what Alderman Hansen and the rest of you  
6 have said about having the public have the financial  
7 information that we will have, so if you want to wait  
8 for that. But I know that there is going to be a lot of  
9 people who'll want to speak, and so I wanted to make  
10 sure that we had enough time and ample time. So, that  
11 was my suggestion for the special meeting there.

12 ALDERMAN RAINEY: But when do you foresee the  
13 people who are actually going to vote on this project  
14 getting an opportunity to discuss it?

15 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: It doesn't look like we're  
16 going to have an opportunity to discuss it until after  
17 we receive all of the information which will be April.  
18 We will have to wait until the Economic Development  
19 Committee gets it.

20 ALDERMAN RAINEY: Is there any reason we can't  
21 discuss this, have the special meeting the first week in  
22 May?

23 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: No, not at all.

1 ALDERMAN RAINEY: Is there any reason why we  
2 can't set that right now?

3 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: There is no reason why and  
4 we would want to -- well, we will have the information.  
5 If we have the information back by April 30th and if we  
6 wanted to meet --

7 ALDERMAN RAINEY: We'll have it before then  
8 because the Committee meets on the 30th. So, we'll have  
9 to have it in our hands, you know --

10 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: That's not what the memo  
11 said.

12 MS. AIELLO: I can't guarantee because we have  
13 not seen it yet. So, I can't guarantee that, you know,  
14 staff will have had a chance because we also want Kane  
15 McKenna to look at it so I've got to, you know, we've  
16 got to organize two consultants. So, I mean we hope we  
17 could have it to you as we typically do the Friday  
18 before the Wednesday meeting. But I can't guarantee it.  
19 And I don't want to rush our analysis.

20 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I don't want the Committee  
21 to meet and we don't have the information. And that was  
22 my whole thought on that. Alderman Wollin, Wynne, and  
23 then Bernstein.

1 ALDERMAN WOLLIN: I was just going to, excuse  
2 me, I have a cold. I was just going to suggest that  
3 then all the aldermen should attend the Economic  
4 Development Committee meeting as opposed to just the  
5 Economic Development Committee.

6 ALDERMAN WYNNE: That's a good point.

7 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: That's a good idea.

8 ALDERMAN RAINEY: That's an excellent idea.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: That's a very good idea.  
10 And we could get the information at the same time.  
11 Okay.

12 ALDERMAN RAINEY: And it would be important  
13 for the public to show up. We rarely have an audience  
14 to the Economic Development.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: And what is the date of that  
16 meeting?

17 MS. AIELLO: 30th.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: It is the 30th, okay. On  
19 Wednesday the 30th. 7:30? Is it 7:30, Alderman Jean-  
20 Baptiste? 7:30?

21 ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Is that, all the aldermen  
23 have that? Yes, we would. We should have. Okay,

1 Alderman Wynne, do you have other comments?

2 ALDERMAN WYNNE: No, other than I think that  
3 if we have a special meeting between April 30th and the  
4 first Council meeting in May, I think we need to leave  
5 the public a week to look through the material in order  
6 to --

7 ALDERMAN RAINEY: They're not going to have a  
8 week to look at it.

9 ALDERMAN WYNNE: No, no. I meant, Alderman  
10 Rainey, I think if we wanted to have a discussion before  
11 the first meeting in May which I'm happy to do, I think  
12 we still need to give the people who have spent a lot of  
13 time analyzing this a fair opportunity so that we don't  
14 feel as though we have people asking for additional  
15 meetings. I think we do have to wait for the  
16 consultant, otherwise, maybe we can open it up to the  
17 floor to people tonight to make a quick assessment, but  
18 you know, I think the arguments before were based on  
19 public benefits and economic analysis. And that's what  
20 I want to see.

21 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Alderman Wollin?

22 ALDERMAN WOLLIN: No.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Alderman Bernstein?

1           ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: I would like Ken to get  
2 up here and explain the policy with respect to not going  
3 back to the Plan Commission because it's a lesser  
4 included project, if it's, you know, non-material  
5 change. But to the extent that we don't send it back to  
6 the Plan Commission, I would like the benefit of their  
7 wisdom and I'd like to invite them to come up here at  
8 least with respect to the design and, you know, there  
9 wasn't a unanimous, it was a 4 to 3 but it was a  
10 difficult vote by the Plan Commissioners. And those  
11 that voted in favor, three of the four had criticisms  
12 and concerns about the development.

13           So, I'd like the benefit of their wisdom  
14 concurrent with ours. And this is not going to be a  
15 quick thing. And I'm not afraid to discuss anything,  
16 Alderman Rainey, but you know, I think that the reason  
17 for which there probably wasn't discussion about the  
18 last time is in deference to the developer, I think it  
19 would have failed the first time through. So, they have  
20 an opportunity to come in here and to try to sell it and  
21 to try to come in and provide for a different kind of a  
22 physical plan and some meaningful financials and  
23 benefits to the City. And you know, as long as it

1 takes, you know, hopefully we'll get the job done  
2 efficiently and effectively.

3 But I would like the Plan Commissioners up  
4 here to the extent that they want to come. I see a  
5 couple of them back there.

6 ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: When are you talking  
7 about?

8 ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: I'm saying at our  
9 Planning & Development meeting. And it's probably going  
10 to be at the special Planning & Development meeting.  
11 And you know, we can go until we're done. You know, we  
12 don't have a problem staying until all hours, so I have  
13 no problems with that.

14 ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: That's a proposal,  
15 right?

16 ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Yes.

17 ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay.

18 ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Yes, I just want to --

19 ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: For Ken to talk about  
20 the project and then we can put it on the table.

21 ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Yes. If Ken is  
22 consistent with what my understanding of our law is,  
23 then that's what I would propose.

1           MR. COX: The question has been raised not  
2 only by you at this moment, Alderman Bernstein, but by  
3 members of the public that given the fact that the  
4 developer has come back with a design that is, you know,  
5 substantially different than what was originally  
6 proposed, the question was raised why does this not go  
7 back to Plan Commission and essentially start the  
8 process over.

9           The practice and also the dictates of the City  
10 Code state that so long as the amended project does not  
11 ask for greater zoning relief than was initially  
12 included in the public notice and the Plan Commission  
13 meetings, it's unnecessary to go back to Plan  
14 Commission. If a developer were to come in and request  
15 greater zoning relief, that would be a different story.

16          However, here, again I have not seen a complete list of  
17 the information provided but I've been assured and from  
18 what I did see tonight that there is less zoning relief  
19 requested here. So, it's essentially included already  
20 in the original notice.

21          As far as your point as to inviting members of  
22 other committees or other commissions particularly  
23 Planning coming in, I in now way want to cut off debate

1 but I would just point out that the Plan Commission,  
2 although it has a different makeup now than it did at  
3 the time it originally took its vote, has originally  
4 issued a recommendation to this body. However, members  
5 of the Commission are always, as ever, eligible to come  
6 to any public meeting and speak their minds regarding  
7 the project.

8 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Bernstein?

9 ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Yes. I'm not looking for  
10 them to vote. We've got the recommendations and we've  
11 got transcripts. What I'm looking for is wisdom to the  
12 extent they can provide some to us. We have had a  
13 precedent where we've had meetings combine with the Plan  
14 Commissioners. And you know, I don't see a problem with  
15 that.

16 They're not going to be up here voting.  
17 They're going to be up here asking questions maybe at a  
18 different level than the community would be because, you  
19 know, they are the people in whom we're supposed to have  
20 confidence to make the decisions with regard to the  
21 analysis of our Zoning Ordinance and plans relative to  
22 it. So, I don't see a problem with that. I mean, does  
23 anybody have a problem with bringing them up here?

1 ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Steve?

2 ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Yes?

3 ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: May I?

4 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Jean-Baptiste.

5 ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Ken is not the person  
6 who will make that decision.

7 ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: No, no. We are. I'm not  
8 talking about Ken.

9 ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay. But Ken is  
10 still up there. You're still talking to him, right?

11 ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Ken, I'm done with you  
12 unless somebody else has questions for you.

13 MR. COX: I'm happy to take a seat.

14 ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: He was the threshold  
15 issue.

16 ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: You dealt with him  
17 around --

18 ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: That's all, right.

19 ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: You know, whether  
20 this should --

21 ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Now I'm arguing for my  
22 proposal to invite the Plan Commissioners.

23 ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Yes, but that's not

1 what's on the table right now though.

2 ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Okay, what is?

3 ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: What we have on the  
4 table is public participation in this process. We have  
5 talked about the next scheduled meeting where we can  
6 begin to weigh in and participate. We will meet on  
7 April 30th at the Economic Development Committee meeting  
8 where we will have a chance to discuss issues that are  
9 relevant to the project and relevant to Economic  
10 Development, the TIF request, et cetera, et cetera.

11 When we have our special meeting, the Plan  
12 Commissioners can intervene to the extent that they want  
13 to intervene, you know, to come and make public  
14 comments. But they have issued Minority Reports, they  
15 have issued Majority Reports. They have made statements  
16 regarding whether or not the project meets the standards  
17 or not.

18 So, I don't want to see us make a special  
19 request to enlarge the discussion to include members of  
20 the Commission. Apparently, their weighing in on the  
21 discussion have led the developer to think through some  
22 different approaches. And so, it's before us now, we  
23 have to be able to get the opportunity to consider the

1 question, debate it, and move forward, and with the  
2 benefit of what's already been said and with the benefit  
3 of the new economic analysis, Marty Stern's review of  
4 that, public comments that have accumulated.

5           And so, I don't see the need for us to set a  
6 special process by which we invite the Plan Commission  
7 to come back, there are about eight or nine members of  
8 that Plan Commission, to come and weigh in. They've  
9 already weighted in and we've already read, you know,  
10 their views on it. If they want to participate at  
11 public comment, then they should, you know, to the  
12 extent that that's allowed, they come and do that. But  
13 I don't see -- our responsibility as the P&D Committee  
14 is to make the analysis, make the recommendation to  
15 Council. It's in our court now. And I think we ought  
16 to go ahead and do what we have to do in light of what  
17 we have before us and not enlarge the process.

18           CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Bernstein?

19           ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Yes. It is in fact in  
20 our court, and when something comes to this court, I  
21 want as much information as I can possibly get. Now,  
22 several of the Plan Commissioners had specific  
23 recommendations with respect to the physical structure

1 of that building, the former building, okay? I don't  
2 know, you know, looking at the rendering and looking at  
3 this thing whether or not those things have been  
4 addressed. Chances are, with my inability and my lack  
5 of ability, I'm not going to know even if I look at it  
6 whether their particular concerns have been addressed.

7           So, to the extent that they're willing, it's  
8 not going to be anything tremendously formal. And if it  
9 takes us until the following P&D meeting and Council to  
10 make the vote, you know, I don't know what we're going  
11 to be discussing. Obviously, none of us is ever shy  
12 about discussing anything from this floor, all right.  
13 But I think that we should be armed with Marty Stern's  
14 analysis which hopefully will include an analysis of  
15 what the Evanston Coalition has provided along with  
16 their numbers.

17           They're going to come back and hopefully  
18 negotiate something about the public benefit. And  
19 depending on what the numbers say, they're either going  
20 to say that we can or we can't. Or it's even worse now  
21 than it was before. I don't know what they're going to  
22 say. But I don't want to preclude ourselves from  
23 anything.

1           You know, height has never concerned me, all  
2 right. 49 stories may be too tall but I'm never  
3 concerned about height as height per se height. But I  
4 am concerned about the analysis that was meaningful to  
5 me among those three of the four Commissioners that  
6 actually affirmatively voted for this project. They had  
7 concerns. And that's all I wanted to address. They're  
8 not going to get it back; it's ours. But to the extent  
9 that they're our experts, I'd like to call them in like  
10 we're calling in Marty Stern.

11           CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Hansen and then  
12 Alderman Rainey. But then I just have a question and  
13 I'll have to depend upon those of you who have been here  
14 much longer than I. Is that a normal, have we done that  
15 before? Do we go back and ask a Commission once that  
16 they've put it here?

17           ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: No.

18           CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I mean, I just don't want us  
19 doing anything different, not under my Chair, that we've  
20 not done before.

21           ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: May I make myself clear?  
22 The Plan Commission is not going to vote on this again.

23           CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I understand that.

1           ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Their time is gone.  
2 Unless the applicant wants to go back through the  
3 process which I'm guessing they don't. The Plan  
4 Commission's time is over, but they still have lived  
5 with this thing for nine months, and theoretically, they  
6 are the experts who will look at this with a different  
7 eye than I.

8           ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Point of procedure.  
9 Listen, we had an hour for public comments. If we as  
10 the P&D want to consider inclusion of members of the  
11 Plan Commission in our discussions, we can make that  
12 decision after we have incorporated or taken advantage  
13 of the fact that the public is here. Have them  
14 participate and we can make a decision.

15           CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Well, we have some other  
16 aldermen that would like to speak.

17           ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: That's fine. I'm  
18 just saying that --

19           CHAIRMAN HOLMES: So, let me do that first and  
20 then we can see if we want to vote on that. Alderman  
21 Hansen?

22           ALDERMAN HANSEN: In deference to what  
23 Alderman Bernstein is asking for, I don't think any of

1 us have ever said no, so to speak, to an alderman asking  
2 and wanting some more advice and consultation on an  
3 issue, this issue or any other issue. And with that  
4 being said, you know, I think if we extend the concern  
5 to the Plan Commission of what Alderman Bernstein is  
6 asking for and invite them to come comment as opposed to  
7 having them all sit in the front row and ask them what  
8 they think, you know, and the other thing I do want to  
9 say is there are some Plan Commissioners here and one of  
10 them had raised their hand and I think it was maybe in  
11 comment to what Alderman Bernstein is asking. And I  
12 would ask if the Chair would recognize the Commissioner  
13 so maybe she could speak as to what she wanted to say.

14 In addition, before that, in terms of public  
15 comment, again I just, I have the benefit of sitting  
16 over here so I can hear some comments from the public  
17 without going up there, and I think some of them are  
18 feeling that at least at this point what they've heard  
19 tonight, at least what I'm hearing, there might not be  
20 any additional public comment in the sense that I don't  
21 think their feelings have changed on this project. So,  
22 I mean, that doesn't mean to say that they won't all get  
23 up there again, but at the same time I really think they

1 should all have the information. You know, to do public  
2 comment tonight, I think, would just be rehashing it  
3 after we get this stuff.

4           So, if we could ask Commissioner Burrus to  
5 comment to Alderman Bernstein's request?

6           CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Let me recognize Alderman  
7 Rainey. I'm going to ask you if you just want to wait  
8 until I get to finish with the aldermen. Alderman  
9 Rainey, Alderman Moran, Alderman Bernstein, Alderman  
10 Wynne. And then we'll get to you.

11           ALDERMAN RAINEY: We have a Minority Report  
12 and a Majority Report.

13           CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Right.

14           ALDERMAN RAINEY: From the Plan Commission.  
15 It would be my suggestion to cut to the chase and direct  
16 the developer to address matters that have changed or  
17 have not changed in relation to those two critiques and  
18 find out from the developer how those concerns have been  
19 addressed, and then allow for perhaps a rebuttal by  
20 those Plan Commission members who made those suggestions  
21 if they choose. We can't make them do it. If they want  
22 to say, oh, no, you're wrong, you didn't meet that  
23 criteria that we set forth.

1           But I'd like to hear how those issues have  
2 been addressed. I mean, we know how one is addressed:  
3 height.

4           CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Right.

5           ALDERMAN RAINEY: Major concern: height. We  
6 know how that was addressed. We don't have to hear any  
7 more about that. But there are other issues.

8           CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Well, and I think that they  
9 did address that by saying that they've been working on  
10 the height thing for the last couple of things and they  
11 will come back with the rest of the information at the  
12 next meeting. I believe that's what I heard. Alderman  
13 Moran?

14           ALDERMAN MORAN: That, if there were some  
15 direction or even a generalized invitation to have the  
16 Plan Commission back, that would be a unique event in my  
17 17 years of doing this. And I'm very uncomfortable  
18 doing it. You know, the notion, either whether it be by  
19 fiat or invitation with the implication that the  
20 invitation had better be responded to affirmatively, I  
21 think is not consistent with how our government  
22 operates.

23           I don't think it's correct. I mean, these

1 people who are in the Plan Commission, all of them put  
2 in a huge amount of time. They serve the City. They do  
3 provide a significance assistance to us, but I don't  
4 think it's the City Council's prerogative to really  
5 summon the Plan Commission to come here and either say  
6 yes or no or we agree or we don't agree or this is our  
7 take on the latest and so on and so forth.

8 I don't think that they have an obligation to  
9 come here and be grilled by people including us. I  
10 think that's out of line. They're citizen volunteers.

11 Now, having said all of that, if people who  
12 are members of the Plan Commission want to come here and  
13 provide commentary because it's their desire to say  
14 something to us about this, they're entitled to do it.  
15 They're entitled to do it as citizens and they should  
16 feel free to do it. I would never tell somebody to not  
17 come here and provide commentary that they feel is  
18 important to this process.

19 But I don't think that we should summon the  
20 Plan Commission. I don't even want to invite the Plan  
21 Commission particularly in a way where, you know, we  
22 reach a point here where eight or nine people are  
23 sitting here in the front row so that we can, you know,

1 ask them questions, demand answers, to have them act as  
2 our experts. They do act in an expert function, but  
3 when they take a vote and they provide reports, it is  
4 our responsibility, and I think the idea of bringing  
5 them here and putting them on the spot and somehow  
6 transferring responsibility for either the discussion,  
7 the deliberation or the vote I think is unfair to them.

8 If they want to come here and talk about it, they can.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Alderman Wynne?

10 ALDERMAN WYNNE: Well, Alderman Moran, I think  
11 that mischaracterized what Alderman Bernstein was  
12 saying. And in fact, Alderman Holmes, we have had a  
13 history because I've been on the P&D Commission, you  
14 asked the question, I've been on the P&D for 11 years,  
15 and I don't remember exactly the project, Jim Wolinski  
16 might remember, but Larry Widmayer was chair of the Plan  
17 Commission at the time, and if Larry was here, he'll  
18 remember it. And he came and did provide additional  
19 commentary during our discussion of a major project, and  
20 I'm sorry, I don't remember but I'll call Larry tomorrow  
21 and find out which one it was, in answer to questions  
22 that we had as a P&D Committee to a project that the  
23 Plan Commission had voted in favor of. And it was very

1 clear that the P&D Committee was not agreeing with them.  
2 And Larry Widmayer, who was chair of the Plan  
3 Commission, sat in on our meetings and we actually have  
4 a representative, we're supposed to have a  
5 representative of the Plan Commission at every one of  
6 these meetings to provide clarification to us of what  
7 their discussion is. And I can think, Larry Widmayer  
8 actually prepared remarks on several occasions and I am  
9 sorry that my brain is stuck that I can't remember when  
10 it was.

11 So, it isn't unprecedented. It happened  
12 frequently. And actually it happened any number of  
13 times informally because we always had a Plan Commission  
14 liaison who we would turn to occasionally and say, is  
15 this what you all were talking about? Or provide us  
16 with clarification on what went on during your meeting  
17 on this point.

18 So, I think that because the project is being  
19 presented to us as changed, not materially enough to  
20 send back to the Plan Commission but clearly changed, I  
21 mean they are telling us it's changed, that we should  
22 ask any Plan Commission members who wants to provide  
23 comment to comment. I agree with Alderman Rainey that

1 they had a critique and analysis and they should, if  
2 that's the form they want to bring it to us, then that's  
3 what they should do. But you know, no one is asking  
4 them or demanding that they come. So, I would very much  
5 like the benefit of their analysis.

6 Now, could I just change the subject and ask a  
7 question of this design while we have them here?  
8 Because I'd like to know what the lighted part up at the  
9 top of the building is. Is it -- I mean, is that  
10 dwelling units?

11 MR. BOOTH: It's a halo.

12 ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Is that true? Be  
13 literal.

14 MR. BOOTH: No, the top of all buildings  
15 generally have mechanical equipment and chimneys and  
16 fans and all kinds of contraptions.

17 ALDERMAN WYNNE: So, is that just a shield to  
18 the mechanicals?

19 MR. BOOTH: It's the shield for that. And it  
20 will be made from glass and it will have at night a soft  
21 light behind it. So, it might not be as strong as the  
22 Hancock but it would be just a soft little glow in the  
23 sky.

1 ALDERMAN WYNNE: I hope not as light as the  
2 building just south of the Sears Tower either.

3 MR. BOOTH: Oh, no, it won't look like pork  
4 chops.

5 ALDERMAN WYNNE: No. No.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Bernstein --

7 ALDERMAN WYNNE: No, I have one more question  
8 though.

9 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I'm sorry.

10 ALDERMAN WYNNE: So, when we're looking at  
11 that, how tall is that lighted band?

12 MR. BOOTH: The lighted band I think is 24  
13 feet.

14 ALDERMAN WYNNE: Okay. And dwelling units  
15 start below that?

16 MR. BOOTH: Right. Because there is an  
17 elevator over it about 17 feet generally. So, you've  
18 got, we want to hide that because they tend to, what we  
19 don't want to do is have a bunch of junk in the profile  
20 of the building. So, we want to keep the elevator  
21 penthouse and chimneys and everything else that's kind  
22 of a clutter below that level.

23 ALDERMAN WYNNE: Was that lighted band on your

1 last model?

2 MR. BOOTH: Yes, it was.

3 ALDERMAN WYNNE: It was?

4 MR. BOOTH: We always had that idea.

5 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: So tall you couldn't see it.

6 ALDERMAN WYNNE: Yes. You said it. Okay.

7 I'm finished, thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Alderman Bernstein?

9 MR. BOOTH: It's a light, I mean, poetically,  
10 you could say that Evanston has a lighthouse, this is  
11 another one. I'm sure all my friends over there will  
12 appreciate that.

13 ALDERMAN WYNNE: I don't know that that's an  
14 analogy you want to make.

15 ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: When the light comes up  
16 to that lighthouse, we're all in big trouble. I think  
17 that Alderman Rainey understood my analysis and my  
18 request. I'm certainly not going to summons the Plan  
19 Commissioners here for demand performance, command  
20 performance. But I do, I think Alderman Rainey took it  
21 perfectly well, to the extent that those three want to  
22 come in and comment, and I think it's a great idea that  
23 the developers come in and tell us how they have

1 addressed the issues raised by the Plan Commissioners if  
2 in fact they have.

3           But this is, to me, the 11 years I've been on  
4 this side of the dais and the 15 years I was on the  
5 other side of the dais, I've never seen a written  
6 Minority Report. So, this is new ground. And you're  
7 talking about the potentially tallest building in the  
8 City of Evanston, if Mr. Booth gets his way ever, and  
9 it's a 4 to 3 vote of the Plan Commission, and 3 of the  
10 four that voted for it have questions. So, I think to  
11 the extent that there is some time to change precedent,  
12 this is it.

13           We're not bound by anything up here. I'm not  
14 summoning them to here but I do want to hear their  
15 concerns. I don't want to have them go through it  
16 again. They don't want to go through it again. But I  
17 think Alderman Rainey took that in my point particularly  
18 well.

19           CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Alderman Tisdahl?

20           ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Thank you. I'd very much  
21 like to hear from the Plan Commission and I've never  
22 summonsed anyone, and I don't think this Plan Commission  
23 is particularly likely to feel that they've been

1 summoned. But it's an interesting concept. At any  
2 rate, I would very much appreciate hearing from them and  
3 I don't mind doing unique things. I just would not want  
4 them to be limited to three minutes for their comments  
5 in whatever form we choose.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Well, you know, I'm a  
7 stickler for rules so we'll have to see about that,  
8 Alderman Tisdahl.

9 ALDERMAN TISDAHL: So, we if could have  
10 special rules for the Plan Commission, I would  
11 appreciate it, Alderman Holmes.

12 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay.

13 ALDERMAN TISDAHL: I would like to ask a  
14 question about the amount of retail space. You  
15 increased it and by how much? And is it comparable to  
16 the -- and is it more or less than the current amount of  
17 retail space?

18 MR. ANDERSON: The retail space was increased  
19 to 18,720. It wasn't a major increase. It was, I think  
20 we were 17,900 before.

21 ALDERMAN TISDAHL: But still less than the  
22 current space?

23 MR. ANDERSON: Well, the current space is

1 20,000, so it's about 13,000 square feet less roughly.

2 ALDERMAN TISDAHL: Okay, thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Moran?

4 ALDERMAN MORAN: I'll stick with what I said  
5 before.

6 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: You stick with what you said  
7 before, okay. Alderman Wynne?

8 ALDERMAN WYNNE: I have one other quick  
9 question. Maybe I don't understand because I've been  
10 out of town, but at this point, this is what you're  
11 presenting as the changed project with no other change  
12 in the public benefits?

13 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: That's going to be addressed  
14 later.

15 ALDERMAN WYNNE: Well, that's what I don't  
16 understand. So, right now, this is your changed project  
17 with the list of public benefits that you have presented  
18 with the taller version?

19 MR. FRIEDLAND: What we're presenting tonight  
20 is design, is the new design of the project. With  
21 respect to public benefits, our feeling is that it's  
22 sort of most efficient to deal with that once you have  
23 your consultant's material. So, that's the purpose for

1 which we understand you've hired the consultant, to give  
2 you some guidance in that respect because frankly we get  
3 the sense that there is some skepticism with respect to  
4 some of the financial information we've given you with  
5 respect to our public benefits such as LEED  
6 certifications going to cost this project \$3.5 to \$4  
7 million, and the fact that we've requested TIF  
8 assistance for the Hahn building but we also have told  
9 you that that is in addition to a significant subsidy  
10 the project is providing for the Hahn building, and the  
11 sense we've gotten from some of the questions is that  
12 you have some skepticism about that.

13           So, part --

14           ALDERMAN WYNNE: At this point though, you  
15 aren't changing your public benefits? You're just  
16 waiting for us to hear back from our consultant on them?

17           MR. FRIEDLAND: That's correct.

18           ALDERMAN WYNNE: Okay, that's fine.

19           CHAIRMAN HOLMES: And so, we would expect an  
20 answer, I would assume, from them about other questions  
21 then because public benefits wasn't the only question  
22 that was posed to them at the meeting of the 24th, that  
23 they would come back to us at the next meeting, you

1 know, with some answers in addition to what Alderman  
2 Rainey said tonight. Okay, can we hear now from -- you  
3 want to come forward?

4 COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I'm Colleen Burrus, I'm  
5 on the Plan Commission, part of the Minority Group. But  
6 I wanted to address what Steve had said about the three  
7 Commissioners that were on the Majority and had some  
8 concerns.

9 I've been concerned all along about the  
10 developer saying that this plan that they've brought  
11 before you has been recommended approval by the Plan  
12 Commission. That is not true. What was recommended by  
13 the majority had specific conditions that only with  
14 those conditions including underground parking,  
15 including office space, I believe absolute designed LEED  
16 certification. So, the majority of Plan Commissioners  
17 did not approve this plan that is before you. And I  
18 think you need to be really clear about that.

19 And I'm sure that Chairman Woods or Vice Chair  
20 Opdycke would be very happy to come before you and talk  
21 about why they put those recommendations or conditions  
22 on their recommended approval. They were very strong  
23 about that even though I still didn't agree with it

1 going forward. But I'm sure that they would be happy to  
2 come and talk to you about that. And I just wanted to  
3 follow up because it's been a misrepresentation by this  
4 group.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. ANDERSON: I have to address that because  
7 I don't think it's, because in our first presentation we  
8 stated there were I believe seven conditions specified  
9 by the majority of the Commissioners and we stated we  
10 agreed with all seven conditions except one, and that  
11 was the underground parking. The condition was  
12 underground parking so that we could provide office  
13 space. So, anyway, I just want to be clear that we were  
14 clear about what conditions we were accepting when we  
15 presented to this P&D Committee. We did not do any kind  
16 of a bait and switch or anything. We were very clear at  
17 that meeting.

18 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: We're not going to get into  
19 a debate. Now that we're not going to do tonight  
20 because I don't think we are prepared to do that, at  
21 least I know I'm not until we've read all of the  
22 information. Alderman Moran?

23 ALDERMAN MORAN: This is what I fear is going

1 to happen with this premise of bringing the Plan  
2 Commission forward. We have hundreds of pages, every  
3 single word transcribed verbatim. And what was said and  
4 what was agreed to, and we have a Minority Report and  
5 Majority Report, word for word, everything that was  
6 said. And I think that we're really looking for big  
7 problems by inviting people to come in and provide all  
8 kinds of commentary about who said -- we know what they  
9 said.

10 We know exactly what they said. We know  
11 exactly what the recommendations are. We know exactly  
12 what the objections are. And the Plan Commission in its  
13 last meeting, they had to stop because it was so, they  
14 were at such antagonistic positions with respect to each  
15 other that they couldn't even finish the meeting in good  
16 order. And I think to invite them to come back to  
17 provide commentary, what did you really mean on page  
18 1438, you know, what do you really think about this  
19 stuff, I think you're really, you're getting into very  
20 troubled waters. I think it will be an incredible  
21 diversion.

22 I think we have the responsibility to do this  
23 now. The Plan Commission doesn't have the

1 responsibility to do this. Melissa, you didn't disagree  
2 with me. You basically said what I said which was that  
3 if a Plan Commission member wants to come and give  
4 commentary, I said they should. And I'd be happy to  
5 hear them. But I don't think that we need to issue  
6 invitations or mandates to the Plan Commission to come  
7 in here and start talking about what their  
8 recommendations were, how they feel about it now, you  
9 know. We'll never get through it. We'll never get  
10 through it.

11 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Alderman Hansen and then  
12 Alderman Jean-Baptiste.

13 ALDERMAN HANSEN: I'm going to move that we  
14 set aside a special meeting on May 7th which is a week  
15 after Economic Development and that, unless that's a bad  
16 date for somebody, but it's a Wednesday, it's exactly a  
17 week later. And along with my motion, I am asking that  
18 at that meeting we allow 90 minutes for public comment  
19 with a discussion by P&D to follow. That's my motion.

20 ALDERMAN RAINEY: Second.

21 ALDERMAN MORAN: What date is this?

22 ALDERMAN HANSEN: May 7th. That's a  
23 Wednesday.



1 the past.

2 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. That's fine. Okay,  
3 Mr. Wolinski?

4 MR. WOLINSKI: Yes. I think since this is a  
5 revised plan, the Site Plan and Appearance Review  
6 Committee should also have an opportunity to give the  
7 Committee comments prior to your meeting on the 7th.  
8 So, we will be inviting the developer's team to present  
9 a more fully developed plan hopefully than what we've  
10 seen here tonight so we can comment.

11 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: All right. So that the  
12 public can understand clearly, that you're invited on  
13 April the 30th to the Economic Development Committee  
14 along with the rest of us to hear all the financial  
15 information. Then the following week, a special meeting  
16 beginning at 6:30, and probably then again on the 12th.

17 We'll have it on the agenda for the regular Council  
18 meeting at P&D. Okay? Okay. Go ahead.

19 Would you want to come to the mike and give  
20 your --

21 MS. ANDERSON: My name is Marge Anderson.  
22 With having the economics material from the Economic  
23 meeting, when might we hear the public benefits portion

1 of it that the developers would be redressing?

2 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I would assume that they  
3 would redress not only the public benefits but the other  
4 questions that have been asked of them by the Council  
5 and they would have that information hopefully back to  
6 us probably by the special meeting. That's what I would  
7 assume. We'll confer with staff to make sure that the  
8 developers can do that, and that information would be  
9 available.

10 MS. ANDERSON: Okay. And if that's available  
11 any earlier --

12 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: It may be available by the  
13 30th, you know, we're just not sure.

14 MS. ANDERSON: Okay. So, just keep in touch  
15 with the City staff on when we might see that?

16 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I would say that that would  
17 be the best thing to do, yes.

18 MS. ANDERSON: Okay, thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. All right. Is that  
20 it? Okay. Is there any -- well, if you want to. About  
21 this particular project or do you want to --

22 MS. SUMMERS: Well, it would be in any  
23 project.

1 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: In any project?

2 MS. SUMMERS: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: All right, fine. Do you  
4 want to come?

5 MS. SUMMERS: Thank you. I couldn't come on  
6 the date that you set. I'm Renee Summers. I live at  
7 2126 Orrington. I am personally and professionally  
8 opposed to the plans for 708 Church.

9 I decided to live in Evanston with my husband  
10 Frank because we thought it was a community in which we  
11 could have a voice in decision making. We have been  
12 involved in the community in various capacities: Mental  
13 Health Board, the Human Relations Commissions, schools,  
14 sports and professional advisory committees. As a  
15 practicing psychotherapist, my office at 708 Church is  
16 in an ideal location for my diverse clientele which  
17 consists of children, adolescents, Northwestern  
18 University students, adults and Medicare patients.  
19 There is no alternative space in Evanston to see my  
20 patients.

21 I have worked with the City Development  
22 Planner, and with other therapists have canvassed the  
23 available spaces and have found them unsafe, difficult

1 to access or not zoned for office rental. I have been  
2 at a majority of these community meetings and I have  
3 heard over and over that the community is not in favor  
4 of the plan. The City Council should not act like Dick  
5 Cheney who when asked about the public's overwhelming  
6 opposition to the Iraq war answered. So, an Evanston  
7 that would operate that way is not the Evanston I chose  
8 to live and work in.

9 (Applause.)

10 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: We only had three people  
11 that were signed up tonight to speak. And I'm again  
12 suggesting that you wait until you have all of the  
13 information before you speak. But the other two people  
14 that had signed up besides Ms. Summers, and that's why  
15 I'm calling on her, was Mr. Adams and Mr. Ursini?

16 MR. ADAMS: I'll wait. I'll wait.

17 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Oh, you want to wait until  
18 that? Thank you, I appreciate that. Ms. Rakely? Go  
19 ahead.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You're not supposed to speak  
21 in this Council if you are not a resident of this City.  
22 Is that correct?

23 MR. ADAMS: Is this not a public meeting?

1           AUDIENCE MEMBER: It is not public for non-  
2 residents.

3           CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Well, excuse me.

4           ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: We want to hear every bit  
5 of information we can get from every source.

6           AUDIENCE MEMBER: He is not a resident.

7           ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: We want to hear every bit  
8 of information --

9           ALDERMAN JEAN-BAPTISTE: Let the Chair respond  
10 to that rule.

11           CHAIRMAN HOLMES: It is a public meeting and  
12 we would ask anyone to give their address and, you know,  
13 state where they're from so there would be no surprises.

14           MR. ADAMS: I have no problems with that.

15           ALDERMAN RAINEY: Let's not forget why we all  
16 moved here.

17           CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Right.

18           ALDERMAN RAINEY: Because we are open to  
19 every --

20           MS. RAKELY: My name is Barbara Rakely and my  
21 comment will follow on Ms. Anderson's. I would like, I  
22 think it would be very helpful to put in place some  
23 procedural mechanism by which the public is assured of

1 having access to the developer's revised or not revised  
2 public benefits in advance of the May 7th meeting. It's  
3 going to be very difficult for those of us who plan to  
4 comment during that 90-minute period if we're only  
5 hearing about the public benefits, the revised public  
6 benefits for the first time that night.

7           And I would really request that a firm  
8 mechanism be put in place so that public benefits are  
9 made available to all of the public without sort of  
10 loosely keeping in touch with staff because I don't know  
11 what that means. Thank you.

12           CHAIRMAN HOLMES: You know, Ms. Rakely, the  
13 Council is at the same advantage or disadvantage I think  
14 as the public in terms of receiving some of the  
15 information. Hopefully we will be getting all of the  
16 information maybe on the 30th, and that's why we are  
17 inviting you to come on the 30th, there might be some of  
18 that information available then. If not, it may not be  
19 available until the 7th and we would be looking at it  
20 probably at the same time you are. We may get it in our  
21 packets on the 3rd or on the 2nd.

22           And that's why we are saying if you would call  
23 the City staff, then you'd be able to get it. Other

1 than that, I mean, I don't know how we can assure you  
2 that you're going to get it in a more timely manner  
3 because it's not in our hands to tell, you know, for the  
4 developer to give it to us because they can get it. I  
5 mean, I just don't know how to address it any other way.

6 MS. RAKELY: I'm sorry. Maybe I misheard  
7 the developers or maybe I'm just not clear. Are  
8 the developers planning on presenting a revised  
9 public benefits section on the 30th to Economic  
10 Development?

11 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: They may or may not. I  
12 don't know that. Absolutely, it would depend upon the  
13 information.

14 MS. RAKELY: Oh, that's right. Okay. Thank  
15 you.

16 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. Alderman Bernstein?

17 ALDERMAN BERNSTEIN: Yes. I'm really, you  
18 know, frustrated. I don't think we've ever precluded  
19 public commentary, nor will we preclude public  
20 commentary. This Council won't act until we have the  
21 facts and I think that throughout the time, I think  
22 that's been consistent. People may not have approved of  
23 what we've done after hearing the facts or our

1 interpretation of the facts, but we want to hear  
2 everything we can hear.

3           Now, I don't know what people are expecting  
4 with respect to the Economic Development. Much of what  
5 they will give us is proprietary information. They  
6 won't even give it to us, they'll give it to our  
7 assistant, Mr. Stern, our consultant. We can't, don't  
8 expect to come and learn what their costs are, you know,  
9 there is going to be a certain analysis and our  
10 consultant will comment on that analysis as he has in  
11 many numerous occasions before.

12           But you know, what I heard the developer say  
13 is that they're going to wait to see and maybe they're  
14 going to take comfort in what our consultant says and  
15 maybe that will bolster their case with respect to their  
16 inability to provide public benefits. If that's what it  
17 is at the end of the day, we're going to have a decision  
18 to make whether or not they're asking for something for  
19 which they are paying. All right? But please, there is  
20 not going to be any quiet here. The people will be  
21 heard.

22           You know, and Ms. Rakely, I've gotten a whole  
23 lot of emails from you and hopefully we all respond to

1 them. Keep emailing, keep calling, and keep being here.  
2 Your voices are being heard.

3 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay. If there are no other  
4 comments, then move adjournment?

5 MR. ERNST: Can I make one very brief comment?  
6 I don't know if you need me to go to the mike or not.

7 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Yes, we do. And we need you  
8 to state your name.

9 MR. ERNST: My name is Chris Ernst, 1639  
10 Hinman. I am on the board of the Southeast Evanston  
11 Association as well as affiliated with Evanston  
12 Coalition for Responsible Development. And my one  
13 comment is that if we are going to be limiting public  
14 comment at that meeting to 90 minutes, that we give some  
15 sort of benefit to groups, to speakers who represent  
16 large groups such as the Central Street Neighbors, such  
17 as the Downtown Residents Association, such as the  
18 Southeast Evanston Association and others. Because they  
19 are giving voice to many, many people and they give a  
20 lot of thought and they're well-reasoned presentation.  
21 And to cut them off at one, two or three minutes I think  
22 is doing a disservice.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I appreciate that comment,

1 and I did try to do that at the last time. We gave them  
2 more --

3 MR. ERNST: Oh, I'm not saying anything about  
4 that. I just --

5 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: I know. But I'm just saying  
6 to you and I'll say to the rest of the public, it  
7 depends on the number of people who want to speak.

8 Now, if we have 90 people that show up  
9 that want to speak, they're going to get one minute.  
10 So, I'm just, I'm being honest with you. I'm just  
11 trying to be as fair as I can.

12 MR. ERNST: Okay. I'm just giving you a point  
13 of view from organizations that represent thousands of  
14 people.

15 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: And I hear you. I really do  
16 hear you.

17 MR. ERNST: Okay. I just want to be heard on  
18 that, okay? Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: And I try to do that. But  
20 it all depends on the number of people that speak.

21 MR. ERNST: And I totally understand that. I  
22 just want to make my point.

23 CHAIRMAN HOLMES: Okay, thank you. Okay.

1 Move adjournment?

2 (Moved and seconded.)

3 (Whereupon, the hearing on the

4 above-titled cause was

5 concluded at 8:15 p.m.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23