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CHAIRMAN WOODS: Let's call to order the Evanston Plan Commission meeting of Wednesday, November 12, 2008. And we do, in fact, have a quorum so we're ready to go. The first item of business is the approval of the October 22 meeting minutes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Move to approve.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Any discussion, questions, comments? Seeing none, all in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

The next item of business is the application for Zoning Map Amendment 08PLNC-0119 222 Hartrey Avenue.

You have something to introduce for us, Bill?

MR. DUNKLEY: Good evening. Bill Dunkley, Zoning Administrator. I have, what I've distributed is the staff report on the case. The case was heard at the Site Plan and Appearance Review Committee this afternoon.

And so, while we don't have the approved meeting notes from, or the meeting minutes from that I do have, have included notes regarding the discussion of the meeting and the, and the outcome. But I would like to read the staff report into the record at this time.

The request is, the applicant and the property owner, and I do apologize if I really completely miss...
the pronunciation, but it's the Joan Dachs Bais Yaakov School. Is that correct? Yeshivas Tiferes Tevi, Incorporated, and the Yaakov School Orthodox Center request the zoning district for 222 Hartrey Avenue be changed from the I-2 Industrial District to the C-1 Commercial District for the purposes of operating an Orthodox School, classified according to our Zoning Ordinance as a private educational institution, as well as a temple of worship, clothing collection, storage, and distribution center, a community center, and banquet hall, and a kosher commercial food preparation and catering center.

The I-2 Industrial District does not permit, either by right or by special use, the operation of a private educational institution. The C-1 District permits this use by right.

The notice for the case is reproduced. A description of the property and the area. The subject property is approximately 223,800 square feet, or 5.1 acres in area.

It's improved, it's a big site. It is improved with a single building of one story about 15 feet high that houses approximately 62,500 square feet of floor area, which is arguably the largest
manufacturing industrial-type building in the City of Evanston under one roof.

The site is also improved with a parking area to the west of the building that with parking spaces located adjacent to the building on the south provided about 280 parking spaces, there's lots of parking.

Immediately to the north of the property is the Skokie Swift CTA Rail Line. To the west is an adjacent parcel of similar size, also zoned I-2, that is currently occupied by the Vineyard Church. To the west of Hartrey, to the west of that is the North Shore Channel and the Village of Skokie

The property is bounded on the east by Hartrey Avenue and a residential neighborhood of primarily single family detached dwellings. Abutting to the south is an existing big box commercial center on Howard Street whose occupants include the Jewel Osco, Target, and Best Buy. That property is zoned C-1.

Primary access to the property is provided by means of an access easement to the west of the shopping center to the south. That, through the, it's not actually through the parking lot, but it's a easement on the west side of the parking lot.

Although access is possible via Hartrey
Street, it is Hartrey Avenue, it is not a frequently used means due to the configuration of local streets, difficult to get back to Howard from there. The site is not accessible from a significant public road, nor is it easily accessible by any form of public transportation.

Background on the case. The property was a manufacturing operation for the Shore Brothers Company, a manufacturer of high-end audio components for many years. After the Shore Brothers vacated and sold the property it was sold to Center Point Properties and remained vacant for approximately five years. During that time, the owner, Center Point, actively engaged in marketing the property to large manufacturing and industrial users.

The Yaakov School purchased the property approximately one year ago for the purposes of locating an Orthodox School. At the time of the purchase the property was zoned I-2, which it still is, which does not permit private educational institutions either by right or by special use.

The applicant subsequently submitted an application for special use for a religious institution, which was returned to the applicant by the Zoning Administrator, who after a review of the proposed
activities to be undertaken at the site determined that, in fact, the primary use was not a religious institution, customary uses surrounding that, but rather for a private educational institution. The applicant then submitted an application for unique use, which was withdrawn before public notice.

You then have a synopsis of the permitted and special uses of the I-2 District, as well as the maximum height and maximum FAR permitted. Following that is the same set of information for the proposed C-1 Commercial District. I won't read those. Notes from the Site Plan and Appearance Review Committee, and I won't, I won't read the, it's really bullet points.

The outcome of the, of that meeting was that, this afternoon was that committee members voted on a motion to recommend the change from I-2 to C-1. The vote was three in favor and three opposed, so the motion did, the motion did not pass. There were no additional motions made. So the SPARC Committee officially passes the case on the Plan Commission with no recommendation.

Are there any questions?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Since I wasn't at the meeting could you just, in a synopsis form if you are able, summarize --
MR. DUNKLEY: Sure.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: -- the reasons for the three-three vote, for the --

MR. DUNKLEY: Yes, we don't --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: -- and concerns that the SPARC Committee had.

MR. DUNKLEY: Yes, we don't really --

MR. MURRAY: Excuse me. My recollection of the vote, and it was a negative vote to begin with, the proposal was --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I'm sorry, wasn't the, excuse me, wasn't the question directed at Bill?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

MR. MURRAY: But Mr., in my view, Mr. Dunkley has presented erroneous information.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Okay, but --

MR. MURRAY: I'm attempting to clarify that.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So, hang on.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Can we let staff finish their report, and then you'll --

MR. MURRAY: I'm sorry, yeah.

MR. DUNKLEY: If there's a correction I'd be glad to clear it up, and that will certainly come out.

And it was, the vote was a vote of, there was no, there
was no motion that was passed at the committee, that is
the outcome of it.

Items that were discussed, well, many items
were discussed. But possible other uses for the site,
the surrounding the access to the site was, was one
topic that had a lot, quite a bit of discussion. The
impact of the proposed use on the, when the children and
buses would arrive how that fit, how that worked with
the immediately surrounding current uses.

There was discussion about the marketing
efforts that were made when the building was vacant.
There was some discussion of economic development
issues. And then the impact on the overall ability to
support industrial manufacturing issues was discussed as
well.

And, of course, members aren't asked for
reasons on why they voted one way or another. So I can
give you, I can't give you any direct information on
that.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: -- I was just
wondering what the discussions and points made, that's
helpful.

MR. DUNKLEY: Okay. There's been a suggestion
that that was not the actual vote that was taken. I
will review the notes from the committee members. We will get the approved notes to you as soon as possible.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Bill, just one more question, you may not know the answer. Generally, the SPARC meeting happens not in the same day as the Plan Commission Meeting. Was this just a special scheduling issue, or is it a new mode of going forward, or?

MR. DUNKLEY: No. We do try and get it really as soon as possible.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Currently, are there taxes being paid on this property?

MR. DUNKLEY: I believe there currently are taxes being paid.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Do we know how much and --

MR. DUNKLEY: But the, and the, you know, of course, as a non-for-profit use that would, there would be no --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: That's what I want to understand, what would be the impact to the tax roll?

MR. DUNKLEY: There was a discussion of payment in lieu of taxes as a possibility. But, you
know, no, no really specific outcome from there.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So we don't know --

MR. MURRAY: There's a suggestion on the SPARC notes that it's approximately $200,000.

MR. DUNKLEY: That would be the original, you know, what the site would originally generate.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Dennis?

MR. MARINO: Yes, based on the Cook County Treasurer's website for this PIN Number current taxes due $115,000, $115,094.07 for tax year 2007. In tax year 2001 the site, when it was occupied by Shore Brothers generated approximately, I think it's $201,000 in real estate taxes. And based, again, on the Assessor's records, I'm sorry, the Treasurer's Records the taxes have not been paid for tax year 2007.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Well, it's customary, I assume we all know that, the higher rate, a real estate tax attorney in a situation like that, and you can go in and pretty much, of course, get a substantial reduction of real estate taxes because the building is vacant. And I assume that that's what's happened here.

If it were up and operating I assume the taxes would be around a quarter of a million dollars based on what they're talking about.
MR. MARINO: Yes, just a correction, tax year 2001, that building generated $215,244.60 in real estate taxes.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Is that the Shore --

MR. MARINO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Is that just the, the property tax on the Shore facility?

MR. MARINO: It's the property taxes in 2001 on the easterly-most building that's the subject of the hearing. Their, Shore also owned the westerly-most building, that was a separate PIN number, that's currently owned by Vineyard Church.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: And what about the building in the middle?

MR. MARINO: It's, in between the two --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Yes.

MR. MARINO: -- is basically a surface parking lot.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: But is there not a business immediately to the west of the Shore building?

MR. MARINO: No, there are two larger structures. They may have been some structures that were combined over the years.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Okay.
MR. MARINO: The two larger structures, the one to the west that's directly behind the Jewel Store, and then the easterly-most one, which is the subject of tonight's hearing. And then there is a surface parking lot in between, which I think is also part of the parcel to the --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Okay. And then there's --

MR. MARINO: But they are three, sorry, three separate PIN numbers at least at this point.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Okay. And then there's the Vineyard on the extreme western --

MR. MARINO: West, yes, yes. And that's a building that also used to be occupied by Shore's, Shore Brothers.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Right.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Has there been any type of traffic studies, or I believe in the documents that I read that there was a --

MR. MURRAY: There will be testimony on that in a second.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

MR. MURRAY: My turn?
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely.

MR. MURRAY: I didn't mean to interrupt the --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, that's all right.

MR. MURRAY: -- free flow of information from the staff. It was a concern to me that we have an appropriate record that reflects the, the actual activity that I participated in as well as Mr. Dunkley did. But that's more or less a side issue to the purposes for our being here this evening.

I'm here on behalf of the Joan Dachs Bais Yaakov Elementary School. It is an institution of some 60 years in operation, and has, was incorporated back in 1953 as an Orthodox training center and educational institution to provide both secular and Hebrew education to a group of Orthodox children. Supported and funded by, in large measure, their parents and grandparents and relatives.

It has been, most recently housed at California, the 6100 block of North California in the city where it has approximately a student population of 250 or more boys. This is a gender-exclusive organization, but the intention to occupy and to conduct the operations of the school at the Evanston site on Hartrey is intended to contain some pre-school people.
who will be mixed gender, boys and girls. And the,

let's call it the K through 8 program for boys only.

You'll hear from a series of witnesses this
evening who will tell you that toward the, well, a
couple of years after the millennia, 2002, 3, somewhere
in that vicinity they became aware that this property
had been placed on the market by Shore Brothers because
of a, an opportunity that Shore pursued to take over the
old Halo Building that went into bankruptcy and was
never occupied by Halo.

But at Touhy and Lehigh, approximately in the
city, Niles or Skokie, I guess. So that left, perhaps,
10 or 12 acres of a block of property north of the
shopping center at Howard and Hartrey to the channel,
the North shore Channel.

As it was suggested Mr., by Mr. Dunkley, the
property had been actively and aggressively marketed for
several years without success. Mr. Weis, who you will
hear from, became aware of it during the course of 2004
or so and considered the opportunity to continue its use
as either a, an industrial or commercial enterprise,
we'll get to him.

You will also hear from Rabbi Cohen, who's
basically in charge of the directors of the school with
reference to curriculum and operations. And he will
tell you how the school operates and would intend to
operate at the 222 Hartrey.

You'll hear from Bonnie Flock, from Dewalt
Hamilton. She does the, she did the traffic study that
I've offered just a few moments ago, and I can provide
multiple additional copies should the desire request.

The, you'll also hear from Marcello Campanini,
a commercial industrial real estate broker who is
familiar with the property and its historical past. And
I'm sure I'm missing somebody.

Steven Lenet, a Planner, who will give you his
opinion relative to the viability of the existing zoning
and the, the potential of a, the zoning change that
we're seeking from an I-2 to a C-1 zoning district.

The entire property to the north of the
shopping center is basically now, or would be dedicated
to religious or quasi-religious institution. It is
indeed a, an insular property, and I believe that you
will hear that that is one of the reasons that mitigates
against its viability as an industrial site. It lacks
immediate access to major highways, there are no
railroad off-loading areas.

Its capacity to create its own visibility is
virtually non-existent because of, its tucked behind the shopping center there. And there are some other difficulties, of course, that mitigate against its continuing use as an industrial property.

The perception that we have is that because of the proximity, the very close nature of the permitted and special uses available within the two zoning districts, C-1 and the I-2, that there is a prospect of substantial enhancement of the value of this site, and in fact that entire block, if it were to be changed to a C-1 zoning district.

The additional elements, very simply, are religious institutions, educational institutions, both private and public, which is what the Yaakov School Board has committed to utilize this property for.

If you recall, back in the days of the District 65 giving up its property on Ridge Avenue at Dempster and moving, or seeking to have the classification of their site on the channel re-zoned for their purposes, the intention was a significant one. And I think it had a momentum factor associated with it that was persuasive and, and founded very seriously their intent to make proper use of this property.

I would suggest to you that the Board of the
Yaakov School is similarly intended and similarly committed to make a very special use, from their point of view, of this site if it were to be changed from an I-2 District to a C-1 District.

There seems to be a substantial amount of logic as well because of the adjacency to the C-1 District to the south so that the entire area there could be beneficially enhanced, in our judgment, from such a change in use.

We believe that we'll be able to persuade you by persuasive evidence that the standards for amendments to the map will be met, that the property indeed, the change in zoning district for this property would indeed be consistent with the goals and objectives policies of the Comprehensive General Plan of the year 2000. That in fact the use as commercial property in C-1 is compatible with the existing development in the immediate vicinity.

That the, will be no adverse impact upon property values in the adjacent properties, and that public facilities and services are available to afford complimentary service to the proposed site were to be changed from I-2 to C-1.

With that as an opening statement I would
present our series of witnesses, will ask a few
questions myself, and encourage the witness to carry on
his or her testimony unassisted in non-Socratic fashion.

    MR. DUNKLEY: I'd like to defer to my peer
here, he is in fact correct about the details of the
vote taken. The motion was to recommend denial, there
were three votes in favor and four votes against. So as
correctly stated, there was no vote, no recommendation
from the SPARC Committee.

    MR. MURRAY: Thank you.

    COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: And I would like, I
think we all, I don't know, but I would like a copy of
this --

    MR. MURRAY: We'll see to that, sir.

    COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: There are some
different uses in here that in the, limited
documentation, and I don't know how much else is
different in here describing the use of the property.

    MR. MURRAY: Well, I also, well, as a
housekeeping matter, I submitted at least 10 copies of
the series of photographs that I personally took of the
site as it currently exists. I would offer those as an
exhibit to enhance your capacity to struggle with this
decision.
The, there is also an aerial photograph that shows the relative adjacency of properties. There is one further element, a Certificate of Good Standing for the corporate entity of the school that was provided by the Secretary of State of Illinois. And I think I have a two-sided, if necessary, a two-sided document that contains the permitted uses for both the I-2 and the C-1 districts, I can provide that as well.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I think we understand that.

MR. MURRAY: Okay. Then with your permission and the acceptance of those exhibits that I provided to the Chairman earlier, if he would be so kind as to allow me to distribute them? If not, and --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely.

MR. MURRAY: -- then proceed with the first witness. No necessity to distribute? Very good.

Mr. Weis, please.

COURT REPORTER: I'm just going to move this over for television --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely.

COURT REPORTER: -- so we can see your faces on TV. Is this okay?

MR. WEIS: Good evening.
MR. MURRAY: We'll try, because I think you'll tell me later.

MR. MURRAY: Is this functional?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

MR. MURRAY: All right. Maybe I should stand over on the other side where I don't have to look across Mr. Weis' back.

Could you tell us your name, please?

MR. WEIS: Jake Weis.

MR. MURRAY: What is your address, Mr. Weis?

MR. WEIS: 6256 North Central Park in Chicago.

MR. MURRAY: What is your occupation, please?

MR. WEIS: I'm a real estate developer and management company.

MR. MURRAY: And how long have you been in that business?

MR. WEIS: About 14 years.

MR. MURRAY: All right. What is your relationship to the Yaakov School, please?

MR. WEIS: I'm a parent of three children in the Bais Yaakov School as well as a Board Member.

MR. MURRAY: Now, in the course of your daily operations as a developer and a real estate, real estate developer, I guess, how did you first become aware of
the site at 222 Hartrey?

MR. WEIS: Somewhere in 2005 I believe I was contacted by a broker representing Center Point Properties who had listed the property for sale, the former Shore facility.

My business is primarily based on, I'll take larger industrial properties and reconfigure them to allow for a multi-tenant use, primarily in the Skokie, Morton Grove areas. And I've done a number of those projects, thank God, successfully. This project seemed like it may be something that fit, fit the mold.

The dollars and sense of the project did not make sense to us at the time, I think they were asking somewhere under $7 million or so. And it really just, the numbers didn't work for us.

MR. MURRAY: What was your first impression when you saw the property and reviewed it as a developer, potential buyer?

MR. WEIS: I mean, I, certainly for my needs as a developer it fit a lot of needs. Parking-wise it had an abundance of parking, the facility itself was well-kept. The former owner, as long as it was vacant, kept the building heated and cooled and pristine condition for a very long time.
It had a relatively good layout for splitting it up for a multi-tenant use. Although, I was slightly concerned about the exposure. A lot of the tenants that I deal with who want the smaller, when I saw small it's a 10 to 15 to 20,000 square foot spaces, because they are independent, do want to have some type of street exposure, identity, this property really didn't allow that.

MR. MURRAY: Did you determine whether or not it had any appeal as an industrial site at the time when you saw it then in 2003 or 4?

MR. WEIS: It was, I think somewhere in '05, I don't, I'm not sure I understand the question.

MR. MURRAY: Well, did you determine whether or not it had asset value for an industrial user?

MR. WEIS: I'm sure there's a value, you know, depending on where the dollars are there's a value to any user, you know, it's locating the right guy.

MR. MURRAY: Right. You were not the right guy at the time?

MR. WEIS: No, it did not fit what, we couldn't make it work.

MR. MURRAY: All right. And do you frequently make properties available to small industrial users?
MR. WEIS: Yeah, that's the nature of our business. I would say at least 90 percent of what we do is deal with larger former industrial complexes that were used for manufacturing distribution, we redevelop them to allow for multi-tenant use, primarily catering to a five, or 10, or 15,000 square foot tenant, which are typically more for distribution than for manufacturing.

MR. MURRAY: All right. At a time during the last couple of years did your interest in the property change from that as a developer of industrial and commercial properties to something else?

MR. MURRAY: Aside from what I do in my daily life, I, obviously, I'm very involved with my children's school as all parents should be. And I, we had a search committee set up to find a new location for the boys division of the school. The girls division currently has a beautiful facility that was purchased about 12 year ago. The boys division has been in the same building for much longer, and it's really not optimal for the use.

We had sat down as a board and decided that we wanted to search for a new building. And constantly I'm approached with different properties and real estate,
and we always have it on the back of our mind to try and find a location.

I was contacted in the end of '06, I think it was right around November of '06 by the same broker from Center Point, I think it was through CB, I don't recollect exactly but it was the same broker, letting me know that the owners at Center Point have decided that this property would be torn down in the near future, they did not, no longer wanted to maintain the property and to continue to heat it and cool it, and, you know, keep all the systems up and running, or pay the taxes on the property. So they were going to raze the property.

He told me that there was an opportunity that if they were able to find a buyer by the end of the year, and if the number started with a three that there may be an opportunity to save it from the wrecking ball.

MR. MURRAY: And what, if any, impact did that have upon your role with the school?

MR. WEIS: At the time, we were actually looking very seriously at a property in Chicago on California just south of Devon, a former conservative synagogue that had a school component to it when they originally built it in the '50's. Although it was far better than the facility we were in on California
Street, this other property, it would suit the needs. It wouldn't provide an ultimate scenario, but it was far better than we were, what we were currently housed in. So we were focusing on that property, and I, in fact, brought the architect over to look at this location we were looking at in Chicago, and on the way back I circled around and I drove him through the Hartrey property. And he wrung my neck pretty hard and told me that we're making a major mistake, and if we're going to go and make a commitment to a new building we should do something that's really going to serve us long term.

I was then able to get a couple of the senior board members involved and we walked through the property. I told them of the very tight time frame that we'd have to act on here and the amount of cash we'd have to come up with, you know, it would be impossible to finance such a deal in that short time. And we made a commitment to move ahead with this project.

MR. MURRAY: Now, what is the nature of the intention of the Board relative to the implementation of its plan to utilize this property as a school? How will it operate? How will it work as far as the Board's concerned?
MR. WEIS: Well, the Board would like to redevelop the building to accommodate the school for between four and 500 boys as well as the younger grades, you know, the pre-school division is co-ed, we would have them in the same building. We are looking to build the building of dreams for the school. We want something that's going to really be the chance to have a supreme and beautiful facility that's going to stimulate the education for the kids. We're committed to do so.

I think we have a $10 million building campaign that we're ready to put into action, pending the City of Evanston's review, and build the dream.

MR. MURRAY: Now, how does the change to the C-1 District affect, in your view as a property developer, the immediate vicinity?

MR. WEIS: Well, I think it's a, it matches well with the C-1 that's directly to the south, the Jewel and Target.

I know from the Jewish community that is really the parent body of our school, that's probably the largest destination, the Jewel has done an outstanding job at marketing directly this kosher food and services to the community. I understand that it's the most successful Jewel that's done a, a niche market
in the city, or in the region.

And, I mean, you walk in there on a Thursday night and you can wait in line for hours, that's really amazing.

I think that it fits well with it. The industrial use is, you know, behind the building with the Vineyard next door. And I think, you know, Mr. Murray, you left out, we'd be talking about the whole strip. I think the Vineyard was contacted and we're partnering up with them a little bit in regard to the change of zoning so you wouldn't be left with a small sliver that's not part of the parcel.

MR. MURRAY: And in that regard, Mr. Chairman --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: -- to explain that?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, I will try to explain that.

We solicited the consent and/or cooperation of the Vineyard. They today provided me with a written document that indicated that they had no objection to the change in, in the zoning district from a, an I-2 to a C-1 District that, so long as their operation rights to the use of Shore Avenue or Place, whatever the name of the street is, and there were no significant conditions imposed upon their operational use of their
property that they had no objection whatsoever to the C-1 designation.

I do have a document to that effect, there are some other materials in it, but I'd be pleased to make available.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: If you could get us a copy of that that'd be --

MR. MURRAY: Yes, sir. I would invite questions from the panel.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Do you know what the Vineyard's long-term plans are as far as their present building? I thought they were going to move to the west?

MR. WEIS: I understood, if you'll take a peek over here for a moment. This is the property that we purchased along with this entire parking lot. This is the only other structure to the west, they occupy this entire building. I don't think they're utilizing it to the full extent, I think that there's some vacant area in there. But that's the only building before the river channel.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Is it your understanding that they are going to move from that, from that building?
MR. WEIS: It hasn't been, not that I know of. I haven't --

MR. MURRAY: And it does not, that does not indicate my understanding either, that there is, there may be considerations with reference to the Center Point of their congregational usage that might dictate that kind of relocation. But I am not aware that they're actively seeking another site. After the pleasant and enjoyable opportunity that they exercised here in Evanston I think they'd probably be likely to --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: So that property is not in play at all, the --

MR. WEIS: Not that I understand, no.

MR. MURRAY: Not to our knowledge.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Johanna?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I haven't seen the traffic study because it's down at the end of the dias. But I was wondering if somebody could just summarize what the impact to this site will be, because Sunday night, or I'm sorry, Sunday services for Vineyard are very different than Monday through Friday school. So I just sort of want to understand that.

And then also, given the current facilities that you do operate out of how many people do you
anticipate would be able to walk to this site, or would most of them have to be, you know, would they be riding the bus, or would they be dropped off? And, because I'm just trying to understand, there's only one signalized intersection there, and it's not near your site. So I'm a little concerned about, you know, just the interaction of cars and trucks and children.

MR. WEIS: Sure. The majority of our --

MR. MURRAY: We'll address that with, if I may, with Bonnie Flock from Dewalt Hamilton who did the study, if I can defer that inquiry for a moment or two.

And with reference to the operational aspects of the, the school I would invite you to hold your comment and inquiry and place it to Rabbi Cohen, who is intending to speak next.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Seth, do you know if it's operational at all --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN:

CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- Rabbi Cohen.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Could I have a quick question? You just mentioned, said you have purchased the property rather than optioned the property?

MR. WEIS: Correct. In order for us to, this
is back about a year, when Center Point contacted us they were going to raze the building and they offered us the opportunity to buy the property at under $3 million if we were able to come up with the cash quick enough in order, but we would have had to close, they weren't going to allow any type of options.

I think they went down that road, they actually, one of my competitors had the property under contract with this type of option, and he did initiate a project to put condominium industrial spaces in here. I think he actually had signage up on Howard, and he was unsuccessful in his attempts. He had, I think he was going to split it up into 25 individual units, and he was offering them at, I think it was around $85 a foot.

And he, and that's pretty low.

And he really, he, I think because of the street exposure primarily he really was not successful, and he ultimately could not close. I think the bank was only going to finance him if he had some pre-signs.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Thank you, that's interesting to know. Because, in fact, one would imagine with the condo boom that many spaces have been imagined for condos all over Evanston. And with the park you would imagine you'd have a nice view, even
though you're in --

MR. WEIS: I think his --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: You mean industrial condos, right?

MR. WEIS: -- his plan was commercial condos.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Commercial condos?

MR. WEIS: Yeah, similar to what I do, I primarily lease out space, 10, 20,000, he was going to sell them. There's a lot of individuals who say, well, why should I lease it and I'll buy a 10,000 square foot facility. Residential, well, not my business, I stay away from it.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Thank you.

MR. MURRAY: Anything else?

MR. WEIS: Thank you.

MR. MURRAY: Rabbi, please? Would you tell us your occupation and your name, please, spell the last name?

RABBI COHEN: My occupation, I don't really have an occupation, I have a life, and my life is a Rabbi.

MR. MURRAY: Your life is pastor care, is it not?

RABBI COHEN: My life is being a Rabbi, and my
last name is Cuhen, which is a very uncommon name among Rabbis, (C-o-h-e-n).

MR. MURRAY: Very uncommon, yes.


MR. MURRAY: Thank you. What is your relationship to the school?

RABBI COHEN: Well, I guess you'd have to really explain the structure of the school.

MR. MURRAY: Please do so for our benefit.

RABBI COHEN: I am a volunteer, the school is a community school. The school has principles, teachers, and all type of staff. There are six Rabbi's from the community who volunteer to oversee the entire school, which means all final decision go through our committee or our Board.

I was a parent of four children, went through the school. I became a Rabbi in the community, I was asked to serve on this Board, I did it, I still do it, I give many hours of my time to the school even though I have no children in the school any longer, because I thank the school for what they did for my four children, or our four children I should say.

We meet, I'd say, at least once a month.
Under a crises we can meet once a week. And I myself, right now, am not the head of the committee. But one of the Rabbis who is head of the committee recently was not well, he had surgery, and so I kind of took over his schedule a little. So I've been in contact with the principle for the last two weeks on a daily basis for different issues going on in the school.

MR. MURRAY: If the Commission were to recommend and the City Council to grant the change in zoning that would permit the school operation, would you give us --

RABBI COHEN: We would pray for all of them that they should have long life with lots of health.

MR. MURRAY: Absolutely.

RABBI COHEN: We would do that anyways, but this would be in addition --

MR. MURRAY: And on top of that, perhaps that would give you some reason to tell us how the school would operate on that site on a day-to-day basis. What would be the first day of the week, the end of the week, what type of hours would the schedule entail? Who are going to be the students, and who are the teachers of those children? Begin with --

RABBI COHEN: Okay. Let me begin like this,
I'm not sure why I, I give about, I don't know, somewhere in the vicinity of 40 to 50 classes a week in the synagogue, and that's besides speaking on Saturday, and for some reason I'm nervous right now. I'm usually not nervous when I speak, so I'm a little nervous, trying to wonder why I'm nervous.

So I would like to, perhaps, give a little bit of a preface, I think that would explain what a day school is all about just very succinctly.

My father went to day school, I went to day school, my children went to day school. Day schools begin usually, depending upon what grade, let's talk fourth and up, usually begin at about 7:30 in the morning, children come for prayers, and somewhere between 5:00 and 5:30.

Children are basically in school in the morning the first half of the day with religious subjects. Depending upon the age, somewhere between 12:00, 1:00, 1:30 they switch and go into secular studies. It's a long day, the children are very responsible, they're very serious.

The purpose of the school is to create productive citizens who are well-mannered, sensitive, compassionate, care about the country, care about the
community. Obviously religion is extremely important, I would say it's number one, but it's number one within the rubric of living in America and trying to do the most that we can for the country and for the world. That's our goal, that's what we want our students to become.

By and large that is what they become. Thank God we can say that we have no problems in our school with drugs, no problems in our school with misbehavior. We thank God every day with a lot of work that our students try very hard, together with their parents and even their grandparents, to became, as I said before, model citizens and productive citizens.

And thank God our alumni are presently all over the world in all different types of positions, and have added to all of the communities that they are in.

Did I answer all your questions?

MR. MURRAY: Not quite.

RABBI COHEN: Not quite, okay.

MR. MURRAY: Starting at 8:00 and ending at 5:00 is a framework upon which the school operates. How do children arrive at school and leave during the course of the day?

RABBI COHEN: Okay. Well, let me just say the
following, it's really 7:30. And that's for the older
grades, it's about 8:30 for the younger grades. They,
that schedule is Monday through Thursday. Friday,
because of the Sabbath, ends earlier, somewhere in the
vicinity of 2:00, never later than that, sometimes
earlier. Sunday for the older grades is a half a day in
the boys school, which is what we are talking about.
Half a day means somewhere between 7:30 and
approximately 12:30, 1:00.

Thank God we, not in my time, in my time
there's a, it's a joke in the Orthodox community, the
most hated word is a seven letter word, it's called
carpool, carpool is a hated word, it was exasperating,
it was tension-producing. And it caused Rabbis to spend
many late hours counseling couples on how to deal with
their carpools. That's a joke, but it's true.

About two years ago we were able to get
bussing, and the bussing has relieved that entire
scenario. We now have about six buses coming to the
school in the morning.

In answer to a question before, I don't know
if it's my privy to answer it, but I don't think anybody
is going to be walking to the school. Basically, maybe,
maybe one percent tops of any of the students will be
walking there. But the busses are really going to take everybody there. They, we think we'll need about six busses, they would, coming to the school.

And --

MR. MURRAY: Is it the expectation that they would all arrive at the same time or within an hour or two?

RABBI COHEN: I would say within an hour or two max, yes, maybe even less than that.

MR. MURRAY: And at the conclusion of the day is there also a, a split in the --

RABBI COHEN: In the conclusion of the day, yes.

MR. MURRAY: -- busses leaving and concluding the day?

RABBI COHEN: Dismissal will be varies also because of the age. The boys in the younger grades have a shorter day, and the boys in the older grades there they go to school about 5:00, 5:30 depending upon their activities.

And the bussing works at that time as well.

And we hope that this should be a, a maximum of busses and minimum of traffic. That's the, that's the goal.

MR. MURRAY: What levels of school are
accommodated at the Dachs School?

RABBI COHEN: The school that's going to be in that location will be the nursery, the pre-school, and then through eighth grade. The, as was mentioned earlier, as a religious school, not all Orthodox schools are like this, we are, the boys and girls are separated after, after nursery. And this building will primarily be for the boys.

May I add one thing?

MR. MURRAY: Please.

RABBI COHEN: Maybe this is an appeal. I grew up in a small town on the east coast called Brooklyn. I then moved from Brooklyn to another town on the east coast called Brookline, which happens to be adjacent to Boston.

The difference in the two cities, to me would be, was that in the school that I was, attended in Brooklyn, the facility was, basic would be a gross exaggeration. It was a very, very small crowded building. Our students now, the boys are in a building, which adequate is a gross exaggeration.

And as long as my children have been in the school the school has been trying to find a facility. Thank God we found a facility for the girls, which is
beautiful. And we have not been successful with the boys. The parents here, as we just heard from Mr. Weis, are extremely dedicated to try to do that.

I'm just appealing, my heart is telling me to appeal, that this would afford a great facility. A great facility would afford our children the opportunity to grow. That's my appeal.

Being in a crowded facility, I don't think I have to explain it to anybody, is just, it hampers the potential of every child. And this would give every child the ability to maximize their potential.

MR. MURRAY: How will the school, in your expectation, interact with the community that surrounds it, particularly to the east which is residential?

RABBI COHEN: I'm not a prophet, but I would say that all interactions with the school and the community would be pleasant and productive. I can't say that there will be interactive football games or basketball games. I can say that the interactions with the students will be very respectful.

I can say that the facility might be beneficial for the community because we may end up having some type of a social hall, which might be open to the community and anybody might be able to use that
facility. I can't say, again, I'm only presenting
without any definitiveness.

But I would say that all our children and all
our staff, as I'm sure in all schools, but we try very
hard that all interactions will be respectful, pleasant,
and only beneficial.

MR. MURRAY: Now, the anticipation is that the
use of the school would be oriented to the west, and
that the current facade on the east side of the building
will be virtually unchanged. Is that consistent with
the plans the Board have developed so far?

RABBI COHEN: I believe so, but I have to be
honest with you that I can not tell you that I am
intimately involved yet with the, the plans because they
haven't come to us as the Board because so many
preliminary things have to be done until we, until we
finally get to that stage where we are going to be able
to really discuss the detail, you know, these type of
details.

MR. MURRAY: Based upon your lengthy
experience in Brooklyn, Brookline and --

RABBI COHEN: Chicago.

MR. MURRAY: -- California Avenue, what is
your expectation about the compatibility of the
institution, of the school with the surrounding
properties and neighborhood?

RABBI COHEN: And I was wondering, I've never
done this before. I was once in this building, I don't
know if you know, there's something called an A-roof
that was, that is put up in West Rogers Park. And the
northeast corner of the A-roof, an A-roof is an
enclosure with a wire that allows Orthodox Jews to carry
on the Sabbath. The northeast corner of the A-roof is
in Evanston, about five feet. And we had to come here
to meet with the mayor at that time. And I was nervous
then also meeting with the mayor.

So I wanted to tell you like this, I was
thinking, I don't know if this is the wrong thing to say
or the right thing to say, but this is the feeling I
have. I'm looking at that sign sitting here, 1863, my
great-grandfather was born in 1873. He came to America
in 1902. My grandfather was a veteran of World War I,
my uncles were veterans of World War II, and my mother's
cousins were veterans of the Korean War.

I was trying to think why nobody was in
Vietnam, I'm not sure, I'm not sure. One of my cousins,
his number was very high, he didn't have to go, and I
was in the, studying to become a Rabbi at that time.
I'm telling you this only because we have created, and we continue to create, a feeling among our students to be thankful on a daily basis for the country that we live in. We have never experienced a country like this in the history of the Jewish people since we've been exiled from our own country. And we try to instill that all of our students should have that feeling. That is one of the primary goals of our school and of our teachings, both in the synagogue and in the school.

So in answer, I would reiterate that we teach respect, we teach admiration, and we teach the concept what's called -- to recognize the good that we receive from other people. And we have never received so much goodness from any country in the history of the Jewish people.

So in answer to your question, I'm hoping that every student carries that message and does whatever he or she can do to benefit Evanston, Chicago, and anywhere else that we live. I can not tell you directly what that will mean, maybe a student of Joan Dachs will become the Mayor of Evanston, I don't know, could be, never know.

MR. MURRAY: I would invite questions of
the --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Seth?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Good evening, Rabbi Cohen. My father, too, came to the Chicago Area from Brooklyn, both my parents, Brooklyn, to Brookline, to Evanston.

RABBI COHEN: Serious?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes, serious, yes. My father was born and raised in Brooklyn as were my mother, and went to Brookline, lived there for MIT, and then came here to Northwestern.

RABBI COHEN: And now I'm relaxed I think.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: And now you're relaxed, okay, all right.

I do have a question about the, the ancillary usages. So we did not receive this document, so it's new to me, and I did review these documents that we did receive before the weekend. So thank you to the staff.

You do, it does say that ancillary uses such as a clothing center, a community center, which I understand, and the kosher food preparation.

Now, a clothing center, is this going to, and the community center, will this be attracting other people in the community besides the students and --
RABBI COHEN: I'm sorry, go --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: No, that's okay.

RABBI COHEN: The clothing center is basically a, it's called a FESIT Organization.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Okay.

RABBI COHEN: And that is that people collect clothing and then they distribute them to the poor, that's the only thing that's going on there with, you know, no business, nobody's coming to buy it --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Very good.

RABBI COHEN: And students of different schools come and package the clothing as part of their orientation to being involved in acts of kindness to the community.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Absolutely. Thank you.

MR. MURRAY: I can assure you that --

RABBI COHEN: I could see MIT out of the back porch of our house.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: You could see MIT from the back porch? Okay.

MR. MURRAY: I can assure you that there will more information from other witnesses.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Mr. Murray, can you remind me of the order of other presentations? Is
the architect going to speak this evening?

MR. MURRAY: In a moment.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: In a moment?

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Anybody else have any questions? Thank you very much.

RABBI COHEN: Thank you all very much.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Hedlund? Would you tell us your name, please, your occupation, and spell your name for the record?

MR. HEDLUND: My name's Nevin Hedlund with Nevin Hedlund Architects, (H-e-d-l-u-n-d), 7985 Lake Street in River Forest, Illinois.

MR. MURRAY: Would you tell us how you came to be associated with the development of the, of the conceptualized drawings for the building known as 222 Hartrey?

MR. HEDLUND: I had been associated with several religious facilities in the Chicago Area and have developed a specialty in this type of facility, and I was known by some of the committee members and was asked to take a look at the building.

Did that answer that particular question?

MR. MURRAY: Right. And were you given a
program to undertake in terms of design and utility of the existing structures and any ancillary aspects of those?

MR. HEDLUND: Yes. In fact, the idea of being brought to the site, I was very excited of the fact that coming to a building that was about 100,000 square feet that was empty with a very large parking area solved a lot of problems right away.

One, usually you're battling parking all the time. And if you can get past that issue you've solved a lot of problems.

The other thing that you have is a very large footprint, which is a great thing to have. You can learn to grow into a building and not necessarily come back and try to add onto it all the time.

So what this building offers is a complete package for internal growth throughout the life of the building. So we wouldn't necessarily have to come back at all to say, well, we've outgrown it we need to add on. In the other way it's actually the opposite of that. We'd be able to occupy the building and grow within it without having to expand outward from that.

MR. MURRAY: Now, would you tell us, please, what, what your initial assessment of this building was,
and what the elements that it was to contain as
presented to you by the, the Dachs School?

MR. HEDLUND: Yes. Well, it, the site itself
is very unique, and it's unique in a way that benefits
our project. The fact that, this is the aerial photo of
the site, and this is our building located here. And
it's sort of landlocked in a dead-end area, meaning that
Hartrey dead-ends to this location, it's backed up
against the Skokie Swift, it's behind the shopping
center, and it's very difficult to get to, and there's
no visibility. So it's perfect for our project.

The other thing, too, is that being able to
handle access is actually a blessing as well, because
with the bus system that's implemented by the school we
have a traffic plan that, our traffic consultant will go
into, in-depth in a moment. But I can specifically tell
you how the traffic will flow briefly here.

All of the traffic will come off of Howard at
this location, circulate, do a right-hand dropoff, and
come back and exit the site onto Howard. So there would
be no access by any users of the group through Hartrey.
This is open, but at the option of anybody could be
closed or controlled at any given point. So the idea is
that we wouldn't be flowing into the residential
In fact, I drove there once and made the mistake of going out this direction, and I got lost, I couldn't find out where I was and it was very difficult to get back to Howard. So if anybody should travel that way that would learn by their first encounter that the way to get in and out would be through this location here, even if you were coming by automobile.

Now, the benefits of the, of the building, too, the fact that it's large enough to satisfy all of the requirements plays into the building program quite, quite well as well.

One of the ideas with a pre-school program and grade school program is the need for outdoor space. And being such a large building, but being sensitive to the fact that we have a neighborhood to the east, we wanted to be able to control that experience as well as make it a safe experience for the children as well.

So what we've done is we've actually carved out a portion of the building in the center as a courtyard so we can have an outdoor playground area enclosed, safe for the children, and enclosed for the neighborhood as well, so we wouldn't have lots of children screaming with delight and bothering the
neighbors, so to speak.

Again, the parking area is sufficient for this right-hand dropoff of all of the buses. We've then taken care to enhance the, that industrial-looking building into what we think is an attractive entry, which I'll go into in a moment.

But the actual plan also takes advantage of the attributes of the building in many specific ways. I believe you have an exhibit that matches this floor plan here. With the right-hand dropoff at the bus at the west end of the building we've located a lobby area with a circulation path to the main school area, which is on the east here.

We've then taken advantage of the courtyard to provide glass and light into an interior set of classrooms maintaining daylight to each classroom. So that's another advantage of this building, being able to carve it out for the playground area, but yet again introducing light into all those interior spaces.

Surrounding these --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So, excuse me, is it the, the children's area, the young children will be on the playground? Is that what you're saying there?

MR. HEDLUND: The early childhood are located
at this location.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Okay.

MR. HEDLUND: And then a circulation to the playground here. The idea there that as the early childhood is in recess here that the other children can actually observe them, and there's no conflict between any scheduling.

So the idea is that you have the early childhood here surrounding the playground they would distracted anybody that'd be using that area. So we're trying to focus the kids where they need to be.

And actually these, the location of those look out onto the embankment of the Skokie Swift. And we're hoping that that overtime becomes a more green and attractive area that is really pleasant to look at over time, ideally.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: There's currently windows on the south side of the building. Are there windows on the north side, or are you going to --

MR. HEDLUND: There are some. We would introduce them as we did for the classroom during the renovation project.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And can you just briefly tell me what the structural module is so I can get a sense of
scale?

MR. HEDLUND: In one direction it's 20, and the other direction's 25 feet. This is actually a series of really three buildings, and you can see how that worked. The original building was about this big and there was an addition here and then an addition here. And it grew from the east to the west.

Other functions that are housed within the building, obviously, we're going to have a gymnasium, a multi-purpose room, would have a library, a prayer center located here as well as laboratory spaces and other functions for the school.

So the social hall functions are located at the west end of the building off of this main entry lobby. We'd have three function spaces, kitchen, a prep area, and then the large social hall located at this location where you see the tables there.

What is nice about the fact that we are able to map this program into an industrial building is, again, a wonderful thing. It's like a blank canvass that you're able to them meet all the needs of each of the program function with an existing industrial building, which is hard to imagine necessarily, but I think we demonstrated that clearly on our plan here.
Now, we also, obviously also want to enhance
the exterior of the building, because it is a, an
industrial building, of course. But we've been able to
do that by incorporating window areas, two-story window
areas at the dropoff, and then adding some exterior
materials of masonry and stone, providing some lighting
as some landscaping in the entry.

So if you can compare this to the photo that I
believe that you have in your exhibit of what's
currently on the west elevation it's a dramatic
improvement.

To that end, we think this is a perfect match
for a filed industrial building. The fact that you
can't get to it, you can't see it, and it's surrounded
by all sorts of different functions including a railroad
embankment, the back end of a Target and a Jewel, and,
you know, a quiet residential street.

So you can see we've taken care in programming
the building to match all of those functions and still
make this a successful project. We think that's a real
benefit to this rather than having it torn down, as it
was envisioned prior to us buying the building.

Now, with that, if there's specific questions?

MR. MURRAY: Would you address the issue of
the assets that the building would present to an
industrial user if one came, were to come forward?

MR. HEDLUND: Well, I may not be the most
qualified to answer that specific question. But the,
obviously, the technical problems with dealing with
this, this location are many.

The fact that access to the site is difficult
being located back here, it's not close to any, even
expressway. It's just a difficult site to deal with on
any industrial application that I can see.

MR. MURRAY: Your point of view as an
architect, is this particular plan for the building
consistent and compatible with the adjoining properties?

MR. HEDLUND: Well, I think so, very well. In
fact, it's compatible with the neighborhood to the east
because we're maintaining and enhancing the landscaping
here. We're really providing no additional people in
that direction. We're doing dropoff and pickup to the
west. This will be, there'll be windows obviously, and
we would maintain that facade, but yet no circulation
would happen outside of that, outside of emergency
exiting.

We think it's compatible with this zone here.

The fact that we're providing some daylight to the
classrooms and other functions, yet, you know, if you could think of another use that would look at the back of a Target and still be successful, I'd like to hear a couple other ideas for that.

To the west, you know, we're doing the enhancements here on the west. And we think that parking lot is also an asset that is far beyond our needs, but still an asset in itself for social hall functions. We would be able to accommodate all possible parking in that lot and there'd be no overflow whatsoever under any given scenario.

MR. MURRAY: How many people would the so-called community or banquet facility accommodate? I think you show something like 60 tables?

MR. HEDLUND: Yes. I believe we had approximately five to 600 people.

MR. MURRAY: And are there any other of the so-called non-school purpose areas, rooms, and/or designated spaces that you can tell the Commission about?

MR. HEDLUND: Well, the pre-function areas are located here, and the kitchen is right off of a service entry and a dropoff loading dock. The other compatible thing about the program is that, that any time that this
social hall would be used would be off hours from the school, so you never have simultaneous functions, you would either be using the school or you'd be using the social function, they would never be simultaneous.

MR. MURRAY: And I would invite questions of the Board.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Johanna?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I have a could of questions. I think at the beginning you mentioned that you, some of this, you could expand within the building as time went on. Could you talk a little bit, I mean, I'm seeing a very complete plan here for a footprint. What, I mean, is there components that won't be developed? Tell me more about that.

MR. HEDLUND: Well, the, within each of the spaces day one we wouldn't have a full capacity of the school, we would grow into that as shown here. So currently they have, I believe, 250 plus the pre-school, and this would be sized for a total of 500. So they would go within and use those built out functions as needed.

The second space, we have some unassigned space in this location. And obviously we put operable partitions within the social hall to be able to use for
smaller functions first, anticipating in the future that you'd be able to expand and use this full social hall at any given larger event in the future.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: So the building would be finished and there wouldn't be any additional expansion or finishing of the building?

MR. HEDLUND: Correct, you're correct. We wanted to show you the full master plan, even though they would functionally grow into it.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Okay. And then I also was wondering, are there any green construction elements within this building or plan?

MR. HEDLUND: Yes. Now, the exact extent of the green architect, we're going to fully develop that, we will hire a LEED consultant. One of the issues that we will address, we think we can, in this particular location be able to do geothermal energy. And we will strive for a LEED certification whether it's silver, gold, or platinum, we haven't determined that at this time.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: It's Evanston, you shouldn't leave that information out there, you sure, include that.

MR. HEDLUND: Okay. Well, we wanted to make
sure that we were going in the right direction here, and
we can further define those details based on the
approval process.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Seth?
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes. I'd like to
understand a bit about the banquet facilities and what
they'll be used for. So --
MR. HEDLUND: I think others could address
that more than I could from a --
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Okay. And I'd also
like to understand a bit about, Rabbi Cohen, you did
suggest a community commitment, or perhaps a commitment
to the community to maybe use facilities. So I'd like
to understand that a bit as well, that actually sounds
like a very exciting component. So, Nevin, if you want
we could, I could wait on those questions. But if there
are any other questions here from the Board for you?
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Coleen?
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes. Actually, I just
wanted to say it's really great that you're doing an
adaptive re-use, we talk about it a lot, and, as far as
green and LEED, and we don't see enough of it. So I
just wanted to commend you on finding a building that
you can actually re-use.
MR. HEDLUND: Well, if that, I mean, if I can just go back, it's kind of a basic green idea. Re-using a building is a green idea. If you did nothing more than that, that's green. The cost of tearing it down, the energy used in tearing it down, the energy used in having to bring something back, I mean, I'm preaching to the choir here I guess. But that's an important thing for all of us to, to understand.

And the fact that you have an asset that is so compatible and that has not been able to be used, I think is a compelling argument for this project.

MR. WEIS: There hasn't been any specific plan made in regard to renting out the, of the social hall, you know. And we looked at the project and we sat down, but the word is, wow, what can we do with the building to make it really accommodate our needs.

The social hall certainly is something that we used, the building itself is not only a school, you know, we do a tremendous amount, it's a community center. It's probably the largest single asset that the Jewish Orthodox community has in the city period, anywhere in the area.

And there's countless events that'll take place that really, you need a large place to house them
in. So whether, it may be a wedding, or unfortunately a
funeral, or whatever may take place where you do need to
have the space available.

So we started to look at, you know, what else
could we do with it? So one of the ideas that was
floated was opening it up to the community, I don't know
how far that is, and it's a little bit outside my
projecting to the Board of, you know, as they go further
it's probably going to be defined a little bit better.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Will you be using then
this facility for our community, for the temple, for the
community or is this just for, or is the sanctuary then
just for the school?

MR. WEIS: Yeah, primarily I don't anticipate
any Saturday services. You know, really, I think Rabbi
Cohen mentioned maybe one percent of the student body
can actually walk to the school. Just proximity-wise we
can't drive on -- at all. And so it would be very
difficult for us to use it for a Sabbath Temple. The
temple that's in the building, the boys will use it two
to three times a day for their own internal prayers.

MR. MURRAY: What will be the expectation with
reference to times of usage for community or banquet
facilities and the kitchen and the operations of the
kitchen for let's say, offsite provision of foodstuffs?

MR. WEIS: There's not a lot of offsite. I mean, primarily you have any number, let's say 35 or 40 different active community organizations within the Orthodox Jewish community. All of them have their annual fundraiser and different things going on, which will all take place in the evenings so the adults can attend these events. And that'll, you know, get the four, three to four to 500 people at these different fundraisers or events for those different organizations. That's probably the primary use for the hall in addition to the weddings, those would all take place in the evenings simply to accommodate when people don't work. The school is obviously during the day.

Some of the other things like the clothing drive is really, you know, like Rabbi Cohen mentioned, you'll have, I don't know how many kids will go out there and go home and get whatever clothes that they're ready to bag up and throw out or, but actually we don't want clothes that you're going to throw away, we really want clothes that are usable, and they'll take them here. We'll sort them here in the building, we'll invite some of the high schools and some of the other grade schools to come in, help out with the sorting.
There's no real pickup or distribution here, it really, primarily gets shipped overseas to Israel.

There's a food drive that happens during the high holidays and three other holidays during the year where families need a little extra help. So we'll go and get food delivered that we have the ability to buy in mass amounts because we're serving to so many people, and we'll make individual packages for different families. And that'll happen out of their, mostly evening activities.

MR. MURRAY: And the gymnasium, et cetera, is that associated both community-wise as well as the school?

MR. WEIS: Yeah, I mean, primarily that'll be the school function, will use the gymnasium. But I'm sure that there's going to be a outside extracurricular school activities and probably some of the adults and parents in the community that could maybe use, a couple of pounds of overweight and we want to exercise a little bit.

MR. MURRAY: What is your expectation as to those, let's call them secular activities? Would they be predominantly evening affairs and not conflict with the Vineyard's use of the property on their holiday,
holy days?

MR. WEIS: You're talking about for the
banquet hall or for --

MR. MURRAY: All of the secular, but your area
as well?

MR. WEIS: I don't know how they conflict
necessarily, I'm not sure.

MR. MURRAY: There's not likely to be a
conflict between --

MR. WEIS: No, I can't imagine they conflict,
we have an exclusive parking lot for the facility of
well over 300 cars. I think the Vineyard's using the
water reclamation parking exclusively to the west.
They're not using the parking now at all, they don't
even travel that distance into the property. I don't
see any conflict.

MR. MURRAY: So are there any other questions
of Mr. Weis concerning the, the elements of the school
that we just --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I have a question that,
actually I'll wait, I'll let Bonnie answer the question.

MR. WEIS: Okay, very good.

MR. HEDLUND: I thank you very much.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Campanini, please? Would you
tell us your name, spell it, I think that would be
helpful and --

MR. CAMPANINI:  Sure, right.

MR. MURRAY: -- and tell us what your
occupation is?

MR. CAMPANINI:  Sure. My name is Marcello
Campanini, first name is (M-a-r-c-e-l-l-o) last name is
equally as Irish, it's (C-a-m-p-a-n-i-n-i), and I'm a
commercial real estate broker with CB Richard Ellis.
And I office in the downtown office at 311 South Wacker,
Suite 400.

MR. MURRAY:  You said you're a commercial real
estate broker?

MR. CAMPANINI:  Correct.

MR. MURRAY:  Okay. And do you have a
specialty within that subset?

MR. CAMPANINI:  Yeah, I work primarily on
adaptive re-use properties within the City of Chicago
and surrounding suburbs. I have worked on projects here
in Evanston, and I have worked on projects just
immediately southwest of this property also. So I'm
pretty well-versed on industrial buildings, adaptive re-
use for those buildings and such.

MR. MURRAY: How did you first become aware of
222 Hartrey as an available real estate property?

MR. CAMPANINI: Actually, not through the group here. I, when I, at CB and one of my colleagues, Dan Swanski, had a listing with Center Point on the property. So I knew because I had a property in proximity that his property was somewhat similar, one where you had industrial buildings that were kind of running through their life and they were looking for some alternative uses or some, a buyer to step up. So Dan and I would talk a little bit about his project in relation to what my project were and compare notes.

MR. MURRAY: And what was the degree of success achieved with reference to the ultimate development of this property, Hartrey.

MR. CAMPANINI: Well, yeah, I understood it's Hartrey and I had driven it, and I knew about it from, for numerous years is that it was a very challenging property to get done. It was one where you kind of sensed that it was, I don't want to be so bold as to say, like, a white elephant within an industrial market. It was kind of landlocked, it really wasn't accessible. It became a property that, you know, the way I kind of really judge it is the fact that you had a large reed like Center Point who is very well versed in
industrial projects and product. And they try their, they kind of ran through it and were unsuccessful as far as making it a viable industrial project.

So when you have a big reed like that with the resources they have and they can't make sense of it or make it a viable project, you kind of start looking for alternative uses.

MR. MURRAY: And what alternative uses came forward, if any, that you know of?

MR. CAMPANINI: The ones that I was cognizant on, because I had similar ones in mine, were you have to kind of look back in the day a little bit when the residential market was still somewhat attractive and you still had that sense of condo, for sale townhomes, you know, mid-density type projects. You could possibly make that argument a little bit because of the residential to the east, but it is pretty tucked away. You have the elevated train line there.

I still think at the end of the day it would have been a little bit challenging even on a residential end. You're behind a Target, it didn't really have a lot of the amenities that a lot of the developers would be looking for, or people would say, hey, I really want to buy a home or townhome here.
MR. MURRAY: So if you were to move that property down to Howard Street would you improve its appeal to a --

MR. CAMPANINI: Yeah, definitely, definitely. If it had some frontage on a main road then you'd kind of could look to other commercial-type uses, you'd kind of get away from the residential at that point.

MR. MURRAY: Now, you've sat here this evening listening to the explanation of what the intended use of this property is. Do you see the intended use of this property and a change of the zoning from an I District to a commercial district to have any adverse affect upon either property values in the immediate vicinity, or the use of any property in the immediate vicinity?

MR. CAMPANINI: It's a fair question. You know, my opinion would be that I couldn't see it having any impact in a negative way. Generally, on projects that I've worked on, and I have worked on and converted industrial buildings, is that when a new use comes in generally it's a complimentary type of use that actually benefits the neighborhood.

So on mixed-use projects many times the use that's coming in is a softer use, it doesn't have that feel of the industrial product that a lot of them had
before. And that's what I was doing with the property
to the south and west.

MR. MURRAY: I would invite questions of the,
of the Commission. Thank you.

MR. CAMPANINI: Thank you.

MR. MURRAY: Ms. Flock, please? Would you
tell us your name and your occupation? Spell your name
for the record.

MS. FLOCK: My name is Bonnie Flock, I'm with
Dewalt Hamilton Associates, Flock is (F-l-o-c-k), and
I'm a Senior Traffic Engineer at Dewalt Hamilton, 850
Forrest Edge Drive, Vernon Hills, Illinois.

MR. MURRAY: Ms. Flock, at the request of the
Dachs School and mine did you conduct a study of the
site at 222 Hartrey and its projected use as a, a school
and Orthodox Center for, for the foreseeable future?

MS. FLOCK: Yes, I did.

MR. MURRAY: And could you tell us what you
did in that process of your study?

MS. FLOCK: Well, when you start a traffic
study you want to look at the surrounding roadways that
are going to serve access to the site. And so we needed
to take traffic counts of existing conditions.

The closest intersections to this site where
the site traffic would be most concentrated is at Howard and McCormick, and Howard at Kedzie, so that's where we took the traffic counts. The traffic counts were taken during the peak hours of 7:00 and 9:00, and then we also took them from 3:30 to 4:00 p.m.

Then we had to project the traffic that was generated by this development, and that was based on --

MR. MURRAY: Did you conduct interviews with the principles of the ITE?

MS. FLOCK: Correct. Usually you go to the Institute of Transportation Engineers, ITE, trip general manual. They do have information on elementary schools, but not specific information that would be so special to this site. So we had to ask a lot of questions to try to get a handle on how much traffic would arrive during the critical peak hours.

MR. MURRAY: And what types of information did you receive with reference to the daily operational activities on the site? Times, beginning, early dates, after school things, dismissal issues, that type of stuff.

MS. FLOCK: We found out, and we didn't analyze it this way because we wanted the most
conservative analysis. But what we found out is that there is two shifts where they're entering, the kids are entering and they're exiting. What we did is we assumed everybody was arriving in one peak hour. One of the peak hours between 7:00 and 9:00 and then 4:00 to 6:00, so a very conservative analysis of bringing all, staff included, everybody arriving during this one peak hour, and then we began our analysis.

MR. MURRAY: Can you tell us what you did in terms of your analysis and what the analysis indicated to you as a traffic engineer?

MS. FLOCK: What we did is we distributed the site traffic to, on the adjacent street systems. Then we conducted capacity analyses to determine the existing levels of service of the two intersections of Howard at McCormick, and Howard at Kedzie. And then we projected out for existing bus site traffic, wanted to see what the conditions were, the levels of service when traffic from this development was added.

And what we found is that when you add the traffic from this development you get about a second more delay over existing conditions at the intersection of Howard and McCormick. At the intersection of Howard and Kedzie we get a level of service B, you put the site
traffic on the, the network and it maintains at a level
of service B. So very non-noticeable impact generated
by this development.

The primary reason is because schools can get
awfully messy on traffic because you've got all the
parents dropping off and picking up. For this
particular school 90 percent of the kids will be bused.
And as the Rabbi had indicated it'll generated about
six daily buses in and out of that facility.

For our analysis we assumed it was six buses
in and six buses out during one peak hour. We just
wanted to have all of the traffic during this one people
hour, which we know in reality that is not going to be
happening, it's going to be spread out.

MR. MURRAY: Did you also take into
consideration persons or children arriving at the school
in private motor vehicles?

MS. FLOCK: Yes. Like I said, 90 percent are
taking buses, 10 percent are being dropped off and
picked up by their parents, so we will have vehicular
traffic.

MR. MURRAY: And did you characterize that or
include it in the analysis that you ultimately did?

MS. FLOCK: Absolutely.
MR. MURRAY: During the course of your study and development of your, of the analysis, did you arrive at a professional opinion with reference to the amount of traffic and the impact of the traffic that might be developed by this institution local traffic in the immediate area?

MS. FLOCK: We estimate that there will be not a noticeable impact of traffic. You've got the buses being spread out throughout the day, although we assumed them all in one peak hour. The vehicular traffic will be very little, other than staff which will be about 60 people. And then you've got the 10 percent of the children being picked up and dropped off by their parents. So that's additional vehicular traffic.

But when you look at the whole picture during that one peak hour there really will not be a noticeable impact at the offsite intersections.

MR. MURRAY: Was there any concern on your part about the, let's call them secular activities, the community rooms, the banquet facilities and that type of thing with reference to your peak hour studies?

MS. FLOCK: No. We were told that these ancillary uses would generate negligible traffic during the peak hours. The banquet facility, if that does
become to the public, that's going to generate after
6:00 at night.

MR. MURRAY: And your peak hours were decided, or determined to be what, please, for the school?

MS. FLOCK: One hour, the peak hour of the adjacent street system or of the school?

MR. MURRAY: Let's start with the school and then talk about the adjacent streets.

MS. FLOCK: Well, as we heard that the school starts at 7:30 for the, the older kids, 8:30 for the younger kids. Peak hour of the traffic off-road, or on the road is from 7:00 to 9:00.

The departures of the school, my understanding is is that K through 4, they depart prior to the 4:00 p.m. peak hour, with the remaining children leaving during the 5:00 to 6:00 hour.

MR. MURRAY: In the course of things did you determine whether or not there was adequate parking available to the school to accommodate faculty and staff?

MS. FLOCK: Yes. We've got 214 parking spaces total. And when you look at staff is only 60 people, and then you've got, you've got plenty, plenty of parking for the type of operations the school is making.
MR. MURRAY: And did you participate in a suggestion or determination of the appropriate cycle pattern for vehicles entering and leaving the facility?

MS. FLOCK: Yes. When we initially got the site plan we weren't happy with it, it had some flaws on it, and so we revised it. And what we're going to do is recommend, or what we have recommended in the traffic study is that the buses come in, and we're recommending that it be a one-way counter clockwise circulation flow. And the vehicles are going to enter into the parking lot at these two curb cuts with stop sign control for the outbound movements.

Right now on Scher Drive this is not the exact location of existing access points today. But right now on Scher Drive there's three-way stops at both locations. We're going to recommend removing two of the stop signs on Scher, and just the outbound movements from the parking areas being under stop control. This is going to help traffic just flow a lot better, there's not need for three-way stop signs.

MR. MURRAY: Did you consider or make any recommendations with reference to the, the Hartrey end of the property in terms of vehicle access and ingress and egress?
MS. FLOCK: We don't see anybody using that, that entrance off of Hartrey because you can't get to Howard and it's confusing. As the architect had testified, you think you can get southbound on, on Hartrey, yeah, to get to Howard, but all of a sudden you're just dead-end, and then you're pushed into the neighborhood and you're just winding around. We don't see traffic using that.

MR. MURRAY: Would it be your expectation that that would be left open for emergency vehicles and access of that nature?

MS. FLOCK: That would be my opinion.

MR. MURRAY: And if there are any questions by the Commission we would invite them?

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Are there any traffic control devices on Howard Street as you enter the property?

MS. FLOCK: You have a traffic signal at Howard and Kedzie, and that's also defined as a traffic control.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: No, Kedzie, isn't Kedzie west of McCormick?

MS. FLOCK: It's --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: It's east, okay.
That's --

MS. FLOCK: Yeah, it's the south leg of the entrance --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: It's just east of the canal, isn't it?

MS. FLOCK: This is the entrance and Kedzie is the south leg.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Okay. But what's the north? Is there a name to that, that north street there, or is that just sort of a --

MR. MURRAY: It's the entrance drive to the --

MS. FLOCK: It's, to my knowledge, it's just the shopping center access drive.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Okay. And is there, is there a traffic light at that T-section intersection?

There is?

MS. FLOCK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Okay.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Opdycke, the title policy indicates that that is one of the easements that affects this property as well, that is a benefit to the, to the so-called school property now. It shows that there is an easement that permits inbound and outbound access over the, over the shopping center area.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: My personal experience, the biggest confusion exists traffic-wise at this intersection is with the two streets to the southbound side with the one that goes back into the industrial area back to the car repair shops, there's actually two funny occurrences there.

MS. FLOCK: Are you talking about a long Howard?

MR. MURRAY: He's talking about, I think he's talking about --

MS. FLOCK: You're talking --

MR. MURRAY: -- Skokie.

MS. FLOCK: -- about internal?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I'm talking going south from Howard. I understand that, I'm just talking about the biggest confusion in traffic is with the two roads which are basically immediately adjoining to each other, Kedzie, and I don't know what the name of the other one is. It's hardly even looks like a road but there is actually a road there that goes back into a car repair. So, yeah.

MS. FLOCK: Somehow, somehow it even got under signal control. It's a, the signal will only trigger green when a car is on --
CHAIRMAN WOODS:  Yes.
MS. FLOCK:  -- that approach.
CHAIRMAN WOODS:  And it really doesn't affect
the traffic on Howard, it affects, primarily, the
traffic coming north from those two roads onto the thing
in terms of every once in a while you see guys looking
at each other wondering who's supposed to go.
MS. FLOCK:  Yeah, right.
COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE:  Are there any special,
or any significant problems that you see at that
particular intersection on Howard as you enter the
property?
MS. FLOCK:  It is, it's got a lot of capacity,
it's at level of service B during both the A.M. and the
P.M. peak hour. The only concern I have is internally,
this can get kind of confusing.
COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE:  Right.
MS. FLOCK:  However, what they did is they did
ruralogical traffic control. They stop this guy, who
makes a right, the through movement is freeflow, and the
southbound movement has to stop. So entering traffic
you're never going to get a backup onto Howard. So the
traffic control placed at that nasty internal
intersection really does work when you observe it.
And that as my only concern when I, you know, completed the analyses and looked at this, and observed conditions. And I don't see it a problem because of the appropriate traffic control they've placed.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Is there a left turn arrow for eastbound buses on --

MS. FLOCK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: -- Howard Street?

MS. FLOCK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Okay. Thank you.

MS. FLOCK: You're welcome.

MR. MURRAY: May I ask one last question? And that's with reference to the report. We submitted earlier a report, over your signature I believe, that reflects that nature of the testimony that you have given here before the Commission this evening and contains the statistical data and other recommendations of your office.

MS. FLOCK: That's correct.

MR. MURRAY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Does, I mean, I've come at this shopping center from both directions, and a couple things. What, I mean, what's to stop somebody from seeing that this is, oh, you know, you get
directions, go behind Target, it's right behind the
Target. And you're coming from the east and you're
heading down Howard and you see the Target and you see a
street, oh, I'll turn into there. I mean, that's sort
of, I mean, conceptually I appreciate that the access
will be to the, to the west of the site, but I don't
know how you can prevent, prevent that from being,
Hartrey being an access point.

The other thing is, and I don't know if that's
necessarily your purview to address. But the other
thing, my question is that the left turn lane in from,
on Howard into the site, is that long, is that lane long
enough? Because I feel like when I've come from that
direction I've sat there through several light cycles.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: It's, that was going to
be my point, yes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I mean, I --
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: It's horrible.
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: And I don't, it's been, I
mean, I've, go to Target all the time and I come from
all directions and it's not just a Saturday morning, it
could be, especially like a Tuesday evening or something
that can be a really bad spot to turn left.

MS. FLOCK: It could be longer. The fortunate
thing is it's a protected permissions left turn movement. So, yeah, you get your green arrow while everybody else is stopped, but then you get a green ball, and you've got westbound traffic processing traffic with two lanes. Eastbound, however, east of that access drive is only one lane. But, so you're getting more processing of traffic with two through lanes of westbound, and the fact that you get turn on a green ball. But anything can always be improved, you always want longer left turn lanes and longer right turn lanes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: And I guess my other question or comment is sort of directed to staff and people who've lived in Evanston for a long time. When the center first went up I believe Chicago constructed a wall between us and the center, and I think that came down, I don't know, Ann, back there, she might remember.

MR. MARINO: Alderman --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes, Alderman, right. So Chicago constructed a wall between us at one point, and I'm just wondering, is Chicago going to get upset with us if they perceive that there's a lot more backup on this, whether or not it is actually, you know, based on the traffic modeling, I mean, if all of a sudden there's
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a bunch of school buses or extra activity at a hour that Chicago doesn't like, is that going to be a problem? I just don't want to have another --

MR. MURRAY: I think it's an agreement between the cities with reference to the adjustment of those traffic controls, but Mr. Marino should know.

MR. MARINO: Yes, the wall that you described was a very unusual situation and occurrence. I think it was constructed at the request of the 50th Ward Alderman in Chicago to try and keep the shopping center from going forward. And the city was, the City of Evanston was successful in getting it removed as a result of a court process.

I'm not aware of --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Stop traffic from entering the neighborhoods, right, coming out of the mall?

MR. MARINO: No. The shopping center had not been built at that time, but was under consideration by the city and was about to move forward. And that's the time, on a Memorial Day weekend or Friday before Memorial Day that the median barrier was constructed. But that was removed about 10 months later, I believe. Yes, but I, so I think it was a very special unique
situation in the early '90s.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Seth?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: You know, I had the same concern that that traffic light getting in and out of the mall as it is today is horrendous, I rarely, I try to avoid that corner. I'm also concerned, so that's one of my biggest concerns about the project.

My other concern is the flow of traffic along the west edge of that parking lot, I don't know how safe that is now. And I do have some concerns increasing traffic in and out along that, that parking lot, that's right along the Jewel there.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Is there a three-way stop at the Jewel, sort of at the edge of the Jewel shopping center?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: There is, there is stops all along every access point to that drive. But I am concerned about the excess traffic and, that would be coming through there. But I guess it would be coming through there no matter what is happening behind the, the mall there.

MS. FLOCK: Well, and I can see that you've got a Target, you've got a Best Buy, you got retail. The intersection is hopping and bopping on a Saturday,
not on a, and it does attract traffic during the weekday evening peak hours.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: It is hopping and bopping every, on the peak hours all the time. I don't think I've ever been there where it is not busy. I mean, even during the day when you wouldn't expect it to be busy that, heading eastbound on Howard turning left there over the bridge is, is a very difficult situation.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: It's a good problem to have in Evanston where people --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: -- want to shop in our community.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes. But, you know, it's like I could see it getting worse.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I understand your point, Seth, but if we're worried about traffic, this is going to be one of the least traffic generating projects you can put back there. If we're talking about it being more commercial or being industrial, you're talking about large trucks, you're talking about much more, you know, people coming out at all different times, much more, many more trips. So, I mean, if that --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I did say, no matter
what would happen back there --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: -- we would have an increase in traffic.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I'm just saying that it does concern me having additional, sorry --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: You'd like to see it improved?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I would like to see it improved.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes. No, I guess, no, I understand your point. But this, as a project this is a really low traffic project. I'm not, I can't even envision what project would produce less traffic except what we currently have, which is a vacant building. So that's my only point.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I would agree and I am just expressing a concern.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Anything else?

MR. MURRAY: And I would then thank you Ms. Flock.

MS. FLOCK: Thank you.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Lenet, if you would, please?
And I know you haven't been here often, but if you could state your name and occupation and spell your last name?

MR. LENET: Yes. My name is Steve Lenet (L-e-n-e-t), I'm a landscape architect and urban planner with professional offices at 401 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Illinois.

MR. MURRAY: As a result of the interest of the Dachs School and this particular property did you agree to perform a study from the point of view of the change in zoning for this site on behalf of the school?

MR. LENET: Yes. I reviewed the application for the change in zoning with respect to the City of Evanston Ordinances, as well as the existing and surrounding land uses and zoning classifications.

MR. MURRAY: And I believe we participated in a little bit of interaction between the city and staff as well as this appearance this evening?

MR. LENET: Yes, we did.

MR. MURRAY: And would you tell us, please, what, if anything, did you determine as a result of your study? Would you --

MR. LENET: Yes. Well, we reviewed the existing land uses and zoning classifications. As
you're well aware the shopping center is zoned C-1, the residential area to the east is zoned R-2, the subject property and the Vineyard, which I was a, the landscape architect and planner on that project as well, is zoned I-2, but is actually had been incorporated into the application.

It's my professional opinion that the C-1 zoning is an appropriate zoning classification for the subject property as well as for the adjoining property to the west. I base that opinion, first of all, on the fact that the shopping center zoning is C-1, it is the really most recent development in that area, and therefore, the trend of development is clearly toward the C-1.

The site is no longer functional, in my opinion, or can be reasonably utilized for industrial purposes. The industrial properties today really want to be near the airport, want to be near the major transportation corridors. The site is relatively landlocked and lacks significant visibility.

It has, in my opinion, no utility for residential purposes, looking at the back of the shopping center, the service drive to the shopping center.
So the, and also the plans for this, I think, are significant and important in this consideration. The plans are internalized in terms of the activity areas, they are further buffered by use of the building in terms of the transportation corridor that serves the building and parking lots. So from every possible aspect, in my opinion, the C-1 zoning is appropriate.

I further looked at this in terms of the potential impact on the residential areas to the east. The Shore development as well as the residential area to the east are both relatively comparable in terms of age, they're both post-Korean War developed areas.

This, the residential area has seen significant development take place and change of development take place over that area with the development of the shopping center, the Scher development there, the absence of the Scher development in this area. And this area has maintained a very strong residential character, it's viability.

There's been absolutely no adverse impact either economically or from the planning and zoning standpoint on the use and enjoyment of those properties for single family purposes, they've maintained their character. There has not been a high turnover, there's
no deferred maintenance, there's no vacancies that are significant in this area. So it has really maintained a strong presence and character in spite of the adjoining uses to it. So I think that that's significant, especially when viewed in light of the, the plans for the area taking and internalizing the activity area.

I also reviewed the City of Evanston Comprehensive Plan as it relates to the subject property. The goal for the institutional area is to support the growth and evolution of institutions so long as the growth does not have an adverse impact upon the residentially zoned adjacent neighborhoods. In my opinion, this absolutely does meet that goal.

There is, in my 40 years of experience as an urban planner it's been my experience that nothing has a greater impact on residential areas especially, but on a city as a whole as vacant properties. They tend to deteriorate, they have a blighting influence, they affect the tax base of the community adversely in all circumstances.

So I think that the redevelopment, especially the adaptive re-use of this site for the proposed use is really consistent with the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Evanston, and really, I think, is going to be an
MR. MURRAY: And in the, part, did you develop, during the course of your study, an opinion relative to the compatibility of the existing development or the proposed development in the C-1 District --

MR. LENET: Yes.

MR. MURRAY: -- to the adjacent properties?

MR. LENET: Yes, I have. In addition to, to working on the Vineyard I've looked at, as a resident of Evanston, the City of Evanston, maybe uniquely, it really integrates institutions into the fabric of residential neighborhoods, perhaps better than any other community in the metropolitan area. So it's very common to have churches, and elementary schools, and the hospital very much integrated into the fabric of the neighborhood. And I think that this is consistent with that, with that development pattern in the city.

MR. MURRAY: Based upon what you've heard tonight as the intended use of this facility, do you see any level of incompatibility with either residential or commercial uses?

MR. LENET: No. I think that this, as was mentioned, I think this such a low intensity use, and
that is further augmented by the site plan and the
traffic pattern, that I, in my opinion, there's
absolutely no incompatibility and that it is a really
terrific adaptive re-use of this site.

MR. MURRAY: Do you have an opinion with
reference to the, the impact of a change in use to
commercial from industrial with reference to property
values in the area?

MR. LENET: Yes. It's my considered opinion
this will have absolutely no impact on property values
in the area. As I said, nothing has a greater impact on
property values and uses and enjoyment of properties
than vacant and abandoned properties.

This property has been vacant for far too
long, especially given the, in the context of what
Evanston has experienced over the last 15 or 20 years
with redevelopment taking place so rapidly throughout
the city and throughout all the neighborhoods. In spite
of that this property has remained vacant for an
extraordinary length of time. And even the adjoining
property, when the Vineyard came in, was vacant.

So I think that, in my opinion, to directly
answer your question, in my opinion, it'll have
absolutely no adverse impact on property values in this
MR. MURRAY: And, finally, in the course of your study you determined that there were utilities and sewers and waters supplied to this site?

MR. LENET: Yes. There are adequate services to all aspects to service this site.

MR. MURRAY: Do you see any significant increase in city service by a school as opposed to an industrial site for either police and/or fire service?

MR. LENET: No. It's my expectation that this would have no increased impact on city services whatsoever.

MR. MURRAY: That's all of my questions. I would invite inquiry from the Commission.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Coleen?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Hi. I feel really mixed about this, it's more of a comment and then you can, there may be a question involved as well, as I'm want to do. Is the, I really like what's happening here, I think that this is a great project, and especially an adaptive re-use. And where I'm struggling is the whole tax base issue, I think that probably most of us up here are struggling with, with the same thing.

And so there's a tug here for me where, like I
said, I think that the project is probably what's, you know, a great project for this site, it's not been, you know, able to turnover. We are currently getting taxes from it even though it's vacant. So just to sort of throw it out there, you know, the hundred pound elephant room, that's the reality of what we're probably all thinking.

And so following up on that, is, have you done any, and I don't know if this is directed to you or someone else on the development team, of what positive financial impact would the school have to the city? Meaning utility taxes, meaning building permits, I'm sorry, I don't have a whole list on my hand, but you know what I'm talking about. What would be added, money, revenue coming into the city if this was built versus the approximate 200,000, is that right, Dennis?

MR. MARINO: No, it's 100, I think it's about 115,000 right now.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Okay. I'm sorry. But that's a partially assessed building.

MR. MARINO: That's a vacant property.

Currently I, what I mentioned in 2001 is --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, okay, I'm sorry.

So I think that that needs to be addressed. And I'm not
saying that you have those numbers --

MR. LENET: No.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: -- right off the top of the head now, but I think it's something that we, as a Commission, would want to see. I'm seeing also other heads nodding. Okay?

MR. LENET: I think, obviously, this is a significant issue for the City of Evanston, not just this location, but citywide. Clearly, among the things that you need to consider is that, one is that the assessment has already dropped, it cut in half. If the site were to be cleared it would, it would go down again. That is in addition to, at some point, it's my opinion, that a vacant building will begin to impact on the residential character of the area, and have an additional potential impact on property values there.

The other thing is, is that besides property taxes, which is not insignificant, the other thing that is, is significant is sales tax revenue. I think it's one and half percent comes back to the City of Evanston under home rule. So that the addition of the faculty and other people who will be shopping at this, at the center here, I think will have a bearing on it.

And it's my opinion, although I haven't been
asked to do a specific study of this although I have
done fiscal impact studies and presented them to this
Commission on other occasions, I believe that while it
won't approach $115,000 in sales tax, that would be over
a million and a half dollars in just additional revenue
and sales tax, I do think that there will be a, a
benefit from additional sales tax. And you will be
eliminating a vacant, potentially blighting influence
and that impact on the city.

So when you, excuse me, when you look at that
in concert, in combination with all of these factors I
think that it has a significant positive impact,
especially when you consider there's really almost
nothing else that this site is appropriate for. Even if
you had it as a public park, if you cleared it and
turned it into ball fields they would have more traffic
and impact than this proposed use.

So there really, when you consider the
universe of potential uses and impacts, I think this is
probably as positive as it gets.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But I want to go back
to, it would be very helpful to have the hard numbers.
And I'm not disagreeing with you and I'm not trying to
be combative in any way. It's just that when we look at
our bottom line at the city, you know, yes, of course, having a property that is, looks better and is better for the residents is good, but it doesn't keep the lights on in City Hall. And so that's all of, all I'm saying is I think, you know, actually hard numbers would be helpful.

MR. LENET: Yeah, trust me, I've seen combative, I know combative.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Okay. And we are also aware that the community, this center, and this school will be served, serving already shops at the Jewel, we've heard testimony on how the Jewel is already one of the most successful Jewels in, of its kind that targets a certain shopping group.

So I agree 100 percent that it is better than having a building sitting there empty, or a building razed. I believe that the project will probably even increase values of the properties around because there is something in there. But I think we should still examine impact on, on property tax and to the bottom line here in Evanston. Otherwise, we would not be doing, taking our responsibility seriously, that's part of our jobs here.

MR. MURRAY: May I add a response to that
particular aspect of the inquiry? In addition to the potential for generation of, let's call it random taxes that might be generated by persons working on the site.

There is also an area of the law that deals with use which are not necessarily for, or not-for-profit purposes or charitable or educational. And there will be some of those uses contained within this particular facility, which in all likelihood would generate a use tax with reference to the banquet facility, there could be a use tax with reference to some of the food preparation areas. In addition to that there, for the banquet use itself there is sales tax involved which would generate a substantial amount of money because of the, the nice aspects of a, of a --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Perhaps.

MR. MURRAY: -- a prepared and --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Perhaps.

MR. MURRAY: Well, I think most of those facilities are required to report their ROTA just like a restaurant and/or other facility. And in addition to all of those types of items there have been, as I indicated originally, some discussions undertaken between some of the policy makers of the city and ourselves with reference to the issue of tax and
contributions in lieu.

Clearly, there is a philosophical antagonism between a religious or non-for-profit institution either contributing or paying, or obligating itself to undertake the payment of taxes. That is a firmly trenched position, which we are investigating, dealing with on a philosophical and a practical basis, and we acknowledge that there have been other efforts to obtain participation by not-for-profit institutions.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I think all we're asking for is an, excuse me, I think all we're asking for is an understanding of the full impact. Is that correct? I mean, we're not trying to have a philosophical discussion here as to, to the points that you're bringing up. I think we just want to understand the bottom line impact. I think, speaking --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And I think that that's, it's what City Council is going to ask for too, so we're actually probably just giving you a little bit of leeway time.

MR. MURRAY: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Okay.

MR. MURRAY: In my view, the Commission has exceeded its particular element of authority other than
to express its concern. Don't misunderstand me, I'm not saying we can't talk about --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Okay. Can I --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: You know --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Can I just say, I say one thing? I don't feel prepared to vote on this, and I don't know if other people do either. If Dave Galloway was here I think he'd be very upset that there's not enough information about the facade and the exterior treatment.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: -- see anything with regard to this --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right, and I haven't seen --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: -- and all of this stuff until tonight.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: -- the traffic study, and I think that we need some more information about what the fiscal, like, we need a real fiscal impact of this because I think we're all struggling with this because this is going to be taking a large property off the tax roles. And it's debatable if it would sit vacant, if we get an industrial use. But I want to see what this facility would generate in lieu of that.
That's, the other thing, and I think that there's some things that haven't been explored. The LEED and the green architect of the, of the site. I think we need to know more about that, because that's a benefit. And, you know, we don't, I mean, I'm going to feel a little hesitant to start delving into, you know, what this means for the city coffers, but I do want to see what this bringing in public benefit.

And I think right now I'm struggling, if you're bussing people in I'm not sure if this is kids from Chicago that are coming to school in Evanston. I want to understand what the public benefit is to the community of Evanston. And I think that the applicant is starting to think about things in terms of what different, what the facility could be used. And I just want to see a little bit more firm and concrete before we start voting on this.

MR. MURRAY: We would be pleased to supply that information, I'm not trying to duck or hide from that level of inquiry.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And I'm not suggesting you are. But I'm just saying, I don't know how much more, I mean, I don't know if there's people who've come to speak publicly about this, but it seems like there's
not much more, we can keep asking questions, but I would rather let you guys spend your time putting this stuff together.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Additionally, number one, I don't believe we're overstepping our bounds, so I kind of think that was out of line, okay, I don't appreciate that. Number two, it was, they did vote against it in the SPARC --

MR. MURRAY: No, they did not.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: -- it was four and three was against, yes?

MR. LENET: Four, three basically not to recommend against it.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: They voted not to recommend against it? Got it. Okay, so I misunderstood. Well, we would like to, since we have not been, that happened today we haven't even read the recommendations or the arguments that have come out of there to help us make a decision.

I believe this is a very good use of the property, but for us to make a informed decision, which I think is, not I think, I know is our responsibility then we need to have the use of other bits of information. That's --
COMMISSIONER STALEY: I don't think anybody's asking us to vote are they? And I need to go to the restroom, can we take a break here?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Enough is enough, you know.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And, Jim, can I ask you one quick question?

MR. MURRAY: Sure.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Do you have more presenters?

MR. MURRAY: I think we have no more initial presentation.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay.

MR. MURRAY: We are more than willing to respond to the inquiries and suggestions, and --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Do we have sign in sheets, Tracy?

MR. MURRAY: We would be happy to --

MR. LENET: Just very quickly, we can, we'll be glad to provide a fiscal impact study. It will make, inherently must make certain presumptions about the use and potential re-use of the site.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Could you hold on one second. Tracy, are there names on that list?
MS. NORFLEET: There's no one signed up.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay. If you do want to reply I think we should take our break, since we've just lost Commissioner Staley. So let's, I motion to have a 10 minute break and then, you hold that thought, I've had my light on for at least half an hour so we've got a few more things to discuss. No, no, that's fine, I think we just have a break.

(Off the record.)

CHAIRMAN WOODS: We're going to let Steve complete, and then Robin's going to be up next. And what I would like to get on the table is any questions or requests of the applicant, and then perhaps adjourn for this evening and have them come back with responses to the questions and inquiries.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Great idea, Jim.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. Steve?

MR. LENET: I think, before we informally took the break, I started to make the point that the fiscal impact study that we will prepare per your request is going to have to make certain assumptions regarding land uses and certain other factors.

The only other thing I would, I would say to you that in, even with all of these other things that
you have asked for I would like to reiterate that in my professional opinion the appropriate zoning classification for this property, absent any use or anything else, but the appropriate zoning classification for this property is C-1.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. Robin?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Thank you. I have a number of questions. One is a general comment just reiterating that of my fellow Commissioners. I know that many of you are veterans of this process, therefore, it was surprising that we hadn't been able to review the SPARC notes and SPARC decision prior to this meeting because SPARC was scheduled for the same day, that's beyond your purview.

Although the traffic study, which contains a lot of useful information about this project and dated July 30th arrived, two copies, this evening at 7:00 on the dias here. So in terms of our own preparation and questions, do appreciate, we take time out of our weekends to be able to come prepared to these kinds of meetings. And this is a, this is a big project, this is 5.1 acres in terms of a building, it's a major re-use of the site. And so I know we're going to continue that, but I would like to express me surprise at the procedure
this evening.

So with, in terms of looking at some of the questions I have for next time, I think the issue of payment in lieu of taxes is an important one. I haven't lived in Brookline but I spent many years in Cambridge directly prior to Evanston. And prior to Cambridge I spent a lot of time in Williamstown, Mass. And one of the most striking differences between the east coast and Evanston is that somehow in other states that towns have been able to get payment in lieu of taxes to the tune of millions of dollars from their institutions. I know that's a question that we've been wrestling with in Evanston.

You mentioned that Evanston is well integrated with, in terms of institutional use, in terms of neighborhoods, and parks, and the churches, and the schools. And I would say Evanston's almost too well integrated with institutional uses in terms of percentage of land value that's taxable versus non-taxable.

So I think the payment in lieu of taxes in terms of the Comprehensive General Plan, to which we are bound to examine Plan Commission projects, which very clearly states, and I didn't bring my Comprehensive
General Plan this week but I'll certainly bring it next time we meet and I'll be able to quote verbatim. But the economic development of Evanston vis a vis a proposed development is a serious consideration for this Commission. I don't think it oversteps our bounds at all.

So I'd like to hear more about the payment in lieu of taxes just so that it's on the record moving forward to the City Council. Certainly, the negotiations are up to them and that is entirely their purview, and I'm most comfortable with them making those recommendations.

However, I do think it does make sense for us to bring it up here. And to say that it's something that we're concerned, I will speak for myself, I'm concerned about, and I'm concerned about going forward to take five, at least from one memo received, also unfortunately tonight, but the subject property is five acres, 5.1 acres in area. It's a 62,500 square foot floor area. And that to me is a significant amount of space in Evanston.

We hear often that there's no where in Evanston to go but up because we're bound by the lake, we're bound by our, our property limitations of this
town, we're only a certain number of square miles, and that continues to be true.

And so because, I realize that the property has been vacant for a while, but to take it off the tax roles in perpetuity, and I would hope if it was turned into a school that that school would be there for many generations, that it would be the, the tradition to have a wonderful facility for those students that they, they could send their children to, they could send their grandchildren to. And I'm sure that the community, the Jewish community is thinking in terms of generations, because it's a community that's particularly good about that and cares deeply about it.

So I think that that's important from both a planning perspective, a tax perspective, and a community, and a Jewish community perspective. And so that's also sort of an interesting idea in terms of the community.

If, in terms of no impact on adjacent values of the property, I think that's probably true with this school. And I think it's true also that being in the area will improve those property values a little bit than a vacant building. If the building continued to be vacant, by your very own arguments, I don't actually
think it would become a blight because nobody can find it, as you've well said, it's unmarked, people don't know it's there. So I don't see leaving it vacant as, for many more years is creating a sort of social problem.

But the questions I guess I have for your would be then to address stronger, the LEED issue and what kind of commitment to LEED and environmental certification you could get. There's a big article in the New York Times, it was either today or yesterday, the day before, about a major lawsuit in New York where they've built a school on a contaminated site, and it's a big problem, I don't have the article with me, I direct your attention to it.

As long, my understanding is that there is some contamination possibly on this site, and I think we need to ask some sort of documentation of that condition. And if you were doing geothermal whether there would be any, any impact, we need to know more about the geothermal.

I echo my Commissioners in that I think the LEED certification is an important and very laudable aspect of it. I think adaptive re-use is essential and wonderful, and one of the biggest proponents as far as I
can be of this for the historical value of architecture, maybe not this building in particular, but particularly.
Yes, so that's also another issue.
The social hall and the banquet, the banquet building, I'd like to know a little bit more about that for next time too. In the beginning you mentioned that maybe the community would have use of it. And I thought, that's good. And then later on he said something about renting it.
And, again, to do with the community, in terms of the taxes they are potentially losing, having some sort of formal and informal agreement where a certain number of hours it may actually donated to, can some of the community groups, other community groups outside your community. That's something I would like you at least to think about in terms of giving back to the community.
And that's all my questions.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Chuck?
COMMISSIONER STALEY: No, I decided I did not want to ask the questions that I was thinking of.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Stu?
COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: As Robin said, this is a, this is a huge project, it's not just five acres, but
as I understand it it's closer to 10 acres. But there
are so many aspects to this project that, that weigh in
favor of approval, but I am very concerned about the
impact on the loss of, of the property tax, a revenue
here.

And perhaps I should direct this to staff.
What is the, the possibility of having an independent
evaluation of long-term development of this property
with a view to, perhaps, determining what we might
expect, what we might reasonably expect 10 years from
now, 15 years from now in terms of revenue generation,
property tax revenue generation?

Because what we're hearing so far is this
property is pretty much dead, it's not, it's not worth
very much, and it may generate a little bit in terms of
sales tax and so on. But essentially the school would
be doing us a favor by putting something productive on
this, on this site.

But might this be a case that would warrant
independent evaluation?

MR. MARINO: Yes. I think certainly an
independent feasibility or market study could be done.
You have the experience of the past three to five years
to, that you've heard about tonight. But I think, you
know, any feasibility study, the further it goes out the
more limited it is, and the accuracy of its forecast.
And given the current, state of the current economy the
next year, year and a half is not necessarily going to
be a typical time.

But beyond that I think there, there is an
issue is, of, you know, what kind of industrial, light
industrial resurgence will there be, what might be the
role of the city being more aggressive in terms of TIF
financing as a possibility. Those kinds of things that,
you know, could capture a market, perhaps. But I don't
think we can be certain of that at all, you know. I
think it's speculative and it would be based on whatever
assumptions people might put together.

So I, you know, I wouldn't want to, you know,
suggest that anything like that would be conclusive one
way or the other.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Is this in a TIF?
MR. MARINO: The TIF is to the south, it
includes the totality of the shopping center, but it is
immediately abutting a TIF.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Okay.
COMMISSIONER STALEY: Could I ask a question
of Dennis?
MR. MARINO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I assume, did Shore leave at the same time the shopping center came in, or did Shore --

MR. MARINO: No.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: No?

MR. MARINO: No. Shore was there for quite a while, I don't remember the exact number of years after the shopping center was built. Shore was very cooperating in doing some things that would allow the shopping center to be constructed.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: How did Shore get ingress and egress and operate its facility there when it was there. Then if the shopping center was already, were they going out and through Kedzie --

MR. MARINO: Right.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: -- and through the parking lot? Because there are big trucks parked in there right now even.

MR. MARINO: Right, yes. The site on which the shopping center located, some of you may know, is the former Bell and Howe facility, a very large facility, and there was always access, I believe, on the west, you know, back to Shore, and Shore has its own
private drive, back there is Shore Drive. So kind of --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: But Shore got to Howard Street down, you know, through that drive along the west side?

MR. MARINO: Since 1990 that's been the case, but it's also been open on the east side to Hartrey as well, although there was often sort of an arrangement with the neighborhood that Shore would minimize the number of vehicles that would go east through the neighborhood and ideally not have any do that.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Mr. Murray, am I correct, is payment in lieu of taxes part of the conversation currently?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Just to clarify a couple things, Mr. Murray, you handed out some photographs.

MR. MURRAY: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: The last two pages say, Pitner facade, Pitner entry, I assume that's Hartrey?

MR. MURRAY: I think we mislabeled those, they, it ought to be Hartrey.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. So I was trying to figure out where Pitner was and --

MR. MURRAY: It was the last one, Pitner the
CHAIRMAN WOODS: And then just to clarify in my own mind, is the western most of this three building joined together, is that a two-story building currently?

MR. MURRAY: A portion of it, yes. It has a, if you will, a mezzanine, I think was the reference in earlier suggestions. But there is a second floor that is at the far west end of --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And is it the school's intent to tear that out or to leave it partially in place, or is there a use for that second floor?

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Hedlund will answer --

MR. HEDLUND: Yes, hi, Nevin Hedlund, (H-e-d-l), okay, you have that. The portions that are, have some second floor space are the two additions here. This portion here has a mechanical mezzanine in the center here. This does have a, some second floor space. Now, another asset of this building is that it's really a big one-floor building, so we don't have any ADA issues.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

MR. HEDLUND: Which is a great thing. So we're not envisioning, necessarily using any of the second floor space at this time. That's part of the --
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Potential future expansion?

MR. HEDLUND: -- potential future should we add elevators and so forth.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay.

MR. HEDLUND: But what we are using the two-story space for, which is for the benefit of the project is --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: The front entrance.

MR. HEDLUND: -- the gymnasium.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

MR. HEDLUND: We're going to use that and then we'll have a two-story entry location as well. And that's what we show in the rendering, having two stories worth of glass here. So it's an asset that we're using, again, taking away square footage from the building and using it for the --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Sure.

MR. HEDLUND: -- benefit of the project.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That was the only questions I had. Johanna?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Can I just add, is it possible to get from the city, the fire and police report, like their input on this project as a school?
And then also, a few hearings ago we had a developer bring, several developers have done this, I guess, actually, samples of what they're going to use and what, the facade treatment. And I just would have really liked to see, I don't, I can't really visualize this building the way I'm seeing these, whatever the perspective, I just can't get into it, I can't, like, see, imagine the building that I've, you know, seen before looking like this. I mean, I can, but I just, I don't, it looks to computer generated or something. I don't know what it is, it's just, it doesn't --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, it is computer generated.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: It is computer generated. I've seen a lot of different renderings that just, you can sort of understand the depth of the space.

MR. HEDLUND: Sometimes we build a full-scale model of it, but that's more expensive than we can afford for this particular one. But we can generate more views and possibly bring some other aids that would help you grasp that.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, but I think we'd like to know what the black material that makes up the vertical columns is, you know, that kind of stuff.
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: What would --
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. We'd like material samples.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Be prepared to talk about the skin of the building and the glazing of the glass.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Exactly. Coleen?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: This question is actually for staff. The, when the Vineyard building was built, or did it come before PC, and were there any discussions about payment in lieu of taxes of Vineyard? I just, was before my time here. So if anybody could address that'd be great?

MR. MARINO: We'd have to look at the record and get back to you on that for your next meeting.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: And if you care to really look at the records relative to Vineyard they are very, many boxes. There are many boxes that have to do with Vineyard.

MR. MARINO: Yes, yes. But you were talking about the most recent application to move forward with, with the site.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

MR. MARINO: That's what you're referring to.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: What happened with the
tax, yeah, I guess, I had may have opened a can of worms by Jim's face, expression. And --

MR. MARINO: Well, we'll get back to you with the record on that.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Great.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, go ahead, I'm going to wrap up, try to wrap up.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, we can wrap up in a second. But Jim mentioned, sort of, that Vineyard was apparently a long-standing religious entity in Evanston. So it would nice to know, they did give up a property that then generated taxes when they got the new, okay, I don't want to, I don't know, I wasn't here.

MR. LENET: Real quickly, real quickly. The Vineyard was originally meeting in Evanston High School. They purchased a property on Ridge that was litigated in Federal Court, the Vineyard won the Federal Court case, and it was all part of a large compromise. And the space now was granted as a special use under the existing zoning classification, in part to make the litigation go away.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I had just one last environmental question for next time too. In the renderings that we see now, and I know your budget is
probably constrained so I'm not trying to add complexities to your constrained budget, and I appreciate, we don't need a model, I would think we'll just want, some more renderings will do on the computer is fine.

But there's a lot of surface pavement here, and there's a lot of roof as well. And whether you would consider a green roof, whether you can investigate that. I mean, the students at Harvard planted our own green roof, you don't have to answer right now, in fact, I'd rather that you wait for Galloway. But since he's the, he's the real architect.

So the green roof question and also --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Ouch.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, but in case someone asks those kinds of questions. No, I've never seen Jim really take the architecture to task. He can tonight because the floor's all his. No, I'm sorry, Jim.

No, he's the one who does ask these kinds of questions. And then the other thing was the pavement, whether you would do permeable pavers in some places. I mean, it's just, I know it's just a big concrete parking lot now, but in terms of --
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Asphalt.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: There you go. But there's a huge environmental impact on these big flat impermeable surfaces. And so whether you would consider whether you're going to need to resurface anyway, whether you could have these permeable pavers or anything else that Jim might, or if that's serving as an engineered barrier currently to whatever's underneath that site?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Good point.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And I think they're, on the traffic side of things people would like to understand a little bit more about either directional signage, making pathways clearer, you know. Right now there's a guardrail basically that separates the rear drive of the mall from Scher drive, and is that the most appropriate solution, or is there something better that should be done.

Along the lines of the parking lot issue, you know, you have some landscaping, obviously, that you've already shown. Is there a potential for more landscape treatment to reduce the heat island effect, blah, blah, blah.

MR. HEDLUND: Well, we can address those
specifically when we come back to you.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: right.

MR. HEDLUND: But the general nature of the response would be, yes, we are improving the site in all of those specific areas by decreasing the amount of parking. We have future area here that we can remove pavement from. And we can balance the issues on the roof as well as, but, and initially we actually are removing some roof too and making the green space as a playground area. So we can address those.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. But, nevertheless, when I look at the plan as you've presented it I still see a lot of impermeable surface of whatever quality. I think the question of whether disturbing that and causing environmental damage --

MR. HEDLUND: Sure.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: -- experience with children, again, this is a really serious issue.

MR. HEDLUND: I just want to make sure that if we remove too much parking you won't make us put it back in? Is that --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, no. I don't think you should remove any parking. By permeable pavers I mean where the rain, where the water can drain...
and be recaptured by a system, and the heat created by
the parking lot.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Quick question. Is this
can be shared use parking with Vineyard for their --
MR. HEDLUND: No, no, this is --
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay.
MR. HEDLUND: No, not at all.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. I just wanted to
find out if that was clear, because in that case I'd
take a close look at the Zoning Ordinance and see how
many parking spaces really are required for the
function --
MR. HEDLUND: Not at all, no.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Because --
MR. MURRAY: We believe that Vineyard uses the
Water Reclamation property to --
CHAIRMAN WOODS: I understand. I just, I'm
not sure, you know, based on what I know about schools,
and unfortunately, that does happen to be one of my
specialties having spent my 25 year career doing
schools, that's a lot of parking for the size school
that it is.
The other things that, first of all, site's
contaminated or not contaminated?
MR. MURRAY: I can't give you a specific answer to that. I believe that there were at least initial studies --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Was there a phase one environmental done --

MR. MURRAY: Well, I'm pretty certain --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- at the purchase?

MR. MURRAY: -- the question was whether --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay.

MR. MURRAY: -- phase two, and we'll --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: If we can, okay.

MR. MURRAY: Yeah, and we'll make it available --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. If you could forward that to us. You know, now that staff has the traffic study I'm sure they'll make copies available to all of us, we would like, for the next meeting, additional information on the LEED aspect of things, the geothermal adaptive re-use, whatever other, you know, even if you looked at a LEED checklist and gave us an idea of what things you're going to go after.

We would like staff to review the traffic study and let us know their opinion. Similarly, as was requested earlier, a Public Works review of the various
aspects of things as well. The fiscal impact study, we had talked about the environmental. And then also, I think, the other issues of fees in lieu of taxes, or payments in lieu of taxes, however you want to phrase it, and community use of the facility.

I think, did I miss anything?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, that's good.

Motion to adjourn?

(Off the record.)

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. Committee reports, quickly.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Okay, well, to, also do we want to schedule a nominating meeting for December or --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Actually, for the December regular meeting we are going to have, as part of the agenda, the discussion of positions, officers, whatever you want to call it.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Great.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, we formally did an executive committee, we're now going to do with the full Commission.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Good plan.

MR. MURRAY: Just a quick question, if I may,
not to pour gasoline on the fire over your head, but in the past this Commission has recommended that there be some sort of contribution or that the public benefit would be satisfied by a particular methodology, including a contribution to either the, the mayor's fund with reference to housing or some other things.

It has not, to my knowledge, involved itself in specific directives to the City Council. And I just want to make sure that if we --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I don't think it's our intent to get into a negotiation.

MR. MURRAY: That's all I was going to --

MR. HEDLUND: And just a quick follow-up, what would be the next opportunity to meet with you?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: The next meeting of the Plan Commission is December 10th.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Do we have anything on the agenda?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: We have two items on the agenda, we have this and we have the executive, formal executive committee discussions of positions and --

MR. HEDLUND: Okay. So we will be able to have the, some time with you on the 10th?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, absolutely.
MR. HEDLUND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: We do executive committee, or that process first and let the applicants know that that could take anywhere from five minutes to an hour? I mean, give them an estimate so that people aren't wasting --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. I think that would be a really good idea, is that maybe we take up our business at 7:00, and at 8:00 we would address this project and anything else that may come up for the agenda of which --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: At this point we don't know if there could be anything else.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Tracy, could you remind me of the date for actually --

MS. NORFLEET: Sure, it's Tuesday the 18th.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Thanks. Tuesday the 18th at 7:00 we're having our Rules Committee Meeting. And do you know what room?

MS. NORFLEET: 2404.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: 2404, thank you.

MR. HEDLUND: Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Motion to adjourn?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Second.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Second.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

(Whereupon, the hearing on the above-entitled cause was concluded at 9:42 p.m.)