CITY OF EVANSTON

PLAN COMMISSION

CASE NO.: ZPC 08-02-M

RE: ZONING ORDINANCE MAP AMENDMENT - 912-946 PITNER AVENUE. An application by Joseph Birgman, property owner of 920 Pitner Avenue, and Andy Spatz, property of 940 Avenue, to consider an amendment to the map of the Zoning Ordinance for the property located at 912-946 Pitner Avenue.

RE: CONTINUATION - DRAFT DOWNTOWN PLAN AND ZONING RECOMMENDATIONS. The Downtown Plan Committee of the Plan Commission has been leading a downtown planning process. Residents, businesses, institutions, and other property owners have participated throughout the process and have provided their ideas for the future of downtown.

Transcribed Report of Proceedings of a public hearing on the above captioned matter, held March 12, 2008 at the Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, 2nd Floor, Evanston, Illinois, at 7:10 p.m. and presided over by J. Woods, Chair.
PRESENT:

J. WOODS, Chair     L. WIDMAYER
J. NYDEN               C. BURRUS
R. SCHULDENFREI       C. STALEY
D. GALLOWAY           S. McMURRAY
S. OPDYCKE            S. BOWIE

ALSO PRESENT:

D. MARINO, Assistant Director for Planning
B. DUNKLEY, Zoning Administrator
T. NORFLEET, General Planner
J. AIELLO, Assistant City Manager
CHAIRMAN WOODS: I'd like to call to order the Evanston Plan Commission meeting of Wednesday, March 12th, 2008, 7:00 p.m. Welcome all. We do in fact have a quorum and so we'll go to the second agenda item, which is the approval of January 9th and February 13th meeting minutes that's in your packets and hopefully you have all the minutes and proper stuff.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I move approval.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Second.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. All in favor of approval of the, we're doing January 9th?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: January 9th meeting minutes and such, in favor, all in favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN WOODS: All opposed? Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Hearing none, motion carries.

Okay. Can we consider February 13th?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Move approval.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Second.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Any discussion? All in
favor?

    (Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN WOODS:  Any opposed?

    (No response.)

CHAIRMAN WOODS:  Hearing none, motion carries.

Next item of business is the recognition of outgoing member, Sharon Bowie. Sharon is here at her final Plan Commission meeting. And I would like to say that I've been now a Commission member for four years, and you know, Sharon has sat with us through the majority of those meetings and I would like to voice my appreciation of the time and effort that she's put into doing those, and when she hasn't been able to be here, to reading the transcripts and all of the stuff that goes along with that vote so that she was able to vote on issues.

    And so, Sharon, I want to express my appreciation and the appreciation of the rest of the Commission.

COMMISSIONER BOWIE:  Okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER:  I'd just like to thank you for the good times we went through. We went through some very interesting times.

COMMISSIONER BOWIE:  To say the least.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Very good, and thank you for all your help.

COMMISSIONER BOWIE: Thank you.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Jim, could I make a request?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: It's real easy. I'm the Chair of the Rules Committee. Could anybody email me who plans to be on the Rules Committee? As well as any citizen groups or individual citizens that you think would like to have input on our processes, I am going to be putting together, doing kind of a facilitating meeting with those folks to get input on how to be, get input from more citizens as well as make our process more streamlined. So, we'd like citizens' input so we stay inclusionary. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And one item that I would like to refer to this Committee for discussion and maybe some determination on which is the idea that at some point in time we might institute some sort of rules about time limits such that like Planning & Development and City Council has. Something that would be
reasonable, and I don't profess to know what that would be at this point in time. That's for the Rules Committee in terms of --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right. Yes, I mean, I think one of the things that, you know, we want citizen input from is, you know, I think, and Stu has brought this up at other times as well as other Commissioners have, we hear from the same people over and over again and I think that's partly because people, you know, get tired or they don't want to stand or whatever. And so, it's really trying to get more input instead of less input. So, even though time limits may sound not democratic, I really think it's more of we want to hear from everybody that shows up instead of people taking off and we don't get to hear from them or getting tired when they're standing in line or something like that.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And perhaps with some sort of time limit the input would be more straightforward, less convoluted and it's more meaningful as a result.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I'm sorry, did you have an input for that?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: No, we were talking. I said there was one particular person and he'd mentioned
something, I said no, I thought he should have twice as
much time as anybody.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS:  Oh, okay.  No, I'd like
any input from everyone.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: It's frivolous. That
was frivolous, I don't want to get frivolous. I'll pay
more attention.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. The next item of
business is Item IV. Zoning Ordinance Map Amendment
Public Hearing, ZPC-08-02-M, 912-946 Pitner Avenue. And
Mr. Murray is here to speak on that. The only question
I would have is whether this is something we're going to
go ahead and forward to the Zoning Committee to address
as we traditionally don't.

MR. MURRAY: I certainly hope it is because I
was advised to pass it --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So moved.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: So moved. Second?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. Now all in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

MR. MURRAY: Will that be on the 15th?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That would be on the agenda
of the 15th.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: But not necessarily likely --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Not necessarily likely to be gotten to.

MR. MURRAY: There is someone that's being represented who is in the immediate vicinity. Mr. Johnston has a lawyer here this evening -- in the back row. And it was my intention to include him so that we could be similarly notified as to the time and place of the next meeting.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: 15th of what?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes, it will be potentially introduced in the 15th of April.

MR. MURRAY: And what position? I know there are several other --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: There is one other item agenda.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes, one other item.

MR. MURRAY: Okay. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, the hearing in the above-entitled cause was continued to April 15, 2008.)
CHAIRMAN WOODS: And that brings us to Item V. Continuation of the Draft Downtown Plan and Zoning Recommendations. And I guess at this point I should stipulate that I have read the whole transcript of the last meeting as I was not able to attend and am up to speed as much as transcripts can do that. And with that, I guess I'll --

MR. SMITH: -- those changes.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Actually, I forgot one other item, sorry. No, no, no, it's related to this. Last time, we talked about parking lot items and I'm assuming you still have those listed out, and before we kind of, we're going to probably be adding more to the parking lot tonight because we're getting into areas that are very contentious, what do we plan to do with those parking lot items? I think that needs to be discussed openly, you know, of how do we plan to go about making, we're making changes to this plan of things that we don't agree on.

So far, it's been very, we agree on almost everything or minor tweaks. I'm just, I don't have any suggestions necessarily but I'm throwing it out for discussion.
COMMISSIONER STALEY: Are you talking about turning parking lots into parks and that thing?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, no, I'm sorry. The term of parking lot items, the facilitation term, I apologize.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Sorry, I'm thinking about parking lots. I wasn't thinking --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I'm sorry, I apologize. I went into facilitator mode. The things that we said we couldn't agree on last time, and we put aside --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: We agree to disagree and --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: We agree to disagree and put those items to the side to say we can come back to.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Right.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And as we go forward tonight, these areas, there are going to be a lot of times that we don't, that we disagree tonight. And so, we need to come back to those items. And how do we anticipate the process for discussing those items and how they will be changed or left in place in the Downtown Plan? So, that's what I'm throwing out there is really talking about the process for those items that
are contentious. And please, jump in. We're happy with 
thoughts, ideas.

MR. MARINO: I'm thinking of one item on the 
list at this point and one that I can clearly remember 
which is the Chicago-Davis discussion about two 
buildings in particular as to whether or not the 
petition should be extended. That was a pretty ominous 
discussion -- meeting last time.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right. Right. And I 
think that, yes, I think you guys have a running list of 
those, right?

MR. BISHOP: We do.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right.

MR. BISHOP: Well, we've annotated the draft 
with those that we understand to be items held for 
discussion.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right.

MR. BISHOP: That is the only one in the draft 
so if we miss some, now will be the time to -- 

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, yes, yes, you're 
right. I think we ended up agreeing but I know tonight 
we will have more of those.

MR. BISHOP: Yes, sure.
MR. MARINO: I think the methodology of annotating the draft should reflect whether it's contentious or whether it's a difference of opinion. It might be a good way to proceed if not the only way to proceed, but I think that's a likely way to do it is then establishing it further, you know, once we go through that process.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You know, what we might suggest since this is a plan going to Council is that if there is an item where a majority believes one way and a sufficient minority, and we probably have to decide how many that is, believes another approach, that incorporating that as an alternative minority opinion in a sidebar along the text might provide both. I'm assuming that doesn't mean one person, at least three people or something of that nature which someone should decide.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: So, a majority of a quorum?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: So, we vote as we go along?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: At some point, if you've got a disagreement, you're going to have to make
a selection and that's going to have to come down to a vote.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Verbally.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And the point is if there is, you know, a strong minority opinion, it can be included as a minority alternative as a sidebar along the sides so that those reading it will say, you know, here is what the majority of the people on the Commission propose but there are some other thoughts to be considered and they are listed next to it.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Could you --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Good idea.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I think that's a great idea.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Hold on a sec. Could you just show me, I didn't notice where you had put, well, yes, it's in there. Is that 49?

MR. BISHOP: Looks like 49. I know there's a note.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Oh, got it, yes.

MR. DUNKLEY: Bill Dunkley, your Zoning
Administrator. I very much have seen a lot of value as to the plans that give sidebar material or additional material in terms of these are the other things that we considered in arriving at what is in the plan. I would caution you against identifying those specifically as, say minority before issues, things like that. When I get this from you, one of my great tools is that this represents a single plan that has been voted on by Council. Any indication that there was contention in there makes my job in -- administering the zoning code very difficult. So, that's --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But that's, no, no, no.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: But that's up to Council.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: He's talking about what goes to the Council, that our sidebars would go to Council.

MR. DUNKLEY: So, they wouldn't be in the plan?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right. That they would go to Council with our sidebars.

MR. DUNKLEY: Okay. I take it back then.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And Council has got the job of analyzing it.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Making the decisions.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That's why they get the big bucks.

MR. DUNKLEY: With that understanding --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Further question for the table. Further question for the table. So, if we all turn to page 49 and see editor's note, proposal to include southeast corner of Chicago and Davis held for future discussion. Now, that doesn't in any way indicate what the discussion, what was the content and the underlying rationale for the discussion that was held. You could go through the transcripts. The sidebar, if you were to then finish off this further discussion point properly, would you then have a very sort of lengthy sidebar indicating the points that were made at the period, for instance the continuation of the same type of architecture, that it goes toward, includes the alley. It would be a more thorough explanation than just held for further discussion.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And I'd like to suggest --

MR. BISHOP: I'll include it as an annotation. It probably won't literally be a sidebar but there will be more like --
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: It will be more than this.

MR. BISHOP: But I was very literal. My understanding was you all were going to revisit this --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right, absolutely.

Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: The reason I suggested sidebar is that doing it this way it gets buried in the text. And you can have conflicting paragraphs one after another in the common flow of the text. So, somebody looks at this and says what are they, do they know what they're talking about? But if it's a sidebar, then it specifically states, you know, this was the view of the group that agreed to it but these other items were considered as an alternative logic or alternative discussion and it sets them aside.

MR. BISHOP: We will absolutely de-mark them by way of old flashing lights that there was an alternative view. Laying the page out just at this point presents a challenge, but we will absolutely -- I'm sorry?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You could do it in Word in 30 seconds.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: In under-bar rather than a sidebar.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, it would be an under-bar.

MR. BISHOP: It has implications though, Larry, if we're arranging our page that we'll later have to go back and reformat which is inefficient.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right. What Robin just said or, yes, like a footnote at the bottom so it's actually on the same exact page even though it may not be an X box. And I feel your pain with that stuff.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But one is at least boxed. Well, one is at least set aside so somebody knows this is not part of the --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right, like a footnote kind of a --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Like an illustration.

MR. BISHOP: This is not an indication of how that sort of indication would go forward.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, right.

MR. BISHOP: Is my point.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: You could do it like an illustration though.
MR. BISHOP: We'll be happy to do it. We'll be happy to try to.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: So, maybe for next time you'll do a sample for Chicago and Davis plus everything we add tonight?

MR. BISHOP: I don't think, my intention is not to perfect the language for Chicago and Davis until you all agree and have had the discussion.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right, right, right. Okay. So, then we'll have the discussion to make the boxes, then we'll make the boxes in some fashion to the City Council.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Absolutely. Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Understood, sorry. I haven't done this before.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right. Thank you, I think that's a wonderful idea on everyone's part. I appreciate it.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I'm sorry, I'll be quiet --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: So, my understanding of where things left off is that you had come to close to the end if not the end of the initial --
MR. BISHOP: I really --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Do we want to take any comments on the content of the pages that were made to date before we proceed further?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I'd like to.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I mean, I have a few things I would like to talk about. Is that okay?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Go.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: As it relates to the Chicago Avenue park --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Give us the page?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Page 56.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: As you may recall, I was quite enthused about this park being an opportunity to adjoin both the geographically and shall we say politically or -- perspective the Women's Club of Evanston and the WCTU properties. And then suggested that if there was any way that the City could approach either state or federal funding sources for a Women's Park as a means of getting additional funding that might be able to provide us with the underground parking which seemed to be one of the conflicts of instituting this
park at all. That might be a good idea.

Those type of comments were not included in here and I wanted to know what other Commissioners' thoughts were on that or whether that's to be included as a viable option.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: The implementation portion of it like getting the federal and the state monies or the idea of --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: The viability of the concept, number one. You know, is there any sentiment on the part of other Commissioners that that's a viable and attractive concept? And if so, is there the greater probability or viability of garnering assisted funds to make it happen? That's probably more a question of staff than --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: David, are you asking the question is there support for the concept of the park with the underground parking or, you know, sort of the thematic nature of what you were proposing relative to a Women's --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Predominantly thematic, but also I felt that if there was the opportunity to make it a thematic park by linking those
two historical institutions, that we would have a higher probability of garnering funds whether it be private or public, to make it happen. I mean, we've suggested that the old Varsity Theater be rejuvenated as a potential, you know, live theater venue. So, I don't think that this suggestion is out of the realm of what would be appropriate for us to suggest.

MR. DUNKLEY: And certainly -- in the past.

MR. MARINO: From a staff perspective, I think we're very supportive of a thematic park -- support of a thematic park -- I think the Preservation Commission -- the underground parking we also would be supportive of but as we kind of got very enthusiastic about that, the probability of funding, you know, in the near term is difficult. It's a challenge.

I think your concept of, you know, how to get parking funded, you know, other than through what we have -- would be a challenge, you know. And it could be that it's tied to other chapters that could be funded by -- we might get some money for that. But it's very hard to pull off -- you know, parking -- but it's not impossible that that could be -- if you will at the state and federal levels --
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, even, I mean even the
notion of if we do have this kind of thematic nature of
this area developed that there might be private fund
raising that is associated with it that might help fund
it.

MR. DUNKLEY: We're making magic dollars --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: The thrust here is not
to create a, the thrust here, I mean, as far as a focus
point is not to create an underground parking garage but
to create if you will a Women's Park that represents
women's contributions to the whole nation and the
viability of Evanston.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I think it's, speaking
as a fund raiser, what I do for a living, and WTC is
having a heck of a time raising money to begin with, I
think it would be where, I think your idea is a great
concept but raising private dollars for it, it would
really have to be a consortium of, you know, Evanston
Women's Club, WTC, and maybe Evanston Community
Foundation.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Sure.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But it would still be a
really hard go to get that kind of funding for it just
as a sort of an outside perspective on fund raising in general. And I think I, you know, I agree with you coming from the government, and I work for government, to get funding for parking or a park from the fed or even state. I think it's going to be really a challenge as well.

MR. MARINO: But I think everything else that -- capable of getting outside funding to the parking fund --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You know, I think before you dismiss it as difficult, and there may be federal or national foundations that might be, that the theme of it may attract money from. And I think you also have to take a good hard look at what that parking lot is used for. And it's not really, during the day it may be some library parking but in the evening it's used by restaurant patrons, it's used by people going to Women's Club for their events because after the library is closed the lot is still full.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: That's true.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, ideally if you're going to do a park like this, replacing the parking somehow is at least I think something that should be
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, there may very well be viable capacity in the development of the northeast corner of Chicago and Church.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: There may be, but I think we have to look at that.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: So, maybe just something that says take advantage of the location next to two women's, build on Evanston women's groups to play off the theme or something? I think you have your heart in the right place.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So, can we add some additional language that represents that sentiment?

MR. BISHOP: Yes, absolutely. That is our desire because we do remember that discussion, that's --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: And then I have a question with regards to the Grove Street Park on page 61. I don't really recall accurately how we concluded discussion on this park. I know that there was some commentary about how frequently this parking lot is used by the Y. As I recall, it's not owned by the Y, is that correct?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Yes, Presbyterian Home
and -- and they will probably develop it someday.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: You're talking about Maple Grove?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: The Y has that --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So, northwest of the Y.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: But it's critical to the Y.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McMURRAY: I don't think I've ever, maybe I parked there once in four or five years. I mean it's always full, not that I wouldn't.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: We're talking about the Grove Street which is directly west of the Y, right?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Maple Grove, the one across the street.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Grove Street Park west of the Y.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Oh, you're talking about Grove Street Park.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: That's what I said.

MR. MARINO: The south side.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Oh, that's why I was asking, are we talking about Maple Grove or Grove Street Park.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: So, on the west part of that is residential, right, at the building?

MR. MARINO: Yes, there's residents, the multi-family residence to the left of the Y and south --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: And the owner of that property is?

MR. MARINO: It's the Y. And the multi-family building to the west is the Presbyterian Home facility, they have underground parking. But certainly visitors can use --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Did you want to add something?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, I thought of the last sentence where you added in the nature of the option for this parking lot would be to add landscape buffer into the three elements of the parking area. I entertained adding the words or an option to full park development would be to simply add landscaping for the -- I guess it all depends on how strong a statement we want to make to encourage a full park in this area. And I suppose a lot of the viability of that depends on what
happens in adjacent developments.

MR. MARINO: I think that parking area is even more critical -- Presbyterian Home developed across the street which they did do at some point where they can collect their garbage and give them certain parking --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So, an option would be to amend the last sentence to read an interim option for this parking lot would be to add landscape buffering and the three elements to the parking area or to do so as an option to a full park development if a parking lot is deemed highly desirable to maintain.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That's --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, it's unfortunate because I don't think there is any way I can repeat it.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Well, maybe instead of just saying new, that Grove Street Park new, maybe change it optional or new to make it at that point not seem like this is, it's a park or a parking lot. It's a parking lot with landscaping.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: No, I don't want to eliminate the possibility of it being a full-blown park.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: No, and I don't think it necessarily is but it's saying let's green it up now,
clean it up and green it up.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Well, that's an interesting point. You have to be careful -- last pothole and -- put your, if your bushes are going to come around, they park in every angle.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Tall, very thin trees.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Palm trees, I've seen them, yes. Plastic palm trees.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Then, something to add, I thought we discussed this. And I may have listed it in the text, so on page 62 is the following streetscape changes or reconfiguration should also be considered where feasible. We have a number of bullet points. I thought we talked about those decorative, consolidated newspaper periodicals contraptions as being encouraged.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Well, we have newspaper vending machines there.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Do we?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- crosswalks -- traffic signs, newspaper vending machines, utility poles, mailboxes and street --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: But it doesn't at all
what kind they are.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, put a parenthesis, newspaper vending machines and put a parenthesis there after maybe. And then what are they called?

Consolidated --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, I just made that up.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, it's a good word, consolidated --

MR. SMITH: The City of Chicago has a corral.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Consolidated --

MR. SMITH: I think they're called newspaper corrals.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Newspaper corrals, that's it.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Newspaper corrals, okay. You guys know what I'm looking for, and it needs to be in there.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Okay. I think that's all I have.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Anybody else?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Yes. I had a, well,
they're all on page 39, and really they're all things
that were discussed and I'm sure they're probably other
things I nodded to. Because I read them through, I
just, you know, I don't want to, some of these were
very, very important to people sitting close enough to
me to get a hold of me, so, but I would like to think
about them again. Johanna's point about, very big point
to her of having affordable housing downtown, and so on
page 39 is a bullet point in number 1, it talks about
exploring new types of and locations for affordable
rental and for for-purchase housing in the traditional
areas.

And I guess my question is, is there really
any housing to any extent? I'm thinking, you know, west
of the tracks down Davis and these various areas.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: There's some
apartments in this area.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: So, there is something
that that does focus into?
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes.
COMMISSIONER STALEY: Okay. I wondered, I
just wondered about that.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: On Sherman, it's
primarily, about total office.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But at the corner, above Posey for example, that's apartments. Above, all of that in that corridor along there are apartments.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I just wondered really what's there.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: There are apartments above --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Plus a post office.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes. And, well, a block before.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Well, moving right along just farther away from me, Robin, one of Robin's favorite points is objective 2. We have two in here and we, you know, we kind of, we really worked back and forth as to how to satisfy everything and to me it looks like an animal created by a committee here. We have protect and rehabilitate character-giving buildings and structure sites. And then we've got promote the rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of buildings and sites that provide historical and architectural context to the
downtown. I'm very proud of that second part, it seems to me that it clearly is in there. But I'm wondering about the first. The more I looked at that, the more vague it seemed to me.

Character-giving sort of depends on the area you're in. I mean, out there in the west, there are some lean-to's and things that, again, would give character. I'm concerned a little bit because Robin thought that the Radio Shack building is a character-giving building at least and, you know, I never did. So, I'm wondering getting it in a, you know, in a plan of this type, if one of our goals is to save character-giving buildings, when we're already talking about saving the ones that have historical and architectural significance. I'm just wondering sort of why we're doing that.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, there's actually a distinction in a lot of the other documents that Evanston has between character-giving, landmark and historic. Whereas landmark is pretty cut and dried, it's been landmarked, so it's pretty clear, historic is another category. You can define historic in a number of ways. If an important Evanston resident lived there,
that might be historic just because of that person. And also in terms of historic, specific historic styles. It's a cut above the vernacular architecture.

Then there's the character-giving building. And if Carlos was here, he'd probably do a better job of explaining what a character-giving building is. There's a difference between a historic building and a character-giving building. Character-giving buildings are when that contribute to the overall ambience, so this would be mostly buildings in the traditional area north, in the north traditional zone or west where you've got a number of different buildings. Any one of them might not stand out on its own, but taken together they create something called architectural fabric. And it creates the ambience of Evanston.

A few buildings we have downtown are standouts. Some of them are landmarked, some of them aren't landmarked. But a character-giving building is an important term to leave in here for the vernacular, for the ambience.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: But this is not limited to just the traditional area, is it?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, not at all.
And there's character-giving buildings --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Well, that's my concern.

If it was just limited to the traditional areas, then I can see what you're talking. But if we, when we get for instance to the core area and we're talking about height and this sort of thing, I can see this ultimately being an obstacle if you've got, you know, you have a proposed development but there's a character-giving building, sort of whatever that means, in its way, that's going to become an argument for not putting up the development.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, character-giving buildings are in almost every document that Evanston has. So, if we take out character-giving, we need to then, it's part of the language of all of our plans, and frankly in a lot of our zoning codes. So, I think to take out the word 'character-giving' here would require a serious discussion. We would need the Plan Commission, sorry, the Preservation Commission to weigh in and give a report because character-giving is almost a technical term. I don't think I've given it justice in terms of explaining what it is, but I think there's plenty of people in this room who know what I'm talking about.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And it's sometimes the building, it's sometimes the style.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Sure, of course. And when I talk about vernacular, that can be all sorts of things. A character-giving building in a street of 50's buildings might be the 1930's streamlined gas station or the mid-century modern building. We're not talking just about --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I'll use for example the building across from the bank building on Davis which is three years old or four. But it's a character-giving building because of its architectural design. It looks like the ones that were built 50, 60, 70 years ago.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: A new building that makes historical architecture I don't think would qualify as a character-giving building. It's in the character or in the style of. A character building would be a vernacular building.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And I would be concerned about, you know, some overt protection for some of these buildings where the style is character-given. The building may be ready to fall down.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, I think we need to have Carlos here to have this discussion. I think we should put this in the parking lot. This is just, I mean, character-giving building means something in architecture parlance. So, I think, yes --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I would just like more work done on it.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Ask him to weigh in on it.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, let's ask him to weigh in on it. And also, the Preservation Commission would need to make a statement about that if you wanted to --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Because they drafted --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: They drafted it, yes. They drafted this. I mean, it's an important aspect.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, if we're going to go forward, in the statement it says, if I can read real quick here, I guess as part of this plan, I would want to know exactly what buildings we're talking about. Otherwise, how do you know what you're protecting and what you're not protecting?
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: That's an interesting point. Now, when you read in other documents, I mean, you've seen this character-giving building in documents.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Oh, yes. Oh, yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I mean, there's a certain quality to that. We could delineate them now in 2008, in March of 2008, but as time changes, you know, the wonderful post modernism of 1980's probably in 1990 wouldn't be considered character-giving building but now it is. As styles and times change, like historic, like the word historic building, the notion of a character-giving building is necessarily going to change. And so, we could outline some but that also gets into tricky territory. I think that this is very well written in accordance to other documents that Evanston has.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, I just, character-giving is --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I don't like it as an architectural term. I'd much prefer vernacular. I think character-giving is a fuzzy, nonspecific term. But it's the term that we have across all sorts of documents in Evanston. And so, it actually raises an
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Will you know it when you see it?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, that's an interesting question. It's like quality architecture. That's also in a lot of our documents, architecture of good quality I think there might even be in this plan. I mean, we live with the English language, it's a nebulous language. But within that, there is a shared understanding about what things mean. Do you know what I'm saying?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: One of the things we're not sure that has a shared meaning here is the word controls.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: What are you saying?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Okay, you jumped.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: We're on architectural guidelines and controls.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Bullet point number?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: First bullet point.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Got it, thank you.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: When they talk about...
conservation, overlay district, traditional zone, and let's see, provide additional architectural guidelines, guidelines are fine, and controls. Controls without a definition bothers me. It's a little bit like saying -- really isn't that bad.

MR. DUNKLEY: -- you generally see that as type of height, bulk and --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, generally we see that totally undefined here. It can end up meaning a lot of things to a lot of different people.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: So, can we ask Preservation to, Carlos again to widen this? This is information we got from him. So, we can please ask Carlos to --

MR. MARINO: Yes, we can.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, to make that --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: They may be just fine and they may be very scary, it depends on what that common understanding --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, I mean, for, you know, not to pick on any of the buildings but if you go west on Davis, there is a veterinary clinic on the north side
of the street. If somebody were to tell me that's a
color character giving building in that area --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Today.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Today, I would be going,

well, I suppose it's contributing to the character of

the area but it's not something I want to protect.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, like an orange

-- is a character-giving building.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You know, to the

new --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I have more of a

question going down on the strategies. The fourth one,

it talks about this fund, establishing the fund. And

then the last sentence says the fund should be

administered jointly by the Preservation Commission and

the Plan Commission. I'm wondering how that will work.

Are there any situations where volunteer commissions

are in charge of handing out money? I mean --

MR. MARINO: No.
COMMISSIONER STALEY: No. How do you --

MR. MARINO: Always City Council.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: That's what I thought.

So, how, I mean, this doesn't seem to me that it works.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Maybe recommended

and then administered by the City Council.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, I'm scared when

anything is before two commissions.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Approved by City Council.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That is really a scary thought, folks. We keep saying that delayed projects delay things for years.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, we should probably put it for just Preservation if not Planning.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Why? We're here and they're not. Why would we want to give up doing the work?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, I think your earlier question explained that. They have certain guidelines and a certain understanding of terms and a certain expertise that we don't have.

MR. MARINO: How about if we state that the
funds should be administered in consultation with the Preservation Commission and the Plan Commission?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: That's fine.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: That's fine.
COMMISSIONER STALEY: And then my last one, and this is more just, this is more really to help me because I am less a preservationist than a lot of people up here but I don't want to be crazy although -- we have in here a bullet point, encourage and promote the designation of additional local landmarks from properties by the Preservation Commission in their Downtown Evanston Building Conditions Survey and Preliminary Report. So, we currently have, the Preservation Commission has made a determination and has a list of additional properties that possibly should be landmarked.

And what we're saying is that it's a goal of our plan to promote them to landmark more of them. I'm really wondering, is that appropriate to be in our plan? I mean, there is a Preservation Commission that is making those determinations. Why should the Plan Commission be promoting to them to add even more --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, we're writing
the plan. We're not promoting this --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: But that's what, if it's

in our --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, no, the plan,

but it's Downtown Plan, it's Evanston --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: It's not just the Plan

Commission's plan. It's trying to incorporate --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: The City of Evanston's.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: It's for the City of

Evanston, so it is trying to incorporate, exactly, what

the Preservation Committee, Parks and, I mean, so it's

not just, we just happened to be the ones that are

working on it but it's not just about development. It's

not, it's about overall looking at the big picture which

sometimes, I know, gets lost in a lot of what we do.

But this plan is supposed to be, you know, the 10,000-

foot or the top of the tower level looking at the City

of Evanston of what is best overall and not just about

development.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think one of the things

that was said, Chuck, as we went through these meetings

in the Downtown Plan Committee over the past year plus

was that there were potentially properties in the
downtown that basically had the ability to maybe become landmarked. But nobody just had the gumption to stick it out there and get the application done because it involves a heck of a lot of work. But the Preservation Commission and members of the Downtown -- committee felt were worthy of consideration.

MR. MARINO: The context of that was predominantly --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- condition of the building that had to be -- more thoroughly and -- other things which -- a lot of stuff but there's a lot of stuff there.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Would you feel better if we changed the word designation to consideration?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: He's talking about the second to last bullet point.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Yes, the third bullet there, encourage and promote the designation?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Consideration of additional landmarks for properties but --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: But I don't feel as strongly though --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, let's just leave it.
MR. MARINO: Yes, I don't know if we need to
get into the language of -- preliminary report. Some
suggested language would be encourage and promote the
consideration of additional and appropriate local
landmarks by the Preservation Commission --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: This was written
by the Preservation. I think we could leave it.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Maybe we can stop
wordsmithing. We have two consultants here that are
charging us money and they've taken the time to come to
Evanston until 11:00 o'clock tonight. Let's use them to
talk about before and not wordsmith the crap out of this
because there's 75,000 people living in Evanston, I'm
sure everyone would write this thing just a little bit
wrongly.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Nevertheless, Dennis,
I think you added some clarity to that that I did not
find in that sentence.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, I like the
designation of additional local landmarks. And again,
Carlos isn't here this evening. If we're going to
change his recommendation in concert with the
Preservation Commission, then I think we need to invite
him back and do it with him again.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: So, parking lot?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Put them in the parking lot, sure.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. So, with that, are we back to you?

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: If memory serves me right, we're up to where we started with the -- east of Chicago Avenue and Davis and we were struggling with whether or not we include them in the traditional zoning or not.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I think we finished that discussion and we were about to move to the next zone and then we decided that it was too late and we'd moved on. I think that discussion is --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Well, if we finished it, what was the resolution? What decision did we make?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: The resolution was the parking lot.

MR. MARINO: It's in the parking lot.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I thought it's a bad idea and she thought it a good idea. And I don't know where everybody else go in.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: That's right, we put it as one of those items that we were going to have to arm wrestle about. So, in the parking lot, not really a parking lot.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Oh, I see. So, we're not going to take that up tonight.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right. All those things that are sort of contentious, we'll revisit those big items so we can get through all of this.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. So --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Edge zones?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Edge zones.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Transition zones, whatever they're called.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, 44 according to --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Edge zones, there we go. Northern edge, western edge, eastern edge.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: We're just looking for some of our handouts. We had different citizens groups came forward with different recommendations. Southeast Evanston did, Downtown residents did. We're
just re-familiarizing ourselves with the concerns.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: So, are we starting with north?

MR. BISHOP: Yes, we should start with the north.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think it's fair to say that the discussion of the north edge zone has been about height and particularly in relationship to the fact that there were two approved planned developments along that edge there, one of which, the first of which was significantly, at least their first story is higher than the other one, the second one of which is far superior in design than the first one. And then the question many community members are asking is just because those things were passed, is that the appropriate height for everything there?

The truth of the matter is if those two developments were to happen, is that a building that I believe Betty owns, right?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes. The white ones.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: The one at the corner. You've got the three-story, yes, brick building or cinder block building.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, you have the site of the Research Park buildings that were built previously which could then be redeveloped again to a taller height. Then you have Ivy Court which, you know, theoretically could be 8 to 15-story zoning. Somebody might want to redo that but that's pretty hard to do. I believe it's condominium.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Yes, condo. Yes, that is.

COMMISSIONER BOWIE: I thought also the question was where was the buffer in between if that was going to be the extension of Downtown Evanston. Then you have the Senior Citizens building, the church and so forth in the neighborhood.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. Yes, you have the dorms, the Senior Citizens building, the church, then you have the commercial buildings at the far corner. But then you have, there's a series of subsidy houses in there.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: That's all zoned R-6, right?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, that's --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: What's the height
then if it's R-6?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Actually it's commercial on the corner.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's 85.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: 85 feet.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: So, they all would be up --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: 8 or 9 stories there anyway.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, but there's a big difference between 8 stories and 15 though.

CHAIRMAN WOOD: But I'm sure they would have some bonuses, everybody else has had bonuses.

MR. SMITH: Again, the projects that have been approved, one was 18.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: 18 stories which is the first one. And then the second one, I believe, is 15.

MR. SMITH: 15.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: The second one was much better from a design standpoint.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Is there only one buildable site left there?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: No, there are two in play and then there is a third one that's possible, a
12-year-old office building --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Is there anything else besides that? These others?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Just, you know, it's Research Park -- if that's successful. That's part of it.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: What building, the -- building, dot com, two stories.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Oh, the --


CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. The --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It lasted about a year, year and a half.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I think we should note what Chuck just said is the reality is that whole area right there, the likelihood is there's really only one site. I mean, do we need to --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Hash this much?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Hash this, I mean, really over one site which the likelihood of that getting developed really soon, probably not because it's two different parcels.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Can I ask a question? Have they started construction on either of...
these two big buildings?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: If they don't build it because of the condo and real estate market situation now, how does that impact anything? If they then sell the property, do they sell the property with the 18 stories? Maybe it's not the right question but --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: No, no, it's a great question.

MR. MARINO: They're each under an approved planned development.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right, and is that an option --

MR. MARINO: It's unrestricted in terms of the -- as long as, so they would have to back the removal of that planned development -- that date and City Council would have to approve that extension.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: But after two or three years, if they found that they just couldn't do it, they couldn't build, there weren't any financing and they just wanted to sell the property, when they sold the property, that would be with the current zoning in
place? You don't get to transfer any of the --

MR. BISHOP: Yes, the approval is run with the land.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Really?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, until such time as it expires. It can expire if no work was done yet.

MR. MARINO: They're all term limited.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, they're all term limited so it can expire. In which case it reverts back to the zoning.

MR. MARINO: But it is the investor's right to keep --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: If they're going to build right away. In the end.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: With expiration, right, and what tends to happens with these things is that a smart landowner will sell in the middle of the term or with a pre-discussion about the extension of the --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: -- buildings, these are identical to the ones that are, or very similar to the ones that are -- sites. Because it's even, to my mind, to be too much of a, you spend a lot of effort on this edge here as much as I'm disappointed with the
occurrences of the buildings. That's why --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: We agree?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: We agree. Check.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Check. So, that would take us to B, Western Edge.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: 6 to 10 stories.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Last time, you all had a rather lengthy discussion about moving the traditional edge or not moving the traditional edge. There is a whole series of building heights that were identified for existing buildings. Could somebody sort of review the existing building heights for me just so I can --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I think, most of our conversation I think touched on a number of landmarked apartment buildings.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. The ones on the --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: What started, they're all located on the east side of Ridge.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Starting in Davis and then extending to the, including the building on the east side of Ridge just north of Church Street. That
amounts to, that I see here, four buildings that are all
in the neighborhood of two, three to four stories in
height depending on how you counted some of the upper
stories or the garden walkups.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. And then you get
Rozac's development to the north.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Which Rozac's development is
going to appear as how many stories from Ridge?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: What I've got is about
eight.

MR. MARINO: It's either eight stories or --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, I just, because that
land slopes, I'm never sure exactly how tall they might
appear.

COMMISSIONER McMURRAY: -- can't look at it
when you're driving to there because it would be
dangerous then.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And then if you go --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: South of Davis --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Sort of the high-story
buildings along the --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: That's what we had
talked about taking --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes. Yes, I think we talked about just taking it out of zoning and, didn't we mention taking it out of the zoning? The apartment buildings?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: The thrust of our discussion as I recall was a concern over losing those character-giving buildings I would say.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, those are new, some of them are new.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Some of them are landmarked if I'm not mistaken and some are --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: And other members of the Preservation Commission spend a lot of time presenting to us on these.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: And I think -- this pressure on a three-story building when you can build ten stories was the sort of concern.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. They're currently zoned R-6, right? Which would mean they could go to 85 feet which is roughly double their height.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: So, we could, we bump ten stories down to 85.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, I'm just wondering if there is any logic to taking a swath from sort of the west side of the alley to Ridge from the alley south of Rozac down to Grove and just making that --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right, that's what we had talked about.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: A different west link --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: West link, yes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, like the University Link is the 8th.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, right.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, that's good, that's good.

COMMISSIONER McMURRAY: Are you talking about on the west side of Ridge?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- west of that alley that's east of Ridge --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay. Everyone look at Jim. Yes, that would be good, make a link.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: And they could go how many stories?
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Six to eight, like the University Link, which is basically what it is now.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That makes a great deal of sense.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I'd like to understand it if it makes a lot of sense. Where is it? Slow down, I like to pry something that makes a lot of sense here. Where is it? We're worried about what happens --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Kirk, we got two buildings in that area that are designated as potential development sites?

MR. BISHOP: Yes, the opportunity sites?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, the two opportunity sites within that boundary.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: One on Church and one down on Grove. I think the one down on the corner of Grove and Ridge, that's a permanent parking lot.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, that's fine.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: But there's a taller condominium. So, I guess my question in that regard would be would six to eight stories still provide
significant incentive for those lots to be developed?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Six to eight?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Eight stories?

Well, Rozac, didn't you just say the Rozac was eight-story?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I'm just asking the question because --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, doesn't it, that's a recent development where the B is, if that's eight and that's being developed, then I think certainly that answers the question.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: It's also, well, that's not quite true because you'd have to, that was a parking lot before Rozac built that. So, the value of a parking lot is very different than the value of income producing rental buildings.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I thought that this was a parking lot.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: But there's a built parking lot. Both these sites are --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Oh, I thought you were talking about the building. Sorry.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: They're talking about the
current parking lots in our future buildings.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes, so it sounds good.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So, I think what we're saying --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: So, beyond the parking lots becoming buildings over time. Unless we tell them to put the parking there.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: How close --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I already said it.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Say it again, Jim.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think that that's it.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes, Jim thinks that's it.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes. West link, six to eight.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Wait, did you just do that?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes. How did you do that?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Because of shape and --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Shape and --
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: We're like it's a miracle.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: You've got a future in this.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I'm so excited.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: All right, that's it. And the rest -- did anyone comment on that?

MR. SMITH: So, now do you want to divide the west edge and south edge?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, I mean, it's the same color.

MR. SMITH: I know. I'm not saying it's any different, I just, it's no longer joined. So --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. We actually have northwest and southwest.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You can still call it West B.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I like south edge like the west bank.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, it probably should be --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: It's the only direction that doesn't have its own edge.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Where?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: South edge. I know that ruins your lettering still a little bit.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Is R-6 85 feet?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, we're saying if this place burned down, they could put up an 85-foot building where there presently exists a three-story. Are we going to, before we're done, convert stories to feet?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: In fact, it would be so nice if we could do that right away, I mean it would have been nice to start with that and certainly that would help a lot of different issues. In fact, do you have a rule of thumb for it? I mean, I converted it based on -- at one point but my numbers are using that math. We had talked about this.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- Tom Smith math.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. It was a rule of thumb. No, no, no, to be absolutely clear on
that, we had talked about the rule of thumb just so I
could convert it --

    MR. SMITH: That's fine. I think you have

similar, the office buildings are different than
residential. There are standards.

    CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, there most certainly
are, for retail space, for office space, for
residential.

    MR. SMITH: Yes, ground level --

    COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Explain to me again

the, keeping this R-6 as opposed to --

    CHAIRMAN WOODS: We're making it, calling it
West Link like the University Link.

    COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: So, it will be six to
eight, not six to ten?

    COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right.

    COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Six to eight, got it.

Okay.

    COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Are we done with western
edge?

    MR. BISHOP: Yes, I think it's a brilliant
idea.

    COMMISSIONER NYDEN: So, we are going to do a
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: -- eastern edge?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. So, that would take us
to eastern edge.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I think this one has
caused a lot of problems simply because it had retail on
Hinman and that's considered a residential street.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: So, while retail purpose
would be okay on Chicago Avenue, not necessarily on
Hinman.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. I've always felt like
there would be --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Except with the
exceptions.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, there are, yes, there
are certainly exceptions at particularly the northwest
and southwest corners of Davis Street.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: But I always have felt like
the other parts of those properties ought to have either
some clause in the definition that says like it
shouldn't have retail on the ground floor if they're on
Hinman or they ought to be somehow on their own thing or
whatever. I'm not --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Can we do that in
zoning?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That would be a question for
the people who knows more about the Zoning Ordinance
specific stuff than I would. Meaning these guys.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, the only retail
we want to retain is what's already there.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So, if we stipulate
that there is no retail to be allowed along Hinman other
than what's already there, haven't we done that?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, here is the issue. I
mean, right now you have a district, the C area, other
than Hinman is property that faces a street where you
wouldn't want retail.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right. Davis
Street.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. So, you're either
singling out properties not at the northwest and
southwest corner of Hinman but on Hinman as not having
the ground for a retail use or you're taking them out of
that zoning.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: If you had made
that traditional, that would take care of it because
that is business use, right? All the way up just around
that street.

MR. BISHOP: You know, I think, I honestly
would throw out the idea that the alley northwest of
Hinman is a better break for this, for the downtown
zoning than is Hinman itself. In general, unless the
streets are, you know, heavier streets like Ridge, like
Emerson. Hinman is not that type of street, and to have
opposing zoning districts facing across the street is
probably not what's -- so I would suggest to you that
maybe the central approach here is to draw the edge
boundary along the alley as opposed to Hinman.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: The Davis Street Fish
Market building. That's the one --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. Well, on 500 Davis.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: They are D-1 I think,
you're right. So, I suppose you could leave them D-1.
It would be the only thing that's D-1 in the Eastern
Link.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: The question I have is what about the corner properties at the northwest and southwest of Davis and Orrington? Do they --

MR. BISHOP: Yes, I think you'd have to sort of follow the existing downtown. You go up the alley, bump out --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. So, like this?

MR. BISHOP: Yes, got it. If you go down to those two buildings.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, just include those two buildings. That's great. And the others remain R, whatever they are.

MR. BISHOP: Whatever they are.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right.

MR. BISHOP: That would make a lot of people over there very happy.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, I agree. If we have people here that are happy.

MR. BISHOP: Well, and I'm not, I don't mean to say that that way. It makes sense.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It does.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. And you can go that way, too. Can you do it on the map for a
second? I'd just like to see it. Now that you've shown
your talent for --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I've got a bigger question on
Raymond Park.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can I just --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: And I know -- but I'm very
familiar with that block.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- that block. What you're
doing right now removes all the -- except the one
building which just happens to be my building on --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- got detail in it, and
then -- our building and then -- right across --
Orrington. So that means that our building could become
retail on the first floor.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Just east of the Shermont?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just east of the Shermont.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: This building right here,
right?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Mid-block.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Between the Shermont and --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Is there an alley there?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, there is an actually an alley behind the Shermont.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: There's an alley there.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That's the alley that would be on 1515. We spent a lot of time talking about that.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just that, you know, it's that one seven-story apartment building, you know, condo building that is there that I suppose if you owned the lot gets redeveloped and then -- but no one seems to be moving. And it is -- I kind think of it as a permanent -- I don't know what you want to do with it but I just wanted to point it out.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Sure.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I mean, we've always -- with the people on the other side --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Sure.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Does that play into what you want to say about Raymond Park?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Actually my whole question about Raymond Park is doesn't Evanston just have a
classification called OS? And shouldn't Raymond Park just be OS? Could we do that please?

    COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: -- downtown it would be OS.

    CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

    COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, that's what it should be. It currently is and should just remain that way. That doesn't mean it can't be part of the planning process.

    CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, it needs to be part of the planning process. It's a major part of the downtown.

    COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So, what did we decide about the building adjacent to the Shermont?

    CHAIRMAN WOODS: I don't know. I don't really see any reason to change it.

    COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: -- the viability of it.

    COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You know, I think that 70 percent of their --

    CHAIRMAN WOODS: That's true. Chicago --

    COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

    COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Ever seen 70 percent
of condominiums -- all right. We are streaming.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: All right. Next would be D, University Link. Personally, I like University Link.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: How tall is the Orrington right now? Oh, with the new thing, you're right.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, it's eight plus.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Moving on, E. Is that it? Nobody?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: What page are we on?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: The University Link.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: 42-43.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Discussing University Link, there's no discussion?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Are there any problems with University Link? I'm ready. You got something, Dave?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, yes. I'm surprised other people haven't noticed this.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Hit it.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Prefaces a remark like that.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, my concern is that we're showing a new development right adjacent that wraps around the D, at least on the map that I got.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: You mean that replaces the Burger King?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes. But they were at six to eight. In our transitional zone K, we're at three to five. And I have some concern about the existing building at what is presently Clark Street and Sherman, southeast corner of Clark Street and Sherman.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, you talked about that.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: There is a U-shaped building there, if I am correct, that's presently four stories in height. That's where Einstein's Bagel -- and so forth. And I find that that building lends a great deal of traditional character to the Sherman Avenue.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Character-giving?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Traditional history. So, I just want to make sure that we're cognizant of the fact and I want to throw out the possibility that that building, could that building possibly survive a six to eight-story --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, look to the south of it. We've got the parking lot of --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Parking garage.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Parking garage.
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Which also has already been approved for three or four more floors or something like that.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. We talked about --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: -- I think it's got eight stories, 85-90 feet, something like that.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Question for you, Commissioner Galloway.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: So, you're concerned about a condo or apartment building that is presently three to four stories, four stories in an area that's going for six to eight. So, it's four to eight, a doubling. But you weren't concerned with the West Davis, that alley jog there, which is an area that is six to ten stories and it's a historic high quality building that's only two stories.

I'm just wondering of your logic because an apartment building I think is harder to wreck than some contiguous storefront that are two stories in a ten-story zone. So, I'm just wondering how you weigh your concern with the structure. I'm with you on this,
believe me. But I'm just wondering vis-a-vis east on
Davis why you wouldn't be concerned with the two-story
building --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Because my concern
is --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I just think that
an apartment building is not under a lot of threat
because it's a lot of units and it's already, for a
landowner it's a lot of different kinds of money,
income.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Einstein's Bagels?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, that's it.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: -- are they all
apartments --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I understand --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Is that what it is?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. So, can you
just --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, I neglected, my
comment was that I felt that that four-story building
added a great deal of character to the traditional area
that we designated at Sherman Avenue. And I was
concerned if that became an eight-story building, that
that would be a detriment to the traditional character
that we're trying to maintain in that area. However, at
the time, I forgot that we've already in effect
potentially killed that, at least the building
immediately south of that which is the Orrington parking
facility -- how many stories?

   MR. MARINO: We think it's four. We've asked
-- confirm that --

   COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Three?

   COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: So, in the
building you killed, you still have a chance to save a
building I guess is my point.

   COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, I wasn't, again
I didn't have a similar concern on the southeast corner
of Chicago and Davis as I felt that Chicago Avenue
afforded an appropriate boundary for that traditional
zone -- so, I guess we're done. At least I'm not --

   COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay. Moving on.
Should we have a break here?

   CHAIRMAN WOODS: Ten-minute break.
   (Off the record.)

   CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. Larry?

   COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: A point was made to me
a few minutes ago and so I'd like to rewind a moment.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And go back to David's comment on the bagel building.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You know, I guess I'm not as worried about the eight stories to six, but the point was made that this is, if we're looking in the traditional area as an area to support low income housing, this building as it now sits is a candidate to maintain that. And from that perspective rather than the height perspective plus some level of architectural benefit --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I think we're stretching that one but okay.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, I like the bagel sign. Consider moving it on to the K area. It does meet that, it does work towards meeting that objective, and any construction would not.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: On the other hand, what incentive is there? Presently it's in the B2 District according to -- What incentive, I mean it's not a great building, what incentive is there to develop that parcel

LeGRAND REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES  (630) 894-9389
under the B2 restrictions as opposed to --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: None, that's the point.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Well, I know. It's --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, I won't say none. I won't say none.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Right, but it's not the same as generally down in the -- you know, I think that we kind of assume that everybody is going to max out if they come in to develop something, they're going to max out. And I don't know if that's a fair assumption, or maybe I'm being naive.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I think you're being naive. And you don't seem like a naive folk.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: You think all these bonuses, they're going to get a hundred percent of the bonuses?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I think that they're going to do whatever they can to try it.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I think they're going to work real hard at it.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Try to get a hundred percent of the bonuses, yes, I do. Where what seems
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difficult today, five, ten years from now might not be that difficult.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes, because the property values are going to increase.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, my concern was that the proposed building wraps around the -- Burger King, if the bagel building, you know, could be acquired at the same time, that could be a --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Monolith.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: A monolithic eight-story building there, it would, in my mind, would not serve the scale either of the transitional district in Sherman or the scale of the revised Oldberg Park.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: So, where do we draw the line then?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Maybe we draw it on the one side of -- because again, if we're going to go with Larry's and my affordable housing, preserving of rental and affordable housing --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: We keep both buildings.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Keep both buildings, and then that creates a nice --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: What building?
COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Both buildings, the bagel building and the one immediately to the east.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Well, can you then put all of that in K except for the Orrington which then you could put into F? It's this building? It doesn't matter, this building? You guys, here is the bagel building right there.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Or build a bigger building if you're going to build a bigger one in the corner.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: It's this courtyard building that has --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: There's no sense in wasting air space.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: -- the one by Kinko's, what is it now?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: That's a block down --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Let's block it out.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And the building, that's about a six-story building, isn't it, in the middle?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: The courtyard?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS:  No.  It's like four.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN:  Four.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER:  Four or five.  I thought --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI:  It's in D2.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS:  It's this one, guys.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER:  Yes, it's three.  I have it as three.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS:  I think it's four.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER:  And there's at least three floors above -- on top of the retail.

CHAIRMAN WOODS:  Well, I'm not so concerned about that building going, you know, as part of the six to eight in the present B as I am the bagel building, the corner of the bagel building.  Well, you know, this is so much easier, at least we know what building we're talking about.  So, if I was to make any suggestion then, it would be then just to include the bagel building in K.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE:  I would say if we're going to include the bagel building include the one to the east as well.

CHAIRMAN WOODS:  I don't think so.  I think
you could keep the traditional right along Sherman and
be consistent along Sherman. And then, if the other
site gets redeveloped, it's not a high quality building
to begin with.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: No, it's not. It's
not.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: So, with that let it be
redeveloped with Burger King.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: I mean, it's just kind
of there. It looks like --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Hold on. Problem?
Share.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: So, is there a consensus then
to include the bagel building in part K?

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Wait a second.
Before we include the bagel building in K, I need to
reintroduce my concern about the East Davis.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Please, can we just
address it as a separate thing?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, because it's
not separate. It's there --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: It is separate. It's
totally and completely separate. It's in a separate zone.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: That's in a separate zone as well.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: If you want, if you're trying to draw some --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right, we're talking about --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: -- some correlation between the reasoning for this and the reasoning for that, then let's wait until we get to that. I think that --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, it's the same --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Why don't we put both of this in parking?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: -- and this thing is going to parking.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Why don't you agree that the bagel building be included in K?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Why would I agree with that?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Wait a second. Robin, you do
not agree with the bagel building being in K --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I don't agree to

decide it now.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Or do you not agree with the

fact that decision gets made relative to the other
decision?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I think you're

joining sides in a --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I'm not joining sides. I'm

asking you a question.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, no, no. I

believe the table is taking sides where there's

questions and that it's a parallel structure in terms of

whether something should be included in traditional or

not. We've got one thing in the parking lot and I'm not

going to agree or disagree. I think that I'm going to

request that that also goes to the parking lot. I see

it as an analogous situation and I don't think it can be

resolved right now given the disagreement at the table.

Therefore, I'm requesting that this go to the parking

lot.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: There's no

disagreement. I don't disagree --
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: -- by itself, on that building by itself.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I'm not disagreeing with adding that to K necessarily but I think that we need to look at what we're including in and out of the traditional zone.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Zone, yes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: So, you're holding this hostage until we get to --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: No, don't use that term because it's not what I'm doing.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That's what it sounds like.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: No, I'm not. Excuse me, this is not hostage taking. This is actually looking at an entire traditional downtown all together and not necessarily, yes, we're going zone by zone but let's maybe say, let's stop for a second and later in the process let's look at the entire traditional zones together and think about what we're adding and subtracting here.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And I think it goes back
to, you know, things that, you know, kind of we in
general have had issues with the rationalization on the
decision making.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, just because it's on the other side of Chicago.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: We have a large parking garage, let's put it in.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, but I think it's a good point and I think that other people have brought it up, too. When we get into some of these heated arguments, having really a rational thought process about why we're doing something does make a lot of sense in sort of going through that in a facilitated way of why does that make sense to you in one place or another. And I'm not particularly saying -- I don't really have strong feelings about it. Shocking, but to have, but to talk about the rationalization of why you vote on something or not vote on something I think does make a lot of sense as a group.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, especially when it's the same rationale but for one lot versus another.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: So, let's just, it's in
the parking lot?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Put it in the parking lot.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: -- to your rationalization but it's not mine.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So, let's just put this in the parking garage and move on.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Good, done.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, that's what I'm saying. That's exactly what I'm saying.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Good. So, it's in the parking garage, move on.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I'm sorry, just a facilitation term.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Where are we now?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Are we out of transitional into core? Let's start with West Core E.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: West Core E, okay.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: What is it now?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: What is it now? Good question.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: What is DC1? It's DC1. How high is that?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: What is there now? It's ENH.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, no. How high is DC1?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- planned development in the -- building and a couple of old buildings.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: A couple of old buildings, Carmen's Pizza at the street, then we've got Church Street Plaza --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: There's two E's. There's the north E and the south E.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Oh, I'm sorry. You're right, I was on north E.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: What's the issue here?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, no. No, you're right.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: So, you've got Church Street Station which is how tall?


CHAIRMAN WOODS: 17? 16?
CHAIRMAN WOODS: And then you've got ENH building which is --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: And then the buildings to the west of Church Street Plaza are, I think, single story to two stories?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, there's some old houses and couple story buildings.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: We're at E?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, we're at E, north E.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And that includes the parking lot I think as well.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: The ENH building, isn't that between the tracks?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Well, there's a building in each corner of the south, you know, northwest corner of --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Oak and --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Northeast corner. There's a parking lot adjacent to it, okay. Right across from the condos that the thing fell through.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Does anybody have a problem with the heights as far as the north E?
COMMISSIONER STALEY: The cutoff seems fine with me.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Kirk, you guys have indicated a potential development building at the west edge, southwest corner of the E. I'm trying to recall what is presently there.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Can you put your other --

MR. BISHOP: Parking lot, there's a -- dry cleaners. Small two-story office building --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Basically, when you go west of Church Street station, there's a series of like three to two-story commercial type buildings that are there.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Actually, it's one of the areas that the Parking Committee at one time looked at selling the air rights over the parking lot in conjunction with the rest of this in the public parking, so like that and a couple of other things.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: So, E, does anybody have any issues? Anybody? Okay. North E, I should say. South E?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Nothing.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: This is south E, across from
the Y.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: How tall is the --

going to be?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: 18. How tall is the Y?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It's 12 stories.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, it's really --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: The Y? The Y is not 12

stories.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: No, no. I said the

height is --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Well, they're four

stories and they have -- and then there's the story

underneath so it's six.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: 5.5.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: It's from five to six.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's relatively tall for the

number of stories.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, that's all I'm

saying.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I'm going to not

have any problems with this, for the record. I'm going

to store my comments for a little bit later on. And the

rationale for that is that where things are parking lots
-- I don't mind height and I think we've got some
precedents there. My objections are paring down --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: I'm curious, I didn't
hear what you said.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Just to reiterate,
I'm not going to have a problem with 18 even though you
could look across the street and see some problems with
going all the way up to 18 stories there. I'm going to
save up my problems with height --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: With height generally?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, I have no
problems with height generally.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: So, you're going to be
quiet for a while, is that what you're saying?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, I'm just
commenting on how I was quiet. I'd be quiet right now
if I hadn't been asked to reiterate. Because I was so
quiet, he had missed it.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Got it.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Now I'm hesitant
to reiterate.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That's all right. So, East
Core.
COMMISSIONER STALEY: In which there are no
development opportunities --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: The Women's Club is
landmarked. Time to look at it.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: There's a library --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Why do we have, just
out of curiosity, did we change, why do we have the bank
building three to five-story here, the south end of
that?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's that portion of that
site.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, we have one
building in two zones.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: That's an interesting
comment.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: He's right. He's
absolutely right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It's right here.
There's a building, that building is --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- zoned, it's in two zones
right now. I understand what the intent was.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I understand the
intent, too, but I'm not sure it makes for a zoning policy.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: So, are you suggesting taking F and extending F for the whole bank building?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes. Unfortunately, yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, because they're going to put stores around it.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You can't move J up to include a 20-story building. It's pretty difficult to take this, you know, divide a piece of property in half.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Is it split today?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, I mean that's the issue. That's the issue.

MR. MARINO: The approved planned development for the -- consistent with the J.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, it is. Yes.

MR. MARINO: So, I mean, it's very important to try and -- so, it's an unusual circumstance that I think --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Is the rotunda built
with the main building when it was -- it was?

    MR. MARINO: Yes, it's part of the main

building.

    COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, it's attached today

but was it at the same time?

    MR. MARINO: It originally was.

    MR. SMITH: Are they going forward --

    MR. MARINO: We hope so. They seem to be

making progress.

    MR. SMITH: The planned development probably

makes the zoning irrelevant unless they don't go forward

with the project and then --

    COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But the whole thing is

a planned development anyway, isn't it?

    MR. MARINO: Yes, originally.

    COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, we pretty much

have to just modify the planned development. So, I

think -- planned development, we can't do anything

there. It's part of that planned development.

    COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, I particularly

want to retain the sanctity of the J, the traditional

district, on both sides of Davis. I certainly don't

want K to encroach any farther south.
MR. BISHOP: To me that and the fact that there is an approved planned development sort of -- what would otherwise be a terrible idea that we're splitting that zoning there.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. I'm fine, personally, I'm fine with leaving it alone and dealing with it later if something were to happen.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: How tall is that dorm by the --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Where is it?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: At the top of F?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: The top of F? It's seven.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Does it --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And then there's three stories I think at the very -- oh, wait a minute. That's the library.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: But does it make sense to put the dorm in D?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes. Yes, or C.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Well, I like D because it's the University Link and it's --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Good call.
COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: It actually makes more sense to make it D.


So, G. The big G. I think it's zoned --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Did we fix the --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, that building is not all --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I have a -- Oldberg Park, can that be OS also? Sorry. We're only talking about City property --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes. So, to go back to when we were talking about the rotunda and problems maybe making that 18-story across from Davis Street which is three to five. I'm thinking we need to look, maybe start looking at some of the parcels that touch the traditional districts because across the street from Sherman where Pete Millers is could be a 30-story building. That's a lot bigger than an 18-story building
where the bank is just around the corner. So, it's the same problem plus the new stories.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: It's already there.

We've already got --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That's Rotary building.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Today we have that, but if it burns down, which you guys keep bringing it up every time we say we don't want to put something there.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right. I think that's a good point.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: 30 stories, 28 stories --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: But we just had, you can't say one minute 18 stories around the corner presents a problem and then the other around the corner at 30 stories is okay.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: What is Rotary now?

MR. MARINO: It's 18.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: 18 sounds right.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: So you know, I represent that building.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: So, you can't really
talk about it at all. You'd have to recuse yourself from discussions other than --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: -- I think on Rotary International, all of the -- clubs and everything else --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: We don't but a fire might.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Fire, what do you mean? You don't want it to be built there?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, I'm saying let's make it 18 stories.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: No, we're not trying to make it lower than 18 at all.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: We're trying to lower all of G to 18 instead of 30.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Well, then that's, I see, but that's all together.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Well, no, I mean, or just bring it into E maybe. It doesn't have to be all G.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You can't use the rationale that first off, -- Rotary building burning down, that isn't likely to happen.
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Whoa, that has been brought up several times.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And Chuck is the biggest one about things burning down.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: No, that's slander. I've never burned anything down. Never, never.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, you're the one who initially brought it up.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I think actually Larry brought it up.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Oh, Larry. We can't think about what's there now. We have to think about what would happen if buildings burn down.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But they would have to go out and fund anything bigger than this.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Essentially.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: -- steel/glass it becomes now, you know, a big funding issue and everything else. All we're worried about is giving them the capability of putting back what's there.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Good, so are we.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: So are we, yes. 18 stories makes a lot more sense.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I think this is an area where tall buildings are by the rail, we've said it all along, are very appropriate.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Hold on. Can you just explain to me why -- hold on. Can you just explain why that logic doesn't apply around the corner for the Rotary building? I'm sorry, not the Rotary, the rotunda, why we're not putting 18 stories at the rotunda?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It's not against the rail.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: But it's around the corner. They're like very close together. Against the rail is -- what's a rail? Like a story or something?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: It has no bearing on how tall a building needs to be.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: The point is the rotunda is attached to a 20-story building. All you have is a setback. So, we could make that all, you know, we could move the rotunda in also.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: To 18 stories?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Sure.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But we were just --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Because you're not
going to tear down, you're not going to reduce --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But that was the
argument that was --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You're not going to
reduce the size of the bank building that's there now.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Exactly.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You're not going to
reduce the size of the other buildings on that block.
So, all we're saying is in relationship here to the
planned development, we would prefer to see any
additional activity on that planned development on that
block, kept at a lower height because we also have said
that for the building next to it, east of it, the
building east of that. You've got a totally different
situation over here where you have a number of tall
buildings and the appearance of the City as a mixture of
tall buildings, traditional buildings, and this is the
area where the tall buildings are providing their
stature in the development of the downtown. It's a very
different situation.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But, no, Larry, in
Sherman, the corner we're talking about, Sherman and Grove, there are zero tall buildings there. The first tall building you run into is Davis and Sherman. I mean, so that corner really is --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Davis and Sherman?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Davis and Sherman would be the orange balcony building.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, but the Rotary building is taller than that.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, I know, I'm talking about let's say the Rotary building burned down is my point.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, they still want to put back their 20-story building.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: That's fine.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No one is arguing the 18 stories.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: They have to rebuild, 20, they have 20 right now.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Okay. So, 20 let's say, I'm sorry, I thought somebody said 18. I think the argument is the 30 stories, it's not the 18, it's 30.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's also a tall 20-story
building because it's an office building as opposed to a residential building.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes. But the general height --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: So, this is where we need to get into the discussion about --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: How tall is tall?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: How tall is tall related to stories of what kind.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, let's just say the Chase building is always --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Taller.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Always been the building that citizens at least in terms of testimony that I've heard have used as the litmus test of height in Evanston. That Chase building, as I understand it, is 277 feet. So, maybe we should talk about tall in terms of the Chase Bank building and 277 feet.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: What are you doing?

COMMISSIONER ODPYCKE: Getting out my tall buildings.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Oh, I got mine. And this one from the Evanston Review, they could have.
COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Now, let me make a
general statement again about these proposed, and I
touched on this earlier before, if the Plan Commission
for example is the -- as to whether or not bonuses are
going to be granted to a developer, and I'm on the bank
commission, it's going to be very difficult in my book
for a developer to get a bonus. It's going to have to
be extraordinary.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Oh, Stu, come on.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: I'm very serious about
this. It's not, in my view this is not going to be a
rubberstamp. So, when you're thinking about a 30-story
building, that's got, I just can't imagine that.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Stu, let's back up for a
minute. Something that was recently approved by this
Commission and with -- merrily approved by this
Commission --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: What is that?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: That would be where the
Radio Shack building is, yes, the 708 Church.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Oh, you're talking about
the 49-story building, right?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes. Is that this
Commission approved things that they claimed as bonuses without blinking an eye. The LEED certified, they can't even LEED certify until after it's built but people in this Commission said, ooh, rubberstamp it, it's fine. You would have given them the bonus for being environmentally sound when clearly they can't demonstrate that until after the building is built and you've already given them the stories. So, don't tell me that we are this hard-nosed Commission that wants to look very carefully at the bonuses. That is not happening.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: I'll tell you that as one member of the Plan Commission, I will be a tough nut to crack as far as allotting bonuses in the --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But you haven't been, Stu.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: And quite frankly, folks, it's a moot point. Bonuses are specifically defined in here as --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: There are formulas. There are formulas which we never had before.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: And that's a huge
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Maybe.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Today --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Today it's difficult but let's not imagine that we're going to stay, today, hopefully the real estate market improves, hopefully a lot of things change. So, we have to think not just today and not just the nine of us or eight of us being on the Commission because we all have term limits and --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: What's the problem if it goes 30 stories?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, it's abutting all these traditional --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: What's the problem with that?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: It goes back to the same problem of, you know, what we talk about as what is the character of Evanston. It goes back to what Evanston is as a community. Do we want to promote 30 stories through the majority of our downtown?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Let's assume yes.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But I assume no because that's what we've heard from citizens.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, it depends on which citizens you talk to.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, but at the downtown meetings --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: It's the citizens who show up to the meetings and speak comments.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Who make their comments and write their aldermen and send us letters.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: And the citizen groups that had lots of meetings and --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: The fact is it's not the citizens, it's your opinion.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Absolutely not.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: That's not true.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Larry, that's not fair.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: That's not fair.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And you know it's not fair.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: That's really not fair.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Because if you look at the transcripts from the meetings and you look at the
transcripts from the downtown plans, even though I
wasn't involved with the downtown plan, you guys were,
and all of the information, the consultants, you guys
teoretically took notes at those, please point to me,
I've been saying this for five months if not longer,
please point to me in the transcripts in the public
hearing where citizens, any citizen said we want 30
stories.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You and I both know
transcripts are not taken in every discussion, in every
planning session.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But were notes taken?

Were notes taken?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And we've been
around --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I'm afraid you're not
going to be able to rely totally on pre or post
documented information. You have to assume --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: We were all there.

Okay, we were all there.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Okay, but the citizens
that have come to the public hearing, and we do have it
on the record, please point to me in the transcripts those citizens that have said 30 stories, that they want that. I want to see that in black and white.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Who said, which one of them said 20 is the maximum?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: There's lots of them.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Show me which one said 20 is the maximum.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I'll tell you it's the southeast --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Which one said that 30 was okay?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Which one said 20 was the maximum?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: What's her name?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, no, no. Actually I take that back. Many said --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: The point is some people have said height doesn't bother me, other people have said I would like to see it restricted to not more than what we have now.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: It's one of the
consultants who have said that people have said that
height doesn't bother me. Come on.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That's not true.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Come on.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: We have heard some
of that.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Can we get off this
tack please? This is going nowhere. Can we please go
back and address this section of G which is, in my
opinion as well, if there is any area of G which is most
sensitive to the potential with 30-story building, it's
this area across from Sherman. But I ask myself the
question, okay, we have a 20-story Rotary building, what
is the likelihood of that building disappearing? And
Rotary building, a 30-story building, the only way that
would happen would be if an errant missile, you know,
from a military aircraft destroyed that building in its
entirety because --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: You guys are like death
and destruction.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, I think that in
my mind equates to the level of probability of the
Rotary building disappearing at 20 stories and being
replaced with a 30-story building.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No one is arguing --
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So, that --
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: We're talking about almost every other building.
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, that's where we started and that's where --
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay, let's move north. Let's move north.
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: That's where --
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: It is a parking lot issue. Let's just put it in the parking lot if we can't reach, we'll put that block in the parking lot.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Well, but I also think it goes back to G is this huge district. And maybe it doesn't, maybe there are individual portions of it that we need to break down, either add to some of these other areas. But to say we could do it, I mean, do you know how awful downtown would be if G was all 30-story buildings? Just destroying, everything here burned down, Chicago fire, some cow knocked over a lantern, everything here burned down, and suddenly all the developers came in and put in 30-story buildings all
through G. Is that the Evanston you want? Answer the
question, you know, really.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: No, of course not.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Okay, then. Then why
would you do --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's also not the Evanston
that would ever be built.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But you don't know. You
don't know that.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: With the market demand, it
would never happen.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Market demand,
developers are coming in and asking to build condos when
the condo market has tanked. So, let's not talk about
demand. Developers will do whatever they can to get as
much as they want.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Still, relatively speaking,
they're sporadic throughout our downtown area.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But it could happen.

And is that what you want for the City that you are
serving and you --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: There could be 40 days
and nights of rain, too. And we could all --
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Well, then we'll have a real problem if everything is 30 stories because there's not much drainage. Only those people that could afford to be in the top penthouses like the rich people Dave wants.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: So, within the zone, you already have a building that's 260 feet tall, another building is 276 feet tall, that need to maintain their ability to build back if they were ever --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: That's fine.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: We're not arguing that point.

SPEAKER: What buildings are those please? Could you --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That would be the yellow balcony building.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: The orange balcony --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, no, the yellow balcony building.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Orange is shorter.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Orange is significantly shorter. I think it's --

SPEAKER: That's the 28-story Optima.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: But it's the height of the 20-story, if you count it with the Chase Bank, so we should really start in feet. Nothing is taller than 277. So, really nothing is taller than the 20 stories of Chase Bank even if they have 28 if we're talking feet. So, we've got plenty of 20-story buildings. We're not arguing for less than 20, just to be clear, in terms of the Rotary discussion.

The question is have citizens and does the community want something taller than what has been our litmus test up to now which has been the Chase Bank building? Does the community want something taller than that? Do we need to up zone downtown or is that perhaps where we as a community who've come together in the past and we as a community are going in the future? That's the question I put for the table.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: But we're talking about G though, correct?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Which is the tallest --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: The Chase Bank
building is the tallest.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: No, Optima is taller, I believe.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, it's 260.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, 277.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Chase is 277.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, it still is the tallest.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And what's Sherman?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And Sherman Plaza is 276.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: It's one foot shorter because of the symbolism of the Chase Bank building.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Could we change, that would be some problem, could we change it to 15 to 25 stories without the 30 in G? It doesn't make any difference to the developers, I don't think. I could live with 15 to 25. Is that --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And it's probably a point of trying to get back to stop measuring in terms of stories and start measuring in terms of --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: And I'd be perfectly willing to say 275 feet.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: 275?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: With bonuses, office --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Maximum with bonuses, 275.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Maximum with bonuses, yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, that works for me. That would make more sense because part of the issue is number of stories you get different interpretations and, you know, it becomes crazy after a while.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I'm sorry, can you throw out that number again?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: 275.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So, we just change that to the feet designation.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: We've agreed that the height for G would be 275 feet, not 30 stories.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Max.

MR. BISHOP: Correct, yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: And we're still, we're doing 15 as of right?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, as of right. We should convert it all to height in feet.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I'd just call it 175 feet to 275 feet.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: So, ten-story --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Which makes sense because we --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, we dropped ten off each one. We dropped five, yes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: So, ten stories would be the as of right base height?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: No. It says 15 to 25.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Well, now it's zoned for 85 feet.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right, so we would be up zoning that whole area.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: From 85 feet to 174 which seems a little excessive.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, that's doubling.
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Because we really want --

MR. SMITH: I'll tell you that's not --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, up zoning and down zoning here are relative terms because --

MR. SMITH: Well, also, most of it zoned

Research Park where there really isn't any height limit.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

MR. SMITH: And where there is at one area

that's in there, there's 150-foot height limit at some

key intersection of Research Park District.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: You mean, you can read that

thing? You understand what it says.

MR. SMITH: There is a provision that says

that if -- or a plan comes forward, that the height is

unlimited.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right, right. But

what's the base height for Research Park or the base

number? What's in this book?

MR. SMITH: There was supposed to be a center

of Research Park wherein there were supposed to be 150-

foot buildings.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, but what is

this -- Bill, do you have the numbers for Research Park?
COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: The heights here for the Research Park is anywhere from 60 feet to 150.

MR. SMITH: And then there is a provision that says that all the height limits can be thrown out if it's too implement the overall plan for the Research Park.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's probably -- because Research Park is really evolved because Northwestern was trying to get parking for that building.

MR. MARINO: -- when you're referring to the Research Park zoning, you're referring to the area certainly north of Church Street by the certain site -- north of Davis -- and it varies.

MR. SMITH: Yes, the heights vary.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, I mean, a lot of G is also D3 which is 85. And then Research Park, I mean, according to their charts on page 11, Research Park is, you turn to page 11 you'll see Research Park is 60 feet and DC3 is 85.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Is there a parking bonus in the D3 right now?

MR. SMITH: D3 has a provision where if you have a big lot, you get one height, and if you have a
smaller lot, you get another height.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: D3 allows up to 260 feet on a large lot with --


COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, 125 is what's allowed by right now if you build four stories of parking.

MR. SMITH: What it says is that you get 85, then you get up to 85 and an allowance, then you get four stories of -- height for parking.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, but if you take --

MR. SMITH: So, the allowance in this together with the -- you get up to 210 and that's on a small lot less than 90 feet, 5 feet of frontage. And if you have a lot that's more than 95 feet of frontage, you get 262.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Basically, if you build the parking, it's 125, right?

MR. SMITH: Right. If you don't make any of the allowances.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, no allowance. But just saying I'm going to put four stories of parking in there which I can do.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: 125? Well, should we go to 125 for the base height? 125 for the base height which is currently 15 stories on there? Can you go back to your chart again? The big picture.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Okay. So, wait. 125? 125 feet by right or that's on the table, other suggestions?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: For what?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: By right for G.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: For G by right?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. So, we've determined with bonuses, it's 275. The question is what is the by right for this section.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Kirk and Tom, what was the rationale for the initial 15-story height?

MR. SMITH: There's been a lot of change here in this area. And all of them are, all the newer buildings are more than 15 stories. So, the trend of development here is substantially more than 15. 15 is kind of a reflection of your crazy existing zoning, okay, with the Research Park staying 150 feet at some key intersections and the DC3 actually allowing a little
bit more than that.

So, it was both, I think that the range that we were thinking about is really a reflection of the trend. This is an area where land values are changing significantly and the City Council has approved some big buildings and where the development community feels, I believe they see that change occurring and they think this is the place where the City does want some substantial buildings.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: The City or the people? The City of Evanston, you know what I mean?

MR. SMITH: No, I'm thinking about the market here, okay.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Okay, the market.

MR. SMITH: It's really, the message is that this is a good place for tall buildings or big buildings because the City is approving big buildings here.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: But from the point of view of the citizens --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Was that the market a year ago or is that the market now?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: There is no market now.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, the market I
think, we can't have a plan based on the market. I think that's not a good way to plan. I don't know if it's a good way to plan, I don't know if it's a good way to plan based on what the City has done up to now because there is a big call for this plan in part in terms of the response to recent development. And that's why this fast tracked from the point in which it was an internal committee and then consultants were brought on board because it wasn't happening fast enough in terms of what was happening with the development.

So, in fact the approval of some of those buildings is also I think a trigger point, correct me if I'm wrong, to some of the issues. And I think citizens have spoken pretty clearly about a concern that this plan is reflecting recent development rather than really looking at what citizens wanted. And people commented on now they can build by right 15 stories what they used to have to sort of argue.

So, the question I think on the table is we take recent zoning trends and then just up zone them or is there --

MR. SMITH: Oh, no, I agree with Larry though also. He's saying that in terms of location and
locational advantages --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: We're not arguing that. We're absolutely in agreement, that's why we're already at 275.

MR. SMITH: Okay. But what I'm not just saying it's a matter of the trend or the market. It has all the locational advantages that Larry was talking about in terms of encouraging people to use mass transit, to walk, to create a density where you have --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Sure. There is no one in this table that's in disagreement with you. It's a question of how high. So, the question on the table is how many feet, not are we going to put feet there, and whether those feet are going to be a reflection of local trends or if those feet are going to be determined by looking at what people in Evanston want. And I guess --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: This is 150 feet. What's that about in height as far as stories?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: 150 feet? 150 feet would be approximately --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: 13.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: 13 because 15
stories is 174 with Tom Smith's numbers.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right, 11 to 12.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: It could be 11 to 12.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, 12 stories by right and then you can --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: -- residential, if it was offices, it would be about 11. If residential, it would be about 13.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I could live with 12 stories by right -- 12 to 15, three stories of --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: 150 would get you right around --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Right around 12?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: So, 150? 150 on the table? 12 would be about 125 I think.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: No. It's going to be --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: 11 times 11 is 130 feet --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Does anyone have a calculator?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: 11 times 11 is 121 plus 18 is 139. Call it 140 feet.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: That's for 12?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That's 12.
COMMISSIONER STALEY: I could live with that.

MR. SMITH: Bonuses are not automatic, okay.

You know, I worked for the City of Chicago and I administered a bonus program and the city is very generous, okay, on bonuses. But some of these bonuses that we have suggested, sites in Evanston could not possibly take advantage of these bonuses. You cannot, on a small lot, you cannot put a big plaza, okay. In a lot of sites in Evanston, you cannot go underground for parking. Those bonuses will not be available.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Is that true about underground parking? Where couldn't you go underground?

MR. SMITH: Well, the parcel you're worried about, okay, is such a tiny little lot, it's only 60 feet wide, you can't put a parking structure on that lot. You can't put a parking underground on that lot.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Why?

MR. SMITH: Because of the dimensions of the lot.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: By the same token, with a lot that small, it's difficult to build a 30-story building.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: It's impossible.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It's impossible.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: -- a lot of my concerns about --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: You're only talking about --

MR. SMITH: -- isn't relevant.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: You're not talking about the whole piece that was previously proposed on?

MR. SMITH: Oh, no. I'm just talking about the one lot --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I just wanted to get that clear.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: This?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: He's talking about this.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, exactly. And also --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It doesn't matter if you can't reach the height with bonuses on a lot that's too small, the footprint is too small to build a building that high in the first place.

MR. SMITH: Yes. There are some basic dimensions about building a bigger building that many of the lots in Evanston are just small retail buildings.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, you physically
can't do it.

MR. SMITH: You can't do it. You don't have the depth for it.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes. So, you know, those buildings may not be over 60 feet anyway.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay. Shall we say 140 there?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That's just by the nature of the beast.

MR. BISHOP: The caution I would throw in is 140 represents a significant down zone. In comparison to the 125, it's -- every opportunity site and most actual sites within the DC meets the 95 feet threshold, and thereby, their as of right zoning today is 260.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay. We're happy with 140.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I don't know. It doesn't --

MR. BISHOP: With the parking, with the four floors of parking and the 95 feet of frontage, that comes up to 220 plus four floors of parking. 260 feet of building as of right, as the base, whatever we want to call it. The apples to apples comparison is the 140
you're talking about against the 260 that's allowed today in the most transit accessible area of downtown by and large.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: What I would like to throw out there for consideration is 175 feet. That's based on 14 --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: That's what it is now. Why are you -- it's what it is.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, it's not what it is. It's 15 stories.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Which I have at 174.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, it's approximately 175 feet.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: So, you're saying don't change the base?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. I'm just talking about translating it into --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, I think there's so much, there is some concern about really this major part here in terms of it that if the bonus system is going to work, that it has to really be some bonus for that. And to take again what's already been
approved without so much bonus --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: 100 feet more.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: But it would be nice to -- okay, so in order to do a building and they want to get a few more stories on that, they have to do some of the bonuses, the things that Evanston wants and needs.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: So, by right, you're not gaining anything because the by right is already the height that's been approved.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: What do you mean the height that's been approved --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: The 15 stories.

If you keep with the 15 stories as the base height --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: They don't have to do anything.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: To do what?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: To build by right.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: They can build whatever.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, they can build 15 stories by right. So, which of those buildings is 15 stories?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Which --
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Which of existing buildings is 15 stories?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: The ones that have all been approved.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: The orange balcony building is the only one that's 15 stories. Under 15 stories. Everything else is 18, 22, 23.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I think there's 150 --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: But that's up here.

MR. SMITH: I concur 175 is -- 175 and at the other end you have 275.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, the -- is 18 stories --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That's not in G.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Is the current height you're talking about throughout G?

MR. SMITH: No. No, it's because the Research Park is such an odd zoning. But yes, part of it is 220. The as of right --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You know, the other thing you want to remember when you're worried about everybody building like that, if you look at the new
projects that have gone in, the Sherman Plaza has a number of two-story buildings. A lot of footprint that's only two stories. The theater side is what, two stories, and that's the whole block. So --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Sherman Plaza, if Evanston would have let them build 20 stories all the way around, it's not --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: The numbers, they said the numbers didn't make sense.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: What are you saying, Robin?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Oh, I'm just saying --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Wait a second, wait a second.

MS. AIELLO: Robin, you can't say that about Sherman Plaza. It was a planned development.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, it's a whole plan. That's what I mean.

MS. AIELLO: There was never ever any plan to build 20 stories the whole square block.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: That's not what she said.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: That's not what I said.
MS. AIELLO: But you did say that if Evanston would have let, they would have built the whole block at 20 stories. There was never a plan, they never wanted --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, no, of course not.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: That's not what she said.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: That was never a plan for it. Absolutely not. No, I couldn't agree more.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, what I'm saying is, you know, the economy of this type of development does not necessarily say that it makes sense, that it makes economic sense, it makes finance-able sense to go out and just build 30 stories everywhere because none of these developers has that capital. They can't go to the bank and get the money.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: To build 30 stories?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: All over, everywhere. It's a balance between what you can finance and where and what is saleable and what is that. So, to assume
that everything would be 30 stories is assuming that
this finance market that just fell apart is all of a
sudden going to go back to be increasing again.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Can I ask one question?

Hold on, can I ask one really quick question? Ann
Diener, in all of your lifetime in Evanston, did you
ever imagine that somebody would want to build a 49-
story building in the middle of Evanston? Did you ever
think that would be able to happen given finances,
economics --

MS. DIENER: No, in fact, when the -- State
Bank -- City Bank I guess?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, Chase. Chase.

MS. DIENER: Chase. I remember the old State
Bank building -- three stories. And they decided they
wanted to expand, so they wanted to put up a high rise
building but it was not going to be more than -- 12-18
stories -- and they had to wait a while. But in the
meantime, they had a topnotch architect -- over the
first -- that they came up with -- economic crisis. No,
I don't think we ever, and there was as big controversy
about that bank building going up -- in Evanston. And
you know -- alderman said -- wedding cake effect -- and
that's why --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: So, I guess the point that I was trying to illustrate there was that at that time things changed and we can't just, we have to just keep kind of, I don't -- but like we have to not consider what's happening today as the punch line.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Can I make one observation here? We're making the assumption that nowhere else in the zoning here, there is something that controls height and relationships of buildings. And to me, part of what we had talked about was in the form-based code language, whatever, something that would talk about spaces between heights so that obviously if you zone everything at 30 stories, there's a chance to be built 30 stories. Just like Washington DC, everything is 14 stories, so everything absolutely fits within 14 stories. And with a few exceptions, it can be the most amazingly boring architecture you've ever seen in your life.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I love DC though.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Believe me, I lived there a long time. So, I have a lot of fond memories of that city. But I can also -- lot of architectural decisions that were not good architectural decisions. If there is
something in here where there is a requirement in terms
of whether it's -- or spacing or something so that you
literally can't develop everything from the 15 to the
25, that to me would be a beneficial part of this
because I, too, don't necessarily want to see everything
to be flat top 25-story.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Let's just, should
we just agree with what we have right up there, 175-
275 --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: What is that 15 to 25?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's roughly 15.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Oh, it's 15. I
thought he agreed --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Yes, I think so. Yes,
Robin.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, no, no, never
mind. I take it back. Sorry, I misread.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: All right. Parking lot?
The base height is going to have to be parking lot.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Because we can't agree
and we --
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: That's three people already.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So, we can't -- 175 to 275, is that right?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: We have a majority and a quorum that disagrees.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I think the 275 --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: 275, I'm fine with the 275.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, 275 is okay. Yes, that's exactly right --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: We can't agree on 175? I mean, look at the buildings that pose potential developments in the -- the north has taller buildings, right? The northeast corner of G has ten-story and the New Horizons building by Optima, those are unlikely to be changed.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No. In E, we've got 170 feet with the Church Street Station to the north.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right, right. We've got a cinema building which is unlikely to go away.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Wait, what's the
point? We don't --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: The point is you just can't look upon this as everything that is on the site has the highest potential of being developed to --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I don't think so.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: To whether it's 175 or the 275.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. No, it's just a question of what we as a community want to decide with the few remaining lots and what that together going forward to the plan for Evanston should entail. I think we have enough disagreement and enough other things we need to get to that I think we should agree to disagree and put it in the parking lot.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So, we're not agreeing at the 175?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: We're agreeing on the 275.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right. Exactly as he's given.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: All right, let's move on.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: The next thing is the Central Core.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Oh, anybody? I think the Central Core is a little too high.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I would agree.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Shocking. Shocking.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And I think it's too low. Ah, table it until City Council decides on a current project in front of them. Yes?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I think we have been -- still -- and it can start crowding -- buildings in a less open area which would be very unattractive. That's why maybe the height limitation would be desirable -- spread out -- big open space -- and I think that makes a difference for the pedestrian and for anybody that's in the area. It makes it more attractive that way. If you --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Which open space --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: The open space that's created by not having a large building, that open space.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: You know, as far as I'm concerned, you can just put this in the parking lot
right now.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: That may not even be relevant.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I've got some relevant --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, no, wait a second. The truth of the matter is there's a planned development in front of City Council.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: They're going to make a decision one way or the other. I say we wait until they make a decision and then we can revisit this issue.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes. Because I think it goes back to our point earlier about rationalization and why people make decisions the way they do. And some people make them irrationally and we need to go back to talking about how somebody does one thing on one end and then speaks out the other side of their mouth to make a decision on that end. So, that all comes back, you're right, we should parking lot because it goes back to how
do you make a decision and your rationalization. Do you
like somebody, do you like their buildings? Do you say
49 stories or do you really do something more like
doesn't really belong in the City of Evanston.

So, I mean, you're right, we should parking
lot it because it's about rationalization.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's also about opinion.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, no, but it's not.

That's the thing. That's the thing.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's absolutely about
opinion.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: There needs to be facts
and there needs to be clearly defined what is
appropriate and what bonuses, you know, should be
allowed for something so egregious in the City. So,
when people make rational decisions, or clearly not
making rational decisions, we need to talk about it.
You know, Dave says on one end of the City, well, we
should keep it lower, and then says something else in a
different part of it, how are we making decisions? And
I think that really needs to be out on the table.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Another point I'd
like to make is also is the Downtown Plan, are decisions
being made for the Downtown Plan based on developer interest in the site or are we making it based, you know, how uncoupled should the issues be, and I think your idea of waiting and seeing what the -- council does, I guess would be important. But on the same token, I'm not sure the developer-led planning makes sense. I don't know that you learn that in time so I just find it --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Of course you don't.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I don't know -- what the hell you mean by developer-led planning.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Oh, come on. Clearly, this 42 stories was put in because there was something in front of the city.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: This is just going to come back to exactly where we were when we voted on 708.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: There's something in the meeting minutes I just want to read out to the record.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: You are absolutely right.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And I just don't see the
point in continuing the discussion.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, I just want to --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Because it goes back to what Robin's point is, are we being led by the nose by developers and theoretically consultants, or are we really talking about it openly about really what this should be.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, I just want to read before the consultants --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And we'd like to hear, honestly I would like to hear from the rest of you on your real rationalization.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And I can tell you from day one of the beginning of the Downtown Plan Committee, I've said that this is a site for the tallest building in Evanston.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay. But Mr. Marino noted something --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: -- 49 stories out of there?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay, hold on. Let me just read from the Downtown Plan Subcommittee
minutes from Tuesday, June 6th, 2006, so way before, 2006. So, way before any developers were necessarily on the site or before any consultants were talking about this area. And it says, so, Mr. Wolinski stated that on June 12th, the Planning & Development Committee will hear the proposal for a planned development at 181 Oak which received a negative recommendation from the Plan Commission at its May 10th meeting.

Next paragraph. Chair Widmayer stated there was an article in the June 5th, 2006 issue of Crane Chicago Business regarding the new proposal by Mr. Rozac for a 38-story hotel and condo tower on the Fountain Square block. Mr. Wolinski stated that the City had not seen the concept nor has a formal application been received. Mr. Marino noted that the Downtown Plan Subcommittee identified this block as a preservation/conservation opportunity. Mr. Opdycke thought that this proposal indicated the urgency of the Downtown Plan Subcommittee to act.

And so, that's an interesting statement about a preservation block, or conservation opportunity, and then an issue of a proposal apparently from Mr. Rozac in 2006 for a 38-story hotel and condo after something had
been identified. So, again, I just question --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I'm sorry, who

identified it as a preservation block?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Dennis.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: 'Mr. Marino noted

that the Downtown Plan Subcommittee identified this
block as a preservation/conservation opportunity.' Of

course things have changed but again --

MR. MARINO: I don't remember saying that.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Well, it's in a legal
document. No, no, you can't just make stuff up if it's
in a legal document, the minutes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I don't know who just

said that but you can't tell a woman to just take her

drugs.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Who said that?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: One of them.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Well, it's the same, you

know, same comments --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I stopped reading

from approved minutes.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: -- to the parking lot.

Well, no, but I actually think that we need to put that
also hopefully in the record that you can't say you
didn't say something if it's in the minutes. I mean, so
we're going to go back later and say, oh, I didn't say
that even though it's being tape recorded and it's on
television? Maybe we should pull up, you know,
whatever, are we saying that --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I can guarantee that that was
not taped or recorded.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: So, it's in the minutes
and the minutes were approved by the people on the
committee, correct?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: The point is at that
point in time there was a lot of discussion. And where
in some people's mind it may have been a preservation
area, in the mind of others, that was an area that was
ripe for a large development. So, just because somebody
said it --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: It said the committee
said it.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: No, it didn't. You
said Mr. Marino said it.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Mr. Marino noted
that the Downtown Plan Subcommittee identified this
block as a preservation/conservation opportunity.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I think he misspoke.
The committee did not although some people may have.

MR. MARINO: I think like any set of minutes,
if there is, it represents a summary, it's not a
transcript. Also, clearly on that block, one of the
cconcerns was the Hahn building related to Mr. Rozac’s
proposal. And I would suspect that if you look at that
contextually, this was some time ago, you know, I think
that probably would have been part of the concern that
Rozac put in the proposal, which we didn’t see
because --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Was that a local landmark
at that time?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: So, was it going to be
torn down as a local --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I believe Mr. Rozac's
proposal, I'd have to look at it, but I believe it
included tearing it down. And I believe that was the
concern of the group, tearing that building down and not
the fact that it was a tall building at the end.
MS AIELLO: And that is why when Mr. Rozac finally did at least approach people, we said no because the Hahn building would not be torn down. So, in the context of conservation for the Hahn building on that block, yes, it is a preservation/conservation area, that building.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: That's not what it said though. It's a meeting and it says --

MS. AIELLO: You know what, how many minutes are taken in this building every single week? And the people who waste the time --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It's not a transcript.

MS. AIELLO: It's not a transcript --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Guess what, when you go through the minutes and how many mistakes have you found? If you're doing your job as a committee member or commission member, you should look at the minutes. How many times have we gone through and had to go back to staff and say no, this isn't correct and we've made corrections.

MS. AIELLO: Of course, and that is your job. But also they're not transcripts. You take it in the context of what is being implied.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But I guess the point is then why didn't that committee make changes? They approved those minutes.

MS. AIELLO: They understood having been there at the time that the context was the Hahn Building on that block.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Well, then people need to learn --

MS. AIELLO: So you know, when I go back and I look at minutes of the 40's and the 50's and the 60's to understand the legislative intent and sometimes you can, and sometimes you can't because you weren't there.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Colleen, parking lot. Parking lot done.

MS. AIELLO: It’s 10:00 o’clock. I think you got to keep moving.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Good. Okay. Well, I think we're done.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I think I'm done.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And I actually, could I ask which one of you said that? Because I'd like to bring a formal ethical complaint against whoever said it.
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: That was me.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Okay, thank you. Dave, you just can't say things like that. I don't personally attack you.
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I apologize for that --
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I mean, that is so sexist and so wrong of you to say that.
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: It has nothing to do with sex.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: How can you say --
COMMISSIONER BOWIE: Can I just say a timeout for one second. It's been enjoyable working with you. I'm glad my term is up.
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I make a motion to adjourn.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Second?
COMMISSIONER STALEY: Second.
(Whereupon, the hearing in the above-entitled cause was concluded at 10:05 p.m.)