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CHAIRMAN WOODS: I'd like to call to order the Evanston Plan Commission meeting of Wednesday, April 9th, 2008. And the first order of business is that we do in fact have a quorum. So, the next item of business is the approval of March 12th meeting minutes.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I would move approval.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Second.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Any discussion?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I was mystified for a while though because I had the new plat and I was trying to figure out the new plat, it's like I went crazy on it. I suddenly realized it anyway.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: All right. All in favor of approving the minutes?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN WOODS: All those who are not in favor?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Hearing none, motion carries. The minutes are approved.

Next thing we'd like to do is introduce our new member, Seth Freeman. Seth comes to us as a, actually a long-time involvement in Evanston back and
forth. Came to Evanston in 1967 when his father came to Northwestern as Chairman of the Physics Department. He's a product of the Evanston Public School System having attended Orrington, Haven and ETHS. He has a Bachelor's degree in Business Administration from the University of Illinois-Chicago, Circle Campus at the time.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes. You could just call it Northwestern just to cut it.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: He has 25 years of experience in business insights and intelligence in product management. He worked for AC Nielsen for 15 years where we created and marketed a global business intelligence and analytics platform. That was used by over 46,000 new services in hundred-plus countries, and revenues in excess of a hundred million. He resigned from Nielsen two years ago to focus on his family and other opportunities, and he had moved back to Evanston six years ago with his family from Wrigleyville. And both boys are attending, he has two boys attending Dewey Elementary School. And it sounds like he is looking forward to being involved.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Absolutely. Exciting
time to be here.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It is indeed. The other
thing that I wanted to report on is that the Mayor
received a letter of resignation from Sara McMurray.
So, we're down a member still.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Anything we said?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: You think?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Probably. But I'm sure she
addressed that herself. Anyway, so that brings us to
the continuation of the Draft Downtown Plan and Zoning
Recommendations. And we have two items of business that
we're going to take up first before we get into resuming
our process. And I'll let Johanna introduce our first
presenter, and then after he has completed, we're going
to move on to a presentation relative to the
Preservation Commission.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Well, John is here, John
Kennedy is here and he's part of the group that is an
involved organization with several other neighborhood
and community organizations in Evanston called the
Evanston Coalition for Responsible Development. And he
presented something very similar to this a couple of
weeks ago in regards to the tower development. And I
was thinking since we had a very heated discussion about
the Core Downtown District, it might be nice to step
back for a minute and get through an objective, somewhat
objective I guess, view of what something in the
downtown would do and the impact of taking out the
retail and the office and replacing it with something
different.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And one other item of
business before we get moving too much, any member of
the audience or staff, as we go through here, who wants
to make a comment, when you get recognized from the
Commission to be able to do so, if you could please
identify yourself at the beginning of your statements
and be sure to speak loudly and clearly so that we have
a better chance of having it all recorded properly.

MR. McGONIGLE: Andrew McGonigle. Does this
relate just to the presentation of the same? Or does it
relate to the presentation and discussion afterwards.
There was some vagueness the last time as to whether the
council allowed doing the discussion process with the
commission. So, I just wanted to clarify that.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, we have certainly at
each of these meetings had audience members participate.
I don't think that we're going to necessarily stop that.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But at the last meeting, we didn't let them comment.

MR. McGONIGLE: The last two.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: The last downtown one. It was because we had shut down public comment on it previously but --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: We called on them.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right, we called on them.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes, then we asked them.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

MS. DIENNER: -- feedback --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

MS. DIENNER: It's a way for --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And it would also be very helpful if we try to speak as much as possible one individual at a time. It's very hard for the court reporter when multiple people are talking all at once.

So, with that --

MR. KENNEDY: First of all, thanks for letting me come and present a presentation. This is actually a
modified presentation, not only did I take out many
references to "a tower", but I did work with some of the
City staff people. I think Steve is here? Steve is
here, who actually went over my amateur numbers and
tweaked them a little bit. And there's a basic, for the
south, of a difference between what I presented and
which I'll get to in a minute.

But I kind of got into this really just
thinking about the second floor of that building. And I
said, gee, you know, I wonder how many professionals are
up there. So, one Sunday morning coming back from EAC,
I pulled up and I just went and counted the directory.
There's a directory in the front. 120 names,
professionals all of it multiple letters behind their
names. And I'm going whoa, it's quite a number.

So, from that, we kind of, you know, looked
at, you know, I was involved with the tower and this
Evanston Coalition. Obviously, you know, another hat I
wear is in the Civic Center issue which I won't bring up
today. But we kind of, you know, I took on this
economic analysis. The developer, Klutznick, claims
tremendous economic benefit to downtown. They used the
words "a boon to downtown." And although there is a
slight economic benefit as you'll see in a second, I
don't think it's a big boon.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Excuse me. Will we get
copies of this?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes. And I apologize for not
printing them out but I didn't want to print them all
out at 5:00 o'clock. I didn't have the time. But I
will email them and you could have this and all the
supporting documents that you want.

The Kane McKenna report supported this claim
through, I thought, rather not quite exact analysis.
There was a lot of holes in it and I'm not a
professional at this. I'm a software guy and I'm just
kind of doing this on the side. But the interesting
thing was looking at this from the net present value
point of view. For those of you that don't understand
what that is, it's basically saying there's a stream of
funds that's going out over time and you discount that
back to today to basically measure the impact of this
investment versus that investment. And that stream of
funds obviously is interrupted when you take a building
down, basically pay property taxes just for the land and
then three or four years later build it up. But
The other thing that we did, and I should say this was a joint effort by several members of the Evanston Coalition for Responsible Development, Barbara Janz spent several, a considerable amount of time literally going door to door on the second floor and talking to all the owners. So, there is some backup to all this.

Some of the core assumptions with regard to the proposed building, if I can use that term neutrally. First off, the key thing is the timeline. You know, you have to start somewhere. So, we're going to make the rash decision that the Council okays this to go ahead by this June which looks more and more unlikely, that there is a whole year of pre-construction permits beginning in June of 2009, construction will begin 3.4 years later, it will complete, this is all according to their plan. This is right out of their book.

Property taxes, we're going to ramp those up similar to what we actually see in Sherman Plaza. Even though the building is up and constructed, the City
doesn't benefit from the property taxes right away. It takes somewhere, three to four years sometimes to ramp that up. Retail sales in the new projected building, I think that's the right number of square feet. It might be a little low, but with an 18,000 square-foot deal batted around the other day, I didn't update it because I didn't know for sure. But that was what was in the printed original plan.

Residential spending, in other words people in the 218 units we figure at $18,000 per unit. I'll show you how we got to that number in a bit. And obviously employee parking is part of this deal. This is just one aspect of the sort of background analysis we did. Here's the impact of the proposed building residents, number of units. I'm guessing here and I can give you guys all this and you can play around with the numbers you want, you know, 1.25 to 1.75 residents per unit, number of residents, you multiply that through.

Okay. What about restaurants? How many times do people go out? Well, on average 1.5 on the low, maybe up to 3 times a week on the high. This is on average, all right? How much do they spend? $25 to $30. What is the weekly expenditures? What's the
yearly expenditures? What's the City's share? Steve, is that 1.75 correct?

MR. DRAZNER: It should be 2 percent.

MR. KENNEDY: Okay. Well, see, I'm off on that already.

Shopping. Groceries per week. You know, I don't do a lot of shopping but here you see 75 bucks to $125 per person per week. You know, total per year, merchant shopping per unit, this is kind of a plug number, $5,000 to $10,000 total per year spending there, total shopping revenue, and again City share, that's probably underestimated a little bit. I'm sorry, if we're just getting a little kind of confused here. But the total spending basically comes down, well, it's somewhere in the area of $12,000 per unit.

All right. Let's keep moving. It will be summarized toward the end. Let's talk about the core assumptions of the existing two-story building. Property taxes again, retail sales. We actually surveyed the present current stores, there's 12 independent stores. We came up with actually $340 a square foot, we're going to use $300 a square foot. Second floor professionals, we actually
counted up 41 offices, 120 professionals. We worked in
the 7.6 to 9.6 clients per office per day. That's 375
to 460 people, plus parking fees, shopping revenue and
lunch. And I'll show you how we got to that.

This is actually a build sheet listing out the
offices on the left there, number of tenants, you know,
in that office, and also some of these people we got the
traffic, some of them we had to imply what the traffic
is. Okay, by that I mean if there is one person in the
room, Jane Miller there, 234, we implied that she sees 7
to 10 people a day, okay. It all kind of averaged out
down at the bottom. I won't go through all of it.
Basically, we came up with an average of 7.6 to 9.6
clients per day. Now, per office, 312 to almost 400 for
the whole building.

Number of tenants, again, what's the average?
And we've actually looked into our data to pull that
out. What's the absentee rate? I mean, you don't have
120 professionals there all the time. So, we had a
range of 30 percent to 25 percent in terms of absentee
rate. Came up with the total number of tenants that are
in the building. And so, the total is the total number
of visitors and tenants coming into that building.
Now, what's the economic impact? In this case, we looked at the estimated number of people that travel by car. From a standpoint of the tenants, we figured 70 percent on the high, 60 percent on the low. Again, working down from the assumptions of the numbers, they're going to be, people that do come are probably going to be paying purchased monthly versus, you know, per day type of thing. In any case, the revenue was $200 to $250 on average per day from just the tenants.

Now, the clients, this is where the big numbers come from. I mean, the clients are being brought from all over the North Shore. And we have to realize that this is one of the core economic engines here because people are coming from as far north as, you know, Glencoe, coming to see their favorite therapist. God knows I am. But in any case, we figured 80 percent on the high, 70 percent on the low were driving. And they're going to park probably for a two-hour stay, all right. That's three bucks, all right. You multiply that through, it comes out to a fair amount of money, of revenue into the parking operation. I know Melissa Wynne was basically, when she saw these numbers, said we can't afford to lose that kind of money in terms of,
from a parking revenue perspective.

Okay. Other in tax. People go out to lunch, okay. We estimated the number of tenants goes out from two-thirds down to half. Clients who lunch, 20 percent to 15 percent mainly because the clients are going to be there only, you know, those people coming in the middle of the day. Range of revenue per day, you know, as you can see there, the total $150,000 to $400,000 for lunches.

In terms of shopping, some of the clients are going to shop while they're here. And we figured how many, 20 percent, 10 to 20 percent, you know, on their visit. Tenants who might shop by the 10 percent is on a per day basis. Average purchases, run that down through, you know, basically 220,000 bucks yearly shopping.

Total impact from a parking perspective, lunches, shopping, you know, $700,000 to a million bucks coming into the economic end of downtown. Revenue of the City is a little different than that obviously. But you know, it was upward on average $300,000. Okay.

Now, core assumptions from a net present value point of view, discount rate, key thing here is we're
using 6 percent on both analyses. Now, a discount rate
is not only a function of what you think inflation is
going to do but it's also a function of risk. A higher
risk situation should have a higher discount rate
because it's more riskier. You know, where you have a
building that already is paying taxes and has paid
taxes, there's a very low risk there because that's
going to continue. But we're not, you know, discounting
higher or putting a higher discount on the Klutznick
proposal. We're leaving him 6 percent for both.

We did extend this out to 2029 as opposed to
just the position of the TIF. We did, in our initial
presentation, focus just on direct income to the City
and I took out the money to the TIF. Julia and Steven
basically said no, the money to the TIF is revenue to
the City. And so I said all right, fine.

This is what it kind of looks like. This is
an example of the net present value model. Again, if
you guys are interested in it, I can give you a copy
that Steve updated and fixed.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Please.

MR. KENNEDY: This is not yours, Steve, this
is the old one.
MR. DRAZNER: I was going to say.

MR. KENNEDY: This is actually the net cash generated by year by both the, you know, in terms of both, you know, money to the City. And as you can see, it spikes way up there. The reason it spikes way up there is because of the TIF, because all the monies coming in minus that residual from the previous is going into the City's coffers. So, that's why there's a fair jump there.

However, there is a finite end to the TIF, all right. It's 2017, 2018 --


MR. KENNEDY: 2017. But because we, you know, they get revenues for the next year or so from back taxes, but if this is delayed for a couple of years, look what happens. All of a sudden now you don't have that same area underneath the curve there. And the implication of that comes very striking in this example. You've got an existing building, net present value of 6.35 on the left. You've got the proposed 42-story building, if everything went according to June as the start, if this thing gets pushed back to your committee, gets delayed by other issues and pushed out for two
years, the City doesn't get the advantage of the TIF and it drops down to 9.2 in terms of net monies into the City, okay. It's still a little higher than the existing building but not as much.

Now, let's talk about the economic implications of the proposed building and the effect on downtown. First off, the existing building is an economic engine, all right, we talked a little bit about that. The professionals on the second floor, the number of people bringing in the parking, the lunches, the shopping, the total, okay. Local versus national stores, now I sent out, I don't know if many of you had a chance to read that Andersonville report, I highly recommend that you, there is an author on the back of the book that actually lives in Andersonville, I would encourage you to bring him in, sit him down, ask him some good questions. He's got some very interesting insights. He does work all over the country.

His analysis in the Andersonville, despite what our Chamber of Commerce says, is actually not voodoo economics. It's very real economics. And he lays it out fairly, and he sees it in every city he's gone to, and he's doing the work all over the country as
I said. His big thing is local versus national chain stores have a different impact on the downtown area. We've got the existing 22,000 square feet, again it's just $300 that's bringing in $6.6 million worth of business into the downtown.

The proposed is a little less than that. That may be a little underrated but let's just put it there for now. The key thing is there's a multiplier that a locally owned business provides to the community that is not existent in the national chain. Why? Because the locally owned business, that actually works out to $179 per square foot versus the national chain is only $105 per square foot. Why? Because the local business hires local accountants. They hire local lawyers. Their suppliers are local. The profits stay in the community. The owner of the business is actually taking the revenue and not just a manager. They tend to pay a little higher to their labor than the national chain. And the profits in the national chain get shipped back to wherever, okay. So, there is a big difference.

Andersonville, when they basically realized this, put a big portion on it and it kept for the most part national chain stores out of Andersonville.
for those of you who have gone through that area or
spent any time there, it's a nice, vibrant area. It's
attractive. People physically come there to shop and to
walk around because of their unique stores, their
interesting stores. That is one of the things that we
might lose with this new building.

Summary of the economic impact, existing 708
building, basically the second floor, client impacts
about 900,000 bucks. That's the average of the two, 700
to 1.1. Retail sales, multiplier effect, total 11.4.
Proposed building retail sales, 4.3. Only multiplier
1.4. The residential spending is 3.7. The total is
9.4, okay.

So, if you took this analysis and balanced it
with the City deal, okay, of the 6.7 versus the 9, it's
kind of a wash. But I think more than the wash aspect
of it, the pure dollars and cents, you know, we need
something to attract people into the City. Okay.
They're not going to come here because a Banana Republic
is here, okay. Or, you know, North Face. They're going
to come here because William's Shoes are there, you
know, or some other unique kind of store. That's what
people are looking for, not necessarily a remake of Old
Orchard. Any questions?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: How long did it take you to gather all this data? I mean, because from my perspective, it's really helpful. And when you gave the presentation, this was almost a month ago, maybe longer now, and I'm all about data and rational thought on how to make decisions, and so, how long did it take to pull all of this together to make this analysis?

MR. KENNEDY: I would guess Barbara spent two or three afternoons wandering. I talked to Jim Nash who's the property manager. He was kind of, you know, she pissed a lot of people off, John, because she kept knocking on doors, you know, walking in on somebody's dental, you know, operation. But that's Barbara.

But anyway, I would say there was that, Jean Lindal put the model together initially, and then I kind of tweaked it and kind of pulled the presentation together, the analysis. You know, maybe five person days.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I think it's something that's important as we have gone to, you know, obviously the 708 is out of our hands for now. But going forward with other large proposals like this, this type of
analysis would be really helpful, I think, instead of, you know, having sort of the cookie cutter "we're going to believe whatever the developer tells us" approach, which is currently --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: We're just saying applying a generic term, this building is going to create a lot of tax and this building is going to do a lot for Evanston because of taxes, and we have to think about, I mean, every time I think Class B or saving office space in town, then I think Larry because, you know, that's something that he keeps driving home. And we can't lose this precious office space that's keeping people in Evanston and bringing them there.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I have a question for anyone. What do we know about the tenants that theoretically will, would be displaced from 708 Church? Where would they go? Do we know if they would stay in Evanston and relocate to Central Street or Main Street or Dempster Street or West Church Street? Or do we believe that they will leave Evanston?

MR. KENNEDY: I can speak a little bit to that. Almost every tenant in that building would like to stay in Evanston. The problem is there is very
little Class B space available in Downtown Evanston.
So, they are kind of being forced to move their
practices to outer areas or into their own homes.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Can you define outer
areas?

MR. KENNEDY: Pardon me?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Can you define outer
areas? Are we talking out of Evanston? Skokie?

MR. KENNEDY: I heard one tenant moved up to,
yes, to Glencoe.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Right.

MR. KENNEDY: You know, found some, you know,
space over some store in Glencoe and you know.
Currently, where that building was 100 percent full, the
second floor, is now 20 percent vacant because tenants
have been hearing about this. They said, oh, I got to
move, they got a space, they jump on it. It's a big
problem. And if this thing lingers for another year or
two, the people in that space will slowly ebb out.

Jim Nash isn't going to be able to bring
anybody new in. So, you're going to end up with a
vacant building by just our inaction. And then I don't
know how many years it's going to take to recover those
same kinds of professionals with their clientele into that building.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: So, we're already losing --

MR. KENNEDY: We're already losing. We're already losing it just because of this air. I urge the alder people to vote no on this thing and not push it back to your committee just for that reason alone.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: David, oh, I'm sorry about that.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Also, to follow up on that is if, I've been at every one of the City Council or the P&D meetings where, I know in front of us we didn't hear much from the tenants of the second floor because they usually have night clients so they weren't able to come. But for the P&D, many of them ended up making it and you heard impassioned pleas, you know, that they could not find space. They've been desperately searching for space and they're going to be tossed out.

And so, probably I would say five to ten, something like that, came before, I don't know any of
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: One gentleman said, I mean, he was probably in the 60's or 70's, he said what's going to happen to my career? What's going to happen to my practice? My practice will be destroyed if he has to move. And I can imagine that's all the same for several of these other tenants out there.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: You know, being brand new, I do have a question. And I was not involved in the tower deliberations but I'm an analyst by trade and I appreciate that. And I actually think this market study was, some of it was very good. But where studies, obviously it seems that studies like this were not done on the tower and for that matter the plan, you know, that I've heard a suggestion from you just now that perhaps you add this type of analyses before you move forward, do a real economic impact, and the City needs to do that.

So, I'm very surprised sitting here, brand new, that this had not been done before because I think the tower really is an issue of economics and the impact from a business perspective on the City. Granted, aesthetically, some people will say, well, they love
hundred-story buildings and some don't. But you know, so, just a question.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, and I think it's not necessarily true that there was no economic analysis done or being done because in fact the City is now engaged in the --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I had said like this.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, I understand.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: On the impact of what was happening with the building.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: The amount of revenue that's brought into the City with the building.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: What's going to happen when, okay, those type of things.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. And a lot of that, a lot more of that analysis happens when things get to P&D than they are before us. The City, at least on all the big projects that I know of, the City has engaged a consultant to do a more detailed economic analysis to try and, in some cases leverage it for additional public benefits.
MR. MARINO: And whenever, excuse me, whenever
there is a project that a TIF is -- we retain kind of --
forecast --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I'm just surprised, I
guess I'm not surprised to hear that.

MR. MARINO: But there's not a comparative
study, I think, at this point.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I'm not surprised, but
that these people are leaving and a study like this
hasn't been done. So, we are impacting livelihoods,
right, before we even know whether the building is a go
is what I'm just hearing. And I'm surprised.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, there's a little
bit of difference in this project than most projects.
Most projects are not replacing an ongoing viable
economic entity. You know, if you look at Sherman
Plaza, there was maybe one, two people left in the
Citibank building and they were running all over town
negotiating the best deals that they could with five or
six different landlords. It was not a big problem. The
bank building, the old Bank One building when they tore
that down for the condo, it was empty.
So, this type of economic analysis wasn't really even viable, I mean, in a sense because --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I'm sure it was obvious.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, it was obvious. The economic benefit, what was there was close to zero.

This is a little different. You know, it looks at a number of things. I mean, when you take into consideration some of the comments as it relates to what we're doing now, you know, you have to look at three or four things when you start saying, okay, what is it we think should go into the new zoning requirements? I could put a five-story building there. I could put a, what is it, three-story and two apartments and be right on with the current zoning. And that would still have some impact.

But that's, you know, that wouldn't have all of this. That could happen. The current landlord could raise rates, could raise the office prices if he really wanted to do something to scare some of these people out. I don't think he would because if he doesn't build anything he'd have a hard time filling it at a higher rate. So, there is some economics in there as well.
So, there's a lot to what you say when you're talking about tearing down an existing building. And I made a big point of that when there was this continual talk about buying the Fountain Square building with 50-some thousand square feet of office space that was full and the impact. So, I guess what we're saying is I know that, you know, you did this in terms of a specific project which is beyond us. But there's some things to consider when we're doing this part.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That makes some sense. And I don't think we can tell people they can't build, they can't do something with their property. But there are certain impact ideas that I think we can move forward with in doing this.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, for example, just you know, the whole notion that has been added to things in terms of bonus incentives for putting in office space into a project, it has really been introduced into the discussion where they get bonuses, I think goes directly to that point in terms of being able to provide that kind of, those kinds of spaces and uses within the City that does encourage those kinds of activities.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And maybe even taking a hard look at reducing that kind of space. You know, you may be building a new project, because you can get people back in that building very quickly. It may not be the same people.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Mr. Kennedy, if I may ask you, and I don't mean to be contrite, but are you saying from an economic point of view nothing should be done with this property apart from perhaps an adaptive reuse?

MR. KENNEDY: Absolutely not. I'll tell you what, going back to the term we call ourselves, Evanston Coalition for Responsible Development, we purposely said we're not against development, period. It's the right kind of development. One of the things that we thought and, again, we're just citizens here, one of the things we thought that would be a much better use for that space would be a McDougal or a Ratell type building. Six, seven stories, offices bringing 500-600 people into Downtown Evanston. You know, that would be a benefit from an economic point of view.

I'll tell you another concept --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Have you done an
MR. KENNEDY: No, we did not.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: The folks at the Parking Committee would love it.

MR. KENNEDY: The other interesting concept that even Mr. Klutznick brought up was that the Barnes & Noble building is vacant, has been vacant. And his idea was to take the second floor of that building and turn that into Class B offices. You know, and he said that he tried to talk to whoever owns this thing out of New York into doing that. Great idea, okay. You know, move everybody on that floor over to the other floor, throw some skylights in there and you're done.

But the answer to your question is we're not against development. We just don't see the need for 218 condo units in Downtown Evanston. It's not, I'll tell you another story. Melissa Wynne who is on the 3rd Ward spent a lot of time in the Chicago-Dempster area. And before the Church Street, whatever that 150 condos are on the west side just south of Dempster on Church, there used to be Duxler's and a carwash. The economics of that little shopping area have yet to recover from
getting rid of Duxler's and the carwash. Why? Because people would bring their car, get their tires changed, have 45 minutes to walk around and buy something and then go back. Or have their car, you know, cleaned and stuff and go walk around.

And that is why she's dead nuts against this development because she sees in her own ward the impact of condos on a local area. They're not people coming in shopping. They shop to some degree but it's not the same economic engine.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: You talked about displacement for example. Where do you put up a six-story office building? Shouldn't you have the same kind of displacement?

MR. KENNEDY: Certainly in the short run.

That's why I followed with the creative idea of moving into the second floor of Barnes & Noble is that, you know, you kind of think through, as a Plan Commission, you've got to think through how can you move the chess pieces around the board and not just, you know, make a decision in a vacuum.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: One other thing. What do the economics look like 30 years out?
MR. KENNEDY: We ran it up to 2029.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: You ran it up to 2029.

How about 30? How about 30 years?

MR. KENNEDY: The problem from a net present value --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: I say that because --

MR. KENNEDY: Excuse me. From a net present value point of view, once you get out beyond 20 years, it's virtually no change because you discounted those dollars so much that it's rounding or it really doesn't impact. The net, again, if you buy in the net present value concept, you're discounting 6 percent that flow of funds. So, when you're out there 20 plus years, a dollar is not worth a dollar. Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Have I missed something? Is the tower coming back to us? Is that why we're having this presentation?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: What's this really about?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: The purpose of this presentation was to talk about certain issues that, although these specifically originally related to a lot
or a site in the City, really applies to all of downtown which is the notion that office space is an economic engine that we can't just get rid of all of it.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: And that condos can't replace what office brings to them.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. Right. The one thing that I would say that is, there is not an economic, I don't have an economic analysis for it but there is certainly a lot of published literature about it. The reintroduction of residences into downtown areas has done a tremendous amount throughout this country to revitalize downtowns and bring them back from a moribund state where things had become a Class B, Class C, Class D over time because nobody cares, nobody went there.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: But we do have a pretty vital downtown.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: We do at the moment, yes. Thanks to a lot of work on the part of the City.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, the condominiums we built there, without having done the work that has been done, I don't think this City would be nearly as viable as it is.
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I agree, I grew up here.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You remember 1990, 1985?


COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, there have been days.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I am home.

MR. MARINO: I have a question. Dennis Marino, City staff. Relating to when the TIF winds down in 2017, you showed the ongoing analytical impact for the City of Evanston in terms of the property taxes, wouldn't you also need to add in the two school districts? Because the City's kind of, share of the property tax bill, if you will, is about 19 percent --

MR. KENNEDY: We were focusing in just from a city revenue point of view.

MR. MARINO: Yes, okay. Fair enough.

MR. KENNEDY: And the reason being is, you know, we're still running a deficit, you know. And yes, this would benefit the school districts and so on and there would probably be not many kids in there. But --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: What do you think your
analysis would show if the commercial aspects of this
were equal or slightly greater with condominiums above
that? So, in other words, we keep the retail, at least
the square footage we have, we keep at least the office
square footage we have, maybe increase both of them and
then maybe, well, enhance it with some kind of a new
development above that?

MR. KENNEDY: I actually went up to Mr.
Klutznick early on in the process and I said, you know,
you could make a lot of votes here if you did the
following. Put some parking underground and take a
layer at the top and put in Class B space. In other
words, don't charge the Class A space, just benefit the
community by putting in a Class B space and figure out
how people could, you know, for two years go somewhere
else.

That was an idea. I proposed it to him. He
looked at me like I was on the moon.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It's hard to build
Class B space.

MR. KENNEDY: Well, you subsidize it.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You have to subsidize
the Class B.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: This could have been --

MR. KENNEDY: You know, you just subsidize it.

That's what he could have been, from a benefit point of view, he blew me off as if I had nothing, like I was talking to the wall.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That's why we're looking I think at what you're talking about, we're looking at it in terms, not of his project, but in terms of what we're trying to do with the next phase in downtown.

MR. KENNEDY: I understand. I understand.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Where some of this begins to say, okay, maybe we have to incorporate some of these ideas in terms of public benefit. You know, making stronger public benefit options.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: State your name.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: I'm sorry, what?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: State your name.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Oh, Al Hunter. No, in response to Chuck there, and I think it's valid in terms of where we're going forward is it highlights that you have to take into consideration what is already on the site and what is it generating, and not simply focus on
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what the redevelopment -- and it's that comparison that
really has to be sensitive to --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, and I think it's also
more than just what is typically presented to us but
shows the property tax --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Yes, that's what I'm
saying. It's a much more --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Where somebody may say, well,
they're paying for this in property tax now and I'm
going to provide this. But the reality is there is a
bigger economic picture of where it has to be.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: And it's the
differentiated usages together with that.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: And I think as, you
know, as you go through, you, we, I don't know what I'm
going to use here, talking about specific sites and
stuff like that, that it's relevant in what is this,
what is it --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: One thing that I've
become aware of as a result of this discussion and it
relates to something that Jim said is, ironically, we're
trying to generate a master plan for downtown. And yet,
as we try to develop the downtown, invariably there will be a threat to downtown B office space, whether it's replaced by residential units, condos or whether it is replaced by A office space because it's highly unlikely that anyone is going to build like a U or B office space in the downtown.

So, ironically, part of what we might want to do is, in regards to incentives for our master plan, would be to try and encourage the City to renovate and build B office space in other parts of the town, you know, other net systems where there is access to mass transit, you know, along Central Street, along Main Street and so forth.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I wish that would have the same effect, but it doesn't.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: It doesn't.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It's just hard to, there is just a mass of people who want to be downtown.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And as much as we try to convince them, because there is some decent office space out on Dempster, a little west of Dodge, and places like that. And it's sometimes hard to get them
to, there's a great office space over in the 5th Ward in
the north on -- area. But a lot of times it's hard to
get them to move out to there. They look at it and say
that's too far a walk for people coming to see me from
the train.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: But there's a
conglomeration, it's a multi-functional use -- in a
highly centralized space.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right, and a lot of those
people just like the idea of being downtown so that they
can go out, go to a restaurant and go shopping.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: There are those areas
like maybe the Methodist buildings that are still close
enough that could encourage that kind of --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: They don't want to move out.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Because they're, you
know, a couple of blocks and that becomes important.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: So, Larry, are you suggesting
that maybe we ought to think about actually requiring
provision of office space in certain areas?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: No, I'm wondering if
there isn't something that would require a justification
at least for reducing the commercial space. Sure, we
may find, you know, 15 years from now that brick and
mortar isn't what it used to be and, you know, a plan
has to be flexible in that regard. But by the same
token, a point that's made is when you impact negatively
part of the economy just to the benefit of another part,
you want at least to ensure yourself you got a net gain.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I think that what Mr.
Kennedy has brought up here is an economic analysis, an
economic impact analysis when you're doing that. You
know, so if you're replacing a condo with a condo,
that's one thing. But if you're proposing to replace a
business with a condo or something, changing the tenant
structure, then perhaps we should require an economic
impact analysis.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: One of the things we
might want to consider is not only is it an economic
impact analysis but also a justification for changing
the use of at least that amount of space.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Would you want to go so
far as entertaining the idea of an incentive for the
benefit -- transition from other use to Class B?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, you know,
affordable, you know, something that is defined
somewhere as kind of affordable office space, affordable retail space could be a public benefit for greater something else.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: That's what I meant.

Exactly.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Because in many cases it's going to require a subsidy.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And in most cities, if you're requesting a subsidy for one thing, you have to give them an opportunity and most people are willing to do that to make the money somewhere else. But that's certainly, I think, something to look at very significantly. As I say, it's the first time -- this development would really run into. I mean, even the one-office building in the Research Park is empty.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And they were charging a rate that they had a difficulty to fill. So, this is really the first time we're, this is at --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Really uses the place.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That's being proposed to
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Well, I think we're going to, going forward I think we're going to continue, you're going to see these uses, you know, that office, trade office for condos because we've run out of sort of vacant, I mean, the Sherman Plaza block was probably the most developable site in downtown for many years. And we just don't have those sites in downtown anymore.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, once you've done the Research Park, once you've done that block.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Burger King.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That's right.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Well, it's the Burger King.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Quite frankly, I don't even want to know about the economic analysis of that site --

MR. KENNEDY: Cholesterol city.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, they could still put the Burger King down there.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That's fine. Thank you.

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you. I will get copies of not only the PowerPoint but all the spreadsheets to Tracy who can then distribute it to you guys. And you
know, if you are interested in having an ad hoc citizen participate in one of these economic views down the stream, you know, I'd be more than willing to put the time. Okay.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Thank you. Steve?

MR. DRAZNER: Yes. Steve Drazner with the City. Before I say anything, I just want to say I'm completely neutral towards this whole issue. I'm neither for nor against it. And the only thing I wanted to just make sure, the numbers are accurate. That's my only goal and objective.

Just to clarify how the TIF works, the City would get 100 percent of the amount over the frozen value. Any EAP above the frozen value can go to the TIF as far as in 2017. And actually, now it would be -- fiscal year 2019 because of the lag with the county with the levy taxes. So, I just wanted to point that out.

And so, the additional revenue would come from transfer tax or real estate transfer tax because there would be the turnover of the units each year that would generate some more revenue. And just in terms of the sales tax, I can't really comment on this, on John's figure, as I have no way of, you know, verifying that
information. So, I can't really comment on that.

But in addition, this would also increase our per capita amount for our income tax, tax revenues that are distributed on a per capita basis such as utility taxes, income tax to the state, motor fuel tax. So, those would be some additional revenues.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Do you have those numbers? For 218, let's say 250 people, what are those numbers per year for those things?

MR. DRAZNER: I don't have that information. You're talking about on a per capita basis?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Well, you're saying that the extra money would be, you're saying that that's, I guess you're bringing it up because it was obviously a huge error that you're seeing. So, you're saying that --

MR. DRAZNER: I just want to point that out.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: So, what are the numbers that will be generated there?

MR. DRAZNER: I'm talking in general terms right now. I don't have specific numbers. I just wanted to make a few points, that's all.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Okay. I'm just, I just
MR. DRAZNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I'm all about the data.

MR. DRAZNER: Those were things that I was, I just happened to notice that weren't in the analysis. I just wanted to bring them to your attention.

MR. KENNEDY: But they're in the analysis, the numbers are there, but they --

MR. DRAZNER: I didn't see anything on utility tax.

MR. KENNEDY: Oh, no, I didn't --

MR. DRAZNER: Or per capita or about any distributions. Building permit revenue would be another one. And after the TIF expires, in my opinion, it still would help the City because it would decrease the tax burden for all other property tax owners.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Do you have numbers on that, too? Like how much --

MR. DRAZNER: I have this number. I can give you --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, no, no. I'm being serious. So, if you're saying that it would reduce the tax burden, which I have not seen my taxes go down in
eight years, but how much would the taxes for each property owner would go down by this development coming in? I would love to see the numbers on that, that you are saying with more development coming in downtown which we've seen a lot over the past however many years, and I would like to see where that has brought down property tax for anyone in this room.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, first of all, can I comment a little bit?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes. Well, I'm just, I'm asking him to give me real data.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: First of all, we've got to remember, mostly developments occurred in TIF districts, so that money is going to the TIF right now.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: So, the City is not really seeing it in those terms yet. Secondly --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, no. I just think if we're going to throw something out, that I would like real numbers versus --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I agree with you, yes. It would be great to have real numbers.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Just so we have real
MR. DRAZNER: In general terms, the higher the total tax or EAV --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I want real numbers, not theory. Do you understand?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Let me ask you just one question because I know schools do it differently. In Evanston, is it not true that once the budget is established, then that is divided equally over each dollar of assessed value?

MR. DRAZNER: We levy a dollar amount, not a percent. So, that --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: No, but if there's a million dollars, you have a million dollars in the budget, then each EAV would cost a dollar to pay for that budget. If the property were worth a million dollars.

MR. DRAZNER: Let's use simple hundreds. Let's the total EAV is $1,000.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Okay.

MR. DRAZNER: And our levy is $1,000. So, you basically just divide the levy by the EAV and come up with a percent.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Right.

MR. DRAZNER: So, the higher the EAV, the less percent each individual --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, if the EAV goes up to $1,200 and the levy is $1,000 --

MR. DRAZNER: Then it would be --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Then each person is going to pay more --

MR. DRAZNER: Right --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But all I'm saying is, no, I understand --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That's because you keep raising how much you're spending.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right. Well, I'm, wait, what I'm saying is I understand the theory. You know, I understand it. But the reality is not, that's, you know, something that people throw out but the reality is not true that our taxes are going to go down because we put up 218 condos.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's totally false that taxes are going to go down because our expenditures keep going up.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You're not going to
CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's true, it's exactly what Larry just said. They won't go up as high or as fast.

MR. DRAZNER: That's not what I'm saying. I'm saying they won't increase as much. There's a difference. Because you have an additional EAV, it's really just straight math.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Well, I would like data exactly on how much that's going to impact every single property owner, especially also with the utility tax that you mentioned since that wasn't included in the analysis. And real hard numbers would be awesome.

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you, everybody.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Andrew?

MR. McGONIGLE: I just want -- on the gentleman's presentation -- his presentation on the process that you're going through right now. I think Larry put it fairly well that we have a very good opportunity right now and -- do it to actually balance out what you allow in the zones and what you actually require in each development. And over the long term, you -- flexibility that will allow the multiple uses within the same spot so that you can put in a second
floor or fifth floor or whatever term you want to apply
to it, whether it's Class B, Class A, a creche or
whatever. But I think you have a wonderful opportunity
right now in looking at the zones that you're creating
to actually allow that flexibility and not to cut that
off.

And the other question that I would like to
ask is you have two great consultants sitting in front
of you -- presentation. Neither of them made one
comment on the whole -- discussion. And based upon what
I've just said and what I've heard you say, I would
actually like to hear comments from them, either support
or disagree with that other view and as to how it can
benefit the City at all.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Mr. Lamotte?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Give your dollar's
worth.

MR. LAMOTTE: My feeling is that, you know,
the more we're thinking through the locations and
impacts of everything you do within the process is
great. And we do need to get a plan to the Council so
we can move forward so you will have a plan so people
will be following the plan to take the vote off staff,
the vote off of you. And the numbers, I mean, some of
the assumptions I think made some sense, but we were
questioning the per capita numbers, the national
chain/local spending numbers, the number of visitors
coming through residents. I'd say residents are better
than office but sometimes the residents are pumping up
the economy a lot more than employees that don't come
out for lunch, et cetera, et cetera.

So, the theory I think of what he presented
probably made a lot of sense, but we shouldn't hang the
whole plan on, well, local is good and the national bad,
because a mix of local and national is what's making all
downtowns work as long as they're not dominated by the
nationals. And as I said two or three meetings ago,
we're starting to see with our firms, some developers
are saying, hey, people want the locals, they want their
mom and pop, those that are doing pretty good, let's get
them in and maybe do a little subsidy just based on the
whole thing, mix it up.

So, I think we just have to be careful on
getting too hung up on the numbers because we're really
saying what's the land use first and where do we go from
here. I think we made great strides internally in the
team with staff and a few. I'm saying what about bonuses, what about incentives? Because we collectively can only move the market so much. We want to guide it, we want to push it, but we can't say, well, this guy is going to go here because then they're going to buy that and we're going to protect these guys and move that.

Now, we're going to try but the bonuses -- affordable office and affordable housing is there. We've got to shape it and put all numbers on them when we get to zoning in the next phase after this is done. So, we rule the whole thing on a happy medium. What's the right balance for this town? And I think you hit it earlier.

We all know what it was like years ago when you went down into the -- funds. It's come back now. What's the balance? There's only a few sites really that are susceptible to change. And we can say, you know, we want a mass of uses. At each site, you can do office, hotel, residential, retail, commercial. Well, then everything goes and it's going to fill in according to the market, the bonuses and the incentives are going to be there to help make this happen.

I think the next phase not only is to tighten
all the zoning down but to get in all these incentives.
You are being a lot more creative than most towns. I was just in a town a week ago and they're trying to figure out what incentive to get something going because they have no action in the future. What can we do to help get this space affordable and get people out here and filling it?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: And there's also supply and demand. So, as you're talking about the --
MR. LAMOTTE: Right, the market.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Right. And you know, from my perspective, if I'm a developer, this is the place I want to develop so I think we can be a little more demanding. I think our incentives could actually be more demanding than they are saying you're not going to develop here unless you're going to do these things.
MR. LAMOTTE: And that's a great question.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: You know, and so that's one thing I didn't see in this plan. I see incentives but that we're trading out for these incentives. And I think some of those incentives should just be requirements. I mean, we have a really unique opportunity here in Evanston, you know. It's like,
there's not a lot of it to go develop --

MR. LAMOTTE: -- point of your thinking, right.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes. And we have a real opportunity to make it really special.

MR. LAMOTTE: And at the earlier meeting, we talked about that, about the Christmas tree, you keep adding on, I want gold pavers and green roof and I want all this stuff. But it gets to the point then nobody is going to develop, we're not going to change obsolete buildings. But there is a happy medium in incentives and requirements that should be there. And we just have to be careful to keep that balance because these downtowns whether it's your downtown or it's Mayberry are very delicate little Swiss watches that we got to keep going.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And one of the things that tends to happen in a situation like this is the specialty, if you will, of the developer. So, if I have Klutznick & Anderson who are both retail and --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Retail and residential.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: They're retail and
residential. If I have Jack Buck, it's residential and office. And there are others, and sometimes we kind of try to mold a little bit the mix of developers that work together on a project by saying, okay, you know, as much as some of us have talked to Klutznick's about getting in more office space and then -- office space, and I think he's trying. But his forte is not office space and that's just a fact of life.

MR. LAMOTTE: And then the next -- point is what you brought up earlier, is it possible -- and we can't keep saying -- you know, that's the way out. But then how do we get around it?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: What's the incentive, the requirement, how do we help that person make that work?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes. Yes, because if we want certain things, we may have to give certain things to help that together. This is the way to live or it's nothing, then everything stops. So, that's what I'm suggesting we try to figure out as we just kind of wrap this thing up and how do you put that in there.

MR. LAMOTTE: And the other thing as we get back in the discussion, we used these locations of
heights and -- the Fountain Square. The Fountain Square fixed up today and kind of part of the overall global intersection all cleaned up or Fountain Square -- for that building. And the Class B in there would come out at a cost but there would be a bigger open space. So, it's that balance, what are we going to do?

And I think the Goodman Williams market study -- we've got some tier of A that we like and need here for some folks to compare, we've got a lot of B needs here. How do we balance it all?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, do you think we'd throw out the concept of tearing down the building right now?

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: No, no. You tear out the first floor, you open that to the courtyard --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: We still have been trying to figure out how to hold that building up without, you know, suspending it in mid air there.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Come on, no, no. I have seen buildings like that in Prague.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But they weren't --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: No, I don't think -- I think there is more creativity that can be generated
than I've heard.

MR. LAMOTTE: And, Mr. Chairman, I think as we proceed tonight and the next couple of -- what is the land use that we're recommending? Is it going to be you can do a whole range of things at any site or are we going to be specific which gets a little tricky with the market? What are our densities and heights? And then we've got a great set of guidelines and standards that are now going to be a longer list than we ever had, that you've got to go through that grinder to get a good building out the other end -- developer, it's already being recommended. So, the fine tuning then will come and it comes back to you again in zoning, you've got a lot more ammunition to do it.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Can I ask a general question? It's come up to me in this process, and I don't know how this might be incorporated into planning and so on, is there any way of incorporating iterations in development as it progresses? Say, suppose you were to take what is being proposed here and max everything and say, okay, this is what it would look like in a most dense situation for everything that's available, then take to its minimal thing. And then the question is,
well, how much do you want on a block? Suppose this
goes in at this point, does that now change? Is there
any feasibility of then changing what can be done to the
remaining elements within it?

So, it's an iterative process here. Is that
incorporated into the planning context at all?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I didn't see that. So,
when I looked at the plan and I saw, you know, you had a
zone and you have a maximum height across that zone --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Right --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: On this whole block or,
so --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Right. Or suppose one
goes in, now do you reassess what's the remaining
element? So, you've got an iterative zoning process
here. Is this in the zoning literature?

MR. LAMOTTE: It's in the planning literature.

I mean, part of it boils down to infrastructure and
traffic -- so, if you take the triangle, the wedge of
cheese in the middle and literally fold it up to our
height of 30 something, you know, then okay, that's a
density that's a whole different ball game. But then
you've got a library there and you've got a post office
there that's not going to be built on. So, we factored
our numbers in, we factored the real development
potentials here with some factor that over time other
buildings might go. I mean, that's what was loaded into
the traffic model that they're working with.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: That's not what I'm
getting at. You know, I'm getting ahead with this model
where the elements in the equation are changing, it's a
function of what's moving in.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: He's telling you he
changed it before he started.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: No, no, that it's a
progressive thing. In other words --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: No, I understand what
you're saying but he did respond to it. He said that he
looked at the overall equation --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: What's there now.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: What's there.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: And it wasn't possible
in certain areas to build any more. So, you're talking
about --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: You can tear buildings
down and put in new buildings.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: The library? The public library and put up a new building?

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Well, those next to that building if something goes up. Is that going to change anything in the existing zoning that's there? That's what I'm asking.

MR. BISHOP: No. Nor am I familiar with a model that could do that. And to some extent, that's handed down to us by the laws of the land. I mean, quite the -- the traditional zoning model is really quite the contrary. What goes in influences the next building, not by way of saying, well, we've already filled the available, we've met the available demand so we can then down-zone remaining parcels to accommodate smaller buildings. It's really quite the opposite of the way it works, and the reason is because similarly situated properties need to be dealt with in an even-handed fashion. The law looks unfavorably on granting special permits to people who have, that are similarly situated.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: There is a queuing system that occurs. First come, first served. First
come, best benefit.

MR. LAMOTTE: That's not the nature of the plan. That's --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: No, I understand. That's not the nature of your plan. But what incentive would that provide for --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Part of the plan does talk about, you know, that the buildings do need to blend, right, do need to work together. There is a section in here, the context, but that could lead then to all 15-story buildings in the same block, correct?

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Exactly, that's what I'm saying. Maxing out.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, that's where the question I have asked several times about, the sort of notion that exists in San Francisco in terms of new corridor and spacing requirements from one building to another could come into --

MR. LAMOTTE: And we brought that up in the beginning, the spacing between, they're all 15 in a row.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: We would have space and architecture, but we just don't see that you have that
many big blocks that you would just have 15-story
to time the stage for
anything -- and you've got more of an organic downtown,
an eclectic downtown. If we were trying to create a
street wall like in Washington and Virginia where you're
trying to get everything lined up that's full stories,
10 stories, 20 stories, then fine. But you've got so
many different things going on.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: It's just part of the dynamic of
this downtown that we're setting a stage. The plan says
this, you fill it up some day according to zoning.
Zoning is very tight on what goes in there. It's not
making it up as we go along which is one of the issues
we've been fighting and we're trying to settle. And
then we pound on good architecture so that we get
interesting buildings. And I mean, the whole debate on
the fill the block up as the block rather than go up
slim like when you were debating it on the other track,
there's a lot to it as far as density and views.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And we're also
building in more setbacks so that you can't come up with
a 15-story solid wall. Even if each building is 15
stories, you know, you're not going to get that anymore.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: I'm just thinking that you're going to do an article on --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And I think you're also looking at a new article for a law journal.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: There's precedent to a queuing in the legal system.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Preservation.

MR. MARINO: Preservation is up.

(Pause.)

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay.

MR. CRAMER: Thanks for having us back again.

Jordan Cramer, I'm the Chair of the Preservation Commission here with Carlos Ruiz, our Coordinator for the City. And we've made some changes to the original proposal that we gave to you and Carlos gave you some handouts that you can read at your leisure that eliminates some of these items and you can speak to some of those as well.

But just to take you through some of the changes that we put in here, the first point, I think, is probably the one that maybe causes the most interest and concern on a lot of people's part is the 'Establish
a Downtown Federal Conservation Historic District.' The idea behind this is to look at the traditional areas that you have mapped out and find a way to add additional incentives to those owners in those areas to maintain their buildings if they choose to do so without putting a whole new set of onerous obligations that people tend to have the knee-jerk response of saying we don't want those extra layers added on top.

So, my understanding, and this is all mostly coming from Carlos, is that the idea behind the Downtown Federal Historic District is that we as the Preservation Commission would make a nomination of these areas and they would have to meet certain criteria as established by the national guidelines. And then the, is it the National Historic?

MR. RUIZ: National Park Service.

MR. CRAMER: Would either approve or disapprove of it. Once that's established as a federal historic district, it really, then a lot of it falls back on the owners to decide how they're going to take advantage of this. It gives them the ability to apply for whatever federal incentives there are. There are, as we've mentioned here right now, there's Federal
Historic Preservation Tax Credits that they can have for rehabilitation. They would have to, in essence, if they wanted to make changes to their building, they would have to make sure they meet the guidelines if they are going to get those incentives. We're not going to add a new set of regulations on top of those.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So, it's similar to the Ridge Historic District? So, if you apply for historic status or landmark status, then if you got that, then the tax benefits and everything are similar for this? You can do something if you don't apply for it, is that correct?

MR. RUIZ: Yes. The difference between a local district versus a federal district would be that a local district would be subject to the Preservation Ordinance, the Evanston Preservation Ordinance. That would require a review by the Commission. The federal is not a local ordinance, it's a federal designation which is separate from a local government purview. And they will review it only if you apply for a benefit or an incentive.

If you want to do something within a federal district and you don't apply for any incentive, you
don't have to go through their review at all because it's not a local designated landmark, or district. The one that you just mentioned, the Ridge Historic District, is both local and federal. It was first federal, and then it became local within the ordinance. That's why we can review all the projects inside the district because it's a local district as well.

MR. CRAMER: And I think, in essence, it will give the owner the opportunity to subject itself to a more stringent review than what will be in this new plan. And as a result, they can have certain benefits from it. But you know, the plan will help by incorporating this, give us the impetus to go ahead and let's try and nominate those areas, let's get them designated, let's have them be a part of this plan, and in doing so, help encourage and facilitate some of that preservation.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. We have a question over here.

MS. McWILLIAMS: Yes. I'm Mary McWilliams, an Associate Commissioner, former Commissioner. The difference between the Ridge Historic District is the residential. What we're talking about is a commercial...
and business district. There are specific funds available for federal districts, buildings that are listed in the National Register for commercial property and business properties that are not available to residential properties.

And so, that's what we're talking about is the benefits that would occur from this specific preservation.

MR. RUIZ: And that's the tax credit. The federal tax credit.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Looking at the areas that we designated right now as traditional areas, do you think they meet the federal requirements to be designated?

MR. RUIZ: Well, I believe in conversations with a representative of the National Park Service, the reason I explained and brought -- and without the benefit of being in Evanston, looking at photographs or anything like that, he had the recommendation that the only way to find out is by applying. And, that based on the information I provided, he felt that the intention is that there are communities that are scattered across the country that are smaller communities that perhaps
have less significant buildings that are contributing, or character-giving buildings that do have National Register downtown historic districts.

I'm not sure if they're going to compare to them, but I can tell you based on my research that you can clearly make a difference between Evanston and, let's say a community that is maybe, like for instance, as an example, Bloomington, Illinois. They may have historic districts downtown but it's not Evanston. You know, their resources are different.

I think that you have to, well, when I say you, the City has to demonstrate that certain areas or certain buildings have value to the community, to the City. And if they can demonstrate that, the National Park Service will support that if the standards that they particularly have are met.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, their viability for future success is one of the factors?

MR. RUIZ: I'm not sure if I understand your question.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: There are some downtown areas that are pretty much dead in some small towns.
MR. RUIZ: Right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Even though, an excellent example is the turn of the last century architecture as opposed to ours which we have every reason to believe will continue to be successful.

MR. RUIZ: Correct.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Will that itself help us?

MR. RUIZ: Those communities that have a challenge to revive the downtowns in the 80's and 90's, they went through some of them through what they called the Main Street Program. The Main Street Program was created to motivate and incentivate the economic development of those small communities. And eventually, as they achieved their goal, some of the communities actually nominated their downtowns in the National Register as well.

And now, that program, or at least in the 90's it was expanded to communities over 50,000 people. But I think that somehow that program is not as viable as it used to be before. But that's a good example where they actually used preservation as an economic factor.

MR. CRAMER: Now, I think we could certainly,
as part of the nomination process, incorporate that to say these are historically, you know, thriving, you know, economic areas and they've continued through the ages despite that they haven't changed physically a great deal over time and that's what provides them with, you know, why we should nominate them. I think that one of the challenges that we will have is that each area would have to be designated on its because I think the guidelines require that it be a contiguous area.

So, we would be looking at each zone separately. And certainly, there is no guarantees by even putting this in here that it will be accepted because it's laying in the hands of others. But I think by putting it in the plan, I think it's a step in the right direction saying we, as a community, feel that these areas should be considered for the federal district.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: In the future, if a building has been recognized and has had the tax rebates or whatever it is, is it then precluded from being torn down and putting another building up on the site?

MR. RUIZ: As long as you're not using federal funding, state funding or any type of funds from the
federal and state government, you can demolish. Anybody --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Even if that building has had state funds in the past and has been --

MR. RUIZ: Right. And as a good analogy to that is that right now, for instance, the Evanston Lighthouse, it's not only in the federal, this is a national historical landmark which is the highest recognition you can get. That building, if the keepers decide to tear it down, if they're not applying for any federal funding or --

MR. CRAMER: To tear it down.

MR. RUIZ: They could.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Even though they've had federal funding in the past to keep it up?

MR. RUIZ: Right. Right. And that is the difference between local designation and federal designation. That's what protects the lighthouse. It is not necessarily the federal designation, it's the local.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: It's the local.

MR. RUIZ: The local designation.

MR. CRAMER: I don't think necessarily a good
thing but it does go to show you as well the people's concerns in applying for these things is, my God, we've got a whole new set of regulations. I can never change this. That's just simply not the case as he was just, you know, pointing out. So, I think it kind of dispels that myth of, you know, bringing some sort of preservation overlay, it's going to prevent any sort of change on this property over time.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So, they can observe it for 10 years and then, you know, get federal funds for 10 years and on the 11th year if they want to tear it down, they can tear it down.

MR. CRAMER: Subject to what, you know, this body has to say about it I suppose. Yes, in theory, I guess you're correct.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But according to this, they contributed 50 percent of the cost or something.

MR. RUIZ: No, that's a separate --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That's a separate --

MR. RUIZ: Yes.

MR. CRAMER: That's separate. That's on the facade retention.

MR. RUIZ: Right. It's modeled after the
facade increment program that we have in certain areas
that are under CDBG areas.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, the Preservation
did put up all the money to do the repairs or the
modifications and what they're going to return are tax
breaks?

MR. RUIZ: Yes, that's a 25 percent tax break
I believe.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Okay.

MR. RUIZ: Right. Now, the other incentive
that most of you are familiar is the Class L which is
available to local landmarks, not federal but local.
And the Chandler building is the best example we can
mention. That was not a landmark, they came before our
Commission. They wanted to nominate as a landmark. The
Commission had certain concerns about replacing the
original windows. The owner understood that that was a
major component of the design and architecture and
integrity of the building. He decided to restore those
windows. Everything else that is facing north and west
is new but is compatible with a historic building and it
became a landmark. Then they applied for Class L and
they had the benefit of those.
MR. MARINO: They get Class L and there's a county assessment reduction program for landmark properties and it reduces the assessment to 16 percent.

MR. RUIZ: Yes, from 32 percent to 16 percent.

MR. MARINO: So, it's a very significant benefit. The County will only act on it if they have resolution from the local City Council --

MR. CRAMER: And that kind of ties in to the second bullet point that I think some of you had some questions in looking at the transcript about this is I think it pretty much remains as it was in the original draft but I can expound on it if you'd like. It's to encourage and promote these additional landmarks.

We went through and we did a survey. We determined which buildings we thought made it above the cut in terms of these are potential landmarks. We don't, we can't say for certain but they at least have the potential. Their integrity is good enough. They have enough characteristics that we think that it might meet our local standards.

And what I think ideally we'd like to do in the end is work with those owners and get them involved in this process eventually to say, you know, we've
looked at your building, we think it's significant. We think it's worthy of landmark status. There are many benefits that will come with that sort of designation and that we, you know, through the plan at least acknowledge that those buildings are worthy of that.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Do you have that list?

MR. CRAMER: Yes.

MR. RUIZ: That's provided in the --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I actually have a question about the list.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Oh, it's right here.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's right there. It's your last page.

MR. CRAMER: I'm glad you asked, yes.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I'm leading you, okay.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: You say there's 25 downtowns identified but then there's only 20 on the list.

MR. CRAMER: No, we discussed an original list.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Okay, 25.

MR. CRAMER: And then we went through potential buildings and I think it was 25. And then we
actually went out and did site visits on all these buildings and weighted them. And then we came back and said, okay, you know, some are going to make it, some aren't. You know, we're only looking at the top echelon and, you know, amongst those are what you were discussing earlier. 708 Church was one that, you know, we didn't think made the cut.

But of those, there were 10 that we believe that are potential landmarks.

MR. RUIZ: Most likely to meet the standards.

MR. CRAMER: Right.

MR. RUIZ: That was the criteria, most likely to meet the standards.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: And those 10 are the bolded?

MR. CRAMER: Yes, right.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Would you be good enough to describe the buildings in a vernacular manner so we would know what they are?

MR. RUIZ: We did a condition survey. That was already --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: No, I mean on this list. Benison's Bakery --
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Burger King.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, right.

MR. RUIZ: We can do that.

MR. CRAMER: There was an original. I don't know if all of you --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.

MR. CRAMER: This is the original.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Months ago.

MR. CRAMER: Right, months ago. So, we visited some of it --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: As I recall, you had pictures of the various properties and the little --

MR. CRAMER: Right, yes. It's this original survey, it's got all this nice, you know, array of photos --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I'm just lazy, you know --

MR. CRAMER: I mean, you know, it did include amongst others the Benison Bakery, there's this Harvard & Root building at 1520 Chicago which I think is where the AT&T --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: AT&T, right.

MR. CRAMER: The old North Shore hotel.
MR. RUIZ: That's the brick building that I was telling you about on Chicago Avenue.

MR. CRAMER: Right. I don't know how else to describe that. So, this is 1728-30 Chicago. It's kind of tucked away a little bit. And it is listed in the National Register of historic places.

MR. RUIZ: Right. And that's why this is bundled 10, because it's already in the National Register.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: If it's already listed --

MR. RUIZ: In the National Register.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. Shouldn't we then not use them as a slot of the 10?

MR. RUIZ: Because it's not local.

MR. CRAMER: It's not local yet. I mean, if it would be nice if they just came forward and applied.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: But if it's a national landmark, how endangered is it as a building in transit being torn down?

MR. RUIZ: It can be torn down any minute.

MR. CRAMER: Yes, it could be. I also, just to point out for the benefit of everybody here again, we
did not look at this with the eye towards what's got the wrecking ball right outside. We just looked at this fresh and said here are buildings that, and I think Mary McWilliams described in our last meeting that in the original survey you're necessarily considering all of these. So, they weren't necessarily overlooked or weren't worthy back when the original ordinance was written. They just simply weren't considered because of lack of resources, time or what have you. So, we've gone out and actually done that.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Can I ask whether the 915 Davis was in there? I mean, it's got a higher rank and it's not bolded.

MR. CRAMER: 915 Davis? And that's the Chicago Northwestern Station.

MR. RUIZ: Yes, I think that's my overlooking that.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Oh, this should be bold?

MR. RUIZ: Yes, it should be.

MR. CRAMER: I think it should be bold.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: No, no, I was just curious.

MR. LAMOTTE: It might be helpful to clarify,
I think, for everybody to understand the district versus the building.

MR. RUIZ: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: That is, the first strategy is done, the whole downtown or the shopping downtown as a district. Then the building inside that is local, and just so you understand incentives, requirements, you know, what do you get as the owner.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: You have to have the district designation first, is that correct?

MR. RUIZ: No.

MR. CRAMER: No, because one is going to be a federal designation that we would nominate. These are local under our existing ordinance.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay. So, if an owner of a building is in the district, they've got these certain benefits, to explain it, the building is actually called out as a local landmark, what does that mean for that local owner? What extra, you know, stick or incentive that --

MR. CRAMER: Well, there's the tax incentives that I think Dennis mentioned through Cook County.

MR. RUIZ: And these are reviewed by the
Preservation Commission.

MR. CRAMER: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay. So, everybody caught that? You know, it's a district wide of a bunch of bundle of things and then the building gets some other bundle of things like the Cook County --

MR. MARINO: The tax breaks.

MR. LAMOTTE: Incentive which has been, being used more and more in Chicago for some buildings that have been saved because they could get that lower tax and people are being marketed with that, you can drop your taxes for six, seven, eight years or whatever. And they market that right in the brochure.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: As long as Cook County keeps raising the tax rates. Jordan, what would you think about the idea of rather than giving a specific number on that second bullet point, just say promote the designation of official local landmarks from properties identified in the Downtown Evanston building condition survey?

MR. CRAMER: I have no qualms with that at all. I mean, 10 was just the number we came up with.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right, yes.
MR. CRAMER: It wasn't a magic number. We really said anything above this number we'll consider. And that's how we came up with that.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So, if there's 20, we're fine with that as well.

MR. CRAMER: That should be --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Should we, again thinking of posterity because again some of us won't be here on the Plan Commission for the next 25 years, shouldn't we put 10 or more so that they could see that the next iteration of the Preservation Commission doesn't look for 5?

MR. RUIZ: No, but if you're looking at a number, that means that it would be even more significant because then you can eventually nominate more buildings over time that the criteria is age, 25 years or older, more than qualified.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Somebody is not going to designate Sherman Plaza --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: In fact, you know, as time goes by, there may be other buildings that will come into play in this thing that aren't even in this
condition survey report right now.

MR. RUIZ: One of the challenges that
generally speaking preservationists have are buildings
that may be in physical bad shape and they are
overlooked and they could be restored and then actually
become a contributor or significant landmarks on their
own right. So, just the fact that a building is in bad
shape, it doesn't automatically disqualify it for local
designation or for the National Register.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Which leads us into the next
bullet point when we get there.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Just to, again, share a
specific clarification on that very point, you have,
assuming there's a little standard there on the ranking
here, number 8 is a 6.9 and it's fair condition. And
then, what did that say here, 18 is 6.8 and it's good
condition. So, you've got two that are very similar,
one is fair, one is good. And does that influence the
designation here?

MR. CRAMER: I think, well, the overall
ranking is --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: The overall ranking I think
tried to incorporate more factors.
MR. CRAMER: Right. I mean, it was multi-
faceted.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Right.

MR. CRAMER: One thing we looked at was the
integrity of the building. That was an issue for quite
a few buildings we looked at is they have so
significantly changed over time of deteriorating.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right, right.

MR. CRAMER: That you really --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Couldn't restore it or
something?

MR. CRAMER: You could, but looking at it as
it stands today, it really didn't cut the muster.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So, you could have --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: So, the theory on the
good are really summary kind of judgments on these
various --

MR. CRAMER: Right.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So, you could have a
building that's in poor condition and that nevertheless
might score very highly because of its design and
integrity.
MR. CRAMER: Right, its historic value for some reason. Exactly.

MR. LAMOTTE: And so we're just clear, because of the wordology of some of these things, I guess we've run into this when we've talked about encourage, consider, you must establish, 'you have to' kind of things, so that the property owner types aren't, you know, coming in with the pitchforks either. This is the incentive approach.

MR. CRAMER: Correct. This is encouraging.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, we're basically saying that if X building gets a landmark designation by the City and/or as a district, there's going to be a bunch of bundle of stuff to help try to make them not tear it down.

MR. CRAMER: Correct.

MR. LAMOTTE: So they're not fighting always with the -- there could be a bundle of goods if they're ready to something, they could go there rather than tear it down. Is that correct?

MR. CRAMER: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay. Because, you know, the words we're sending is guide, policies, we've got to
just be careful what those words are.

MR. CRAMER: Right, and I think the --

MR. LAMOTTE: We must do this versus let's consider it. If we're considering it now as policy, then fine --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: To encourage and promote is incentive.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

MR. CRAMER: Right, exactly.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, the owner of a building would have to approve being designated a landmark, wouldn't they?

MR. LAMOTTE: No.

MR. CRAMER: Well, not necessarily. I mean, we've seen, you know, several of those projects in recent times before the Commission where the owner was not in favor of it. But our hope is that we're going to approach those owners and talk to them about this and explain to them the benefits of it and encourage them as to, the plan will hopefully say to apply for that designation with this Board community and the Preservation Commission.

MR. LAMOTTE: This interpretation sometimes in
a study they will, they almost start forcing their hand
to tear the building down because they think they're
threatened. The idea is we have a new plan, you know,
new guidance. There's all kinds of ideas and benefits
and incentives and a whole bunch of new tools. Let's
not be so hasty in that. Maybe we -- you need to fix it
up. So, that's what we run into, all of a sudden
there's a knee-jerk reaction saying you're locking me
down, you're making me a landmark and I can't do
anything with that building.

MR. RUIZ: But that goes both ways because if
you designate an area with a particular zoning, down
zoning, you know, somebody will think, you know, it's
very similar.

MR. LAMOTTE: There's a delicate balance
there.

MR. RUIZ: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: How much down zoning if at all.

MR. RUIZ: Right.

MR. CRAMER: I think that, you know, all that
leads nicely to the next bullet point which was this,
"Establish a rehabilitative and adaptive reuse fund from
the bonus system," that's contained in the plan already.
And I know there were some comments and questions about, you know, the administration of this and how is that going to work. And I think the comment was made by somebody that ultimately it's going to be up to City Council. They're the ones who dole out the funds, not the Commissions.

But the idea is that the Commissions, and I think jointly is the best way to do this, would make a recommendation. Say, okay, we've got these funds, the owner has come to us, this is a project we think is worthy for a number of reasons. And I think it's important that it be a joint decision because we each lend our own expertise and balance each other nicely in terms of, you know, determining exactly where and when those funds should be expended. And I think that clearly we've established that we've had one joint meeting. We've had these meetings. We can clearly work together on those things and not, you know, hold up funds for years on end trying to get them in the right spot.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: The question again, to use wordology, is administer the appropriate term for that?
MR. CRAMER: No. Commissions don't have the authority to --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: That's what I mean.

That implies too much authority.

MR. MARINO: And that's really staff function, but I think a commission or two commissions could review --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Review and recommend here or something.

MR. MARINO: And we have precedent for that certainly. More specifically, the Community Development Block Grant Committee currently reviews all the facade rebate applications which -- as well. And then that goes on to the City Council.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: The Council then, so it's a review and recommend kind of thing.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, and it's pretty clear to me that the Preservation Commission needs to be involved in these specific kinds of things. But until we resolve the issue of how these projects get reviewed and by whom, since part of the theory here is not having planned developments and therefore maybe Plan Commission is reviewing them and there's some other body or
whatever it is, we'll have to figure that out.

MR. CRAMER: When they get to, you know, a

subcommittee combined with --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It may be.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I was going to say

maybe it's a subcommittee that reviews them.

MR. CRAMER: Right.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, mechanically and process-

wise, then if this is in there as a strategy, these are

the follow-ups that we as a city could do then. The

plan sets this, the objective is this, and then we can

work on this all together, one at a time, whatever the

priorities are. These are things we all kind of do at

the next step of the work program.

MR. CRAMER: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: When then the detail comes for

the bonus system, as Kirk has talked about, we've listed

the menu with some mechanics but not yet, then the whole

zoning process for that and you guys would work this

Commission on how the detail is, 2 percent, 1 percent,
five dollars, how do we review it, that kind of thing.

Because we do need to get into that here as we go to the
master plan. But you're recommending it as a strategy. Is that correct?

MR. CRAMER: Right. And one issue I did want to throw out to this body is with the bonus system, there's a number of places that bonus could be used and certainly there's a lot of different and worthy causes. One of the concerns, I think, the Preservation Commission had is, you know, preservation a lot of times, you know, when a city is pressured and budgets and, it's going to fall to the bottom. Are there any guarantees or is there any other phraseology we could put in here that allows that to maybe move up in the hierarchy or at least keep it in there to make sure it doesn't fall by the wayside?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes. Prioritizing the benefits is done primarily by the percentage of additional construction you allow for each of the benefits. So, if you wanted to take this benefit and give it a little higher priority, you give it a little more percentage. You know, take another one and say, well, it's easy to do and it's nice but it doesn't, as the big benefits, give you a little more percentage.

So, yes, there is a way to influence it, let's
put it that way, but I think that comes over time as you look at your whole list and, you know, what's most important at this point in time. And my guess is it's probably a benefits list that will change on a semi-regular basis by Council, but yes, there is a way to do that.

MR. LAMOTTE: And the mechanics I think would be key when we work on the next round. And I'm envisioning coming in and all of a sudden there's, okay, let's facilitate you getting federal tax credits, let's facilitate the county thing, let's facilitate the facade, let's look at the pot of funds that we have, and there's more tools for you as a city then to work with that person rather than say, well, just kind of lots of luck when you call the feds, you know.

MR. CRAMER: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: And you are here always doing that, and now we're going to just put more tools in that.

MR. CRAMER: Right, and that was the idea behind it, too, was to --

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, so it's down. You have to make it up as you go along.
MR. RUIZ: And I think you brought up a good point in terms of leading by example when the City is protecting buildings through an ordinance but at the same time we don't have tangible incentives other than the fact that we are providing a service to the community or expertise with architects and a commission or review by staff with plans. But I think that if we as a City have a potential program or programs with additional funding, that is another thing and very possibly a signal to the community at large that the City is acting and promoting and doing direct impact on the --

MR. LAMOTTE: Proactive, reactive, right.

MR. RUIZ: Exactly.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right, right.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Are we still going to use, I'm thinking about that glossary that we talked about a few meetings ago, are we still doing that? Because I was thinking it might make sense to include in here the criteria you use to rank these just so whoever is doing this, be it ten years from now, five years from now, can understand how these numbers came up. So, that's just another thing I just --
MR. CRAMER: That we didn't just throw a dart at a dartboard.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Right. And then it could also set a precedent for, 25 years from now, evaluating this.

MR. LAMOTTE: Are you saying that that list would be in the master plan?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes. I mean, we talked about a glossary like sort of an appendix at the back that has stuff in it.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Definition of terms.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: Not the list of buildings, not an address --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: No, the criteria that went into the numbers.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Sort of like a methodology.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, I'm still wondering what you're saying, I'm almost thinking that you're saying to show -- incentives package so any outside business owner or a property can see it right there and that we can -- some of that up in here. And so that it's almost like
what part of it don't you get?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That would always be conveyed.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You're asking about how those ranking number were --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Don't you have that?

Didn't you present something like that to us? Back when we were --

MR. RUIZ: We had a breakdown of the survey and the condition, and then the Commission looked at that and they ranked, I think it was one or two meetings where you worked at that.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, I remember you talking about a process --

MR. CRAMER: We had a list of criteria that to go out and looked at for each building.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, yes.

MR. CRAMER: So that there would be some consistency, too, amongst them.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Right.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: And did those criteria themselves that -- like 1 to 5 or something like that?
MR. CRAMER: Right, yes.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: What I'm saying is you want to specification of the methodology.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Right. It's like you have an academic, he's reporting on how they performed a certain science experiment. They each provide their methodology in the back, so the people who follow up with that research can repeat that and get relatively the same results. And so, going forward in ten years, if someone wants to reevaluate this list or if we're going to do this on an annual basis, that same methodology can continue to be used.

MR. RUIZ: Well, we already have something in our ordinance that sets the criteria for landmark designation. It's there. And then we can model --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Because one of the nice things here is you've kind of ranked, even if it was intuitive to a degree --

MR. RUIZ: It was, yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And I'm sure it is in this case.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I mean, I'm not sure
there is any meter we can put up to a building and come up with a number.

MR. CRAMER: Preservation-meter.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I think just the fact that there is a ranking and that you've used your survey criteria or whatever it was, it would be very helpful.

MR. CRAMER: Yes, I think that's a great idea because we were concerned as we set out to do this that there would be consistency. And to do that, we had to come up with criteria and rankings.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, right.

MR. CRAMER: So, I think we can clearly, we can put that together.

The last two bullet points I think pretty much remain unchanged. There were questions about some of it, there is, you know, in terms of what some of those programs are. There's the Landmarks Illinois. An owner can donate their facade, they basically give an easement that's going to be permanent that's going to run with the land and they get certain initial tax benefits. And then, they have to, if they want to make changes, they have to go before Landmarks Illinois to get those approved. So, that's a voluntary program, but again,
these are things that we can promote I think to owners
to say, they might not even know they're there, and I
think it's a great way for the City to, you know, again
to help encourage preservation.

MR. LAMOTTE: That would be on the list, too,
because if we're giving the menu of things they can
do --

MR. CRAMER: Exactly.

MR. LAMOTTE: And I think just what you said,
that should be one of the bullets for that list. If
it's in the text, fine, but we should just make that,
here is your packet.

MR. RUIZ: I think we need to develop that --

MR. LAMOTTE: A little description.

MR. RUIZ: Description of the benefit that we
know today.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: I'm just curious. With
the facade retention program, the City doesn't include
downtown now?

Mr. CRAMER: It doesn't. It doesn't.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Well, can you --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: It does not.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: It was, I think, mainly
residential, wasn't it?

MR. MARINO: First of all, it's Community Development Block Grant funded.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: CDBG.

MR. MARINO: Federally funded.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: So, it has to be designated.

MR. MARINO: That's principally for the benefit of low and moderate income people.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Right.

MR. MARINO: Of Low and moderate income neighborhoods. So, we have a number of neighborhoods that meet that criteria. I have to admit that based on a -- designation I think in the late 80's, downtown was eligible for that because obviously the downtown --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: So, it's CDBG --

MR. MARINO: Right. There were communities that were used in downtown but I'd basically say that I think that's over.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: These look really, really good and I really appreciate all the hard work. It's a really great list. I'm just wondering maybe one little thing that was on the earlier draft that didn't
migrate to here. That was just the last one, "expand public education efforts to foster greater awareness of preservation and rehabilitation benefits, tools, techniques and programs." And that was nice because it gave sort of guidance for the future in keeping up educational programs for, and sort of how to place preservation in the plan.

It's not a big issue for me at all, I just liked it. I'm just wondering where it went.

MR. CRAMER: I'm not sure which draft you're looking at. I actually like that.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Was it change-ordered?

MR. LAMOTTE: It was the first, our first round.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: The draft of it was probably not your draft, it was probably in her draft.

MR. BISHOP: Yes, we got your draft. We discussed it. You all talked about revising the language.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: But we added the same point.
MR. BISHOP: I revised the language and put it in our plan.

MR. CRAMER: I don't think there was any intentional omission on our part. Maybe just a lack of awareness.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay. So, maybe, I don't know how this would go but --

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, we've got it in there already, we just need to put this --

MR. BISHOP: Well, I need to be clear on that because I'm reading it so far as a wholesale take out what's in there and put in this.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: And I understand.

MR. LAMOTTE: With the exception of that one point.

MR. BISHOP: So, Robin, I have a question, is that the only thing?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: The language? Yes. So, we keep that bullet.

MR. BISHOP: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: We're taking notes on what we're talking about tonight. And then if you can help us, I
mean if it's literally just doing a bullet on federal
tax, county tax, facade renovation, facades, donation
and again the fund --

MR. CRAMER: And I think that a couple of
other things that we had talked about was developing the
nice visuals in this plan would be one that contains all
the landmarks and maybe some of the buildings we
identified as potential. I don't know, that's kind of
on the bubble, but I think it would be nice to have them
pointed out, platted out on one of those maps or a
separate map.

MR. LAMOTTE: Certainly all of the existing
ones --

MR. CRAMER: Because there's quite a few of
them, and I think it would be interesting and
instructive to have a map that shows all that.

MR. LAMOTTE: You're saying when we run
through the analysis for this, I mean, a fresh one,
we'll work it in one of our analyses.

MR. CRAMER: We've got the list.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, or the list, make it look
like all the other maps.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Dennis, a question to you.
So, what you were saying earlier, the bullet, "Extend Evanston's facade retention program to buildings in the downtown," since that's a CDBG funded thing --

MR. MARINO: Yes, you'd really be doing a new program for the downtown as part of the historic properties that you designated or that received the designation.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: This is similar.

MR. MARINO: So, you designate it --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: So, create or seek to create an Evanston facade retention program for buildings in the downtown.

MR. MARINO: Yes. And buildings that --

MR. LAMOTTE: Seek to create, so we won't forget --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Seek to create a facade retention program for buildings in the downtown.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Or just create.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: There's that word, create --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Again, I think that --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: You're here for
wordology but you weren't here for wordsmithing.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It's extremely important to consider strongly.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, right.

MR. RUIZ: I think that one bullet point that can come up with the Plan Commission is a creative way to do it in terms of funding that if you have as an incentive for the developer to actually donate cash that will go towards that facade retention program so it would not be tied to federal money but it would be directly private funding. So, I think that was the intention that with that incentive for the bonus program, you will start, maybe the City can even, I don't know, Dennis would probably know more about this, but if the City itself can put pot of money as a, you know, the seed money, just seed money, and then you build on that with private funding. Or matching funding.

MR. MARINO: Right. And we're already trying to do that. We're looking to sell some bond -- that we won't use -- and to charge one percent fee for that. And a proposal Carlos and I have made already is to put that into this -- fund. We actually -- not in any way
an active fund that we have discussed extensively. But there are opportunities like that already possible with not a lot of money.

MR. RUIZ: But as seed money.

MR. MARINO: But you could put that in, and they are --

MR. RUIZ: I know that there was a lot of discussion on, some talk about character-giving buildings. I know that we have time now. But I think that if you wished I can explain a little more about that, or if you prefer I can come back and make time. I will, you know, be available to you, I suppose, with members of the Commission to address that issue more carefully.

I have given you a document that actually talks about character of historic buildings. And I think it's more than you need to know in the sense that it's sort of detailed, but I think that the intent is that you understand there is a reason why we talk about character-giving rather than the, you know, confusion is can you identify the character of a historic district. The answer is yes.

So, you can use this definition that is given
in the Preservation Brief No. 17 and extrapolate that
definition to, instead of building components, you look
at the components of a historic district or a block or
an area. So, the components are the buildings
themselves. So, if you want to preserve, for lack of a
better word, a traditional area, you need to make sure
that you don't remove buildings that are so significant
or important landmark themselves that if you remove
those buildings, then you will remove part of what makes
that traditional area significant.

And I think that the Plan Commission has to
make a decision: what is the intent of looking at
traditional areas? In the previous conversations at the
beginning of the process, I remember at least some of
the Commissioners saying, including staff and myself,
that some of the buildings that are in a traditional
area could be demolished and a new development comes in.
But you need to be careful if that is in fact the
intent and you have a National Register historic
district, if you keep eroding what makes the district,
then it eventually, you know, can be removed.

And just to give a dramatic example that we
saw just as an example earlier, with the addition, a
National Register historical landmark is no longer this because of that. So, you have to be careful how much could be removed. And even if you remove a building let's say within an area that is not let's say contributing significantly as a landmark, it's a building that happens to be in the middle, within the bonus system, it may exceed what is the character, whether it's two or three-story buildings, with the bonus system you have to be careful that you're not allowing maybe six stories because maybe it's in the middle of the block and you have a building that's six-story around it and maybe two or three stories. So, you need to be very cautious about that. Just be careful to what extent you can actually alter a traditional area if your intent is to keep those as a component or as a major feature of the downtown because that can be eroded as one.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, the zoning we've got where we've got the, you know, the capital type bonus on the traditional, it covers that.

MR. RUIZ: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: But if I get you right, it's not Abraham Lincoln slept there or it's great architecture.
It's contributing to the bigger context.

MR. RUIZ: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: That means it's the character of that block, that street in the downtown, right?

MR. RUIZ: Right. There's different ways to look at it. For instance, one of the character-giving features could be the material of the buildings in the block or the height or that are primarily commercial or mixed use buildings where they have been built prior to 1900's. In the historic district nomination, you have to describe that and then the expectation is that it would be preserved.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: The block of Davis across from the bank, they put up in the middle of that block a brand new building.

MR. RUIZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But most people can't tell that it wasn't there originally. What impact does something like that have if we just, if somehow in the zoning, you know, it requires some, I don't know how you do this yet, but some compatibility with the character of the neighborhood?

MR. RUIZ: According to the National Park
Service person I talked to, there is some leeway. In other words, it's not that you cannot change, but it's how you do it and how much of it you do it. If you look at our current ordinance, the Preservation Ordinance, it does allow alterations, construction, relocation and even demolition as long as the standards are met.

So, that's why I'm trying to just make sure with you that there has to be a point where if you identify buildings in a traditional area that are not necessarily the jewel, the best examples of, but if you remove so much of that even if you substitute with buildings that are not as good as the one you are proposing, it may jeopardize the designation at some point.

MR. LAMOTTE: And let's take it to the next step. So, when the middle is not in great shape or whatever is going to come out, then our zoning caps the height. And then we have guidelines and we still need to look at them when we get to zoning as far as historic that says, okay, if you're going to fill a tooth in, it's got to match the character and it's got to fit the character and the storefront proportions and the articulation. That's a lot more cover than you have
now.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: We still have bonuses, right, for --

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, for the --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So, then it could go higher than any other building on the block which then --

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

MR. RUIZ: May change the character of that traditional area.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Right. So, what trumps what? So, is it character that trumps height? You know, how do you make that decision?

MR. RUIZ: I think, again like I said, it's how you do it and how many of those you do.

MR. LAMOTTE: I mean, you get the, and we've been going through the districts one at a time to get to the middle one but you've got the cap so to speak with just a little bit of bonus on top of it for the traditional so you can get that covered. Then when they come to fill that tooth, they might have to fill a tooth, there might be a bad building or it burned or whatever, then it's got to fit that character and
contribute to the character and not say, well, I'm new and I'm going to stick out like a sore thumb.

MR. RUIZ: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: It's the fight we go into every community where the modern architecture coming right in the middle of a character block. Now, a new modern architecture on another block may not be bad, but all of a sudden it's so jarring in that block. And good architecture, good architects can weave that in and like you said you're not quite even sure if it wasn't there 500 years ago.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I think there's lots of buildings and apartments that are put up good architecture.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, that's one of the reasons that we --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: That's why we have the guidelines.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: So, just to try and clarify my mind, let's take the south side of Davis between Chicago and Orrington and Sherman where the Davis Street Land Company was built. Now, clearly it's a very
contextual building that fits in well with the character of the other buildings around it. I think virtually everybody would agree that it did a wonderful job of sort of filling the tooth. But if you replaced every building on that south side with more Davis Street Land Company buildings, then would that jeopardize its designation?

MR. RUIZ: Eventually it could because I talked to, again, you know, who monitors how much you do in the National Register historic district? And according to the information I had received is either the state, every state has what they call a state preservation office as they call it. We have it in Springfield. Depending on the amount of funding they have, some states are more aggressive monitoring National Register, others don't. We don't have that in place but we also could monitor closely as a community. And that's why I'm trying to bring this up so that it's understood from the beginning that even though development is promoted and desirable in certain areas, particularly the core and others that are more leaning, you know, to development, if you have traditional areas, you need to make sure that you understand that
the intent is to preserve the character of those areas.

That's the --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: And so, this is the iterative process precisely that I was talking about earlier.

MR. CRAMER: Yes. Yes, it is.

MR. MARINO: Going back to Jim's point, I mean, 820 Davis which I think he's referring to, the four-story building --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: You're a genius.

MR. MARINO: Davis Street Land Company actually does contribute to the quality of that block in some ways including the historic character of that block even though it was a building that happened four years ago. It may be a stretch but you know --

MR. RUIZ: But it's one building.

MR. MARINO: Right.

MR. RUIZ: And it is a good example of how you can do an in-fill. And what I'm saying is it will depend on how it's done and how many times you do it.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. And there's a lot of good buildings that need some rehabilitation. On that side of the street, it would be nice if that happened.
But there are also, in other locations in the community, there are some buildings that quite frankly if they got replaced by a building of the quality of the Davis Street Land Company building, I would be fine with it.

MR. CRAMER: I agree. And I think, hopefully through whatever nominating petitions go out for these areas, it's going to describe those areas in detail. And there might be some buildings within those blocks that aren't contributing to it, and clearly those would be the type that you'd say, well, that might be the tooth that gets filled but let's look at what the rest of the nominating buildings had about them that we should keep consistent.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And I think there's a combination of ingredients in these areas. Most of these buildings are individually owned, first of all. Secondly, the cost of construction for individually owned buildings is relatively high. So, in some cases, they're still going to have to tear them down and build something new there because, you know, deferred maintenance can only be deferred for so many millennium and then the thing falls down.

But I think in other cases where if we work
with something like the yellow sheet there, we help
people to rehab the building and we help people to, you
know, bring it back up to standards if you will or bring
it back up to a whole state, we don't have to worry
about a lot of rebuilding anyway simply because the
economics are going to start playing in here.

MR. CRAMER: Right. I think that that was
part of what we set out to do was let's make sure there
is something that's planned for the existing owners to
give them incentives to say, you know, what are we
excited about on this.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I'm pretty sure that
there is a great balance here but I think we're starting
to, we're addressing that. I mean, this is not the area
where you're allowed to build 15-story buildings. So,
there is only so much you can afford to do in three or
four stories.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. The economics sort of
play in your favor towards getting the rehabilitation
that you can provide --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Right. So, it's a
combination of things --

MS. McWILLIAMS: I wanted to expand on that.
The important thing to remember about the historic district is that we are preserving the history of the area, and so that when you start adding new buildings, changing, there will be a tipping point. It's more, I'm just more at least adding to the conversation that it is the historic buildings, and I grant you the Evanston Land Company building is marvelous and it does contribute to the historic character of that neighborhood, of that block because of the sensitivity and the good architecture that went into that building. But it will, some of these buildings that are going to be considered may not be buildings that meet people's personal taste, that's not the issue. The issue is the historic significance of the building and what it contributes to the neighbors. That has to be considered. So, it's a fairly complex issue that has to be discussed with each building that would be considered as a step --

MR. CRAMER: So, any other questions? I think, to sum it up, in the end we really, you know, this tries to strike a nice balance I think to add preservation to this in an appropriate way. There might be some who'd say it doesn't go far enough, there might
be some who'd think it didn't go really too far. But I really think in the end it adds nicely to the work that you've done and to offer something to the existing owners.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: And I also think it's very much in keeping with the original direction and suggestions and requests that we made of the Preservation Commission a long time ago.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Andrew?

MR. McGONIGLE: Andrew McGonigle. I was -- many historic buildings and national state parks and so I'm not new to preservation. But I want to tell you something that -- in a previous presentation to this, there's a financial impact on what you're talking about. And is that financial impact, you're talking about tax reductions, and is that something that this City wants to engage in by losing taxes by designating buildings as a historic landmark? That's something that you, there is a very delicate balance that you need to consider, and I haven't heard that discussed here this evening.

The second one is taking the facades -- several buildings where the historic nature of the areas have been retained just by the facade. Is it the
building that you're interested in? If Lincoln slept there, okay, fine. There's a benefit. But I'm looking at the character of the property and the area specifically by the facade and not what is behind it, because there is a very significant contribution to the development that occurs behind that facade and as to what you are going to -- behind that facade. So, you need to think about.

And the third point is replacement of facades in the historic district. I worked in practices in London where we have put back or retained individual facades on a whole street. The best example for that is -- Bank right in the middle of London where a slice was taken out of Georgian Terrace, it was a terrible building. The entire Georgian Terrace was retained and a whole brand new bank was built behind that facade. The street then was, I think the character was not lost. Prince Charles didn't call it a car bomb or -- as well. So, you need to think about what it is you're trying to designate as a historic district. What is it, the quality that you're looking for? Is it just the facade, is it the building, is it the entity and what you allow to go back in behind one of those that you're
trying to retain?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Great point.

MR. RUIZ: Can I address that?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, Carlos.

MR. RUIZ: As it is right now, the Historic Preservation Ordinance only deals with what is visible from the public way. So, that is already taken care of. And I think that you need to be careful, again, what buildings should be preserved not only for its facade but maybe the integrity has a historic value or it's a design that involves the interior spaces perhaps. But we're not going that far, as far as our proposal, but I'm talking about the National Register. If somebody is in the National Register and they want to, again, if they get a lot of financial incentives, the National Park Service may rule that perhaps the entry hallway shouldn't be altered because it's part of the public space.

Okay. So, yes, you can maintain an entire building. There are communities that have -- from the foundation to the roof, everything that's in between the walls. We don't have that locally. I think the National Register talks about sensitive additions.
You don't want, from the preservation perspective, to make a building look historic when it isn't. So, it's not Main Street, no Disney World.

That's not what they want. They want, if you're going to have a landmark, it's a landmark for what it is. If you're going to make an addition, they don't want it to look like, they want it to compatible with the landmark.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Just to choose two really well known examples in Downtown Chicago, The Rookery, obviously that's a major significant public space that needs to be preserved forever. Presbytery Scott, on the other hand, had no public space on the interior that was really worth preserving and it's adaptive reuse now is office building and whatever else -- got going on in there. It's perfectly appropriate as long as they maintain and retain the facades of that building which are priceless.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: And then you have the preservation of the interior of the Stock Exchange and New York Institute.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, there's a bad example.

At least though we have some fragments.
MR. RUIZ: In Evanston, the former Marshall Fields building is a good example and now it is a condo. For that building, there were some challenges over the amount of retail space. If you looked at the Panera entrance on Sherman Avenue, they wanted to install a different entrance to what it is. And what we were able to do was to create the entrance they have which is actually a window opening. So, the main components of the building all around the window that was removed had been retained. And maybe if in the future Panera goes away and somebody will come and they want to put back the window, they can do that.

So, those are the creative ways that, you know, hopefully we can continue cooperating with property owners so they understand the objective is not to stop what they're going to do but do it in a way that everybody will be satisfied to a certain extent.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: They saved the stone?

MR. RUIZ: We asked them to save, no, but it's true, we asked them to save anything, and they said they would. But we didn't go and say, well, show us the stone, no. They did, they told us they're going to do that.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: And there's a signed affidavit that shows that. Okay. We're going to take a ten-minute break.

(Off the record.)

CHAIRMAN WOODS: We are, I believe, by our little guideline set of process in here, we are in Section D-5, Zoning Critique and Recommendations, which would be Section 7 in everybody's --

MR. BISHOP: Did we want to visit all --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay?

MR. BISHOP: Mr. Chairman, the revisions made pursuant to the March 12th meeting?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I specifically have one --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I thought that just got blown away.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I have one question. If I look at the building heights that's traditional, I notice that you all have added a footnote of sorts here or some sort of designation, I don't know what to call it. It says one thing about within the West Core, East Core, Core and Central Core maximum height may be increased three feet per floor for each full floor of office space?
MR. BISHOP: Yes, we added a footnote to that
effect. What page is that? No, the footnote.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's at the bottom of the
little bar, the rectangle to the right. Now, I don't
remember that discussion actually.
MR. BISHOP: Here's the, the discussion was
we're moving away from regulating by stories or
regulating by absolute height as measured in feet. We
did a, in order to come up with a conversion formula, we
had to determine what is our assumption going to be for
floor to floor height to sort of convert our story-based
or floor-based height. And what we found was, as the
architects in the room could well imagine, a great
divergence between building types. Office building
types had floor to floor heights in the neighborhood of
13 feet. Residential or mixed use buildings, once you
averaged out the taller ground floor, the residential
floors and the parking floors, came in at 11-ish.

And what we wanted to not do was to establish
a conversion based on a residential or mixed use
building that might serve as a disincentive for office
style development. So, in kicking around some ideas,
well, one of the ideas we came up with is we could have
separate height limits for office buildings, for mixed
use/residential or for residential.

CHAIRMAN WOODS:  Right.

MR. BISHOP:  What we finally determined was
let's just say that the height limit is thus, and if
you've got full office floors in the building, we'll
give you additional height to accommodate those office
floors.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY:  For each floor?

MR. BISHOP:  For each floor.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY:  Which in effect
accommodates the initial height needed to accommodate an
office floor.

MR. BISHOP:  Yes, the different programmatic
needs of the office. And so, that's where we came up
with, you know, that's obviously on the table. That was
how we kind of worked through how not to, because if we
came back and if we used 13-foot floors for, you're
going to say that's not fair, that's not fair.

So, we used the overall average that we found
for recently constructed buildings in Evanston which
gave us the 11-foot floor height as a conversion factor.
But in order to respond to, you know, some people's
suggestions, Klutznick and others, that they ought to add a couple of office floors in the building and he or she comes back and says, well, that's all well and good but you just caused me a residential floor at the top of the building by doing that. This is a way to respond to that, say we'll give you the floor height you need for the office.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Only, I guess, if we create a bonus incentive for providing the office space, aren't we in effect doing that anyhow?

MR. BISHOP: Well, we're giving them a floor area bonus for the office space but we aren't, at least so far, aren't necessarily giving them additional height.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: But in, well --

MR. BISHOP: I mean, I guess we could word it, we could accommodate this only through the bonus formula but that's only available to affordable office space, that's still to be defined, affordable office space. It wouldn't be available to a Class A --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Affordable Class A minus Class D plus?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: It should also be
available to people --

MR. BISHOP: We thought this was --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, but here is my question

though. If I take one example, West Core, where we've

said 198 feet max, and if I figure that out in terms of

residential floors and a retail floor somewhere around a

17-story building 16 floors of which are residential,

and all of a sudden I decide, you know what, on that

Northwestern University property that now some magical

developer somehow made a deal with Northwestern and

gotten --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Now you went and did it.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I'm just saying, you know,

okay, then, whatever, pretty magical to figure out how

to get it from Northwestern I think, but I'm going to

build an office building there. And so, now I get 48

feet because I want to provide 16 levels of whatever.

All of a sudden, I go from 198 feet to 246-foot building

there? I don't think that that's necessarily what we

had in mind.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: That's true.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Well, you still need to

conform to the overall, if I'm reading the documents
correctly, you still have to conform to the overall building height regardless if it's --

MR. LAMOTTE: That's what I'm thinking.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Or if it's residential.

MR. LAMOTTE: You could get that, if you're going to hit the cap. So, I mean theoretically --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: For the zone, you're going to hit the cap for the zone.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, and that's what I'm thinking.

MR. BISHOP: No, that's not what this footnote proposes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I understand.

MR. BISHOP: But if that's the direction of the Commission, then, you know, the footnote goes away or is modified. But our proposal was, given the discussion about office, was that we didn't want these height limits in our original proposal to regulate by floors was to accommodate varying floor to floor height needs of both different residential designs, different markets, office users, retail, you know. A small grocery on the ground floor of a building, they need 18-foot, 15 to 18-foot floor ceiling height.
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: But then that's going to be --

MR. BISHOP: And our stories work with that all day long. But when we convert these, we begin to penalize people who want to do something a little different, and something a little different that comports with many of the objectives expressed at this table. And that's how we came up with the recommendation.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Can I ask --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Or maybe it doesn't apply through an entire office building. Maybe it applies to a mixed use building.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: What you said is that there are FAR bonuses. So, how do I determine what height I can go to when? In other words, once I've provided a 10 percent, I've gotten a 10 percent bonus because I've provided something, can I go from --

MR. BISHOP: No. You live with this. The only --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, no, no, no, no. I understand that.

MR. LAMOTTE: If you're in between?
CHAIRMAN WOODS: If I'm in between, for example, in the East Core, 125-foot base height, 198-foot maximum height, once I've provided some bonus that got me a 10 percent FAR bonus, I can now go from 125 to 198 feet with my project?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: How?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: By adding the --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: By adding to the floor height and going up.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I think we asked for feet so we'd have a definitive, understandable --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, I know. Now it's not --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: -- address and I'm not saying I oppose it necessarily. And I don't think that was the intent --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: But I'm still worried now because what we just said is these are FAR bonuses. And how do you determine at what point in that FAR you can go what height? Once I've gotten one bonus for 5 square feet, does that mean I can now take my project and go from 125 to 198? That's the question I'm asking now.
Because if it's an FAR bonus, I'm saying there's nothing that's controlling.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, the cap is going to control.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, the cap controls the ultimate.

MR. LAMOTTE: That's the question, and I may be taking too much on kind of what zoning is going to do, so we're going to carefully craft percentages, dollars, and pools of funds so that the mix is there and you can scenarios. Two of these bonuses gets you here, three gets you there. And if that literally filled up from the base to the cap, that could be done. I'm not saying that's the right way and we got the numbers right, but if you said I can increase 10 percent whatever that 10 percent is, I can get that all the way up to the top cap, you're right.

Now, whether that's right or we need another bonus to fill the cap before you let them get to the cap, we've still got to work that out. And I guess the question for all of us, and Dennis, maybe I'm jumping in too much of the detail of zoning, is that if you're saying yes as Commission to the Council, we need new
zoning, yes we want to go form-based, yes we like the
approach here but we know we've got to roll up our
sleeves and hack away all those numbers and formulas yet
in the next round, then how far do we go with this. We
say yes, here is the menu of bonuses are great. But
whether it's 10 percent, 2 percent or 5 dollars, we're
going to get to that later. That's the question. And
we're recording all the notes. We're saying these are
being raised up that we've got to still hack away.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It was just a realization on
my part, you know --

MR. LAMOTTE: What does it mean?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: How high can I go when.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Would you have the same
question if the footnote were not there?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, I wouldn't, well, yes,
ultimately I have that same question whether the
footnote is there or not. But my concern with the
footnote was all of a sudden I could get a building that
was 246 feet rather than 198 feet.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: So, you have two
concerns now.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. I just can't help it.
MR. LAMOTTE: No, no, that's how does it work.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I don't think it was ever the intention of letting you buy higher than the maximum.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: No sense in buying over so much FAR, additional FAR because eventually you're going to exceed the maximum and still be held to the maximum.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I have a question about assumptions. You said that you took a survey and it's like 10-11 feet per floor for residential? That average, was that for the new construction?

MR. BISHOP: The 11-foot figure that we ended up with was an average. New construction in Downtown Evanston, I think I have the --

MR. LAMOTTE: Putting all the new buildings together.

MR. BISHOP: Putting all the new buildings together.

MR. LAMOTTE: 9-foot ceiling.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: 9-foot ceilings.
That's claustrophobic.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: You live in a Victorian.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You're trying to --

your house.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And I think Andrew had a

comment or a question.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes?

MR. McGONIGLE: Andrew McGonigle -- If you

allow something like that related to office -- we're

going to eventually build to green buildings and it can

include condos. One of the things related to that

stratification in using that as a way of -- buildings

which goes back to the house that you had, that way

we're going to end up with greater floor to ceiling

height. So, the question in my mind is if you allow it

for office building but not for a residential, I can

come back and say I want to do a shorter building, that

way I can say that's -- well, why can't I go the same

way with the office building? And then you're going

to --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. Yes, I don't think we

want to make a distinction between the different

building types.
MR. SMITH: I do believe you end up penalizing the office, the person who is building an office building then. And I think that's something that you don't necessarily want to do just based on what I've heard you say. And I think you have to be very careful with it because it's extremely clear that office buildings are different in terms of, and you might be right about the long-term trend, but currently there is a significant difference in the floor-to-ceiling heights between office and residential.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Is there a significant difference between cost per square foot as well?

MR. SMITH: Sure, there is.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So, it's more for an office building?

MR. SMITH: Yes, it is.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So that where is the discrimination, right? I mean, you guys would just --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: No, it's more for residential.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: It's more for residential.

MR. SMITH: Well, yes. That's --
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I can build a shell office building a heck of a lot cheaper that I can rent.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: No, the cost per square foot whether you're renting or holding it for renters for income. So, how are you penalizing a builder if they are making more money on a business floor, right, versus a residential? So, I'm just questioning whether you actually gave --

MR. SMITH: I think the other question though is does the City want to have office downtown. And if I'm an office developer and I see your height limits are really geared based on what residential buildings need and not what I necessarily need as an office developer, maybe I'm discouraged by that.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Well, it's not based on the residential, this is what the need of the City says we don't want to have a building above a certain height. Right?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I think you're taking that into consideration only because most of the recent developments has been residential. But that's not to say that the market is not going to collapse, and after this one, you know, maybe nobody wants to build
residential for five or six years but they want to build
an office building. They're still going to look at the
height and say that's how many floors I can put in. Is
it worth it, yes or no? Because I think that as much as
I understand what you're saying, I just think that there
is a certain message that's coming through loud and
clear, and that's that in most of this area there is a
height limit beyond which we really don't want to go at
this point.

MR. LAMOTTE: Predictability?
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, predictability.
You know, if we're going to try to reduce the amount of
time and overhead and complexity to build a project, one
of the things we've got to give the City, the public in
return is predictability. The predictability in height,
predictability in bonuses, predictability in, you
know --

MR. LAMOTTE: Use, this character --
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Use, character, things
like that. If we get away from that, then you've gotten
away from the whole concept of what we're trying to do.
And then we have to go back to the process we had
today.
COMMISSIONER HUNTER: And I don't understand
the calculus. You're doing a comparative analysis of a
developer of a business property versus the residential
property. Why are you even making that comparison? I
mean, I don't get, he's getting more than I got,
therefore --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: He can put in more
floors --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: I mean, I understand the
person is getting more.

MR. SMITH: Well, okay. But then, this is I
guess my own perspective on things is that office
building will be more intense use, okay. In general,
they'll be a taller building. There will be an effort
to make those a taller building. It's just economically
more reasonable. Downtown Chicago, the office buildings
are substantially bare than the residential buildings,
okay.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No.

MR. SMITH: I mean, certainly there are
exceptions to that.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

MR. SMITH: Well, yes, okay. But in general,
they are certainly bigger.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Instead of making more money --

MR. SMITH: You want to set reasonable regulations on the type of buildings that you get. So, you should acknowledge the fact that sometimes office is bigger than residential.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Why?

MR. SMITH: Because of the cost of construction and because of typically --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: But you gain a greater return, right?

MR. SMITH: Well, yes --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Your profit is there.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I mean, one of the interesting things about Evanston is of course that we have had recent residential buildings and one recent office building, and the recent office building is actually quite a bit shorter than a lot of the residential buildings.

MR. LAMOTTE: I'm sorry, I missed that.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: The new office building is considerably shorter than the new residential building.
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: And the assumption I don't think is that you're always going to build to the maximum, is it?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, no.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Right, so --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: We would hope not.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It's relative to market.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And it's always going to be relative to market. And where I think we want to encourage office as much as we can, I'm not sure that as excited as we are about the office market, the three 1600 Orrington's, so I don't, you don't build office for three or four office buildings that tall.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: My personal perspective is that I like much better the idea of including some office space in these mixed use buildings. And that's kind of a more kind of consistent kind of thing where it's filling a couple of floors or something like that, just because I think it would make it much more of an interesting mix within the City rather than --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I think what everybody
wants is predictability, I think above all else right now. Even the developers, they want to be able to do a quick analysis and say I can build this, here I can't. I mean, one of the problems even that Klutznick is facing is the ongoing cost of trying to figure out what you can build there. And that's getting to be real expensive.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, let's just try this, if we have 28 stories in a certain location and it was kind of a residential set height and you came back and said we're going to do an all office building, well then it's going to be 23, 22, you know, by the time you did the math. It's the cap of the height, I think that's where we're trying to go so people won't worry that it was 28 stories way up beyond the cap.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, the question is if you're going to do the 23-story office and I'm going to do the 28 residential, is that a disincentive or is it just hey, it is what it is.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It says what it is.

MR. LAMOTTE: -- do what you're going to do because you might have a huge base with a two-story
retail on there for a bookstore, whatever it is.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, it is what it is because when I do my evaluation, I'm going to look at my market and say where is my money. And the fact of the matter is, if I'm a John Buck, I'm probably going to go after the office if I think it's there. If I'm a Tim Anderson, I'm going to go after the residential.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Especially if I've had experiences with certain kinds of residential buildings that would cost me a lot of money.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes. Or if I've made a ton of money selling a certain residential building that I --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, exactly.

MR. BISHOP: Let the record reflect that the footnote --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: The footnote is gone?

MR. BISHOP: The official scribe is moving on.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: It's gone? The footnote is gone?

MR. BISHOP: The footnote is gone. I have one other question. I think we'll have to come back during the zoning discussion to this question of
proportionality between the floor area increase and the building height increase.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

MR. BISHOP: That was present whether we were regulating on the basis of floors or feet.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right, and it just dawned on me.

MR. MARINO: If I could just add, you know, around the table for the past couple of months there's been a very strong positive direction where you wanted more office space in the downtown, particularly in these two settings. But don't we also want another -- if we can get it? Part of the reason why we don't have it is the extraordinary cost to Cook County imposed on commercial property by the assessment process, it's more than double what it is in certain -- so, it's very difficult to make the numbers work outside of Downtown Chicago for an office developer with the exception of maybe -- so there isn't a lot of money being made in office building development in places like Evanston.

So, I think if we have as a policy statement a direction that we want more office, we just have to be sensitive as we go forward here because I think that's a
strong City desire as well. I think the issue, you know, the three feet per floor, I think that's fine, you know, taking that off the table. But as we go through this whole plan, you know, we have to be sensitive to, you know, what are the obstacles and also what are the potential incentives to getting the kind of office buildings, the kind of office users that we really want.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: But isn't this where the mixed use incentive could come in?

MR. MARINO: It could come in, but I think we also would like other -- buildings.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, it seems to me that the entire thrust of our desire for office space was more oriented around injecting some office use into mixed use buildings. And as I recall, we even referenced the, what's its name, the building on, close to Chicago and Davis?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: David Hoby's. I think.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: David Hoby's. Well, it was too big for the site. Nevertheless, the concept was an extraordinarily attractive one, groundbreaking in that the retail --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Included parking below grade.
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: It looked great, office above and then condos --
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.
MR. LAMOTTE: And I think that's where we --
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And what was the total height of that? I mean, it was wrong for that location --
CHAIRMAN WOODS: That was 18 stories.
MR. MARINO: But only two stories of office.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I look at it in terms of this if I remember what the height was to make that happen.
COMMISSIONER HUNTER: I think it was the mass, I'm sure.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I thought it was the location.
COMMISSIONER HUNTER: It's the location of the mass.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, it brought a lot of air in places that meant the height had to be the height. If the air was taken out of certain locations, it could have come down in height.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But I'm also saying I'm not sure if that building moved into one of the core areas, it wouldn't have fit right into what we're talking about.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It was just where they tried to put it and it worked.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, my point is if we're trying to encourage office space in a mixed use building like that and if a developer has got three floors of residential and the space is required for two floors of office, what's his incentive to put office in there?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: His incentive is going to be an FAR bonus, FAR and height bonus. They'll provide it.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And the market.

MR. LAMOTTE: And without the doing the calculus as I think somebody has determined, if you just said okay, we want to slip that two in there, you can add your three on top of that because you're going to get a bonus for that. Now, if there's new construction -- but they've got to do that kind of math. And then I guess, and it goes back to what Dennis is saying, is the
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envelope that we're setting the stage, forgetting whether we got the right heights, is that an envelope for all these different users? Because -- an office like you say, I think Goodman Williams market study indicated that we've got to look at a different look now, more professionals coming in. Some A is not bad, B obviously we want to keep, so let's not shut the door. And it helps especially to bring in jobs and things like that.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: If Sears wants to come and build a building in here, we're going to talk to them, right?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: No, they pulled that --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So did Marshall Fields and -- but you know what I mean.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, absolutely.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, you're comfortable on some sort of a number height and we --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. The other question I had about this map was I'm sure that, when you created the new Zone F we had talked about in terms of the West Link, my question is should that be the same color as B,
D, C and E and A?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Why is it a different color?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: The other links are jealous.

MR. BISHOP: I think we wanted to, this was not done by true design professionals. We wanted to, this was kind of a quick and dirty, it's a little bit better than our PowerPoint one, but we wanted to call it F.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. I'm just saying in the ultimate presentation, I think it would be better if it was more consistent with all the other edges.

MR. BISHOP: I couldn't agree more.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Because I think one of the things, as I started to read and this maybe helps us lead into Section 7: Zoning Critique here, is that one of the things that is criticized in there is the fact that there are currently 11 different zoning classifications within the planning boundaries. Well, actually if I count them all out there's 13 now, but realistically, what we're really talking about is four general descriptions of things: links, traditional
areas, core and a central core to be defined.

MR. LAMOTTE: And it's one that I just, we're trying to simplify --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: And just make it easier for people to understand.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: right.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: You might even make it easier if you put the colors and then the letters like the way you have them sort of broken up now. Put edge and then put the A, B, D --

MR. LAMOTTE: List them onto their colors?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Right. That may take care of it so they don't seem so separate.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Also, just typographically, the parked item here should go to the alley.

MR. LAMOTTE: Go to the alley?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Which one, Robin?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Same --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's 1515.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Come on, guys, you
1 remember this one.
2 COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: On Davis Street?
3 COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.
4 COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, you're right. It
5 should go to the alley.
6 CHAIRMAN WOODS: It says --
7 COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right behind the
8 500 --
9 CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's the alley between 1515
10 or the traditional storefront there, the 500 Davis.
11 MR. BISHOP: So, if you go all the way down.
12 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. What Robin is calling
13 into question is the traditional nature of the existing
14 buildings, the two existing buildings on that lot or
15 lots.
16 COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: You know what
17 we're talking about --
18 MR. BISHOP: Okay. Anything else on the map?
19 CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, nothing else. And we
20 already, we did two, we have text modifications. I'm
21 looking at the other piece of the modifications that
22 were handed to us as part of our packet. So, if you
23 look at 39, all of those changes were specifically
related to Objective 2 which we've already discussed this evening, the new language. And then, we have pages 56, 57 and 62 that they've got this revised language for. The one on 56 and 57 particularly relate to the Chicago Avenue park, the new Chicago Avenue park adjacent to the Women Club, and the Olberg Park enhanced/expanded which relative to that, that's just really an editor's note that revised the drawing to take out the hatching so it doesn't look like the street ends since it doesn't.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, we'll take the street hatching out.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. And the Chicago Avenue -- Then 62 had to do with the consolidation of the newspaper vending machines into corrals.

MR. BISHOP: Okay.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: So, that takes us to Section -- we're trying to get there.

MR. MARINO: So, Kirk and Tom, can you give a sort of overview of the --

MR. SMITH: So, we basically looked at the existing zoning system in Section 7 and we didn't find anything worthy of saving. But there is no real, and
part of what we're trying to achieve is this idea of an urban form, and the current zoning has no concept of urban form. The example that we used in the previous meeting are down by Grove where the height limits in two-block area change four times. There was just no rhyme or reason that you can see in some of the current zoning maps.

You know, the Research Park zoning that is currently part of the ordinance, everybody in the City acknowledges that it's no longer relevant and it really has no meaning, that it's not a master plan that the City is following any longer and yet it's on the books. It's part of the code.

The parking code, we did some survey work on it. We looked at whether the City is requiring too much in terms of parking, and that's part of the critique here. I know that there is some debate about that, but I think that there is some opportunity for reform there also.

And we also talked about, especially on the traditional districts, you have a lot of smaller buildings with smaller floor plates. If people want to, in the event that some of them are torn down, they don't
appear to be the kind of streets that need their individual parking lots on site in our opinion. So, we suggested raising on those streets the exemption from the parking requirements for any building. So, you could put in a smaller retail building, replacing an existing building and not have to have an onsite parking on those locations because those are great pedestrian streets.

The planned development review, I don't know of any city that, in a downtown location, applies a lower threshold for planned development. So --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Because we know we like getting --

MR. SMITH: Pardon?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Because we like getting --

MR. SMITH: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: We want the control.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: There's public debate.

MR. SMITH: The allowances and exceptions, you know, the fact that they're unlimited, that they have no real guidelines, that they really have no standards for the public benefit, you get the allowances or you get
bonuses for undefined public benefits now. It's just not a good system. The exceptions that are allowed now really have no limit. They're unlimited, okay. I have worked in very permissive jurisdictions myself, okay, but we didn't have anything like that.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Or the maximum flexibility.

MR. SMITH: There were a lot of aldermen who tried to establish a system like that but did not, it really did not happen.

I think the, you know, the final thing is the planned development guidelines. We're trying to put into code what you currently use as guidelines, in part, and to expand those to really, I think that design issues and urban form issues and, you know, pedestrian friendly design is really important to this City. And it should be expressed in the code itself and it's not there now. And the City kind of takes a band-aid approach to it through the planned development guidelines and through your Site Plan Review Committee, but it should really be in the code because everything I've heard from people it's a very important issue.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: So, is this sort of like
binding appearance?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Which is not illegal.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Huh?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's not illegal in the State of Illegal.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: It isn't?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Really?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Can you repeat that?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Binding appearance review is now fully permissible under the State of Illinois.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: What does that mean, binding?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It means you can have an architectural review board that tells you how your building needs to look.

MR. LAMOTTE: Using guidelines and standards because you must bind that --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right, yes. Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: You must follow that versus where you hope you follow, no, you have to follow that.

But they've got to be written good and you've got --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. And the truth is that
there have always been communities in Illinois that have
had those. Lake Forest is a perfect example.

MR. LAMOTTE: And now this, the -- you as a
body is whether it's under you or --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, the City calls that --
architectural review, I'm not sure.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Are we commenting on the
critique or are we just sort of like, what's our --

MR. LAMOTTE: I think everybody is nodding on
the critique.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think we should comment on
specific things as we go through but I think Tom was
giving us an overview. And the simplest way to do that
would be to start on page 63. The first section there,
upper 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 paragraphs, does anybody have
anything they want to add, change or delete?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: This is where it's
getting hard.

MR. LAMOTTE: Do you want to beat a dead --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: We try to do it at little as
possible here but there are some things that are going
to come to play here quickly.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Now, just a rudimentary
notion of what you mean by form.

MR. SMITH: Well --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: I get a sense of image really.

MR. SMITH: Well, yes. I think that that's what that map is all about actually. You know, I think that there are certain physical attributes of your downtown that sort of determine form. Certainly the train stations are going to determine form. Certainly your traditional streets really define. Everybody knows Davis, you know, they know parts of Sherman. So, those are form issues, those are heights and scale. And also, those physical attributes like the train stations, I think they argue for a certain form.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: So, are you thinking of a cognitive mapping or are you thinking of functional usage?

MR. SMITH: I think we're talking about that type of map today in terms of the City's scale is what it really is all about. Form is basically about, in addition to, you know, your traditional streets, to me it's about where the windows are, where the front doors are, whether the retail is really accessible.
COMMISSIONER HUNTER: That sounds like use.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, I think it's much more than that. It's really what ultimately, for lack of any other term, form-based code which gets to the amount of, for example, on the ground level, the amount and spacing of glass required to create a sense of transparency and openness to shop fronts so that we can avoid having, you know, CVS with a whole blank wall.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: So, it's how it's perceived --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, some of that.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: That's a perceptual kind of form.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. Setbacks create certain kind of --

MR. LAMOTTE: Think of the traditional zoning that we've all worked on for years is here is your site, here is your base, here's your setbacks, and then you go on to height. And that's the traditional building envelope. But then that's it, there's no guidelines then that says we want it articulated, stepped back, glass front, we want the loading screen in the back, the parking deck speed. And that's what everybody, the
community is wanting now, and it is becoming law where
we want to see more than just you fill up the box.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Right. So, I get a
sense then that what we are talking about is people in
the street and how they perceive and use it which I
define as a cognitive site process. That's what I was
talking about.

MR. SMITH: I think that's a big part of it.
I think it's a little more than that though, too, okay,
because I think that there are some locations in your
downtown that are more accessible than others. There
are locations in your downtown that people can find
services and goods and access to transportation better
than others. So, if we have density and scale, those
are the places we should put it.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: So, those are nodes
where these kinds of things happen.

MR. SMITH: Those kind of things and also the
scale and the density changes because you're in a
central place.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Okay.

MR. LAMOTTE: Take Jim's point earlier on the
process about, well, if you fill it all up and they're
all filled up the same and then we just got one roaring solid wall, in some communities that works, in Paris it does. Here it's eclectic. You need to talk a little bit about that, too. And maybe you want to step back in mass so the towers and the tower building will relate to each other, gives some light corridors, gives some focal points, some landmark to the buildings that end at streets.

So, we think it's great because you get more control in defining what you want but you don't want to over-prescribe. You know, you go back to the happy medium earlier. We have some communities that want the parapet that's exactly like this and the windows like this and the doors should be here and the wall, then there's no architecture, no architects and that's just spitting out what's kind of common architecture. But if you look at the happy medium, then that's more dynamic eclectic architecture, creative.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Jim? Under form-based, this is really you, under form-based zoning, other than the economics, is it really limitation on use? I mean, we're talking about the traditional area of Davis Street and we want retail, I assume, in there. But what if I
like it so much I decide I leave my law practice plus I
get the windows right so everybody can see me and I can
see them, can I do that?

MR. BISHOP: It depends on how far you want to
go down the form-based continuum. The folks who
invented form-based, they would probably say no, that
form trumps use every time and if you can design the
face to interact with the street and our perception of
the places that buildings create, then use is --

MR. LAMOTTE: Secondary.

MR. BISHOP: Is at least secondary if not in
the middle --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: So, it's a yes?

MR. SMITH: Yes, you're looking at it.

Absolutely.

MR. LAMOTTE: Some towns are saying no though.

Some say all retail based.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That's how -- started but the
reality is they quickly evolved to include use as a
component of that.

MR. BISHOP: Absolutely. And often at a
three-dimensional level. I mean, you know, ground
floor, second floor and above.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

MR. BISHOP: That will address use. Not in the sort of heavy-handed way that you clearly in a conventional zoning historically has where in minute details tell us where we can put hat shops versus, you know, umbrella repair stands. But most form-based codes continue to have some use regulations going in. But it just depends on where --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Is there such a thing as an umbrella repair stand?

MR. BISHOP: There are such things in zoning ordinances that tell you where you can put umbrella repair stands.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Go see the business plan.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Well, thank you. I was just trying to get an overall look on --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: In an effort to try and move this along, the first comments I have about anything are on page 64 where in the, under Urban Form Recommendations, it seems like we now need to also refer to the West Link just in terms of consistency of text now that we have introduced the new zone. And that I'm assuming that the Table 7-A is going to get revised for
whatever decisions we make.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes. We have to be consistent.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. I understand. I'm just making sure that if nobody says it out loud then it gets forgotten.

MR. LAMOTTE: It's good, it's good. Any other critique things that we've missed?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: That's coming up.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. Page 65, any comments?

66?

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Yes. Could you elaborate a little bit on parking here? This is all you're going to limit -- because I don't know whether to discourage people from having cars, make it more pedestrian and transit oriented by reducing some of these parking spaces. Or do we increase the number of parking spaces to deal with parking problems in the street?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Before you ask that, can I add like a little story?

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Sure.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I was in the Sherman Plaza building a couple of weeks ago. And I was there
pretty late and I'm driving down the parking ramp. And I'm noticing, and I really haven't been there since I -- in the resident portion of the garage to see if they're filled out, if they're empty, what. And they're empty. And I'm like, do people not live here? What's the -- on cars? And then I realized there's a lot of cars in the area where the door is located to the residents' entrance. And if I'm living in Evanston or Chicago and it's cold out, I'm not going to park 15 feet, 20 feet, 50 feet away from the door I have to go in. I'm going to park by the door to go in and that's in a public park.

So, I'm wondering if when you were looking at some of this and there is public parking in some of these buildings, if these people are parking in the public park because they get to a spot where they get in --

MR. LAMOTTE: They get in the door quickly.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: They can park wherever they want.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Right. And so, I'm wondering, I know KLOA just went and did a simple --
survey on kind of the spaces, but I'm wondering if they
need to go back. I'm all for not putting more parking
to units but I just want to make sure we're being
accurate.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I would like to know if
this is preliminary findings from parking surveys who
did the surveys.

MR. LAMOTTE: One of our team members, KLOA is
a top traffic and planning and parking firm. They were
asked to go in the middle of the night and see what
really the occupancy was overnight for a residential
use, not for the retail, to say are we asking for too
many spaces, are we building bases too big. They
specifically addressed -- and that we could reduce --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: The problem was they
did it in the summer and the people are gone on
vacation.

MR. LAMOTTE: And the students aren't there,
but --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: The students aren't
there. They didn't do it in September or October, I'm
not sure, the two months where everybody who's around is
around, that who lives here is actually here.
COMMISSIONER STALEY: -- public, too, then
maybe they should have done that.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes. From a
demographic perspective, I mean, these buildings seem to
be attracting empty nesters. And so, I don't know, I've
never done a study on empty nesters and car usage, but
you know, there's going to be something out there
demographically that say the amount of cars these people
own. And you know --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It also varies greatly across
the country depending on the specific locations.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes. I mean, I know a
lot of people in condos and a lot of families in condos,
I know there's tons of single nesters, but almost every
family I know that live in a condo have two cars.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Okay. And I've got to
say that if, you know, if empty nesters are moving out
of their houses in Glencoe or in Evanston and they have
two cars, I don't know, but I wouldn't want to get rid
of my mobility by just letting my significant other have
the car all the time.
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I think what happens a lot of times is people will not, they won't give up their two cars but their use of the two cars will be significantly reduced. So, in effect, what you have is a storage situation, you know. So, how can -- and in Europe, what they're doing half the time is building a double back. You have a car lift where you put your inactive car up high, underneath your active car, you know.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: There are places in Chicago that are doing that.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So, I, too, question the --

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, the question comes up in every community and we debated it on Central Street, too. You know, some folks were saying, well, near the train station let's have zero cars required in condos. It just doesn't work. It doesn't work.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: And also, for all the people to arrive into the neighborhood to park to get to that on that train.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right, right. Let's take the residential base. The question put to us as a team was
are we asking too much. Do we need to build all that base and concrete in there or are we okay? And so, our conclusion was it's a little high. You probably could knock the ratio down. But two per unit is too much for a downtown especially with two train stations. And when you look at our circle, most of it is in a quarter mile of the stations. Plus, you have all that menu of things you can do. You needn't to have go out for groceries in some respects.

So, we think you don't need to have two. 1.5 is plenty. Most developers of these condos say if I can get one in the building so I can sell a condo with one unit and have some shared or extra space somewhere else for visitors or the second car, it all comes out in the wash. So, we recommend dropping it down to a more sensible space because you don't want to have that much more parking base in the downtown.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I just really think we, maybe if like KLOA calls the condo associations, because I know, like I live in a condo and I didn't have a parking space, I park in the street and they wanted to know my license plate number. So, I think condo associations are taking this information and it could be
like a half an hour of phone calls here.

MR. LAMOTTE: They did interview the managers and they did, and I don't have the specifics, but he made, Tim made some factor for the off peak.

MR. MARINO: Yes, I think what we should do is put in the methodology of the statements or a report on what's happened because there has been a pretty strong methodology -- issues and debates particularly, but at least you have that in front of you when you discuss this the next time --

MR. LAMOTTE: And then, the other thing is the lifestyle or behavior pattern. If someone says, well, I have to have, you know, two cars per unit, well, maybe if that condo doesn't offer that and they don't have that extra one for the spouse or someone who may have only one, then they make a different change. But someone coming down here as an empty nester who probably have two cars may not want to give them up, but not always. And then, these retirees are really starting to drop the cars off. So, you balance it with them. You may have two and I may have one but you don't need the two per.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: But I'm thinking of the
notion of the disincentive to, I mean, to build in the
incentive. Okay, you want two cars, that's fine, but
you're going to have to pay for it.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, that's what people do.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Yes --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: If you have a $700,000
or $800,000 condo, you know, I mean, that needs to come
with two parking spaces, right?

MR. BOVA: It doesn't at Sherman Plaza.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: They're going to ask you
to pay extra for that second parking space. That's what
I think.

MR. LAMOTTE: Absolutely. But you as a City
can --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: That's what I think, got
it.

MR. LAMOTTE: That's the developer. Right,
you don't have to get into that as a City. You're
basically setting a regulation for how many spaces --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Exactly.

MR. LAMOTTE: 1.5 is pushing it because you
have so much business parking.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Dennis, just a quick
question?

MR. MARINO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Let us assume for a minute that everybody who lives in those condo buildings buys a City sticker. Can't we go and just look at the City's records on how many people have bought City stickers at an address?

MR. MARINO: We should be able to. I'm not sure how easy that is to do, but it should be doable.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: -- revenue, maybe --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, we may find some people to --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: They're still buying their sticker in Glencoe.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Let's put that in as a warning.

MR. LAMOTTE: The other quick thing on parking that you have is way over anybody else is that when we get the condo with the 1.5 or 2 and you accommodate that extra, you know, one person and the other is two, then it's the visitors, too, sometimes. In Chicago, in some of the tighter neighborhoods, you know, six people come to a dinner party and they -- you've got so much great
parking all over in different strategic locations,
street, decks, public, private, that you are way ahead.
That's an incentive for someone to live downtown, to
have guests, to have plenty of places to --
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, I know certainly when I
come downtown, I come right down Church, make that right
onto Sherman. If I haven't found a parking space by the
time I get to the corner, I'm in Sherman Plaza garage
and go where I need to go.
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Do you know, did they
raise the rates of that garage or just the meters?
CHAIRMAN WOODS: I don't know.
MR. MARINO: John's point about the
distinction between Central Street and downtown, what
we've noticed for several years now is you're much more
likely to sit two-car households up on Central Street or
on Chicago Avenue. You will see that certainly downtown
but not nearly as much. And I think some of the survey
research bears that out. You know, we should cross-
check it in other ways also, but I think you're also
saying nationwide is the higher density downtown condos
can be much less likely to have two cars but will on
certain cases.
COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Are there any provisions in the planning of -- as opposed to stickers, that if you have only one car there's a reward?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: You can rent it out.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: We'll give you a free Zip Car every other night.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: I don't know. Why not add positive incentives?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: -- City stickers.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: There you go. There you go, that's a great idea.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: That was to put in Zip Car, you know, a couple of spaces in with these developments.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. How does that work? Does Zip Car rent a space from the garage or can we, is there any provision for that? So, Zip Car has to pad a pocket, there maybe an incentive there.

MR. McGONIGLE: There's two -- one is not-for-profit and one is profit. Zip Car I think is --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: For profit.

MR. McGONIGLE: And Go Car is the other one.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I Go.
MR. McGONIGLE: I think the discussion that we had earlier was one of the -- to put provisions for that and if you put that in, you could reduce the amount of parking or increase your FAR.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: That's what I mean, an incentive.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: We have a --

MR. BOVA: Carl Bova. I've been pretty vocal about this subject of parking in our community group. And I've put together a little cheat sheet of some of the factors related to specifically Table 5-A. I don't know if there's enough. But with respect to one and two-car ownership, there's a summary there. If you can take a -- typical development that has currently say a mix, half one-bedroom, half two-bedroom, the zoning says 1.25 for the one-bedroom, 1.5 stalls for the two-bedroom. So, just half and half, take the average, 1.38.

Now -- a little bit about the personal survey that we conducted in which 265 people responded. And that is in my -- Section 5. And our findings suggest that people in downtown newer condos own 1.38 cars per development unit. That's precisely what the existing
code requires. If you run a mix of half one and half
two-bedroom. And so, that's one thing to consider.

I think we're going a little bit, we're
jumping the gun to change the parking ratio requirements
based on very, very, very questionable surveys that have
been conducted. And about those surveys, I did go with
my college age son just literally Tuesday morning into
Sherman Plaza. And I, too, took a look at how few cars
were located in the public portion of the garage. I
also found that there were quite a few cars, quite a few
stalls empty in the cordoned off area which the
residents owned.

Furthermore, the only cars it seemed or a
large majority of them were in fact in the public
stalls. They were clustered around the entrance to the
residences and I counted 68 cars. There were only 253
units in that building, and there are 68 cars that
aren't parking in the right spot. This single point in
time in one survey night did not consider anything
related to that issue.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, I'm unclear what your
issue is. So, 68 out of the 273 are there overnight.
So, are they hurting the retail shop space?
MR. BOVA: That's conceivable.

MR. LAMOTTE: But I doubt it because they're usually coming in the evening was what we're finding in our trend. The second thing is their job, KLOA, was to go into those new developments as best they could.

MR. BOVA: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: Make phone calls to talk to all the managers, they had two or three interviews with the managers. The other one was an older City survey on what it is. And the good news which you acknowledged is that your usage ratio is 1.38 which is great. You guys have lower than the national average. Plus, you have all the transit and the grocery stores.

MR. BOVA: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: When we saw that the zoning, you know, is 2 cars per unit and for the larger units, it's just too much. So, I guess I'm unclear what you're trying to, do you want to go back up to the 2 per unit?

MR. BOVA: No. All I'm saying is actually you have -- you have right now -- and seems to work.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, that was the question put to us is that we're requiring too much parking for these units, I mean, for these buildings.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I think you'll find that stand from developers. There two surveys done over the last eight years, seven years, somewhere in there, looking at condo and apartment dwellings. One was done, I believe, by the City, one was done by the City. Another was done by a group on Main Street privately. And they came up with almost identical numbers and those are the numbers you're talking about. So, the parking ratios at that time were based on these two separate surveys. It showed that's what was living in Evanston right now. Now, I know there are developers who have come back and said, but downtown is different. But you know, the difference between, I think that we always have to remember the difference between Downtown Evanston and Downtown Chicago is Downtown Chicago has a lot of taxis driving around. Downtown Evanston does not.

You know, what I think Dave had said is true. You know, people who live in Downtown Evanston don't use their car as much but they still have it because they still have quasi-suburban attitude that they have to get in their car sometime and drive to Old Orchard or drive to O'Hare or drive to the airport there.
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Or drive to the drugstore in the middle of the night when they can't get a cab.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes. Yes, and I think that's why as much as the developers would like to reduce the cost of parking spaces which are now, what, $22,000-$25,000 a space depending on where you put it, the reality still is that the numbers that we have seen over the last two or three surveys that were taken in a general sense, not in July which I'm sorry is I think a really bad time to do it, are probably still very true.

MR. BOVA: Yes, the latest US Census for the mid ten-year or 2005 -- suggests for Evanston I think it was 1.4 cars per household. So, we're seeing the same numbers time and again. And so, we need to be able to have some kind of ordinance that reflects that kind of number. And what I'm saying is what we've got now seems to be working.

MR. LAMOTTE: But your ratios are higher. If you go to the front end of Chapter 5, it's 2 for the larger units, it's 1.5, and we've scaled it differently. It's 1.25, 1.5 and we're done. 1.5 is just a hair over the national trend.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I think it's 1.25 for
one-bedroom, isn't it?

MR. LAMOTTE: It's right here on Chapter 5.

MR. MARINO: Yes, it's steps --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, it steps --

MR. MARINO: It's 1.5 and 2. But I think it has a different maximum -- two versions.

MR. SMITH: I think it's also something you have to acknowledge is that people will make a lifestyle choice by living in downtown. And part of that is not so much reliance on cars, okay? And in many cases, it may even mean that they are just storing a car, okay? But it may also mean that they got rid of one of their two cars because they live downtown now.

So, you know, these numbers can be debated a lot but I think there is evidence that people live in a downtown location because they don't want to be so dependent on a car. And sometimes, that choice of not being so dependent upon a car means that they get rid of one of their cars.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: I would suggest the demographic trips, too, which are saying that we're getting increasing retirement baby boomers are going to be lots of cars so that when you look at the
demographics of who is going to be coming into these pedestrian friendly -- it's going to be people that are --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And yet in the retirement homes we're building, we're adding parking spaces.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: But those are outlying homes. Those are --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Like the Mather.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: No, I'm talking, well, that's for the employees as I understood it.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: No, no. It's because residents are coming in with cars.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: That's because Mather is going to compete in a market that's different I think.

MR. LAMOTTE: I think the bottom line is, because I think we're there, is that Central Street talked about there's a question can we go to zero. And that was a great question, we debated it, and everybody realized that, okay, I walk to the train but then I have to go somewhere for groceries or somewhere else. The suburban and urban folks are having cars, even the Chicago or shopping center cars are there. So, we have
to accommodate it, it's not going to go away.

Your downtown can really accommodate a lesser ratio because of all the things you can do walking. And maybe like a car sits there for just the weekend or they go to the I Go or the Zip Car. But we don't need to have the higher loaded up rates because then your bases of buildings can go down here, you have less craziness in the building to work with, with the parking.

MR. MARINO: What about the idea of if you lower the parking requirements plan and set aside -- program?

MR. LAMOTTE: We should look at that.

MR. MARINO: Is anyone else doing that, do you know?

MR. LAMOTTE: Where if you put in X Zip Car spaces then you can knock your ratio down because then your folks can have a quick car in the weekend to --

MR. MARINO: Right, exactly.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, I thought it was a great idea. We should look at it. And we'll get some national --

MR. BOVA: I'm on the mobility transportation subgroup. And that is one of the recommendations that's
come forward, to take a look at introducing a
requirement to have car sharing --
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And does that mean
that they require condominium --
MR. BOVA: I think they did.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: -- to maintain X
number of, if they have over so many units to
maintain --
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: The service would be --
would be 18 --
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But maybe the service
goes away.
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: But you have a problem
with that if it's a private condo and there's no public
access to that car. I don't see how any of these
companies are going to put a car in there just to, you
know --
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, that's what I'm
saying, that the condo has to provide it.
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Which maybe we do?
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Which under a LEED guidelines
actually is a way of getting points under LEED.
MR. LAMOTTE: But your point is the market
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one. So, if I go, you know, and the others have to make
money to keep this going. The 200 units in that
building may not do it. Now, if it's in your retail, if
you're in a mixed use building --
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: That's correct. Then
it's very doable.
MR. LAMOTTE: Then everybody makes out and say
okay, can you knock down some of the numbers for your
residents so they can mark down -- there's a very
logical --
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I understand. But, you
know, I'm building something like the DeVilla
Balconies --
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: The whole tower across
from Oldberg.
MR. BOVA: That's interesting --
recommendation that's going to be coming forward again
for the same working group related to what's perceived
by many to be empty spaces within the condo parking
garage that are basically unoccupied because people
don't have a car where they have two spaces and you only
have one. So, the whole idea is that a space is locked
up on a per unit basis as opposed to unbundling them and
allowing a greater flexibility with the use of single space. In this way, when you start seeing figures that -- other building, you might see 1.2 stalls occupied per unit, in fact, they may have built 1.3, that flexibility of that -- 10 percent of the spaces, may be you could save, it's like on the airlines, you double book if people don't show up.

MR. LAMOTTE: If someone's out of town or whatever. Right, right.

MR. BOVA: If somebody's out of town, on vacation, people are moving in and out which is another thing that didn't get taken into consideration with this survey. In Sherman Plaza, there's something like 35 units that are being either on the market or had been sold, I guess in turn that are being used as rentals. It's not to say also that you shouldn't have some flexibility for the future because if you're going to allocate spaces per unit, if I own two spaces and I simply decide to buy a second car, I've got the space for it. If I sell that unit and then somebody else comes in and wants to have two cars, they have a space for it. So, there's some pluses or minuses for any -- some kind of, I can see some kind of modest reduction
teamed with this unbundling concept. Maybe you could reduce it by ten percent if not --

Finally, the damage that you cause is irreparable sometimes to congestion on the streets. The ambience of Evanston going downtown in your car or on a bike or as a pedestrian, the last thing I want to see is wall to wall cars.

MR. LAMOTTE: And that's not going to cause, if you're saying that that extra that we would not require, now these people are going to be circling the blocks looking for parking space? But you've got to remember how much retail and public parking you have there. So, that's what I'm trying to get at. You've got so many great amenities here, why are we building the big bases in these buildings?

MR. BOVA: Well, the other interesting thing is let's look at an example, an example that comes to mind is 708 Church. And this efficiency that they are proposing of 134 parking stalls, if you take a figure of $20,000 per stall, that amount of savings of cost to developer is $2.68 million. Where do those cars go? Plus the people do in fact have those cars.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Maybe they can --
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Can I ask a question?

We'll probably --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think we need to --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: We'll work on this in zoning, right?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right. Detail it out, right.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Good point.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Is it not the case though, irrespective of what the ratio is, that the developer is going to make an independent decision as to what he needs in terms of parking space?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: To market his units, yes.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: To sell those units.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right, absolutely.

MR. BISHOP: That's why the trend nationally is to really establish a maximum ratio as to correct that imperfection in the market that those create building bases that are completely out of proportion with the --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, right. And in fact, as a rating system, you get points for providing the same
or less than what is required as a minimum.

MR. SMITH: And the people who really are into
this form-based code and trying to shape the size and
form of the City, this is what they control the most,
okay, that the overbuilding of parking so influences the
appearance and the texture and the feel of the city,
that they really are careful. They are establishing
these maximums because that’s what’s at risk. If you
allow just unlimited amount of parking or you have
really high ratios, you end up with these blocks at the
bases of your buildings.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: One of the wonderful things
about going to a lot of European cities is the fact that
for a lot of them they build garages at the edge of the
community so that when you come to that community, you
have to park at the edge and then move your way in as
opposed to what we do which is --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: And have you noticed the
size of their cars?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, a little small.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: How many can you squeeze
in?

MR. McGONIGLE: Can I make an observation?
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

MR. McGONIGLE: As a radical concept, we're all considering -- what it does to -- looking at the concept of reducing the number of cars, is there a merit in actually increasing the -- of putting parking underground. By reducing the number of cars --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That's one of the bonuses we have. In our list.

MR. BISHOP: One of the things that we've done in other towns, too, instead of establishing maximum, they chose to establish a ratio above which providing parking in excess of that ratio cost you in terms of, it counts as floor area.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Wow.

MR. BISHOP: Because now the reason those hulking bases exist on buildings is because most zoning ordinances don't recognize that, you know, tell the person on the street, tell your mom, that's not floor area. Those five floors, that's really not the building.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: So, we sort of recognize that within the current zoning situation.

MR. SMITH: No, you don't count FAR and
parking is FAR.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right, it doesn't count as FAR, it doesn't count as building height even, for the first four floors of it.

MR. BOVA: I have a last comment.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, no, no. We're going to move it along here. Anybody else have any more comments on pages 66 or 67?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I do. So, first bullet point, I just, on 66, I just have an issue with the wording of how a compact dense and high-rise downtown is appropriate for a central location. You know, that may be for Chicago, but is that what we want, a dense, high-rise downtown in Evanston? So, you know, I think you could take this definition and apply it to Wilmette. They have a, you know, shopping and mass transit right in downtown that goes all the way up. So, I mean, I have an issue with this paragraph. And is that something we want to include as a definition for our downtown?

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Can I ask exactly which word -- your reaction?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Compact dense.
COMMISSIONER HUNTER: The high-rise doesn't?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: You know, having a high-rise or two doesn't, but the compact and dense, the density.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, you don't like that word?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I don't like that. I don't like compact and dense.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I do.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So move to Chicago.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- I love it.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: But you see, I feel that one of the nice parts of Evanston is some of the openness that we have, okay. And you know, hey, you know, I just feel that that definition, you know, in our plan that it's going to become more compact and more dense --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Let me just say, you expressed earlier your appreciation for the liveliness that is occurring --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: And I would suggest to you that the reason it is lively is precisely because it is compact and denser than it was when you were here --
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I think, I don't necessarily agree with that, but the issue becomes how compact and dense do we want to make it? So, does that, are we saying that if it is more compact and dense, if we don't make it more compact and dense, that that liveliness is going to go away? I mean, I think Downtown Evanston --

MR. LAMOTTE: You're reacting to us observing that that's what it is now in a positive sense because if you go back to where we, in the book and where we explained, you have a lot of things going on in a quarter mile. And when you add up all the ingredients, sustainable, transit oriented development, neo-traditional, it's all in there. So, that's compact in a positive sense that you can walk to a lot of things like a grocery store. Not compact as bad. It's like --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Compact says to me lots of buildings close together.

MR. LAMOTTE: Which is there.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: No --

MR. LAMOTTE: They're there.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes and no.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, they are already there.
COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Can I suggest an insertion of a word? A compact, dense and high-rise downtown, currently a current dense, compact, et cetera. It's not saying we're going to build more. It's saying what is there is dense and compact.

MR. LAMOTTE: Does anybody else feel this about this paragraph?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes, I feel, I mean that's a good, I didn't really, I just sort of read over the -- there's quite a few paragraphs that, you know, allude to that and it's like --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: This jumped out at me.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes. And then, but I also, I think -- Evanston is the traditional districts and the low scale --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: And the three-story buildings in the middle of downtown. And so, I think that's something that makes Evanston different than Downtown in the Loop. And I also think, to respond to -- downtown having turned 21 when all of these bars seem to start showing up, it seemed a lot of liveliness had to do with the City starting to get more liquor
licenses.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: A few restaurants in Downtown Evanston.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: And I also think the liveliness also had to do a lot with, you know, hey, the 90's were pretty darn good, you know. There was economic boom. The affluence of Evanston has changed, okay, and the affluence of Evanston has not changed because downtown has become more compact and dense. The affluence of Evanston has changed and I've been here since '67 and that is not just based in downtown, that's based throughout Evanston.

There are Northwestern kids that are driving $100,000 cars. They are spending $40,000 to go to school. That's an affluence that wasn't here when you and I were growing up in this, well, you had already grown up in the 60's, sorry, Al.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: That's all right.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: You know? So, you know, the affluence has a lot, you know, it has much more to do with, you know, okay, so the economic growth that was occurring at the time of the 90's and the turn...
of the century, okay. So, I do not subscribe to the
fact that we have high rises downtown and it's become
more dense has made downtown more happening, you know.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I disagree because --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I'm not saying a
hundred percent to that.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Yes, I know, but I'm
just saying I can argue in terms of research but I can
also argue on a personal anecdotal, you know, precisely
people, I mean the research does suggest high-rise and
density does produce greater pedestrian environment
and --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, more activity at
the street.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Yes, I mean, the whole
-- but also, a number of people I've known both in
Evanston and throughout the North Shore who have retired
and who have moved in to the high-rise condos in
Evanston precisely because of this pedestrian proximity.
I mean, that's very anecdotal and I wouldn't use my
network of friends as a generalization. But nonetheless
I did.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: -- only places that
there are people out are at the bars.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: I'm not denying the
11:00 o'clock scene et cetera, but I am saying around
the 6:00, 7:00, movie scene and what have you, yes,
there is stuff happening here that --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I'm just saying and
that is absolutely correct.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: And I would suggest that
the sheer number of people that are in proximity here
that are part of it. Now, I would agree with you that
I'm not sure I want to see this continued, like I said,
to the built out phase.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So, my point on this
paragraph, and I agree with, we are in a hundred percent
laser alignment there, my issue with this paragraph and
actually probably the one before it as well is that it
implies that we want to see that continue.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Okay. That's why I
introduced current. And I would be very receptive to
the notion of the uniqueness of the historic or
traditional aspects for downtown --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: And I'm not referring
to the tower here.
COMMISSIONER HUNTER: No, no, no. I'm talking about the three tradition district or whatever they're called. It's just that I see a certain --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes. We're in violent agreement.

MR. McGONIGLE: Can you just add the word blend of? Blend of the current density with --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Can you come closer? It just makes it easier.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: My own position which I'm not going to fight over here, I think it's fine the way it is because it's a statement of what's there and the fact that we have transportation, it's just a logical thing. We have transportation here, we have all these things. If you're going to have any density in the town, this is where it should be.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Right. But it doesn't have the traditional is what, the unique, what differentiates this is going to be the traditional, you know, whatever.

MR. MARINO: So, Kirk, when you edit, could we basically, you know, include that?

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: That's what I'm saying,
add a phrase on that.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Thank you.

MR. BISHOP: So, how will it read then?

MR. LAMOTTE: The unique blend of the traditional areas and new denser areas, something like that, downtown --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Is appropriate for this central location.

MR. LAMOTTE: -- things that other Americans would love to do with their cities.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: That didn't have the beautiful -- okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Carlos, did you have a comment?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, he did.

MR. RUIZ: I did but I don't know if it's really relevant other than the central core, when we look at the core, what -- with the bonuses -- build a high-rise or -- if you just have a central core which is the one that has 49 stories or bonuses, that would be high-rise in the way you look at it. But if you look at the core, you have to talk about -- which probably is what you want to attract anyway. When you look at this
density, sorry, compact, it doesn't necessarily have to
-- you can have very compact storefronts or any mixed
buildings, commercial, office that are compact but not
necessarily dense.

So, I think that you need to kind of find the
middle again to, you know, what do you really mean by
dense, what do you mean by compact, what do you mean by
high-rise.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: That's a good point.

MR. RUIZ: In the glossary, you may have that
-- this is what we mean by a high-rise, no more than 40-
foot story.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, and I think the compact
in this reference is specifically relating to the fact
that basically within a quarter of mile walking distance
downtown is a compact entity.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes, it is.

MR. RUIZ: But not necessarily dense.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: The word dense means --
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right, but than an increased
density over the rest of Evanston is appropriate for
places of mass transit.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Right.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And then it's a question of within here we're defining in other sections exactly what that density is. Or can be.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: I like the statement as is. I wouldn't change anything.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I agree with you but I'm more flexible, you know. You're absolutely right. But you know --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. All right. Can we go to page 68?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: We have 11 minutes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: This one. Can we for the moment table the development review process? Do we have a parking lot issue here?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, it's not parking lot.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, it's not a parking lot issue. I just, I want to move, that's a long discussion I think -- all of us. I'm not saying necessarily that we're in any disagreement because I don't think any of us -- know what the answer is right now.
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: And I think after, I mean, that's something we're doing in the Zoning Committee for West Evanston.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: We're going through, and we're also looking at what administrative processes are in place in other communities. So, I think --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It can feed into that.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes, after we do, yes, after we do West Evanston, we'll probably have a better idea of how to go about this.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: But can we go to the development allowances specifically and talk about things on this list that are now, I think that we've tossed off? And then there are other things that --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Other things that we've added.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That we've added. Make sure that we are as complete as we can be about this.

MR. LAMOTTE: Survey says?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Childcare is out as I recall. Daycare, I apologize.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Can I go again?
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I'll go again, okay. You know, I'm really wearing up my welcome on my first day. I just feel some of these have the potential to be requirements and allowances, okay. So, right now you have gold and platinum LEED. Perhaps silver should be a requirement if you're going to develop in Evanston, period. I don't know if gold should be, but silver should be.

You know, we have things like, I probably wouldn't vote for Daley but if I still lived in Chicago I'd vote for him and that's because of the greening he is doing of that city. I think we are all in violent agreement. So, is there anything we can do to require, you know, a green development? You have on rooftops, you don't have it in here though, do you?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So --

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, let me just clarify. Or equivalent green building designs or something that could come in and maybe not do LEED. But we have to be a little careful. What we're finding around the country is that some developers of smaller buildings, they are...
saying for me to go through all the LEED, I'm going to spend a lot of money to get my certification. If we as a City had a checklist, I think there was something on TV the other day, I'm drawing a blank, and they gave a certificate and used the same thing and gave them, have them spent 60 grand --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think the biggest issue with any of that is that in the LEED process, you have to demonstrate that you've actually done what you said you were going to do, and the non-LEED certified or whatever you're going to call it, not having to actually submit everything. How do you verify that in fact?

MR. LAMOTTE: And still have that check and balance. The city that was on TV and I'm drawing a blank in, they incorporated in their -- but it's still cost for staff but it was a lot less cheaper for the owner than to go through LEED.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Now, isn't, you know, doesn't somebody out shopping for a condo, won't they be pretty interested in buying in a LEED certified building versus an --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I don't know. There is a very green building on Lincoln Avenue immediately across
from the middle school there that has been on the market
for, oh, pretty close to a year now, right, Larry?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Pretty close.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Is it pretty big in
size --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's a two-unit building.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Lincoln by Haven,
right?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: By Haven.

MR. LAMOTTE: The folks that are looking,
they're looking at what are the green elements in the
building, not whether it's officially LEED or not a
fake --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: That's correct. So,
you know, if you're moving in with kids, you don't want
to have paint that leeches or --

MR. LAMOTTE: Right. What I would suggest,
because this is the venue again that we're going
through, if you as a group say yes, we want to recommend
to the Council that gold LEED or equivalent, that that's
something that gets detailed out when you start hacking
into --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.
MR. LAMOTTE: So, how do we do that, is it a bonus, is it a percentage, allowances or required.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Again, this is, just so that you understand because you are new --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I am new. Everybody was in violent agreement when I raised the issue of making it a requirement --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And if I'm not mistaken, the Environmental Review Board or somebody was working on some sort of recommendation about green buildings within a certain strip of Evanston. So, there's also good things happening on that front.

MR. MARINO: But, Seth, the other part of the process here is the Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission will do things --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Specific to the zoning.

MR. MARINO: Right. Towards the text. Think of this as some of the policies that --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes, that's fine. My issue is, again, why are we providing bonuses for some of these things when they should just be standard for doing business in Evanston.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: So, is that what we're
deciding now or --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, couldn't make it --

MR. LAMOTTE: You're deciding on a menu you as

a policy sending to the Council and we said we have a

list of possible bonuses or requirements we can put in

there. Just for the next round.

MR. McGONIGLE: The Mayor's agreement that the

City of Evanston signed is having a presentation either

on May 4th or May 7th for -- throughout the entire City

-- so, I would say the portion related to -- be deferred

until that is actually presented and that that has been

debated by some of the Council because that has far more

reaching implications.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes, big time.

MR. McGONIGLE: And would look at many things

in many directions this Committee has not considered.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

MR. McGONIGLE: It's being looked at even in

advance of the green building portion. It's just a mere

portion of the --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That's the 20-30 stuff?

MR. McGONIGLE: Yes.
MR. LAMOTTE: And you're sending the message that this is a bonus or requirement to be studied further but this is our list. We want this to go on to the next recommend.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Okay, recommended list.

MR. LAMOTTE: Jim, should we go through each one just to double check?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. Affordable housing I think is in.

MR. MARINO: It is as of the City's --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: And then the one that's on Kirk's one list here with the affordable office space, we've slipped that in right there.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, okay. Now, street and sidewalk improvements and planning of street trees, can't we just require that?

MR. SMITH: These are intended to be the entire block though, not just in front of your building. You have to go around the block.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right, and that's, you know, having a plan of where to put these things, where they should be.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think the City does require it.

MR. MARINO: We do require it out of the building -- but you're saying basically adopt the whole block?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Adopt the block.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: That is a great idea. I have a question. Is there a lot of development here around Fountain Square?

MR. MARINO: Not really. I mean --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Is it feasible to require -- I'm sorry.

MR. MARINO: But if a developer comes along with his or her parcel as they're required to by the City then says, okay, we'll do the same thing to the rest of the block, should that be eligible for bonus?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Maybe not a huge percentage but --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: That goes to my question here is, okay, we have all this building around Fountain Square, right? And so, it would be feasible
then as a bonus have them do something to Fountain
Square.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, that's coming up. That's coming up. You're jumping to that.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That's the idea, the creation of public parks or open spaces and I would like to add "or funding of significant improvements to existing ones."

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: In the downtown, yes.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Is that creation or renovation?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Creation or renovation or upgrading or --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Contribution to the creation or renovation fund.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, just so I'm clear real quickly, and we're going fast in here, street and sidewalk improvements, leave it on the list?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: It might be a minor bonus but in the full block, you know. For more block, we'll figure it out, block face.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Adopt the block, yes.

MR. McGONIGLE: Adopt the block.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, adopt the block.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And then you've got trees and the street and sidewalk all together.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, move that up --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Put the two together.

MR. LAMOTTE: Then the creation or enhancement of public spaces, or public or open spaces, right?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But I think Larry's point to that is give to a fund to that because it's going to be public parks or open space.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I think the fund is --

we're talking about the rehabbing fund.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Okay, for the -- all right, never mind.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, wait. Let's be clear.

Because it's either like in the right location as I put it in and we don't want the thing in the back. Or I can put ten cents into the pot for someone in the City to go do Fountain Square or somewhere else.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, I think, what I was talking about was we talked about developing a fund
CHAIRMAN WOODS: That's the next one, historic preservation. We should add into that a description.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Okay, there you go.

That's it.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

MR. MARINO: The facade part.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: The facade part.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Yes, under historic preservation.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, let's be clear on the open space one because it's either you create it, or if you want around the corner enhance it yourself, or it's really, third, you can contribute to the pot to help the City do it.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, it's a three-fer, we just got to split it up. Yes --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, and in many cases we'd want them to contribute funding to it rather than doing it themselves because we want to control, as the City, we want to control what the result is.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Or it may not work on
that particular site, too.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Or maybe there's a park for --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, Raymond Park.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: This also said downtown and city-wide.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, city-wide --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I don't think we ought to do city-wide. No.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Well, it says city-wide development, then we're going to fix that.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Where does it say that?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: No, above that.

Available buildings should reflect the City's goal for downtown and city-wide development.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: She's in the paragraph above it.

MR. LAMOTTE: Above it, yes. Well, I guess that's the question. If you contribute to something out of your site, it's just something you brought up, can we do affordable housing over on Central Street instead of downtown, that's the question.
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Right.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, that's city-wide.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, it is city-wide.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Because the fund, if you put money in the fund, additional money in the fund --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: It's hard to --

sidewalk in front of your building, is there a way for the City of Evanston to actually take those funds and do it? I don't know the budget process.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, but they have to conform with the City's --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Well, you said give the money to the City. So, the City --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, what I'm talking about is for Fountain Square.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: For a public --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: We don't want them to design Fountain Square.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: But we don't want them to still build, once they do the sidewalks and the trees in the sidewalks in front of that whole block, who's
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responsible then for maintaining it? Is it the City or is it them?

MR. MARINO: The City.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: The City.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Okay.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay. We're getting down.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Historic preservation.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Carlos.

MR. RUIZ: This is subject to the education grant. For some time now, I think the National Park Service and the National -- have been negotiating with the LEED organization to include historic preservation as one of the factors for giving certification. If it's not already in place within Evanston, we can take the initiative to include restoration as a LEED -- so that might be an additional bonus -- adding that as a LEED -- there's no greener building that are existing than, that's one of the reasons.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, they're saying since you're not knocking it down --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And those are LEED points now.

MR. RUIZ: Are they now?
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, they are, for preserving and existing building.

MR. RUIZ: You could maybe even --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: The one thing about the LEED system in general is that a lot of, the weighting of things is kind of very even and flat.

MR. LAMOTTE: Just quickly, to get the wording later, but it says historic preservation, if you're going to preserve a building, you get a --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Adopt a landmark facade, restoration fund --

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, that kind, so we've got to expand it.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

MR. MARINO: -- some minimum threshold.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right. Next one, arts and culture?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Adopt an artist? What does that mean?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: -- places in the world is the Netherlands. And I used to go there for business
two or three times a year because I had an office there. And they adopt artists. In fact, the residents for the warehouses can actually rent art. So, they hang them on the walls and they pay the government who pays the artists to be artists. So, I don't know, I think the adopt an artist is a pretty darn good idea. You know, swap out art on your walls and stuff.

MR. LAMOTTE: You get X percent if they're locally known. If they're nationally known, you get a big bonus.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: But it's a great idea, it's a wonderful idea.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Actually for offices it may work. There might be --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: It's a wonderful idea.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: But is it publicly accessible? Because --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, I think that's in the details, what would have to be involved.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: -- helping the artists.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, maybe we should do public arts, statues, things like that.

MR. BISHOP: I feel like I should mention that
we're working off of a list that bears little resemblance to the actual zoning bonus list that's in the form-based code chapter that follows this chapter.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

MR. BISHOP: Wherein we set out the specific definition of what is the bonusable public benefits. So, it's kind of like we're having a discussion based on some general language that is changed --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Maybe we need to go back to the specific list.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Let's just move it in there.

MR. BISHOP: I think that would be appropriate because the specific list, for example, talks about public art installations and financial contributions to downtown arts organizations that are providing --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. I would also, I was going to say there's one other thing I would like to put in here. And I know that it's something that's near and dear to Stuart's heart, and that is a performing arts center or spaces or whatever you want to call it.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: -- call it as a city.

MR. SMITH: -- have the idea of public
benefits but they're not defined.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes.

MR. SMITH: So, this was just a list put together that --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Why don't we just take, take the other list and just pop it in?

MR. BISHOP: I think that's the way to do it.

We're --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: This list begins on page 91.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: How long are we going to go?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think we're close to done now.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: We could start with that next time.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: We're meeting again tomorrow night in celebration of me being here.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: The new guy. No comment.

MR. McGONIGLE: If you all have nothing to do tomorrow night, the -- as a member of the policy --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: It's obvious you don't have a lot to do --
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: What happens, I mean, are we going to try then next time, what are we --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Next time, I would say --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Where do you want to start?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That we should be tackling the form-based zoning section of this. We need to do planned development review and talk about what we as a group conceptually think the best process is going to be for the reviewing of all this stuff, and who does that and how it's done at least in conceptual terms.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: So, we need to make sure Bill is here.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

MR. MARINO: So, we have, are you saying for next time we have the form-based zoning section, Section 8?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

MR. MARINO: The planned development discussion, I think, the recommendations underlying all these -- if we don't do planned development, then I think that's a discussion that needs to occur. If we are going to do planned development or some kind of Plan
Commission review, what's does that look like?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

MR. MARINO: And then we would go with the parking lot issues.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Motion to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Second?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN WOODS: The next meeting of the Zoning Committee is?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Next Tuesday, the 15th.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And the next meeting of the Plan Commission is May the 14th. And you have another Zoning Committee meeting on April 30th.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: We might have to.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay.

(Whereupon, the hearing on the above-titled cause was concluded at 11:08 p.m.)