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CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Good evening. This is a joint special public hearing, a joint hearing of the Zoning Board of Appeals and the Plan Commission of the City of Evanston. It's being held pursuant to Section 6-3-4-8 of the Zoning Ordinance, which requires such joint hearings in situations where, as in this case, an applicant is asking for a change to the zoning map, a special use, and for major or minor variations. And for that reason these two groups are meeting together.

Tonight from the Zoning Board of Appeals in attendance are Board Members Beth McLennan, Lori Summers, and Donald Wilson. I'm Robert Creamer, the current Chair of the Zoning Board of Appeals. I drew the short straw and I will be chairing the meeting tonight.

With us from the Plan Commission are Members Seth Freeman, David Galloway, Johanna Nyden, Stuart Opdyke, Robin Schuldenfrei, Charles Staley, and James Woods, the current Chair. I believe we therefore have quorums of both groups so we can proceed.

Also present tonight from the City Staff are Bill Dunkley, Zoning Administrator, Dominick Argumedo, the Zoning Planner, and Tracy Norfleet, Staff to the Plan Commission.
This is a formal hearing and we have some rules that govern this proceeding. Our most important rule is that only one person speaks at a time without interruption. It's more than just good manners, it's necessary to permit the court reporter to record our proceedings accurately.

Anyone who wishes to address the Plan Commission or the Zoning Board regarding this matter will be given an opportunity to do so at the appropriate time.

We will start by having the case introduced by the staff members, then the applicant will be given an opportunity to present their case. After that members of the Plan Commission and the Zoning Board will ask any questions that we might have.

And after that will have an opportunity for public comment and for questions that may be asked by persons who have a legal interest in real property located within 500 feet of the property that is the subject of the application. Under the Zoning Ordinance those folks have the right to ask reasonable questions, to present evidence, and under certain circumstances ask for a continuance.

So after all of the evidence, testimony, and
statements have been received we will close the record
and begin our joint deliberations. So that's the
batting order for tonight.

So can we have the introduction of the case?
Are you going to do that, Bill?

MR. DUNKLEY: Yes, I'll do that. My name is
Bill Dunkley, and I'm the Zoning Administrator.

The case that we have tonight has been given
Case ID 08PLND-0120, it is a case, it is an application
for multiple forms of zoning relief by the applicant,
the Roycemore School.

The Roycemore School is a private educational
institution, it has been operating in Evanston for many
years. They are currently located on property that is
leased from the Northwestern University, and their goal
is to purchase the property that's known as 1200 Davis
Street, currently the home of, part of the home of the
Methodist Pension Board that's bounded by Ridge Avenue,
Davis Street, Grove, and Asbury. It does not include
the entire block, the remainder of the block is occupied
by a public park.

The application is in four parts. The first
is a request for an amendment to the map of the Zoning
Ordinance, a re-zoning. The property is currently zoned
0-1, which is our office zoning district. That zoning
district does not permit educational institutions
however. The request is to re-zone the entire property
from 0-1 to the R-4 District, which is the, a general
residential district allowing single-family, two-family,
and more modest, lower intensity, multi-family dwellings
as well.

The second part is a request for a special use
permit, which is contingent upon the first. The R-4
Zoning District allows private educational institutions
only by special use.

The third and fourth are both for major
variations. The first being a request to allow an
encroachment of two feet into the required street side
yard of 15 feet, that is the minimum required for this
zoning district, and that is to allow the construction
of an exterior stair. Actually, it's construction of an
additional stairway that's required by building code for
this type of use, and that is along Davis Street.

The second major variation is to exceed the
maximum lot coverage, building lot coverage of 55
percent, and the request is for a 63 percent lot
coverage. And that is required by the Plan, which
anticipates adding a gymnasium and also some additional
paved vehicular accessways that the applicant will
describe.

These separate pieces will be considered
combined into a consolidated application. Of course,
they fall in different purviews, that's the reason for
our joint meeting tonight.

With that I will turn it back to our Chair.

And, of course, staff will be here to answer any
questions you may have as we move forward.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Thanks. Let me to take
roll to see, I assume the applicant is here either in
person or by counsel?

MR. FREELAND: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: And just to get some idea,
is there anyone else here who wishes to speak to us at
the appropriate time concerning this application, either
in support or in opposition? Could you just raise your
hands so we get a sense? I see about half dozen people
who have raised their hands. Okay. Well, that gives us
an idea of what we have going. So we'll ask the
applicant to introduce himself and then explain the
project and why you think we should grant the relief
that you're requesting.

MR. FREELAND: Thank you. Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. My name is Steve Freeland, I'm an attorney at Applegate & Thorne-Thomsen with offices in Chicago, here representing Roycemore School.

First, we do want to thank you for doing a joint meeting, it's certainly the most efficient way for us to deal with this issue, and we understand it's difficult for all of you to get together, so we very much appreciate that.

Let me first introduce my team, make a few introductory remarks and we'll get going. With me tonight, and will be making presentations in a moment, is Joe Becker, who is the Headmaster of Roycemore School. Also, Steven Yass, the project architect from Yass Architecture. Nick Patera, our landscape architect is here, and Neil Kenig, our traffic consultant in the third row back there. Also, Tom Ellis is here, he is the current Chair of the Roycemore Board.

I think Bill gave a good introduction, so he saved some of me making some of my comments. I would just clarify a few matters. Roycemore is the contract purchaser from the General Board of Pension and Health Benefits of the United Methodist Church, which is the current owner of the property, so we're currently the contract purchaser at the site.
The only other thing I would want to clarify, but Steve will certainly get into this when we talk about the variations, the issue with respect to impervious surface actually is not impacted by the gymnasium that you're going to see later. The gymnasium is being placed on currently impervious surface at the property, so that's not the reason for it.

We do have to put on, and Steve will get into that, some additional stairways at the end of hallways for code purposes, and we are extending some additional road, which will create some impervious surface.

What we'd like to do is start with Joe Becker to give some comments with respect to the school, give you a little context of the history of Roycemore and why it's making this move.

After that, Steven will go over the plans and show you proposed changes to the site and the layout of the school within the existing structure, because this is an adaptive re-use of this existing building, we're going to use the existing building.

Then Nick will discuss our landscaping improvements. And finally, Neil will present our traffic analysis. And I'll sum up and discuss the various standards that we have with respect to all of
the requests that we're making. So let's start with
Joe.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Before we start taking the
evidence from the witnesses, one thing I should have
also mentioned is that our testimony needs to be under
oath for purposes of our procedures here. So if those
people who are going to testify on behalf of the
applicant be sworn at this point? Anyone who's going to
testify for the applicant would you please be sworn?
(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: When you testify would you
give us your full name and address and spell your name
so that the reporter has a list?

MR. BECKER: I'm Joseph Becker, my wife says I
live at 640 Lincoln Street, but in fact I live at 3542
Davis Street in Evanston. I have been privileged to
watch Roycemore for many years, we've been around for 93
years. And when our little tiny ones see me they often
assume that I have been there for all 93 years. The
reality is I've only made it through 40 of them, so they
just don't quite have that time perception.

On behalf of Roycemore I also thank you for
giving us this opportunity. We have really tried
throughout all of these years to be a very positive and
proud member of the Evanston Community. We have encouraged our students, our parents, our teachers, to get involved in community activities. When it's been appropriate we've opened our facility to neighborhood groups that have needed places to meet, and we're happy to do that.

Now, there are so many things that I could share with you, but I'd like to highlight just a couple. First of all, and I know this is in the documentation, we are the only private school in Evanston, in fact I think the only school in Evanston that serves everywhere from junior kindergarten, and I mean they're tiny three and four year olds, all the way through grade 12, and that has always been part of what we have done.

We have approximately 250 students, we have responded over the years to family needs so that we provide before and after school care as well as a summer camp as well. We think we are a destination school for families that are seeking the distinct advantages of small class size, personal attention, and differentiated instruction.

But we are also a very diverse school. Geographically we draw from Evanston, from Chicago, and over 20 other suburbs. Over 30 percent of our students
are of color. Nearly half of our students receive financial aid. This has been a tremendous commitment on our part to say that we want to have an economically diverse student population, and that includes making aid available to those families that simply would not be able to afford the full tuition and fees.

We have been very proud over the years that we help all students achieve their potential, we respond to the individual needs and interests of students. And I say, from a very personal level, that we promote self-confidence, which is perhaps one of the most long-lasting portions.

The fact that we do so much, despite the limitations of our current facility, speaks volumes about the flexibility, and the creativity, and the cooperation of a remarkable group of teachers.

After a long search we are delighted to identify the 1200 Davis Street site as a future home for the school. It meets so many of our goals. Number one, and most importantly, allows us to remain in Evanston, our historic home and the center of our geographic blend. It brings us closer to public transportation, which we think is going to become increasingly important in the future.
The site is 70 percent larger than what we currently have. The building that exists will provide 40 percent more space for laboratories and classrooms. There will be dedicated areas in the building for student performances.

There is space, as Steven already indicated, for a full-size gymnasium, and that will accommodate, what has been a long-standing commitment on our part, to treating physical education as part of our core curriculum. Every student from grades one through eight has Phys. Ed. Five times a week. The little ones, they simply can't have it five times a week because we don't have enough space in our one little room, they will have in the new building.

It also will provide space for a modest but very important athletic program. But again, the emphasis at our school is on participation not on a great deal of competition. And so what we're looking for is to have the space so that all of those students that want to be involved will have an opportunity to do so, rather than just a handful of the most gifted athletes.

We also recognize that this will give us the opportunity to increase our enrollment. We're currently
at 250, our long-term goal is to have 350. About 20 of those would come by adding an extra room for our early childhood program, the other will most likely happen at the high school level. And that becomes important because of peer relationships as well as the opportunity to get a critical mass so that we can expand some parts of our program.

And finally, the building at 1200 Davis Street just is a hand-in-glove for us because we operate with three divisions, a lower school, a middle school, an upper school. And that building at 1200 Davis Street happens to have three floors in three wings surrounding a core. And that's exactly what we try to do is to provide dedicated space to each of the different age groups, but also to treat ourselves as one big extended family.

We look forward, with your cooperation, to working with the City, to working with the neighbors around 1200 Davis Street, to continue a very long and treasured tradition of being a good neighbor, someone that can support the City of Evanston, somewhere where our passionate teachers can really continue to help fulfill the dreams of the students of the future. We thank you.
MR. FREELAND: Steve? Steven Yass will present, I think he can use that mic and speak to the plans up there. If that's --

MR. YASS: Yes, thank you. Good evening, I'm Steven Yass from Yass Architecture, and with me today is Joseph Neil from Yass Architecture as well.

We've been working for the last two years with Roycemore School, first doing initial programming, and then really testing a number of sites throughout the area until we narrowed down onto the 1200 Davis Street more recently. And it's almost like the building was really designed as a school. It's got a width dimension on the wings to provide for double-loaded corridors of classrooms as you can see in the plans.

And in process we actually met with the neighbors twice prior to coming to visit with you. And both meetings we were able to take some of the ideas from the neighbors and incorporate them into the designs as best we could, others we were not able to. But again, we're trying to be quiet neighbors in the location, which I'll point out in a moment.

The site, as you may be aware, is bordered by --

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Just for the record you're
directing our attention to a --

MR. YASS: A context plan.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: A context plan?

MR. YASS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Okay.

MR. YASS: That shows the site bordered by

Ridge on the east, Asbury on the west, Grove on the

south, and Davis to the north. The original building

has three wings, it was designed and built by Perkins &

Will around 1960.

And it's ironic, I was on the Plan Commission

for about eight years with Larry Perkins who used to
talk lovingly about the building. And I actually had
the opportunity to do programming and studies for the
General Board of Pensions back in 1989, and then did the
building across the street for them. So there's an
irony of working on this building.

But basically, on the site plan you can see
that the gym addition is here on what is an existing
parking lot. So we're really not changing the
impervious ratio in that location, and we're not
impacting really Alexander Park, you know, as well in
terms of context.

The site, as you're aware, Ridge is a high
point at this location in Evanston. And really between
Ridge and Asbury along this area, really where there's a
number of non-for-profit institutions starting north
with the YWCA, then the General Board of Pensions, then
presumably us, further south the Unitarian Church, and
then Bethemt Synagogue. So we're really in sort of a
non-for-profit institutional corridor as you might say.
In terms of the context it's a highly wooded
site.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: For the record --
MR. YASS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: -- you're showing us now --
MR. YASS: Aerial perspective, or aerial
photographs.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Called urban context?
MR. YASS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Okay.
MR. YASS: Was sort of working from the
outside in. And on the perimeter of the site it's a
heavily wooded site with some open meadows, Alexander
Park in the southeast corner of the site. There's a
parking lot at the northwest corner of the site that
actually is a half a level below grade and a half a
level above grade.
And right now the site holds about 131 parking spaces. In our program we only require 75 spaces. On the parking lot, as you can see, to the south of the west wing of the building is where the gym addition would be placed. The open area of lawn at the southwest corner of the site at Grove and Asbury will remain and just be an outdoor informal play area.

This just shows the --

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: The chart that you're showing us now is labeled, Existing Context?

MR. YASS: Correct. And it's showing ground level photographs and we'll walk around the site at the ground level.

This shows the southwest corner at Grove and Asbury and the open lawn that's there that will basically remain. At the southeast corner of the site at Grove and Ridge, Alexander Park, which will remain.

And --

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: While you're getting the next one I should say, for your benefit and for the record, all of the materials that you've put up here today we will need to keep. If you show it to us it's ours. So I just wanted to let you know that.

MR. YASS: It's all inside the binder.
CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Okay. Well, we'll need to keep these as well --

MR. YASS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: -- as part of the record.

MR. YASS: Okay. This is showing the northwest corner of the site where there's parking half a level above grade and half a level below. Again, the lawn at the southwest corner of the site.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Excuse me, sir?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: It just occurred to me that none of the audience can see any of this. Would it be possible to place it someplace where both we and the audience could see it? That's what we normally do in terms of Plan Commission.

MR. YASS: I have placed it here because there's so many of you. We can place it on one side.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Just a little bit.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: We do have it in our binder.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: In our binder, but I don't think anyone in the audience has a binder.

MR. YASS: That's fine.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Why don't you move it over in front of the --
MR. YASS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Where Mr. Freelander is standing, or Freeland, sorry.

MR. FREELAND: I think the practice, I think the ZBA usually do present from here. So we're happy to --

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Well, it depends on the circumstances. We'll be flexible.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: But Steve, I think you're going to have to talk from this microphone now.

MR. YASS: Right.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: If I can pull it out of here.

MR. YASS: This is showing the location on the existing site, photograph adjacent to Asbury and Davis Street at the northwest corner of the site.

On this photograph, as I was showing the Commission before, this is the southwest corner of the site at Grove and Asbury, which is an open lot and which will remain.

This is the southeast corner at Grove and Ridge where Alexander Park exists and will remain as well.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Okay. For the record, you
put up two new charts, another existing context set of photographs?

MR. YASS: With ground level photographs, and then also the site plan.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: All right.

MR. YASS: Were you all able to find the drawings? Okay.

In these existing photographs we're looking on Ridge Avenue and we're looking north towards the Davis and Ridge intersection where there's really an open meadow under the trees and then landscaping closer to the building. And this is the side of the building where the land drops down such that there are actually three levels of building expressed. Whereas, on the Asbury side there's only two levels of building expressed. That will come into play later.

This is the view from Davis Street looking southeast at the half level above grade existing parking lot that will remain with ramps that go down half level below grade for existing parking. And this will actually be our main entrance to the school as it is the main entrance to the existing building now.

In terms of circulation, I've just added the first floor plan as an additional exhibit.
COMMISSIONER McLENNAN: All right, thank you.

MR. YASS: And the site plan remains. On the site plan the blue, the pale blue is existing building. And the gray is the proposed addition, the primary addition of which is the gymnasium that is on existing parking lot.

Also, we're proposing a road, a drive coming and exiting onto Grove Street as well, and the traffic engineer can talk about the impact of that. Again, north is to my right.

This shows the on-grade, the parking, the upper level of the deck which is accessible on Davis Street. You enter here, you can drop off, and then drive out. There's also the opportunity to come down Grove Street and drive in and drop off.

And this is potentially an evening entrance where there might be, or later in the afternoon, when there's events in the gymnasium. This is a high school sized basketball court, and there's an auditorium that's in the west wing of the building.

Currently, the school has a gymatorium, a combined facility that really doesn't work well for either auditorium or gym. And this will afford them the opportunity to have a separate gym to perpetuate the
vision that the headmaster was just talking about in
terms of physical education programs, and then have a
quite suitable auditorium space as well.

There's a courtyard here adjacent to Alexander
Park called the Four Square Courtyard. In front of the
Roycemore School on Orrington Street there's four
patches of concrete. And over the life of the
institution kids have developed their own game called
four square, and so we're brought that back here.

There's also the opportunity for students
using public transportation to walk down Davis Street
and come down Davis on the sidewalk and then enter the
building and walk under the covering of the first floor
into the main access of the building.

Also on the site, and you'll see in the floor
plans in a moment, the lower level is lower school where
junior kindergarten and an extended day program, and
we've got a proposed play lot that's sort of tucked in
between two wings that would be accessible from the
lower level where they'll just walk out basically a
grade and be able to go into that play area that will be
really enclosed with landscaping and one of the exit
stairs.

Next, I'd like to relate to you the first
floor plan, really the interior so that one can understand better what's happening on the outside and the relationship between inside and out.

Here you drive up and you drop off and go under a canopy, enter into the building. The building has three levels. The first floor is more communal functions of auditorium, media center, or library, the administrative wing with headmaster's office and other administrative offices, the gymnasium, and then some general music classrooms. So when you walk in the front door you can hear great music being played by the students as part of the atmosphere of the school.

On the lower level --

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: And you're putting up the basement plan now?

MR. YASS: Yes. On the lower level is what's called the lower school. And that consists of junior kindergarten, kindergarten, and really all the way to fourth grade. It also has cafeterias for both lower school and upper school, and upper middle school, sorry, and sort of an art wing with art classrooms and pottery. And then also has the locker rooms for the gym.

One of the things we tried to do is minimize the impact of the gym addition on the exterior of the
building. And we've also kept the height of the gym
addition so that it's at the same height as the existing
building from the Asbury Street side. And so we've
actually put the locker rooms for the gym in the lower
level accessible through a corridor, and stairs, and
elevator up to the gym level so that we don't have to
have more addition visible from the outside.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: And now putting up --

MR. YASS: The next exhibit is the second
floor plan --

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: -- the second floor plan.

MR. YASS: -- which really is the top floor of
the building. And that consists of the middle and upper
schools. So really going from the fifth grade all the
way to the 12th grade.

And it consists of primarily classrooms,
there's an upper division head and a middle division
head, and offices that are sort of at the key point
where the core is in the center of the building. But
there's also three science laboratories, and then the
individual classrooms.

And this is a good plan to look at in terms of
one of the variances that we're looking for. We're
required by code because of the school use to have, not
have dead-end corridors basically. So at the end of
each wing we're required to have exit stairs that we're
adding on the exterior of the building. Because of the
way the structural slab is in the existing building to
cut into it is really not feasible.

And so on the east wing we've added the stair
at the end of the wing, actually to the side of the
wing. And we're using that as part of the enclosure as
well for the children's motor skills play area on the
ground level.

On the west wing it's coming out at the end of
the wing, and it's serving as part of the enclosure and
some of the symbolic entrance for evening activities.

On the north wing it comes straight out from
the north wing. And that's the location where we're
asking for a variance, was supposed to have a 15-foot
setback and the stair comes up to 13-feet in terms of
setback there.

You can also, bless you, see the upper level
of the gym there. There are also learning disability
classrooms as well as copy rooms and teacher offices.

Next, I'd like to show exhibits that relate to
the exterior elevations. So the next two exhibits are
really showing the four exterior elevations starting
1 with the south elevation, which would be the view from
2 Grove Street. Alexander Park is here, this is the
3 building in the back drop, and then the gym addition
4 here.

5 If I jump to the west elevation from Asbury
6 you can see the gym addition there on the existing
7 parking lot, and then the entrance, Davis Street is here
8 and Grove is here.

9 One of the things we're trying to do, and we
10 talked about this with the neighbors, was to find a
11 compatible way to build an addition and break down the
12 scale and mass of the addition. And what we've done is
13 we've actually taken the planning module, which is
14 around five feet, from the building and the dimension
15 between the width of the windows, and we've used that on
16 the exterior elevation of the gym to use some of the
17 regulating lines and module of the existing building.
18 And then we were able to match with a ground-
19 faced 12 by 24 inch concrete block that looks like
20 panels, the sandstone of the building in terms of color.
21 And so we're doing that at the base of the building.
22 And then we are still investigating a couple of
23 different alternatives for part of the exterior skin of
24 the building, which would be either masonry or a wood
rain screen system, trying to make this sort of a user-
friendly, you know, in terms of materials.

The module is related by aluminum that's
similar to the aluminum of the existing building between
the windows. On the existing building the aluminum
comes out in a dark brown anodized aluminum, but the
interior -- are in a clear anodized aluminum.

But what we've done is we've actually sort of
reversed that and we're looking at a clear anodized
aluminum to show the module, and then the masonry or the
wood rain screen system will be the darker material,
sort of as a positive/negative play on the building.

Then in terms of bringing in natural light
there's also, always a concern in a gymnasium for direct
sunlight coming into the gym. So we're suggesting a
calwall system that will diffuse the natural light but
create a lot of natural light inside the building. And
that would be in the same module with the five-foot, you
know, elements working with the module of the building.

And then at the top at sort of the cornice the
thought was to lighten up the material, either the brick
or the wood rain screen system. And so, again, this is
the Grove Street side really showing the gym, and the
Asbury Street side.
In terms of the exit stairway additions you can see them here, they're basically about 10 feet by 20 feet coming out from the building. And we've even pulled it a couple feet further from the building than the size of the mass to be sort of a reveal, and then come back into the building where there's an existing window that would then be opened and be the walkway, you know, into the addition.

So we're trying to sensitively create changes in planes and changes of materials with shadow lines in terms of sensitive detailing. And you can seen on the Asbury Street side the stairway addition coming as well, which would be a combination of solid and glass, and some of it actually may even be open, we're still investigating that.

So I've got some sections here that are in as exhibits, but I don't think I need to present them. I think, at this time, let me put up the graphics for Nick Patera from Teska Associates who are the landscape architects.

MR. FREELAND: Before you do that --

MR. YASS: Yes?

MR. FREELAND: -- using the site plan could you just point out the new impervious surface just so
we're clear what we're adding?

MR. YASS: Correct. On the site plan, and we can use the landscape concept plan for that, we're adding the gym, but it's on, you know, asphalted surface. So the new solid that's being added to the impervious ratio, the driveway coming in from Grove Street, and then the stairway, exterior stairway additions. And then there's a hallway between the existing west wing and the gym which also adds to that impervious ratio.

MR. FREELAND: Just for the record, the two new graphics are the landscape concept plan that Nick Patera will use, and then the context plan that Neil Kenig from KLOA will use, who will be after Nick.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Thank you.

MR. PATERA: Thank you, Steve. My name is Nick Patera (P-a-t-e-r-a), I'm landscape architect with our firm, Teska Associates, located in Evanston, we're just about three blocks away down Grove Street from the proposed Roycemore facility. A lot of what I'm going to be covering with landscape will discuss fitting into the patterns that are already on this property, we're not really re-inventing things but really re-enforcing what's already there.
With the General Board of Pensions, they did have some foresight with the landscape screening and with the setbacks that exist on the property to consider the neighbors and to consider the views out from the building as well into the building from the surrounding area.

I think I'm going to take you on a kind of a, in a similar way to what Steven had covered, on a tour around the outside. Probably the most recognizable portion of the property are on the Ridge Avenue side where we have a broad grassy parkway, and that's characteristic of the corridor along Ridge Avenue.

That will be maintained in its present condition, the grassy parkway that's existing along Ridge with the building setback and then in this corner area, this small play area is a soft surface play area that will end up having some naturalistic-type plantings similar in characteristics to the kind of free-flowing patterning of informal landscape in that type of category.

There will be a low fence around that play area that if you were to talk from the lower school into the play area you would come through a gate, and this play area would be contained, for safety purposes, within
the landscape but also within a fenced area to the soft
surface play equipment area.

The play equipment won't be large scale, but
there is a climber slide and a swing that will be
located in this play area. But for the most part the
landscape up to Alexander Park and along the east Ridge
Avenue facing will appear to be quite similar as it is
today once we incorporate these elements kind of tucked
into the building.

I think the other, probably the broadest other
side is on the west along Asbury. And there exists a
catoni aster hedge that, it comes up right about chest
height along this parking area that's at the northwest
corner of the property. It's sporadic, the hedge is,
where it's in good condition doing a good job. There's
some replacement that we need to provide where there's
been holes or die-back in the hedge.

And then we're looking at trying to
incorporate some relatively formal kind of plantings
with the hedge and then intermittent ornamental or
small-scale tree plantings just to provide a little bit
of a relief and break, so it doesn't look so much like a
standing row of soldiers as this shrub hedge. But we've
got some height and some variety with the plant material
that begin to work in groupings as introduction to the massing of the building.

The street trees and the parkway trees are all remaining intact. And the parkway to the sidewalk is all very much the same as what you see there today.

The corner, the informal playing field is really just outdoor activity. It's intention, there's a few small trees that are in the middle of that that we would recommend for removal. And otherwise, to create a broad lawn area for outdoor, open sky activity in a proportion that's, you can see somewhat equivalent to the asphalt area where the gym has been described.

That outdoor play area would also have on the Grove south side, or on the remainder of the Asbury side a continuation of the tree shrub pattern that we have kind of running along intermittently around the northing portion to screen the parking lot would also provide screening to go around the perimeter of that informal play area.

So that you could still see whether there's people in there, but if there's a ball or a game going on you're not open to the street, which it is now to Grove Street. Likewise along the drive side that Steve had described that becomes the access driveway, we'd
continue to have shrub screening to in fact frame this entire area.

We still of opportunity with a pedestrian sidewalk coming out from the corridor between the gym and the school with a pedestrian sidewalk, a crossing, and so that there's a way to convey pedestrian students to get out to this outdoor play area.

The Alexander Park has a shrub hedge that is remaining intact along its western boundary that would be right along the edge of the drive. So that kind of completes what is almost a screen planting around the entire vehicular area, which I think helps really emphasize the building and the landscape more so than the vehicular parking and circulation use on the property.

As I said before, Alexander Park remains with the tucked in four square area, this becomes kind of our hard surface outdoor play area for, as Steven again had described, the four square games, or if there's other hard surface type, outdoor, open sky activities, those would happen here, and again, not in the perimeter corner. So we're trying to soften as we go out.

I think most of the elements that I've described here cover the Grove Street side, Asbury.
The only other enhancements that we have considered have to do with just some front plantings where the inbound coming in off of Davis Street on the north side, or the outbound up and down ramps that go the parking might have some supplemental perimeter planting. There is existing planting that would remain intact, if its in good shape we would be keeping what's there.

So again, this is somewhat familiar but we've just amplified or replaced plant materials where we've needed to.

I think generally those cover my points. I can certainly questions if you had them as we go further along.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Well, we'll save questions --

MR. PATERA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: -- until after you've made your initial presentation.

MR. FREELAND: We'll have Neil Kenig present our traffic study, but I would suggest to you that you have that in your package as well at one of our tabs, we've submitted to you so you're welcome to look at that.
MR. KENIG: Thank you. Name's Neil Kenig (K-e-n-i-g), principal with the firm of KLOA, we're located in Rosemont. I previously worked here in Evanston for over 30 years not very far from this site, so I'm very familiar with the site and the surrounding street system.

Those of you that are familiar with Roycemore located in the northeast corner of Evanston at the present time is accessible through local streets in that area. They have very little parking, most of the traffic to and from the school is dropoff/pickup at the present time, and it occurs on the streets around the school.

One of the primary features of this site is it has onsite parking and the ability to accommodate the parents that are dropping the children off and picking them up on the site rather than on the street system.

The other major function of this site will be its location in proximity to public transportation. The current site in Northeast Evanston is just barely served by some bus service and very little El service in that area. Whereas, this particular site is very heavily served by trains, the El, and the bus routes.

The school today has a small percentage of the
students coming by public transportation. We'd expect
that number to increase quite a bit. At the present
time they have a mini-bus operation, which brings
students to the school, again, a small percentage. The
bulk of the students, as I indicated before, come to the
school by parents dropping them off and picking them up
in the afternoon.

Our analysis looked at what we would call a
worse-case situation. We took the afternoon peak, which
really occurs between 3:00 and 5:00 in the afternoon and
superimposed those volumes on the street peak, which
occurs between 5:00 and 6:00 just to look at the impact
on the surrounding intersections to see if that
situation would make those intersections operate at a
much worse condition than they do today.

And we found that the level of service is
basically, remain pretty much the same. We determined
that the impact at that time would not severely impact
the street system.

One of the things we did look at is this
building is currently serving as an office facility,
it's not fully occupied at the present time. We did
look at what would happen if the building were fully
occupied in comparison to the school.
In the morning the school would still generate slightly more traffic than the office, but in the evening the office would generate substantially more traffic than the school would, because, again, the peak is between 3:00 and 4:00.

The school will continue to use the existing driveways on Davis Street. A new driveway will be added to Grove to improve the flexible access and distribution of traffic to and from the area. With driveways on Davis all the traffic, and Davis is a one-way street, all the traffic has to come in from the east and depart to the west, and then go up and down Asbury as they leave. And that access on Grove assists in spreading that load out a little more.

Basically, that pretty well covers most of our findings in the study. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Thank you.

MR. FREELAND: If I may, I'll just complete our presentation, and I appreciate your patience in letting us get through all of this.

To speak to the various standards, and because we have three different requests as you're aware we have various standards that we need to meet.

We've specifically stated our position with
respect to each of the standards for the re-zoning, the variation, and the special use in our application. I want to speak to some of those now. I thought, I don't know, maybe this spices it up a little bit, if we, instead of sort of taking them by request but rather trying to look at the standards that are applied across more than one of the requests, I'll sort of speak to those first and then speak to specific standards that are addressed only by certain requests at the end.

For both the re-zoning and the special use we need to indicate and show that the amendment and the special use are consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan. We think that's met.

The proposed amendment to R-4 zoning is consistent with those goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan for a number of reasons.

First, Chapter 6 of the Comprehensive Plan provides a goal that Evanston support the growth and evolution of institutions while recognizing that they are part of their mostly residential surroundings. Roycemore's use is really a perfect example of that objective, and we think it's met here.

Second, an objective of the Comprehensive Plan...
is to recognize the benefits of mixing residential, commercial, and institutional uses within neighborhoods. Roycemore has a long history of existing within an established residential neighborhood and they hope to continue that history in this neighborhood.

Third, the Comprehensive Plan encourages the use of public transportation. As Neil suggested, there's a great benefit, and I believe Joe said it as well, the close proximity that this location would have to public transportation is a great benefit to the school and meets and objective of the Plan.

And finally, Chapter 14 of the Comprehensive Plan sets out historic preservation as a goal and objection. And while this existing structure is not an historic Evanston landmark our proposed re-use of the building certainly meets the spirit and objective of that notion of the Comprehensive Plan on adaptive re-use of an existing structure.

All three of our requests require that we show there is no adverse affect on adjacent properties, and we think that's met here as well. The R-4 zoning is more compatible with the surrounding residential neighborhood than the current office zoning. Also, R-4 provides for moderate density uses, which will provide
an appropriate transition from the more dense zoning
east of Ridge, on the east side of Ridge.

Second, the proposed adaptive re-use of a
private educational school will not have an adverse
impact on the surrounding neighborhood. Educational
uses are compatible with residential uses. In fact, the
proposed school provides greater compatibility and less
impact to the neighborhood than an existing office use
at this location.

In particular, as its been noted, Roycemore's
existed in its current location for almost 100 years,
and the neighborhood surrounding the existing school has
flourished and proposed during that period. We would
certainly expect that to occur at this new location as
well.

Both the re-zoning and special use require
that there is adequate public facilities and services at
the location. That's absolutely the case, we will be
utilizing the public utilities that are currently
serving the existing office use.

With respect to some of the specific
standards, for the re-zoning we need to show that the
proposed amendment is compatible with the overall
character of existing development in the immediate
vicinity of the subject property. The proposed R-4 zoning is compatible with that overall character. The property's located along the Ridge Avenue corridor and it sits as a transitional parcel between Downtown Evanston to the east and the traditional single-family community to the west. R-4 zoning is really intended for that somewhat moderate density-type use, and it's appropriate in this context for this site.

The special use requires that we provide we will not cause undue traffic congestion. I believe Neil's study and his testimony speaks to that. And when, with the variation standards, which require that we show a particular hardship or practical difficulty that's peculiar to this property. And I hope the testimony was clear, the practical difficulty we have with this site is that because of our particular use as a school where we have to add these staircases to the ends of the building, it creates both an issue with respect to encroaching into the side yard on Davis Street by two feet, and add some additional impervious surface to the site.

And also, in a sense, our re-use of the building creates this particular building because we
have an existing site that in the O-1 there is no
impervious surface limitations. So we sort of have the
existing impervious surface that exists, we've tried to
minimize that to the greatest extent.

We would suffer a particular hardship as
distinguished from a mere inconvenience if the strict
letter of the regulations were carried out because we
want to use this building. If we were required to
strictly comply with the Zoning Ordinance we'd have to
start over, and we don't want to do that, we want to use
this building.

The proposed variation is not based
exclusively on a desire to exact additional income from
the property. Roycemore's a not-for-profit institution,
these variation requests have to do specifically with
the unique aspects of this property.

With that, that's going to conclude our
presentation. There is one item I would note, because
we are the contract purchaser at this site and the
General Board currently occupies the site and is going
to be moving from it, if the Zoning Board of Appeals
were inclined to give us a recommendation with respect
to our special use request I believe the code provides
that that special use exists for a year from when the
council would grant it.

We were going to discuss this with the council when we get to that level, but if it's appropriate, or if it's something you typically do in your deliberations to make a recommendation about extending that time frame we would appreciate that here. We will not be closing likely on our contract with the General Board until 2010 because of their moving out of the facility. So, again, we'll make that request to the council, but I wasn't sure if that's something you typically deliberate at the ZBA.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Typically it's not, we'll note it for the record, and when you get before the council I'm sure they can draft the enabling ordinance to take care of that issue. It's good of you to raise -

MR. FREELAND: Thank you. That concludes our presentation, thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Thank you. Well, at this time, because we have so many people here, I think we'll take questions now from the Board or the Commission. We'll start with the Commission, and if you have any questions for Mr. Becker, Mr. Yass, Mr. Patera, or anyone else please, we'll start with Mr. Freeman. Any
questions?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes. This is actually directed to Bill. Question about the request for re-zoning to residential, is that because that makes it the easiest for us to allow a school, use for school?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: And more specifically, not to see one as another recent proposal has come to us.

MR. DUNKLEY: I'm sorry. Ms. Schuldenfrei, could you repeat that?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. My question was the same as Seth's, so I'm going to just not have to ask it twice, but while you're answering that my question was specifically why not C-1 as the other proposal that's recently come before us that's changing to C-1 rather than residential?

MR. DUNKLEY: Well, when the applicant came in to discuss various possibilities there were a few alternatives that were floated as far as primarily compatibility with the existing surroundings and the desire to not, you know, to what was generally a fairly compatible use and one that has probably similar impact to what the current use is, but really not allowing the possibility of a real significant, especially commercial
impact on that Ridge corridor. Ridge is a very, very special street. In many places it's institutional and residential, it's important to preserve that. And so we felt it was a request that would allow what was proposed, but yet kept that to as modest a possibility for other development as we could. So it was really within the R, kind of the middle R possibilities. C-1, we advised would be a non-starter really. That's just, would allow really an almost invasive level of development, and of a type that's really not appropriate. And so that was, it was felt that that was really the best compromise.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So most schools then in Evanston, are they in residential?

MR. DUNKLEY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Thank you, Bill.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: There's no good way to do this, but I thought since we're on this topic, do any of the other commissioners or board members have a question on this topic?

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: I had a quick question, Bill, in terms of the, you know, what other special uses or other uses might be available in the area. I know a good section of the street, at least on the west side
there, is a 1, and that the 1220 Emerson Property was
looked at for re-zoning. Was it actually re-zoned or
just done as a special use in O-1?

MR. DUNKLEY: On Emerson?

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Yes.

MR. DUNKLEY: I don't know the answer to that.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Do any of you guys
remember?

MR. DUNKLEY: I can find that out and, during
the course of the meeting and --

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Any other questions on this
topic? All right, we'll go back to Mr. Freeman than.
Do you have anything else? Well, let's try it that way,
yes.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I would actually prefer
to do it by, if we could do it by subject, because I
would like to skip to, you know, their plan and for the
drive, and --

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: All right.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Actually, perhaps, maybe we
should do it that way? Okay. What is the zoning to the
north, to the south, to the east, and to the west of the
site currently?

MR. DUNKLEY: Funny you should ask that. As
you can imagine, as you go further east we get, well, we
have a band of R-4.

MR. FREELAND: No.

MR. DUNKLEY: I'm sorry, that's further to the
north of the property, actually R-6.

MR. FREELAND: Just so we're clear, this is
the other General Board Property, this is us. So
there's O-1 to the north.

MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. The current O-1 continues
to take into account both of the, both sides of Davis
for the current, the Methodist Pension Board.

So just immediately to the north is the
extension, the continued O-1 District. As you move
further north from there there's a combination of R-1
and R-4, it's R-4 to the east and R-1 as you go further
to the west. So Asbury on both sides is R-1. As you,
that's also similar as you move south. Alexander Park
is zoned OS, Open Space.

And then as you move towards downtown, as you
can imagine, the intensities rise, R-6 zoning across
Ridge, and then you get into a combination of the D's.
so D-4, D-2, D-3, et cetera, well, that's for now.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: But the block to the
immediate south on Grove?
MR. DUNKLEY: The block to the immediate south is a combination of R-1 on both sides of Asbury, and there is a little kind of a notch, an enclave, that is the, I think it's St. Mark's Place.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: St. Mark's Court.

MR. DUNKLEY: St. Mark's Court? Yes. And that is actually within the, I'm sorry, that is also within the R-1 District, I'm looking at historical designations as well. So it's entirely R-1 south of the property, with the exception of the Open Space that is Alexander Park.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Hey, Bill, what's the church, what's that zoned as at Grove and Ridge?

MR. DUNKLEY: At Grove and Ridge, that is, that's this property here, yes, right here, that's also R-1.

MR. FREELAND: The church is on the south side of Grove, right?

MR. DUNKLEY: The southeast corner, yes, it's R-1. And then immediately adjacent to that is R-5 moving towards downtown.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Okay. Anything else on --

MR. DUNKLEY: There's a transitional residential 2, office and downtown.
CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Anything else on this topic? All right. Beth, keep going, or, all right.

COMMISSIONER OPDYKE: Sure. Mr. Becker, does Roycemore currently use Long Field for athletic activities?

MR. BECKER: Yes, occasionally we do. However, anytime there is a intramural activity going on over there we do not have access to it. But we do use it for Phys. Ed. classes during the spring and the fall, we use it for a little bit of recess. We do not play any of our athletic contests there.

COMMISSIONER OPDYKE: Okay. Is it contemplated that perhaps you might use Alexander Park as an athletic arena?

MR. BECKER: No, not as an athletic arena. Currently, we are using James Park for our home soccer games, we would continue to do that. We do not anticipate that we would want to do anything at Alexander Park. Would some of our kids during a very nice day want to go over there and sit on the swings once in a while? I suspect they might, but it would not be for athletic purposes.

COMMISSIONER OPDYKE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Other questions?
COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: I have a few for Mr. Becker.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: For Mr. Becker, right.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Yes. The school, you said you have school drop, early school dropoff stuff and after hours. I guess, generally, what are kind of your basic hours of operation that you're --

MR. BECKER: The actual operation of the school is from 8:25 in the morning to 3:00 for junior kindergarten through grade eight, and until 3:30 for the high school most of the time, it gets a little bit complex.

We do open the doors at 7:30. A small number, I would say less than 20 of the youngest students arrive prior to that time because it's convenient for families. After 3:00 there are all the different clubs and activities and things that go on. I would say from 4:00, or from 5:00 to 6:00 there probably, again, those same 20 of the younger students who are still on premise.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: What percentage of your students would you say are actually from Evanston in terms of kind of, I guess, I'm thinking of it in terms of traffic generation?
MR. BECKER: About 40 percent are from Evanston.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: What would your total staff be, starting out?

MR. BECKER: We currently have about 40. For example, when we add the early childhood that would add one extra staff, two extra staff members. If we eventually grew to 350, which is our plan, I believe our study called and indicated that we would probably add about six or seven to the current 40.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: One of the not so fun things we get to deal with with special uses is back of house stuff like trash trips, and deliveries, and fun stuff like that. What's your situation in terms of number of delivery trucks you might have in a day, or trash pickups per week, and that sort of thing?

MR. BECKER: Very limited actually. We have three trash pickups a week currently. Really, in terms of delivery, during the summer as we're beginning to open school the UPS folks stop by a couple of times delivering textbooks and materials, but that tapers off, and it's probably more like once or twice a week that they come by.

The only other thing is the service to our...
cafeteria. And that, I think, is twice a week that those deliveries occur.

And indeed, I believe one of the things that we contemplated is that there is a service entrance off of that Davis Street side, which would allow the garbage trash collection to come in without intruding into the neighborhood or anything of that sort. But that would be approximately the usage.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: That's all I have for now?

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Okay. Anything else for Mr. Becker as long as we have him here on the stand?

COMMISSIONER WILSON: This is maybe more of a traffic question, but I think more related to what you're going to be able to tell us. In the afternoons, do you have what I refer to as a pickup line where parents will line up and pick up the kids, and how extensive is that?

MR. BECKER: That's a complicated, first of all it's complicated because I can't see you through the easels here. But there is a pickup line along Orrington Avenue that probably at the height has about 30 cars in it. And that is predominantly picking up students from grades three to eight.
There would be another line at about 4:00 of maybe five or six cars, which would be primarily for the high school students, some of those younger ones that are staying after school.

And then we sort of intrude on our neighbors and our lower school parents tend to park in some university parking lots for the five or 10 minutes to come in and get their younger ones. And I haven't counted them, but I would guess 15 or 20 cars there around 3:00.

So, I guess, if we'd add all those up we'd perhaps have about 40, 45 cars around the school at some point.

COMMISSIONER WILSON: All right. And is it contemplated that this Grove Street entrance, it's a long driveway, is that contemplated that that will absorb --

MR. BECKER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER WILSON: -- that pickup line?

MR. BECKER: Yes, that would very much provide the queue as well as the fact that we've actually build in some short term parking for those parents that do want to come in, pick up their kids, and say a word or two to the teachers as well.
COMMISSIONER WILSON: Okay.

MR. FREELAND: Two levels of parking, so the lower level's available as well.

MR. BECKER: The point is, again, that there are two levels of parking, so we're going to be able to separate that our youngest ones will be picked up at the lower level, the older ones at the upper level.

COMMISSIONER WILSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Anything else for Mr. Becker?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I have a question that relates to the question that was just asked.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Sure.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I think I really like this project.

MR. BECKER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I'm a little bit troubled by the Grove Street entrance and that, you know, that's going to be a queue for loading people because there's no place, like an Orrington or a Lincoln, to sort of spill out the, you know, in this area because this is a pretty congested area. And, I mean, as you probably know you get over on Asbury between 3:00 and 5:00 or even 6:00 and it's just, that's a queue itself because
that traffic doesn't really move.

So from a circulation point of view, if somebody is, are people going to be coming in and then exiting on Davis, or do you anticipate both ways?

MR. YASS: Hi, this is Steven Yass. Actually, the Grove Street entrance will be primarily for service access and for dropoff for more later in the afternoon or evening activities. The dropoff and pickup that the headmaster was speaking of really are facilitated off of Davis Street.

So the lower grade levels will drive to the lower level of the garage, and they'll queue in the lower level of the garage. And that's where the short term parking is as well so the parents can run in for the junior kindergarten and the extended day program.

And then at the upper level, again, accessible in and out off of Davis Street, will be the queuing and the line for the middle and upper schools.

And, again, the Grove Street entrance won't have as much use. But it can be used as a relief so that some parents that would have exited and gone west and south onto Asbury.

So one of things we are trying to from a traffic standpoint was to reduce the amount of traffic.
from Davis Street to Grove Street on Asbury, because that was one of the concerns from the neighbors who live across the street on Asbury.

And by having that relief onto Grove Street the parents that are going back east or south have the ability to drive out onto Grove and go over to, east to Ridge, and take a right onto Ridge and go south. And so it's just another means of egress to alleviate the traffic in the neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Okay. So there wouldn't be, I guess what I'm most worried about is somebody going, you know, coming out of there, making a left on Grove, and then instead of going right to go south they're making a left onto Ridge to go north. And the same thing for Asbury. Somebody's trying to make a left onto Asbury to go south instead of, you know.

So, I don't know, I mean, that's more of a, maybe a city thing where you say, no left turns on either of those intersections between 3:00 and 6:00, and that's a city thing obviously. But that is a concern just knowing the way, and especially, you know, the grades, sort of the way the Ridge is at Grove there's some bad sight lines there as well.

But I know that's not something you can
control on your site plan. But --

MR. FREELAND: And we certainly would work

with the city on that. You're right, that particular

intersection, Grove and Ridge, is, you know, is probably

the most difficult of all the intersections surrounding

there.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes. And Asbury and

Grove, both of those.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I too have a concern, I

have a concern with this traffic pattern within the

proposed property because while I hear you're saying

that the entrance and exit on Grove is not going to be a

focal point, I've got to think it will be for parents

that are going to get very frustrated with Davis.

But my concern is on the property itself, the

flow of the traffic if you were using this Grove

entrance. You know, this whole driveway is just

emptying into the parking lot. And it seems that that

flow will be very confusing for entrance and exit.

There's no logical way to move around and then go back

out that Grove driveway.

I think that might be a problem, especially if

the cars are lining up, as you had suggested they may,

at 30 to 45 of them along that driveway.
Another question I have with regards to this driveway is currently you're proposing the gymnasium go on top of the existing parking lot, but then the driveway will be all new concrete or asphalt where there currently is grass. And on your site plan I don't see how many feet there are actually between the sidewalk and the driveway, so there's an existing sidewalk there which will run along that new Grove driveway. And I just don't know how many feet there is between that sidewalk and the driveway.

So a couple issues, a couple questions.

Perhaps you can respond?

MR. YASS: There's approximately 15 feet from the sidewalk to the driveway. And I believe the driveway adds 10 feet of paved surface, it's not the entire width of that new driveway that's on the west side of the gymnasium addition.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: You have 20, I'm sorry, you have 22 feet for the driveway.

MR. YASS: Right.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: But there is no --

MR. YASS: But if you see with the existing parking lot is we've only added about 10 feet of additional pavement there to facilitate the 22 feet of
COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Wait, you said, I'm sorry, you said 15 feet between the drive and the sidewalk?

MR. YASS: There is --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I believe that's what about what it is.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: But that's not --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: That does not look --

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: -- physically

possible --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: -- based on this plan.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So if we look in front of the gymnasium --

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Like, if you look around where the number six is, at least on the landscape plan, there's no way that's 15 feet. Is that where you're talking about, Seth?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes, I am talking about that. I was looking on the same plan.

MR. YASS: I'm sorry, it's 10 feet on the drawing.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So I do have a question
on how many feet that is there.

MR. YASS: It's actually 10 feet, I correct myself, from the sidewalk to the driveway, and it's listed on the drawing.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Are you talking, I think they're talking about the eastern side of the gymnasium, and you're thinking about the, I'm sorry, the western?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I'm looking at the western side along Asbury.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: And you're talking about the eastern side?

MR. YASS: Yes, the sidewalk from Asbury.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think you're talking about the west edge of the west drive to the sidewalk, which is approximately four feet.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: It looks like you're one foot 10 from the property line to the driveway, which means that you're plus or minus four feet, not 10 feet or 15 feet.

MR. YASS: We can check that and get back to you.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: I guess continuing kind of Seth's comment there about the flow, and I guess your comments, Mr. Yass, about the flow too, and the whole
thought about how this, when I was kind of looking at
this and thinking about what Don said about everyone
backing up, and maybe this isn't the right answer.
But I just wondered, like, you know, would you
get more people off the street if that was one-way
going, one-way traffic going out to the south so you
could literally stack up all the way down and people
would still be able to pull out and drive out, you know.
And people could stack up all the way around there
along the right-hand side all the way out to Grove
Street. And --
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: And still have the
opportunity to exit either on Davis or on Grove, you
could send them either direction.
MR. YASS: Perhaps the traffic engineer could
make a comment. I really don't think we're going to
have that load of traffic the way that you're
perceiving --
COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Well, 30 cars is --
MR. YASS: -- going that entire length.
Right, right. And you really want to drop the children
off on the passenger side of the car as well.
MR. FREELAND: Well, it's, you do that anyway,
I mean, no matter which way you come in. Neil?
It is sort of interesting because we view this site as providing so much more parking and off-street space from what's existing at Roycemore that it's a boon for the school. We're a little taken aback by the questions because we've assumed that we, as I say, this is a wonderful situation from the school's perspective.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Understand from the neighborhood perspective that Asbury/Davis corridor area there at rush hour is, it's a mess today. It's gotten worse with the Ridge construction, but it was a mess before that. So that's where the questions are coming from. You have done a very good job, and I used to live by Roycemore on Orrington, and it is a mess there at times.

MR. KENIG: But, as we indicated before, during the rush hour the school is only generating 35 exiting vehicles during the evening rush hour. So that volume of traffic is not high between 5:00 and 6:00. Their peak is between 3:00 and 4:00 in the afternoon when they're exiting a little over 100 vehicles, and that's over an hour period.

We've observed the dropoff and pickup operations. The pickup is usually the more critical operation, because the parents arrive early and they're
waiting for these students to leave the school. But in this case they've got two locations to pick up, on the upper level and on the lower level. And they've got significant on-site stacking capability. And we don't anticipate any cars sitting on the streets waiting for the students to leave the school to be picked up, we expect that they'll all be on the site. The Grove exit, as you indicated and I've known for years, we don't anticipate hardly anybody exiting the site turning left onto Ridge, because they're just going to sit, and sit, and sit, and wait to make that turn.

We would expect the people to come out, if they're going north we'd expect them to come out Davis and go north on Asbury. If they're going south or east we would expect some to use Asbury, some to use Grove to turn east on Ridge.

And in our report we've indicated all the travel paths of what we anticipate the directional distribution of traffic. And it pretty well spreads out in a quite a few directions. For instance, outbound in the evening we expect about 15 percent to go to the west on Church, six percent to the north on Asbury, 20 percent to the north on Ridge, 13 percent to the east on
Church, 15 percent to the south on Asbury, 25 percent to the south on Ridge, again because of the heavy directionality towards the City of Chicago because we anticipate a very high percentage of students going through the Chicago Area. And then six percent to the west on Davis Street. So it spreads out quite a bit.

The only, like we indicated, the only real problem was Davis Street being one-way. So when you come out the site you really can only come out in two directions, or three directions, west on Davis and east and west on Grove. But we would expect most of the people to come out on Grove to go east because they want to go south on Ridge.

We don't think anybody will go north, well, maybe a few cars. But I think you're dealing with people that are coming every single day to this school. And it's not like shoppers, or whatever, that come sporadic and aren't quite sure what the traffic situation is from day-to-day. These parents are going to be there every single day. They know what the problems are in Evanston, they know what streets are congested, which streets aren't, which intersections are a problem and which ones aren't.

And as we indicated in the report, all the
intersections, except Ridge and Grove, are operating at a very acceptable level of service. Most of the intersections are signalized, except Ridge and Grove and Grove and Asbury. And we didn't assign a lot of traffic to Grove because there is a problem getting out onto Ridge and a problem to get out onto Asbury.

Does that answer your question? I mean, I don't, we don't expect any traffic to be sitting on the street waiting for the children to come out. First of all, there's no parking on the south side of Davis, there's no parking on Asbury, no parking on Ridge. And there's only parking on side of Grove which is mostly used by the residents. So there's no on-street parking available.

I mean, they would have to be sitting there illegally to be sitting on the street waiting for the students, and it's not safe. So I don't think, you know, that they're going to be doing that. They're going to be parking on the site, which the current Roycemore School does not have that capability today.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Thank you very much. CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Anything else on parking and traffic? COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I have one last question.
CHAIRMAN CREAMER: As many of you need.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: ZBA go first, we've done a Plan Commission --

COMMISSIONER WILSON: I do still have some concerns on I think what I'll call circulation within the parcel of property.

MR. KENIG: Okay.

COMMISSIONER WILSON: Like you said, the parents are going to be coming here everyday, so they're going to find, you know, the shortest way in and probably the shortest way out.

MR. KENIG: Right.

COMMISSIONER WILSON: So of some concern to me is are people going to line up on this southbound Grove, I'll call it exit, and tell their kids, okay, I'll meet you on this, you know, I'll meet you on the Grove exit heading south, that way they'll be queued up ready to leave instead of going through the circle here. And then you'd have kids crossing the exit with traffic, you know, heading both directions and that doesn't seem like that's a great idea.

MR. KENIG: That's possible that they would do that, because I've seen that occur at several school that we're working with at the present time. Where the
parents think that they're smart, pardon my comment, that they're going to park out on the street, like, in the neighborhood across the street and say to the kid, you come running out there I won't get stuck inside waiting to pick you up.

And it's true, I mean, the parents are doing things like that. And they expect the child to run across the street through traffic to get to their car.

And there's much, and we try to get either traffic police patrolling the area or the school itself to control those situations. And, you know --

COMMISSIONER WILSON: Don, you were asking about --

MR. BECKER: If I could just --

COMMISSIONER WILSON: Yes, within the site.

MR. BECKER: -- go at this a little differently. I think we've got to keep in mind the size of the school and the number of kids that are coming out at any given time, and our ability to really work very intimately with our parent community.

And I can tell you our parents are, yes, they're impatient at times, but the fact is the safety of their children is paramount. And I think we have tremendous capacity to educate the parents and to
control that simply by being there because we know
everyone of the parents by site, and all of us are out
there, and it'll be worked through.

So I really hear your concern. I do not
believe people will, nor would we allow, them to queue
up headed south to exit on Grove. That simply would be
an unsafe arrangement for the children and would not be
part of what we would anticipate doing, or would allow
to do once we have the site.

COMMISSIONER WILSON: Right. And intuitively
that makes sense. But perhaps there could be some sort
of, you know, restriction, you know, no stopping or
standing --

MR. BECKER: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER WILSON: -- in that traffic lane.

MR. BECKER: Absolutely. I don't think
there's any question that that could be implemented.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Anything else on --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I had one --

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: -- parking and unruly

parents? Yes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: If you're going to have,
if you're thinking that more people might be taking
public transportation will there be any kind of crossing
guard for Ridge or any of the other streets? Because those are some really bad intersections for right on reds. And I know all the other public schools in Evanston have crossing guards.

MR. BECKER: That's not something that we have explicitly addressed yet. But, again, what we anticipate is it's primarily the older students that are going to be using the public transportation, that's the pattern as it exists now. Depending what those numbers are, if that's what it takes to have the children safely across the street then absolutely we would do that.

MR. KENIG: One thing we indicated in our report, all the signalized intersections around the school have crosswalks and have walk/don't walk signal indications.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I guess I'm not so much worried about people, like, seeing those signs. My parents live near here and I'll walk with them with their dog around this neighborhood, and people don't stop for people. I mean, there's several, myself, maybe my mom and a dog, and you'll, yes, and stuff, was in the neighborhood. And I could count on several hands the toes the times I've almost been hit in this area.

So I guess I would just think if there's going
to be even parents with kids, trying to get to school, a crossing guard at a couple of these intersections wouldn't be a bad idea.

MR. KENIG: Yes, no, I agree with you.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Okay. Anything else on parking, traffic?

All right. At this point we need to take a brief recess. So we'll go off the record for just a few minutes.

(Off the record.)

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Thank you all for that indulgence. The Zoning Board of Appeals has another agenda tonight, we had anticipated that this hearing would not take as long as it already has. And since we're not finished what we hope to do is certainly complete the testimony and public comment. And if we have to postpone our deliberation phase to another day that's what we may need to do.

We're going to try to wrap up the testimony and public comment by about 10:00 so that we can hear the matters, the three matters on our ZBA Agenda.

So with that, I think we left off, we had just, I hope completed our discussion of parking, queuing, and unruly parents. And do we have other
COMMISSIONER SCHUDENFREI: I have a series of green questions that may be answered by Mr. Becker or Mr. Yass. I'm very excited about the project, you know, excited about the adaptive re-use aspect of the project because people may or may not know, the keeping an existing building intact is actually one of the most green alternatives to tearing it down and bringing more concrete in.

However, having said that I was wondering whether there was going to be any LEED Certification, in other school projects we're looking at they're going to attempt to get LEED Certification for the building, whether you had looked into a green roof, particularly with the gymnasium since you're building that from scratch? Whether you're looking into permeable pavers, especially where you're adding paving with the new drive? Whether a permeable surface might be appropriate there?

I was also pretty concerned about the number of parents dropping off children and the very few mini-buses, and the very few students who are coming via mini-bus. And I was just wondering whether there was
some effort on the part of the school to try to convince
more people to use a bus service, because 40, 30 to 40
idling parents in particular, I mean, the actual air
quality, Evanston has some of the worst air quality in
the Chicago Area, it came out in the Tribune at some
point this year.

And so, you know, again, this idea of idling
cars, it's a little bit outside the scope of this
project, and I'm sure costs are a concern, but I thought
it might be something important to raise, whether
students would be bicycling. I don't see any provisions
for bicycle racks here, and bicycle racks help encourage
children to bicycle, especially if they're nearby.

And so I just wondered if you could discuss a
little bit what green aspects will be going into this
project?

MR. YASS: Sure, thank you. We are following
a LEED checklist. I don't believe that we'll be going
for commissioning due to some of the costs involved with
this. This is a non-for-profit institution, and so we
will be following the LEED checklist.

And in terms of the adaptive re-use, you're
absolutely right, there are so many points for things
that we're doing in the building that you could have.
But the commission and going through the construction process that way is actually quite costly, and adds sometimes four to five percent onto the construction cost that the project really can't bear at this point.

The other comment in terms of the idling cars, Joe, correct me if I'm wrong, but of the 35 cars, for example, that would be picking up students between 3:00 and 4:00 in the afternoon at least half of those would be going to the lower level to pick up the lower grades, kindergarten, junior kindergarten, et cetera.

And those parents actually have short term parking spaces so they'll actually park their car and not queue, but then go in the building. And this probably is a 15 minute turnaround, and pick up their students and take them. And so those students generally don't go by bus.

I think Joe can probably address the bus circulation a little.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Actually, the 35 was the number of students who actually drive and park permanently. It's 110 who enter in the morning. It just seemed a very small percentage of the school is actually coming, I mean, it's three mini-buses with a 20-seat capacity. Even if those are full serves 35
students out of a 250-student school up to a 350-student
school.

And I just think that these are concerns as
Evanston has a new climate action plan and a couple of
other important plans where it's trying to make
significant cuts in different aspects.

And did you say, so you're not looking into a
green roof or permeable pavers, or --

MR. YASS: We are not looking at those items
right now, no.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Other questions from the
commissioners or the board for the applicant?

MR. FREELAND: Joe can speak to the --

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Another answer. Yes, Mr.
Becker?

MR. BECKER: High school students do not like
riding school buses, this is --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: They like riding
bicycles though.

MR. BECKER: Well, bicycles is fine except
when they're coming from Highland Park or Hyde Park,
which is sort of the stretch of our geographic areas.
We have an increasing number of students living in
Evanston that are using bicycles, that's been evident in
the last, I'd say the last five years. But the seriousness of the geographics is going to preclude some of that.

Now, we do believe, and current data shows that the high school students are the ones who most often use public transportation. And so as we think about growing the school and anticipating that that's going to be at the older levels, we think that it's most likely going to happen that they will be utilizing the public transportation more.

As far as encouraging more to use our minibuses, that's something we can continue to promote. It does sometimes come down to, just again, the geography, the cost factors, the parents that want to drop their kids off on their way to work, and those kinds of things.

So I have no guarantees of that, but I think as the cost of commuting continues to increase they're going to more and more families that realize pooling together and using the bus service is going to be beneficial to them. But we don't have that data to prove what exactly will happen.

But we're cognizant of what you're saying, and we'd certainly like to have more of them on the school
buses, but that's just been a hard sell for some of the families, particularly the ones that are traveling quite a distance.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: And do you have a significant number of bicycle racks that you're going to put somewhere?

MR. BECKER: Yes, yes, those are included. I don't know if they, which of the exhibits they were on, but they are very much part of the plan.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Thank you.

MR. BECKER: Yes, that was just the question.

MR. FREELAND: Yes, that's, where are they on the --

MR. YASS: The bike racks on the Davis Street side on the architectural plan, the architectural site plan.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Did you have a question, Chuck?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Mr. Staley has a question.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Well, actually it's a comment and a question. And overall I think it's a, you know, it looks excellent, I have a architect to my right who designs schools and I've seen him nodding as he's
looking at pages favorably here, so I take that as a
good sign.

I am a little bit concerned about the parking,
but I think really the, you know, the city needs to look
at Grove and make sure that that's really going to work
and not cause some undue problems. I read through the
entire parking proposal, and I've tried to figure out
all the intersections and things, and it looked like
that really wasn't a huge problem.

But I do have one issue, and that's the, and
it doesn't, it's more on the right side of the table, I
think, than on the left side of the table, but its' the
only thing that really I'm concerned about. And that's
kind of the massing of that gymnasium and what that's
really going to look like from the, you know, the
single-family homes across Asbury as opposed to the
parking lot.

I realize as far as impervious it doesn't make
much difference, you know, it's solid, but it's up a lot
higher. And sort of, you know, what's that going to
look like, and how can that be lessened, or does anyone
think that's an issue? But I think I might think it was
an issue if I lived right across the street from it
myself.
CHAIRMAN CREAMER: We just might.

MR. YASS: I'm sorry, I didn't hear all of your question relating to the massing of the gym.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Well, the question is that this something new that's going up there. I suspect that if this were the office complex coming in asking to build another wing on the office building we'd turn it down. This is a different situation here, and obviously I can see the need, I can see the fit.

I mean, it, you know, our children are overweight, I understand all that. You can walk up and down the streets of Chicago and be aghast, so we, you know, we ought to do everything we could. But on the other hand, I'm just wondering how this is going to impact Asbury, residents across the street, the new part of the project?

MR. YASS: The facade set back from Asbury is about 32, 33 feet from the --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: The setback is 33 feet?

MR. YASS: -- from the property line, from the property line it's setback. And we've kept the height of the building to be no higher than the existing office building.

You know, we do have internal requirements in
terms of basketball, and arcs, and things like that, so
we've kept that low so it's not more than above the 29
feet on the Asbury Street side as the office is. We've
also tried to use the module from the building to
regulate the scale and the mass. And the residents that
came to the two public meetings didn't have any issue
with this.

And we're also trying to use much more
friendlier materials on the exterior facade than on the
existing building. In fact, a couple of the comments
that came out in the second public meeting were that,
why don't you cover the existing building with the same
kind of facade treatment that you're doing on this? You
know, obviously, that's not part of our program or in
our budget. But they were quite enamored with the way
that looked in terms of the massing as well.

And so we've tried to set the building back as
far as we could in terms of the property line on
Alexander Park, so we have to meet the setback
requirement here. And so we've set the building back
so, again, so that there's quite a distance of 32, 33
feet from the property line, plus the sidewalk and the
parkway out the Asbury, it's pretty far setback.

And, again, we've tried to minimize the impact
of the massing by breaking down the scale on the facade
treatment.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Yes, go ahead.

MR. PATERA: I do want to say, Nick Patera, from the landscape perspective, there's kind of a
generous parkway along Asbury. There are existing
lindens, 12-inch, 13-inch, 8-inch, 24-inch elm that are
providing, you know, canopy, and mass, and scale that
are already there. But what we're doing is working kind
of between those trees with supplemental trees that are
in that shrub perimeter so that you'll have outer and
inner-type screening.

This perspective rendering has eliminated
those landscape elements so that you can see the
building. But, you know, the one larger tree and then
intermediate trees have been eliminated from this
perspective. So that's something else to take into
consideration.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Any other questions on this
topic?

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: I had a couple for Mr.
Yass. Could you describe further the structural
investigation into keeping the stairs within the
building and not putting them outside the building?
MR. YASS: The typically bay concrete floor slab is a two-way slab. And the way things were designed, you know, back in 1960, there's a lot of reinforcement bar that goes approximately six to seven feet on either side of the centerline on each bay, which only allows for cutting into the slab in the center of each bay, which would pull the stair far into the building and really prohibit and lose a significant amount of square footage available for classroom space. That then we wouldn't be able to have the number of classrooms that are really required for the school, and would potentially create more addition for classroom, which we don't want to do.

So it was more economical and also feasible to put the stairs on the exterior.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: And in relation to this, I may have misunderstood your statement earlier when you were discussing the materials on the exterior of the building. But when you get around to the stairs, did you say you were investigating them being open, or did I misunderstand that?

MR. YASS: Yes. At the moment, on the drawings we're showing that there's a combination of solid material and glass on the, enclosing the stairs.
But we're also investigating the possibility on some of the stairs as potentially leaving them open, because they're only there for exiting purposes.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: You mean open as, by open you mean not having glass not having --

MR. YASS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: -- anything you're saying?

MR. YASS: Correct, correct. Which would allow for them to be much lighter and less existence, you know, in the context --

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: So there's no intention to actually make them, when you said you were investigating them being open I thought you meant you were investigating putting glass in and there was a potential for them to be solid, which I thought was not a good idea whatsoever.

MR. YASS: No, no. It --

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: But there's no potential for them to be solid blocks --

MR. YASS: Right, right.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: -- extending out of the building?

MR. YASS: Correct, correct.
COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Okay.

MR. YASS: It would either be the glass enclosure that is solid 10 feet from the building --

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Right.

MR. YASS: -- due to the fire codes and --

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Right, exactly.

MR. YASS: -- and fire from the windows and --

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: But not taking, for instance, that one that stretches out to Davis and having it be --

MR. YASS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: -- a big solid block hanging off the end of the building?

MR. YASS: In fact, that's one of the stairs that we might like to make is just an open stair with no enclosure so that it's much more light and transparent. The stairs are not used for communication between the floors, but merely for exiting purposes to meet code.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: So your expectation is that all travel within the building will be on that internal staircase that's in the center?

MR. YASS: Correct, correct. And actually, most of the students will stay on their floor level and possibly move between one floor most of the time, you
know, going to the middle level.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: I just had one, I just
had one last one that I --

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: All right.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: -- to you. I'm sorry, I
forgot these little, our of order, one was for Mr.
Becker which was about recess. Do you guys not have, I
guess, traditional recess, or is that more organized
into a gym class like you were talking about, or --

MR. BECKER: No, we do have recess --

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Okay.

MR. BECKER: -- up through fourth grade.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Okay.

MR. BECKER: And that typically happens right
after lunch, and they typically would use the play area
that's proposed as well as the green space on the
southwest corner of the property --

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Okay.

MR. BECKER: -- that's on the site plan.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Okay. And the final
one was just for the landscape architect. It was fairly
clear which trees you had taken out on the site plan.
And I think I gather what you've, I think I've gathered what you're adding here but I just want to make sure that I understand.

Everything that's existing is already labeled. Am I correct?

MR. PATERA: The ones that are labeled, like it says 13-inch linden, et cetera, those are existing terrarium.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Those are all existing. And everything else, such as the four on the, the four trees on the west side near the gym?

MR. PATERA: Those are new.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Those are new?

MR. PATERA: Yes. So anything that, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: And the darker, sort of forest green that seems to be indicated as a tree, are those all trees, or are those large bushes, or whatever?

MR. PATERA: Those are ornamental trees, so those are intermediate scale --

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Okay.

MR. PATERA: -- type trees, but new.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Okay. Just making sure the convention was what I thought it was. Thank you.
questions from board members or commissioners? All right. The next category of persons who can ask questions or make statements are property owners who have a legal interest in real property within 500 feet of the property that's the subject of the application.

So if we have those folks who wish to reasonably ask questions or give testimony, would they come up and identify themselves in whatever order you wish to do so? And please come to the, you can line up behind the podium over there.

MR. MILLER: Hi, my name is Robert Miller (M-i-l-l-e-r), I live at 1564 Asbury, probably within 50 feet of this property, we are directly west of the building.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Okay. Just a second, Mr. Miller. Can we have, I see five people there, can we have you five be sworn in, please? We have our procedures here.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Okay, Mr. Miller, thank you. Please go ahead.

MR. MILLER: Before I start I wanted to state that the first notice or word of this project that I received was when I received a zoning, the notice of this hearing tonight by mail.
I'm not aware of anybody on our side of the street that was involved or heard anything about the plans of Roycemore. So it came as a bit of a surprise hearing testimony about how the neighbors felt about this given the fact that we didn't even know about it, and we're the most immediately impacted by this. That being said, I'm not here to object to Roycemore occupying the property for a school. We think that's actually a very good use for the property.

My objection, primarily, concerns the classification of this property, changing the zoning classification to R-4. And I would like to ask some questions of the Zoning Administrator consistent with that with the Board's permission.

I also do have some concerns about some of the other testimony given here, which, after living on the property for 13 years I consider myself an expert on this neighborhood. I've lived in Evanston my entire life, except for when I went to school, so I'm familiar with the community. And there's a few other questions I'd like to ask of the, I think it's Mr. Kenig who did the traffic study.

So with your permission I'd like to ask the Zoning Administrator a few questions.
CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Okay. You may do so as soon as we find him.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Actually, if I could interrupt you really quick. If the applicant could put up the board that has the context plan? We don't have our usual map that shows us where each address is, so it'd be helpful if as you get up to speak if your house is, if your property's on here if you could point it out to us it'd be, well, it's a little bit turned but it'd be helpful if we could, if I could see where that is.

MR. MILLER: Right here.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Okay, thank you.

MR. MILLER: Just south of the alley, Dewey School is directly behind our property. And obviously, the gym would be right in front of our property.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER OPDYKE: Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Dunkley left about 10 minutes ago.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Well, Mr. Argumedo will answer your questions then. Yes. Is it?

MR. MILLER: We'll share, how's that? What's your name?

MR. ARGUMEDO: Hi, my name is Dominick Argumedo, I'm the Zoning Planner.
MR. MILLER: Okay.

MR. ARGUMEDO: And I'll do the best to my ability to answer your questions, and we will get you answers before this goes --

MR. MILLER: Okay. First, I want to just get into the, just a little more exploration about the current use. The current character of this neighborhood west of Ridge Avenue beginning at Dempster heading north, are there any multi-family buildings going all the way up to this property, to your knowledge?

MR. ARGUMEDO: Well, to my knowledge, no. But we will get that, you know, information to you.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Immediately north of Dempster, sir, there is.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: I do believe, just by the by, that the property on the northwest corner of Dempster and Ridge has just gone condo, and they're --

MR. MILLER: Right. But District 65 property is the one exception to that --

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Right.

MR. MILLER: -- which I understand was registered and they're national historic landmarks. So that is a building that's probably 100 years old.

Heading east, excuse me, heading west on
Asbury you also have primarily single-family homes. Is that correct?

MR. ARGUMEDO: To my understanding, yes, sir.

MR. MILLER: Okay. And extending north of this property going across the street you have the other building of the Pension Fund. Is that correct?

MR. ARGUMEDO: Yes, that one I can say, yes.

MR. MILLER: And then north of that building is single-family homes, correct, except for the building on Church, which is a very low density townhouse. Is that correct?

MR. ARGUMEDO: To my understanding, again, I apologize for that, sir.

MR. MILLER: Okay. And then if you head across Asbury Street primarily you have single-family homes all throughout that area. Correct?

MR. ARGUMEDO: To the west of Asbury is an R-1 zoning district, yes.

MR. MILLER: Right. Would it be fair to say that this area is primarily single-family residential homes, with the exception of churches and the Pension Fund buildings in terms of its current use?

MR. ARGUMEDO: That characterization, to the west of Asbury I would say it's R-1. I would more
inclined, for my knowledge, to go off the zoning map, but it is, we're looking at a transitional area. West of it is definitely R-1 zoning district with single-family homes, sir.

MR. MILLER: Okay. And what's it transitioning to? That's one of the questions that we're concerned about. You have a building that's been there since the 1960's, okay. There basically hasn't been much development in that area. Is that correct?

MR. ARGUMEDO: That is correct. And I believe that is part of the reason that in discussions with the applicant there was a desire not to have it as a C-1 District but a R-4 District right there, to not open it up in case this project does not go through to have a commercial area able to be there right in that district, yes, sir.

MR. MILLER: Okay. So now let's get into the zoning to R-4 versus R-1. Is a special use permit to operate a private educational institution available within the context of an R-1 District?

MR. ARGUMEDO: If you'll, one minute, sir. It does have an, under an R-1 District it is listed, educational institution private as a special use. Correct, sir.
MR. MILLER: So from the standpoint of this property, whether the property was for the purposes of operating this institution, this property could just as easily be classified R-1 if the Planning Commission decided to make it R-1?

MR. ARGUMEDO: If the Planning Commission made it an R-1 zoning district a special use application could still be permitted that way. There would be differences in terms of the lot coverage, impervious surface, and setbacks for the building and what they would want to build there.

MR. MILLER: Okay. With respect to those differences, in terms of the second request which was a, excuse me, request number three which is a major variation permitting a street side yard of 13 feet, could they obtain such a variation in a R-1 District?

MR. ARGUMEDO: One minute, please. In a R-1 District under non-residential structures a street yard abutting, street side yard abutting a street is 15 feet for buildings. So that is consistent.

MR. MILLER: Could they obtain a variation, because they want to go 13 feet?

MR. ARGUMEDO: There is, a major variation would be an allowable use, yes, sir.
MR. MILLER: Okay.

MR. ARGUMEDO: Process.

MR. MILLER: And we also have the lot coverage issue here. They want to go from 55 to 63 percent. Could they obtain that variation in a R-1 District?

MR. ARGUMEDO: That variation would be, that variation process would be allowed, sir.

MR. MILLER: So fundamentally this entire project could happen in the context of an R-1 from a zoning standpoint?

MR. ARGUMEDO: Variances could be applied for under the process if it was determined to be an R-1 District.

MR. MILLER: Okay. I just want to make a note at this point that, once again, we are not opposed to Roycemore having their project here. The concern is if Roycemore fails financially to accomplish their project what you have accomplished is basically a complete rezoning of an area that's primarily R-1 to an R-4 District under the context of putting a private educational institution there. An institution that has requested zoning that it doesn't need to accomplish the very purpose of what this petition's all about.

It strikes me that this is really more of a
financial protection issue from the school standpoint, and does not reflect any fundamental need.

In addition, I do have some other questions, but in addition to that my other comment is the statement, the portrayal of this being consistent with the district, I, as a neighbor, fundamentally disagree. It's not consistent with the district. There is a clear demarcation between the east side and the west side of Ridge Avenue, I think the City of Evanston's zoning and planning has recognized that for decades, that they are very different. And if anything, west of Ridge is primarily R-1 with a few minor exceptions, it is not R-4.

If there was a private developer here requesting that this property be re-zoned from an O-1 to an R-4 for the purpose of multi-family housing I suspect there would be hundreds of people sitting here arguing about this, okay.

But in fact, it's because of Roycemore's reputation very few people are expressing any concern about this project. And again, our concern is not Roycemore, our concern is that they're over-reaching in their request for zoning, okay.

I'm done with those questions on the zoning.
I do have a few other questions I want to also ask.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: All right.

MR. MILLER: As a neighbor we are concerned about traffic patterns and things like that too. So I would like to ask Mr., is it Kinock?

MR. KENIG: Kenig.

MR. MILLER: Kenig, a few questions regarding the streets, the layouts over there and the parking.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Mr. Kenig, can you come up to this podium and it's plugged in again.

MR. PATERA: I'm unplugged now.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Kenig, currently the branch of Grove Street that runs between Asbury and Ridge Avenue, is that one-way or two-ways?

MR. PATERA: Two-way.

MR. MILLER: Okay. And currently, is there off-street, is there parking on the street on that street?

MR. PATERA: Yes, on one side of the street.

MR. MILLER: Okay. Did your study look at the impact of having bi-directional traffic on the ability for people to park there?

MR. PATERA: They are parking there now, and it's --
MR. MILLER: Is it feasible to have --
MR. PATERA: -- bi-directional now.
MR. MILLER: Is it feasible to have cars heading east and west at the same time with people parking over there and traffic in and out of that driveway? Because right now there is no driveway over there.
MR. PATERA: That's correct. But there are people traveling in both directions today on that street.
MR. MILLER: And can you give us an estimate of how many people are actually using that street? That's a very small street right now.
MR. PATERA: Okay. In the morning peak hour there is 30, there is 40 westbound vehicles and 35 eastbound vehicles.
MR. MILLER: This is under the current use?
MR. PATERA: Right.
MR. MILLER: Okay.
MR. PATERA: And in the evening there's 90 westbound vehicles and 35 eastbound vehicles.
MR. MILLER: Now how many cars do you, it was stated in the testimony that the staff of the school is, I believe, currently 40?
MR. PATERA: Yes.

MR. MILLER: Does that include custodial workers, food service workers, other staff there?

MR. PATERA: Yes.

MR. MILLER: And what's the estimate of the number of cars that are going to be dropping people off there and other vehicles on a daily basis?

MR. PATERA: On a daily basis? We didn't do a daily analysis, just the peak hour, again.

MR. MILLER: Well, okay. During the peak hours, how many vehicles are we expecting? Let's say, let's define peak as how many cars are going to the property to drop people off in the morning and to pick them up later on in the day?

MR. PATERA: We estimate about 45 in the morning picking up, or dropping off, and 30 in the evening picking up.

MR. MILLER: Okay. So you're saying that the school, which currently has 250 students, there's only 40 cars delivering, between the cars and buses there's only 40 vehicles going to Roycemore right now?

MR. PATERA: No. You asked how many are going to be on Grove, that's what would be on Grove.

MR. MILLER: Okay. How many vehicles do, are
currently dropping students and picking them up during a
normal school day?

MR. PATERA: In the morning, at the present
time, there are 70 vehicles dropping of in the morning,
and 80 picking up in the afternoon.

MR. MILLER: Okay. And how many of the staff
members are driving to the property and also parking?

MR. PATERA: There are 35 staff and faculty
members currently driving.

MR. MILLER: Okay.

MR. PATERA: And they typically leave after
4:00. School leaves between 3:00 and 4:00, the
students, and the faculty's leaving between 4:00 and
4:30, so they're not in conflict with each other.

MR. MILLER: So would it be fair to say that
you're going to have approximately 110 vehicles coming
onto the property and 110 leaving the property each day
between the staff and the parents?

MR. PATERA: At least, yes.

MR. MILLER: At least, okay. You stated that
you did not expect parents to kind of wait along the
street to pick up their kids. How many parking spaces
are there going to be on this property?

MR. PATERA: 75.
MR. MILLER: So there's, plus or, so we're talking about potentially 40 cars that have no place to park when they go to pick up their kids?

MR. PATERA: They don't pick them up in an instant, they pick them up over an hour, so they're coming and going. So they don't need to have 110 parking spaces at any one time.

MR. MILLER: But if you have a large rush of cars where are these cars going to go if the parking spaces are taken up?

MR. PATERA: We're not going to have a large rush of cars. In the morning they just come, dropoff, and continue, they're virtually in motion while they're dropping off in the morning. In the afternoon in the pickup mode some of them will park for the younger children, the others will come in and either park or sit in the aisles, where there aren't parking spaces, waiting to pick up.

So they'll have the ability to store more cars on the site than there are parking spaces. I mean, we've got a large area to store those vehicles.

MR. MILLER: So you do not expect anybody to be standing, having their cars parked, or double-parked on any of these streets during these peak areas of
picking up and dropping off kids?

MR. PATERA: I suppose there's always that possibility. But none of the streets allow parking, so they'd be blocking through traffic if they stopped on the street to pick up people.

MR. MILLER: Are you aware, have you looked at the traffic patterns involving any other institutions that border Ridge that also have schools associated with them to see what their traffic patterns are like?

MR. PATERA: That border Ridge?

MR. MILLER: Right, between Ridge and Asbury. You have the church, the Unitarian Church, you have Bethemet, you have other institutions that also have very similar problems with pickup and dropping --

MR. PATERA: No parking facilities. The church has none or very little, they park on the street on Sunday, they use Grove on Sundays to park, but there's very little traffic there.

MR. MILLER: Are you aware that they also double-park on Dempster during dropoff and pickup, they also double-park on Asbury?

MR. PATERA: Now, wait, wait, excuse me.

Where do they double-park on Dempster?

MR. MILLER: Let's take Bethemet.
MR. PATERA: Where do they double-park on Dempster?

MR. MILLER: Right on the side of the street.

MR. PATERA: What side of the street and where?

MR. MILLER: They park on the south side on Dempster between Ridge and Asbury, they also double-park on Asbury.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: I can, yes, I can just say that's true.

MR. MILLER: We are concerned about, obviously, the whole issue of parking on the street. Again, I'm not objecting to Roycemore, but I think that the parking issue is a lot more significant than is being depicted here.

You have a huge shortage of parking in that area, you have employees from the post office that are always looking for parking spaces in the neighborhood, it's a real problem.

And I think that suggesting that this is not a problem because it hasn't been a problem for the Pension Fund, the Pension Fund is dramatically understaffed over there. They've moved out a huge amount of their, their people out of that facility. And additionally, people
go there and they park, and they go to work, and then
they leave. I never got the impression that the Pension
Fund had a lot of people that had to park on the street
over there.

So I think you're going to really look into
dramatically increased amount of traffic and a lot of
people double-parking when they're picking up kids, and
I think that's a reality.

I also want to express one other concern about
this whole situation, and that is the whole traffic
pattern at Grove. Currently there is no traffic control
at Grove and Ridge. Is that correct?

MR. PATERA: There's stop signs on Grove.

MR. MILLER: But there's no traffic control to
stop traffic on Ridge?

MR. PATERA: That's correct.

MR. MILLER: Okay. Living in that
neighborhood I can tell you that just crossing the
street on, crossing Davis Street at Ridge is a
challenge, okay, it is a dangerous proposition. There
have been neighbors that have been hit just walking
across the street with the light, with the, you know,
walk sign.

You have a situation here where you're going
to have students that are also going to be walking to
school, to Roycemore, that are not going to just try to
cross at Ridge, they're going to try to cross at Grove
Street.

And there are, you know, in my experience
living in Evanston I don't think there is a good time to
cross Ridge Avenue. I don't think there's any, the only
good time to ever cross Ridge Avenue has been the last
eight months where it's been torn up and there is no
traffic on Ridge Avenue. So I think that is another,
you know, real concern that, you know, should be
addressed.

So that's pretty much my questions. I don't
have a problem personally with the variations that
they're requesting.

We understand that the property has to be
redeveloped, that it's not going to be turned into
parkland. We, at least the neighbors on the 1500 block
most immediately affected, were very cooperative with
the Pension Fund when they had talked about
redevelopment activities on the site, and we feel the
same way about Roycemore.

But again, our primary concern is moving this
to an R-4 designation versus an R-1. I don't think I'd
be standing here today if they had requested an R-1
change in zoning.

And again, I, now, notwithstanding everything
I said about the traffic, we would support it as an R-1,
but I do think that the traffic impact, the safety
impact in that area is being dramatically downplayed
based upon 13 years living on the property.  So, thank
you.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER:  Thank you, Mr. Miller.

Okay, who's next?

MR. PORTNOY:  Hi, my name is David Portnoy,
and it's (P-o-r-t-n-o-y), and I live at 1560 Asbury.
Let me see if I can, right here, my house.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER:  All right. Next door to
Mr. Miller?

MR. PORTNOY:  Yes.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER:  Okay. Across from the gym.

MR. PORTNOY:  And I'm also speaking for
another neighbor that couldn't make it here today,
Jeffery Jones, he lives just three houses south on the
east side of Asbury.

I also, just as with Mr. Miller, I appreciated
the fact that it's Roycemore School that's coming, I
think it's a really good use for the space and we're
looking forward to that.

I do have the same concern about the actual zoning. I think it was mentioned that we have a non-profit corridor, but I think if you look down all of the, the churches and the synagogue are all R-1. So to be consistent there's nothing, no reason that I can see to make it R-4.

My other comments relate to the design. I apologize that this may not be the right forum for this, but again, like with Mr. Miller, this is the very first time that I have seen these plans. So I think there are a lot of things about them that are good, but there a few things about them that I have concerns with.

The first is, kind of relates to an architectural plan that I think the United Methodists had before, when they were exploring the possibility of staying there themselves, what they were trying to do with the site is to mass as much of the building towards Ridge as possible. And I really liked their design, it seemed like it made a really good and efficient use of the space.

And I think that if it were possible to put the gymnasium towards Ridge certainly it would be much more appealing to me., and I think that there is a lot
more you could do with the traffic patterns.

I would rather see the park, the Alexander Park moved to the current location, the current location of the open space on the southwest corner, which seems like it should not be a very difficult thing to do because there's nothing to tear down.

I also think that having a bi-directional driveway onto Grove is a problem. First of all, it'll create a, there will be a blind spot pulling out, especially with there being parking on the north side of Grove. So I think that the blind spot is, besides potentially being dangerous will also slow down traffic.

Looking at the plans it wasn't clear how the traffic flow on the site itself would work, and whether it would be clear and obvious to the parents picking up or dropping off which way they're supposed to be going, you know.

And maybe one way to solve the issue, again, I don't know if this is the right forum for this, but would be to make the driveway that's onto Grove one direction, and maybe make Grove eastbound. That seems like it'll really relieve traffic.

Somebody from the commission mentioned a possibility of a green roof. I'm not sure if that's
just not being considered for economic reasons, but I think I would really like to see that, as well as having more permeable driving, permeable driveway. There is a part of the design that really doesn't appeal to me is the current driveway, which is on me, on the west side of the site, appears that there is almost no space between the sidewalk and the driveway, there's probably just enough for a hedge for a long duration.

And it seems like it would be a lot of, a lot of concrete, a lot paving between, you know, you have Asbury, you have the sidewalk, you have the driveway, and then you have this mass of buildings. And all of a sudden it doesn't really feel that residential anymore. And my final concern or question, maybe it's a procedural one, it's, right now we're talking about the possibility of expanding the school to 350 students. What I'd like to know is if the plans ever change and the school decides to expand to more than that what is the process, or who is going to approve that? Are we going to have a say in that? Is there somebody who can answer that?

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Well, I think as a general matter we're just being asked to approve the zoning and
planning aspects of it. What they do with the building once they get it built is really up to them.

MR. PORTNOY: Could somebody speak to the, how the size of the building compared to the maximum number of students that could be housed in that building?

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Can you address that, Mr. Becker?

MR. BECKER: I cannot address your specific question, but what I can tell you is how we came to 350. The whole history of the school is based on small size of classes and interpersonal relationships. So our only intention is to add one extra junior kindergarten class, which is about 20 students, and to grow the upper school into approximately 30 per class.

And we want to do that, it doesn't have so much to do with how many we could cram in, but that's our mission, that's our core value, that's what we have done all of these years. So, you know, I've only been there 40 years, I can't promise I'm going to be there the next 40, but it really is a significant issue for the school that we stay at that level.

MR. PORTNOY: But in terms of the, how spacious is it? I mean, just --

MR. BECKER: Well, my goodness, I mean, by our
standards right now it's huge, and it's luxurious, it's
the penthouse of the best of the presidential suites
because right now we're crammed into every nook and
cranny.

When we did our programming study with Mr.
Yass we identified how many classrooms for a school of
350, and that's what these drawings represent.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Thank you, Mr. Becker.

Does that answer your question, Mr. Portnoy?

MR. PORTNOY: Yes, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Okay.

MR. PORTNOY: And just one other, again,
procedural question. Since it seems like a lot of these
issues are tied into the traffic pattern and possibly
maybe changing the way that traffic flows on various
streets what is the process here, can we tie the
approval of this to the changing of these traffic
patterns to kind of work better with the neighborhood?

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Well, as a general matter
of speaking for the ZBA, we can make recommendations,
but ultimately the decision to re-zone the site and also
to grant a special use goes to the City Council. And so
the council would be the group who also controls things
like stop signs and traffic. And so that would be the
ultimate forum that would decide this.

You would have to ask staff as to the best way
to raise those issues. But we, obviously, are concerned
about the impact on traffic, but we're not in the
business of re-drawing traffic plans or installing stop
lights or stop signs.

MR. PORTNOY: So will we have another
opportunity between now and when the site is developed
to, for input into the traffic?

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Yes. This will, these
recommendations will go to the Planning and Development
Committee of the City Council, and that would be an
opportunity to raise those issues in a forum where the
people there have the power to make changes.

MR. PORTNOY: Okay. And then I have one
request since, you know, I really appreciate all the
thought that Roycemore and the architect have put into
the plans. But since, I think, none of the neighbors I
know have seen the plans or know what exactly, what
thought went behind it, I would like to have the
opportunity to have a little bit more input, or
understand why the things are the way they are. Is that
possible at some point?

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Well, the plans are
available at the zoning office, and so --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I do have a question, because we were, this was presented at the community, there was a community meeting that this information, two of them, and that the information was provided to the community. And yet I have five residents here who, do have all of you, I haven't heard --

MR. PORTNOY: And another one who's not here.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So six that did not know about any of this until this meeting. Is that correct?

MS. SCHEIDT: I knew of one of them from the neighbor who lives adjacent to me, I did not --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Okay. So, you know, I would like to know how that happens and whether or not there as actually, you know, mailings or things put in the door. I mean, it's a pretty small, 500 feet from the property is not a big area, and how that there are residents who claim that they've not received any notice and still, until the notice of this meeting. So I would like that addressed.

I would also like that resolved for any future meetings with this property, because as neighbors to this they are entitled to that. So I'm very
disappointed to hear, first being told that there were
two meetings, I appreciate that, but to hear that the
residents didn't know about them.

MR. FIELD: I had to go -- so there's a chance
that maybe I missed them. But --

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Mr. Freeman, what I suggest
is that we hear from the three other neighbors and then
we'll give the applicant a chance to respond to the
issue of notice to neighbors.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Thank you.

MR. PORTNOY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Thank you, Mr. Portnoy.

The next neighbor, please, and I know you've been
patient, but we're running out of time so if, we've
already heard about the change to, or the issue of why
not R-1 instead of R-4, and traffic and congestion. So
if you agree, let us know, but we don't need those --

MS. CLARK: I'll be brief.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: -- explained anymore.

MS. CLARK: I guarantee.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: And you are?

MS. CLARK: Mora Clark, and I live at 1550
Asbury, which is right across from David. And prior to
that, I've lived there for three years, and prior to
that I lived right across the Pension Board at 1300
Davis Street, so I've lived in the neighborhood for 15
years.

And I only want to just make sure that you
understand the very strong urging to zone this correctly
and keep it at the O-1, I think it is, and not the --

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: You mean R-1?

MS. CLARK: R-1 and not the R-4.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: All right.

MS. CLARK: I feel very strongly about that.

That would, Roycemore is, I'm very supportive of it, I
have neighbors who sent their children there, it's a
wonderful institution, no problems with any of that.

Just this zoning thing is a huge concern, it's why I'm
here tonight, and otherwise I wouldn't be here. Thank
you.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Thank you for your
comments.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I just want to make
sure that she, it is O-1 now, so it's not R-1 now.

MS. CLARK: Whatever you want to change it to
with R-4 that would allow them to build multi-family use
housing, I'm very opposed to that.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: We take your point, thank
you.

MR. FIELD: Hi, my name's Nigel Field, that's (N-i-g-e-l F-i-e-l-d), I live at 1554 Asbury Avenue right next to these two people here.

I'll be brief, I'm going to add my voice to opposing the R-4 zoning and recommend the R-1. And in relation to Mr. Freeman's comment about the gymnasium, what would the people across the road think, well I'm opposing that really, I think I agree with his comments there,

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: You are not opposing?

MR. FIELD: Sorry?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: You are not opposing?

MR. FIELD: I think it would detriment our view from across the street is what I'm saying.

And thirdly, the exit onto Grove from that new road, I think that will be a detriment too. And I would just like to add in there that Grove, heading west one block, as you probably realize, terminates at Dewey School, and there actually is an entrance and exit from Dewey there.

And we do have parents who pick up and drop off kids right there. Some of them do bring their cars and a lot of them are on foot, but they do bring cars in
there. So we have a lot of, already have a lot of
school traffic right at that junction there right at
Asbury and Grove.

So I don't know if that's been considered in
there, particularly the timing of when a lot of these
cars would be, but that does add an extra complication,
we do have Dewey School traffic.

That was all, thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Thank you.

MR. FIELD: By the way, in general, I'd just
like to say I think Roycemore would be good for the
location.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: All right.

MS. SCHEIDT: I'm Kathleen Scheidt, I live at
1513 Asbury, which is right at the corner of Grove and
Asbury. So directly --

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Could you spell your name
for the record, please?

MS. SCHEIDT: Certainly, sorry. It's
(S-c-h-e-i-d-t). So where the green space is, my house
is here, my driveway is here, looks like directly across
the street from the proposed new driveway for the
school.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Sorry. You said Grove
and Asbury?

MS. SCHEIDT: Yes, I live on the corner of Grove and Asbury, my driveway is accessible from Grove directly across from where it appears the new driveway will be for the school.

And I just want to start out by saying that Roycemore may be our new neighbor, it's certainly preferable to a lot of other possibilities, and I am delighted to have the possibility of another educational institution in the neighborhood.

I wanted to point out, again, I don't know if the traffic studies took this into account, but the Dewey School proximity, one block away, there's a lot of traffic, it's pedestrian, it's car traffic. There is no stop sign on Asbury. On Asbury at Grove there is one at Grove. Some of the same issues that we see on Ridge as far as drivers actually yielding to pedestrians.

So I would hope that the City would take that into account once this project hopefully goes forward into possibly modifying some of the signals or traffic controls there.

But my main point is, I moved to this neighborhood from Southeast Evanston because of the increased density that I saw happening in Southeast
Evanston, and that's continuing, and I'm in favor of development in the City.

But part of the reason this neighborhood appealed to me was because it's R-1, it's not dense family housing, it's close to downtown but it has the benefits of having yards, single-family homes, space, and people who, you know, interact with one another and, you know, are not crammed into buildings together.

And the Pension Board has been a fine neighbor. And I see a lot of people who use the public transit, and that's part of the reason why they've been there. And I'm glad that that's a benefit for the school as well. It's part of the reason why I like the neighborhood.

But I think R-4 zoning is inappropriate for this neighborhood, and I don't want to reiterate everything that everyone else has said. But I didn't hear any argument or explanation for why R-4 is the requested zoning change. That seems inappropriate, I don't believe it was supported in the comments that we've heard this evening.

I'd like to understand better why that was chosen and why R-1 was not presented, or even R-2 or R-3. I think those would be more appropriate if something
other than R-1 is what is deemed necessary for this project.

Finally, there's been a lot of comment about the traffic on Grove. I don't know how much activity there is at the school on weekends, but there is parking on both sides of Grove on the weekends. And, sorry, I'm getting a little emotional here. But I can sometimes hardly get in and out of my driveway because of the way people are parked on that street, let along drive up and down the street when there are other cars coming.

So, granted, during the week it's only parking on one side of the street, but I don't know how much consideration was given to that in the traffic review. I really am hard pressed to fathom the amount of traffic that I think we'll see increasing on this site as a result of this project, and how it will impact the currently relatively idyllic nature with Alexander Park and the green space on the north side of Grove.

I think this is huge difference from what we have now, and it's detrimental from my perspective, and I think it's detrimental for everyone who's using that neighborhood for pedestrian purposes, because it will be a great increase in traffic.

And we're already dealing with, you know, this
because of the Ridge construction. I think that's probably a preview of some of what we will experience with this additional project.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: May I ask you a question then?

MS. SCHEIDT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So are you against the project or just the driveway there?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I'm not against the project, I'm in favor of the project. I was very dismayed given that I was not aware of the prior two meetings, dismayed to see the location of the driveway. Again, it's very, a personal self-interest because my driveway is directly across the street apparently.

I have enough trouble with ingress and egress as it is that I think, you know, having to compete with additional cars that actually are entering and exiting the street at that spot is very dismay ing to me. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Thank you. All right, are there any other persons who have a legal interest in property within 500 feet of the site of the project who want to say anything or ask questions? I see none.

MR. CLARKSON: I'm Walter Clarkson, a
CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Please come up, Walter, I was going to get to you. Come on up.

MR. CLARKSON: I'm Walter Clarkson, a former ZBA member, and also I am speaking in behalf of St. Mark's Church on the southeast corner of Grove and Ridge. And I totally support the proposal here to, for the Roycemore, except the change to R-4. It should be a penetration of an R-1 District to make it R-4, and the possibility that if Roycemore doesn't do it eventually the R-r will still be there available for a density construction of condos and houses. So my point would be to change the zoning to R-1. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Thank you. All right, since we have covered all of the property owners are there any other persons in attendance who wish to make a comment concerning this application? I'm going to ask you, you've all been patient but I'm going to ask you to limit yourself to three minutes. So if there's anyone, I see one person. Please come up and identify yourself and give us your comment.

MR. GORDON: Did you say, raise my hand?

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: I should have sworn you, Mr. Clarkson in as well, but I'll swear you in right
now, yes.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: And let the record show that Mr. Clarkson has been sworn in as well. Okay.

MR. GORDON: My name is Gerald Gordon, I live at 1228 Lake Street, which is the southeast corner of Lake and Asbury just outside the 500 foot limit.

First of all, the lawyer for this project said that this is not a historic building, but it is within the Ridge Historic District I'm quite sure, and will need to get preservation permission. And my opinion about the facade change for the gymnasium is it's weird, I don't know why you don't keep it the same facade as much as possible to the existing building.

My second point is that the stairway at the north end, I wonder if it couldn't be turned to an east/west direction instead of north/south so that you don't need that variation, I think that's a variation.

And my last comment is the traffic. In my opinion the traffic is going to defeat this project because Davis is one-way, as you all know, northbound to Asbury with a stop light there, there's already back-ups there.

The intersection of Grove and Ridge is one of
the highest accident intersections on Ridge. I'm aware of that because I was involved in the discussions on the mast arm signal project on Ridge and a study of the city's records. So that is one of the high accident intersections on Ridge already. So adding this traffic on Grove, it was suggested that maybe it can be made into a one-way street eastbound, they're going to have to come to Ridge if they go eastbound, and you can't get across Ridge now.

And no matter which way you go there on Asbury north or south, on Davis west, on Grove there's no place to go but Ridge, it's going to be a very, very difficult situation. And I strongly recommend turning this project down because of the impact on the traffic pattern.

And the last thing I would like to say is that this driveway along the side of the school, the proposed driveway heading towards, or from Grove is an artificial solution, I believe, and is only going to lead to more problems.

That's all I have to say, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Thank you, sir. If anyone else who has a comment they would like to make? I see one person. Okay, are you from the applicant, sir?
MR. ELLIS: I am but I'm also a parent, and that's the --

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: All right.

MR. ELLIS: -- manner in which I wish to address this body.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: All right. And you are?

MR. ELLIS: My name is Tom Ellis (E-l-l-i-s), I reside at 1110 Grant Street in Evanston. I, as you noted, I am the Chair of the Board of Trustees of Roycemore School, but I wish to address you as a parent. My wife and I are parents of two children who attend Roycemore School and are very well served by Roycemore School, it's individual and differentiated curriculum that it offers. There are also many other parents of well-served children of Roycemore. We spared you having this room jam packed with them, but I hope you don't give any less weight to my comments than if that entire mass were sitting in this room.

As a parent community we're concerned about the future of Roycemore, and particularly concerned as to where Roycemore is going to be in Evanston if not at 1200 Davis Street. Where is there in Evanston where you have enough space and a parcel of land that realistically works with the Comprehensive General Plan,
and compliments the Downtown Plan and is currently engaged.

As recently as the November 18th hearing that the Plan Commission had with regard to the 222 Hartrey Property, I gleaned from that some very real concerns about special use applications for schools within the City of Evanston. And I'm proud of the work that our group has done here at Roycemore in looking at the 1200 Davis Street Property. By soliciting and addressing the concerns of residents and city officials before we engaged in this formal process I think that Roycemore has provided some up-front solutions to some significant issues.

Among these, one, we would not be removing any property from the existing tax rolls. As I say, we compliment the current Downtown Planning, and it's in compliance with the Comprehensive General Plan, and it really does provide an ideal buffer between the downtown area across the east side of Ridge and the residential communities on the west side.

And comments notwithstanding, which I acknowledge are real concerns, Roycemore's use of this property would minimize any impact on the every-increasing traffic congestion in that area. And it also
keeps a long-standing beneficial Evanston institution in Evanston.

If this site is not used by Roycemore what is the future of this site? Do we realistically believe that there is going to be a lesser traffic impact on this area from something other than Roycemore, especially in an O-1 District? In an O-1 District with no restrictions on the impervious, the impervious area of the space you have the potential of losing existing green space as it is.

So with regard to the project, and I don't think that I really heard that anyone is opposed to the project itself. There are details with the project that need to be worked through. But I can assure you both from the parent community and as chair of the board, although I said I wouldn't address in that capacity, that you have a school that is, has a past history, and is making a commitment to you tonight that we will work, and have worked, with city officials, we have worked and will work with residents to address any of the issues that come up with this proposed project.

And as a final note, I want to apologize to the residents who did not get notice of the meetings. I was in charge of that, I assembled, went through the
zoning map, I got every house, every building that is located on that map, went through the tax rolls, identified the people, established a group of people to go out. And in fact, the 1500 Block of Asbury was a block that my wife, my children, and I papered. So apologize if you didn't get it. I don't know if I didn't affix it to a door or put it in a mailbox.

But the fact that we have five people who say that they didn't is a fairly good sign to me. We covered a 25-block area with the fliers for our original meeting, which was sponsored by Alderman Bernstein, and the subsequent was announced at the first meeting. And for the second meeting I also, I also paid for a telephonic service to use all telephone numbers in that 25-block area and notify people by my recorded voice message of the second meeting.

So I do apologize to those residents who did not receive notice. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Okay. Mr. Ellis, I noticed or recall that I neglected to have you sworn in.

(Witness sworn.)

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Okay. Are there any other parents, residents, property holders, or anyone else who has anything to say to the commission or to the ZBA with
regard to this project? I see none.

We will therefore ask the applicant to respond and sum up.

MR. FREELAND: Thank you. Let me address a number of the issues that were raised. The R-4 zoning certainly is an issue.

We discussed with city staff what would be the appropriate zoning for this site. We agree that R-4 zoning is a transitional zoning district in Evanston. You have R-6 zoning on the other side of Ridge, you've got R-1 zoning to the west of this property. There is other R-4 zoning on the west side of Ridge.

R-4 zoning is a relatively, is a very, not a very dense zoning district. The number of units that could be permitted as a multi-family use on this site at a maximum would be something like 40 units. If you were to, and with respect to that if anyone were ever to propose something like that you would need other approvals at Evanston, there's a requirement for a planned development if anyone proposes more than 24 units on a site.

In addition, Roycemore has been in Evanston for close to 100 years. The purpose of this move is to stay in Evanston for another hundred years. So we
certainly don't want to even suggest that there's going
to be any other particular use of this site other than
the school.

However, in choosing the district to go into I
think you have to look at what is the appropriate and
most consistent zoning for that site. And Bill's not
here, we met with Bill, we met with Dennis Marino, I
don't want to speak for them, and maybe they'll speak to
this when this gets up to the council. But I believe
they will suggest that R-1 zoning would not be an
appropriate zoning for the site.

In addition, I agree with Robert Miller's
points that you could approve variations and a special
use for this in an R-1, but you'd have to approve more
variations in an R-1. And part of the balance here is
to pick a zoning district which sort of creates the
minimum amount of zoning variations and changes that are
necessary. And really, we think R-4 fits that bill, so
we're very satisfied with that as the appropriate zoning
district.

With respect to parking and traffic, first of
all, we stand by Neil's testimony and his report.
There's going to be adequate room on site for stacking.
Under the current Zoning Ordinance the required parking
for our use with the number of employees we have, and
with the number of students we have, even at a 350
student school is 35 parking spaces. We have 75 parking
spaces at this site, we are over-parked at this site.
There is, again, we stand by the testimony of
Neil and his, and his traffic report that there will be
no adverse impact to the community.
And finally, just with respect to the Historic
District designation, we did meet and talk with Carlos
Ruiz who is the Historic Preservation Coordinator for
the city. This site is actually outside of the Evanston
Historic District, it doesn't, it's not part of that
district. So both the building is not an historic
building and the site itself is not within the historic
district.
Unless you have questions I don't think I have
anything further.
CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Any other questions from
commissioners or board members? Robin?
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I just have a
short comment for the neighbors, because we at the Plan
Commission and particularly myself as part of the Rules
Committee is working on the prospective of the Plan
Commission making things easier for residents. And
having been, before I was here, having been on the other side I'm particularly sensitive to some of the issues.

And so, if you'd like to get on the zoning e-mail list if you just give your name to Tracy Norfleet, right there in the green sweater, she'll add your e-mail to it and you'll get notice of the, actually it will be once a month notice of the zoning meetings, they're interesting to look at anyway.

Also, online there's a place in the city's website where you can also get on the preservation e-mail list, I'm particularly interested in that myself. But also for P&D, Planning & Development, where this case will go next, you probably definitely want to be on that mailing list as well. So Tracy can either show you how to do it or help you in some way.

The other thing is, in addition to all of these, this really useful binder that we get there's one at the main library on the second floor and then also in the zoning office. The main library is easier because it's open on the weekends, you can look at it, you can photocopy it easily. But those are two sites where that's accessible.

That's all I wanted to add.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Freeman?
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes, I have a question for Mr. Freeland, but first I would like to say I think it's a tremendous use of the property. I live in the neighborhood, I do share the concerns of the neighbors, okay. But I do think it's a wonderful use of the property.

So if we moved ahead with an R-1 zoning I'm assuming you would still be interested in this property?

MR. FREELAND: Well, we would, though, again, I don't know that we, number one, want to fight with your staff about that. Or --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: That's for us. So the question --

MR. FREELAND: I understand. The other concern that I'd have is it would, I believe, require that we would have to start our process again.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Which process again?

MR. FREELAND: This process, which I think would be a hardship to us because we would be required to apply for different variations with respect to the site. The site coverage is different in the R-1 District, the height is different in the R-1 District. We actually comply currently with the, with the gym that we're adding with the R-4 height.
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: But isn't the gym the
same height as the rest of the building?

MR. FREELAND: It is, but it wouldn't be non-
conforming because it wouldn't be legally non-conforming
because it's a new structure. The rest of the building,
there are portions of the building that currently along
Ridge are taller than would be permitted in an R-4.

We were not required to request a variation
for that because that's an existing non-conforming use,
so the building exists. But our gym would require a
variation for its height, I believe.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Okay. So putting aside
those objections, if you didn't have to reapply would
you still move forward with this property it was made a
R-1 District?

MR. FREELAND: I guess I haven't discussed it
with my client. I don't know that it would be, I don't
know that that would necessarily be a problem. But --

COMMISSIONER WILSON: I note from the real
estate sale contract that you've, it's at least been
contemplated that the ordinance would provide for
reversion in event the transaction doesn't close. So I
assume that that wouldn't be a problem having that as a
condition?
MR. FREELAND: Absolutely not, no.

COMMISSIONER WILSON: Right. So in other words, for the benefit of everybody else, if they don't close the transaction it wouldn't stay at whatever it's re-mapped at.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: But if they, yes, could you say that again?

COMMISSIONER WILSON: Well, the real estate sale contract contemplates the possibility that the ordinance that the City Council might ultimately adopt would include a reversion provision that in the event that they don't close the transaction and undertake the building of the school that the zoning would revert back to its current zoning.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: However, if they did go forward and things and say for five years it was the Roycemore School under R-4, et cetera, and then something were to happen, again, I'm not suggesting it, I just, we have to think in these terms because we're thinking always 20 years out, or 50 years out, then it would remain R-4 at that point.

COMMISSIONER WILSON: Unless the City Council made some sort of unusual type of reversion provision. But, yes, under ordinary circumstances I think it would
stay R-4.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: There's been some legal battles about reverting zoning after the fact.

COMMISSIONER WILSON: Right.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Any other questions or comments from board members? Anything else from the applicant?

MR. FREELAND: No, thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: All right. It's 10 minutes to 10:00 and it's unrealistic to think that we could hold our deliberations and make our required findings still within this calendar day. And we do have, as I mentioned, another agenda to deal with before we all turn into pumpkins.

Looking at Section 6-3-4-8 of the Zoning Ordinance that I mentioned at the beginning of this joint hearing, it says that at the conclusion of the public hearing each reviewing body shall forward its recommendation to the City Council within the maximum of 30 calendar days.

It strikes me that in order to make sure that we comply with that that I'm going to suggest, unless you all rise up and lynch me, that, which is quite possible, that we continue this hearing until the day of
the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Plan Commission, which I believe is on December 10. So I'm available on that day, are my colleagues on the ZBA?

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: I am not.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: So we lose Ms. Summers.

COMMISSIONER WILSON: Would it be required that we conduct the deliberations jointly, or could each body conduct their deliberations independently as we would ordinarily do?

COMMISSIONER WOODS: It requires that it be together, but I think there might be some benefit to it.

COMMISSIONER WILSON: I agree.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Wait, Jim --

COMMISSIONER WILSON: I definitely agree with that. I'm concerned about logistics, whether --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Jim, we also have a pretty full schedule. We've already told the applicant that night to come an hour later from our normal 7:00 start to talk about a different school re-zoning.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: If we don't conclude it tonight, no not that, if we don't conclude the meeting then could we continue to January and then, 30 days is at the point at which we --
CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Right, we don't, if I get your point, Robin, yes, if we continue this another date then the clock doesn't start to run on our 30 days. That's what we're saying, that's the way we've interpreted, Jim and I just looked at the ordinance. So we need to continue this to another day.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Are we able to get onto another Plan Commission day or do we want to look at Zoning days?

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Our next zoning day is December 16, which is a Tuesday. We need you. All right. That gets us into January.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: When do you guys meet in January?

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Our next January meeting is the 6th, a Tuesday, our next meeting in January is January 6th. How about the 14th?

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Of January?

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: For ZBA people? That's okay with me.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Yes, it looks okay.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Well, subject to change, with notice and reason, let's look at the 14th, Wednesday the 14th to continue this without concluding
it at, when do you folks normally meet?

COMMISSIONER WOODS:  7:00.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER:  7:00?

MR. FREELAND:  What month are we talking?  I'm sorry, I was --

CHAIRMAN CREAMER:  January 2009.

MR. FREELAND:  If I could, we would, we understand the benefit of potentially you deliberating together, though frankly you really aren't going to deliberate together with respect to the various issues. Certainly the ZBA Members won't comment on the re-zoning in the deliberation and vice versa. If, to the extent, well --

CHAIRMAN CREAMER:  That may or may not be the case.

MR. FREELAND:  Well, I mean, I actually don't know that that isn't the case. I think that we're appearing before you in a joint meeting, but the ZBA is hearing a variation and a special use, and the Plan Commission's hearing a re-zoning, and that's what your recommendations will be with respect to. If we were able to get before each of you at a December meeting we would much prefer that than to wait until January for a joint meeting.
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: We just have a full schedule for our December meeting, we just can't do it, I think.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Our problem, sir, is that we just checked here and we can't do this in December. I would love to accommodate you and move this along, but it can't happen. Unless you want us to say no know, which I don't think you do, well, they can't do it on the 16th.

MR. FREELAND: Again, my suggestion being that you would each do it at your next regularly scheduled meeting.

COMMISSIONER OPDYKE: But that's what we're point out is that we have a full agenda --

MR. FREELAND: Right, exactly, and I understand that. So, all right, thanks.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: I really think the best thing for you is to let us go forward on January 14th.

COMMISSIONER OPDYKE: Mr. Creamer, may I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER OPDYKE: Would it help you, Mr. Freeland, if the members presently assembled expressed their inclination at this, tonight?
MR. FREELAND: No, let's not go there yet.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Assuming they're willing, I don't want to do that, Stu.

COMMISSIONER OPDYKE: All right.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Or I won't do it.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Can I make a request? I just, I think there's the neighbors, and I think some of us have said we sort of have an issue with this driveway and the circulation, and how that's going to move.

I think I haven't heard any huge, you know, sort of reaction that this is not a good project. I just think there's way too much confusion about the circulation of this. And really sitting down with the City and talking about what's going to happen with Grove and how that's going to work.

And I think if you, when we came back altogether in January, if we could see and really understand this. And maybe that means go look at some of the other schools in Evanston, like, look at Lincoln, look at Dewey, look at, I mean, even look at the middle schools because you get larger enrollment areas and you get more people driving. Look at Nichols, look, you know, the places that are a little bit bigger and that I think most of us are more familiar with. Tell us about
what those circulations are like.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes, they change, they make Wesley a one-way during school hours. So you can't, you can only go, I believe it is, north on Wesley. So there are things that the City does to control traffic around these schools.

My children go to Dewey. So, and that has about 300 and something students, about 380 students. So perhaps this is something we can also --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Maybe even Haven, I mean, Haven's off of Green Bay, so tell me what happens there and how they deal with that, and how many cars come through there because --

COMMISSIONER WILSON: Well, and the record's not closed, correct?

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Well, we did declare it closed, but if the applicant has some additional information about any of these issues, particularly parking, I would imagine we would favorably react to a motion to re-open the record.

COMMISSIONER WILSON: All right. And I think what might be helpful for me would be if you took one of your site plans and maybe did an aero diagram of how the circulation would actually work in practice, I think
that would be helpful.

I think what I've done in just looking at this is, you know, making little arrows on how I think people are going to drive. But, you know, how you're going to designate and sign that, you know, by way of painting, or signs, whatever it is, how you're going to direct the traffic flow and the circulation on that.

I think that would be helpful for everybody, the neighbors and ourselves included.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Especially since the neighbors have all said they think the project's a great project, right. We've not heard any objection from the neighbors on the project. So it's, you know, specifically around traffic.

I'm sorry? Yes, one, sorry, that's correct, one.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: So I think we've given you some subtle hints. And I can have a motion now to adjourn and continue this matter to a date certain, namely Wednesday, January 14 at 7:00 p.m.?

COMMISSIONER WILSON: So moved.

COMMISSIONER SUMMERS: Second.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Okay. It's been moved and seconded. Any further discussion? All in favor say
aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: None opposed. We'll see you in January.

MR. FREELAND: Thank you. We'll look forward to it.

CHAIRMAN CREAMER: Thank you.

(Whereupon, the hearing on the above-titled cause was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.)