



Melissa Klotz <mklotz@cityofevanston.org>

## Land Use Commission Public Comment

1 message

noreply@formstack.com <noreply@formstack.com>

Sun, Jun 19, 2022 at 9:18 AM

Reply-To: noreply@formstack.com

To: mmjones@cityofevanston.org, kashbaugh@cityofevanston.org, mklotz@cityofevanston.org



### Formstack Submission For: **Land Use Commission Public Comment**

Submitted at 06/19/22 10:18 AM

**Name:** Amy Hauenstein

**Address of Residence:** [3507 Central St Evanston IL 60201](#)

**Phone:** (440) 488-6902

**How would you like to make your public comment?:** Written (see below)

**Provide Written Comment Here:** While I do not begrudge anyone making profit, yet by code of standards - I prioritize people and planet.  
The request for special use for planned development of [3434 Central Street](#) (Case #22PLND-0012) certainly centers profit.

We live directly across the street (on Central) and this development will change our lives. Our two young children are often in our front yard, ride their bikes in the street - as there are no side walks, no bike lanes - and we walk our dog multiple times a day. All of this will create more traffic, changes ecosystems and habitats, and become dangerous (as proposed) for our children and pets in this residential area.

The Crawford/Gross Point/Central intersection is already dangerous. Adding this level of daily traffic will impede the safety of all - those in cars, on foot, and on bikes.

This area is one of the few lower-middle-income residential neighborhoods in north Evanston and we love it here. We have invested in our house and our

neighborhood. This type of development, as planned, will change the neighborhood 1. safety, 2. ecosystem sustainability, and 3. aesthetic dramatically and we do not have the means to move nor do we want to. Please reconsider these requests and scale them appropriate for a neighborhood (along Central St) like ours.

**Agenda Item (or comment on item not on the agenda):**

Case #22PLND-0012

**Position on Agenda Item:**

Opposed

Copyright © 2022 Formstack, LLC. All rights reserved. This is a customer service email.

Formstack, [11671 Lantern Road, Suite 300, Fishers, IN 46038](https://www.formstack.com)



Meagan Jones <mmjones@cityofevanston.org>

## Land Use Commission Public Comment

noreply@formstack.com <noreply@formstack.com>

Wed, Jun 22, 2022 at 4:13 PM

Reply-To: noreply@formstack.com

To: mmjones@cityofevanston.org, kashbaugh@cityofevanston.org, mklotz@cityofevanston.org



### Formstack Submission For: Land Use Commission Public Comment

Submitted at 06/22/22 5:13 PM

**Name:** Mary Drotar

**Address of Residence:** 3521 Central St.

**Phone:** (708) 829-7470

**How would you like to make your public comment?:** Written (see below)

**Provide Written Comment Here:** We understand that iDOT did not yet approve the ingress/egress on Gross Point Road for the Kensington project. Do we have an idea when iDot will make this determination? And how will it be communicated to the neighborhood?

Shouldn't this meeting be postponed until this is determined since this will have a significant impact on the project?

**Agenda Item (or comment on item not on the agenda):** iDOT and the Impact to the Kensington Project

**Position on Agenda Item:** In Favor



[Quoted text hidden]



Melissa Klotz <mklotz@cityofevanston.org>

## Land Use Commission Public Comment

1 message

noreply@formstack.com <noreply@formstack.com>

Sun, Jun 19, 2022 at 9:25 AM

Reply-To: noreply@formstack.com

To: mmjones@cityofevanston.org, kashbaugh@cityofevanston.org, mklotz@cityofevanston.org



### Formstack Submission For: Land Use Commission Public Comment

Submitted at 06/19/22 10:25 AM

**Name:** Jason Gocek

**Address of Residence:** 3507 Central St

**Phone:** (773) 401-7257

**How would you like to make your public comment?:** Written (see below)

**Provide Written Comment Here:**  
I vehemently oppose the special use for planned development (Case #22PLND-0012). As proposed this will impact the safety of my children, reduce the value of my property by changing the residential zoned neighborhood into a business campus. I live directly across the street and my children and pets will be in danger given the exponential increase of traffic flow - not to mention the impact of this concrete jungle on the plants and animals of the area. Evanston is supposed to care about people and sustainability. This plan does not. My family will bear the burden of this over-development one of the most. Please do not approve this plan.

**Agenda Item (or comment on item not on the agenda):** Case #22PLND-0012

**Position on  
Agenda  
Item:**

Opposed

Copyright © 2022 Formstack, LLC. All rights reserved. This is a customer service email.  
Formstack, [11671 Lantern Road, Suite 300, Fishers, IN 46038](#)



Melissa Klotz <mklotz@cityofevanston.org>

## Land Use Commission Public Comment

1 message

noreply@formstack.com <noreply@formstack.com>

Sun, Jun 19, 2022 at 9:18 AM

Reply-To: noreply@formstack.com

To: mmjones@cityofevanston.org, kashbaugh@cityofevanston.org, mklotz@cityofevanston.org



### Formstack Submission For: **Land Use Commission Public Comment**

Submitted at 06/19/22 10:18 AM

**Name:** Amy Hauenstein

**Address of Residence:** [3507 Central St Evanston IL 60201](#)

**Phone:** (440) 488-6902

**How would you like to make your public comment?:** Written (see below)

**Provide Written Comment Here:** While I do not begrudge anyone making profit, yet by code of standards - I prioritize people and planet.  
The request for special use for planned development of [3434 Central Street](#) (Case #22PLND-0012) certainly centers profit.

We live directly across the street (on Central) and this development will change our lives. Our two young children are often in our front yard, ride their bikes in the street - as there are no side walks, no bike lanes - and we walk our dog multiple times a day. All of this will create more traffic, changes ecosystems and habitats, and become dangerous (as proposed) for our children and pets in this residential area.

The Crawford/Gross Point/Central intersection is already dangerous. Adding this level of daily traffic will impede the safety of all - those in cars, on foot, and on bikes.

This area is one of the few lower-middle-income residential neighborhoods in north Evanston and we love it here. We have invested in our house and our

neighborhood. This type of development, as planned, will change the neighborhood 1. safety, 2. ecosystem sustainability, and 3. aesthetic dramatically and we do not have the means to move nor do we want to. Please reconsider these requests and scale them appropriate for a neighborhood (along Central St) like ours.

**Agenda Item (or comment on item not on the agenda):**

Case #22PLND-0012

**Position on Agenda Item:**

Opposed

Copyright © 2022 Formstack, LLC. All rights reserved. This is a customer service email.

Formstack, [11671 Lantern Road, Suite 300, Fishers, IN 46038](https://www.formstack.com)





Meagan Jones <mmjones@cityofevanston.org>

## Land Use Commission Public Comment

noreply@formstack.com <noreply@formstack.com>

Mon, Jun 20, 2022 at 3:40 PM

Reply-To: noreply@formstack.com

To: mmjones@cityofevanston.org, kashbaugh@cityofevanston.org, mklotz@cityofevanston.org



### Formstack Submission For: **Land Use Commission Public Comment**

Submitted at 06/20/22 4:40 PM

**Name:** Laura Mahoney

**Address of Residence:** Gross Point Road, Evanston

**Phone:**

**How would you like to make your public comment?:** Written (see below)

**Provide Written Comment Here:**  
I'm not confident that the special use and re-zoning request has been properly submitted and authorized by all parties with a legal interest in the matter. Further, due to the challenging nature of a rush-hour left turn off Gross Point Road (if, indeed, IDOT allows it), I think it may be highly likely that parents living to the south of the proposed day-care center/school would use Old Orchard Road to Princeton or Greeley, and then to Central, in order to approach the school from the north in order to make their daily drop-offs and pickups. This would add to the rush-hour congestion and potential safety issues already of concern at the intersection of Central and Gross Point roads.

**Agenda Item (or comment on item not on the agenda):** Planned Development | [3434 Central Street](#) | 22PLND-0012

**Position on** Opposed

**Agenda  
Item:**

[Quoted text hidden]



Michael Griffith &lt;mgriffith@cityofevanston.org&gt;

## Re: Non-Compliance by Design and Project Review Committee with Evanston ordinance, rules, regulations, procedures: re Special Use Applications re 3434 Central Street: tomorrow night's hearing

1 message

**Brian Mahoney** <brianmahoneyjd@gmail.com>

To: Nicholas Cummings <ncummings@cityofevanston.org>, tsuffredin@cityofevanston.org, Michael Griffith <mgriffith@cityofevanston.org>, mmjones@cityofevanston.org, Melissa Klotz <mklotz@cityofevanston.org>, aruggie@cityofevanston.org

I will be submitting public comments and attending the Land Use Commission Meeting tomorrow, but wanted to write today to address:

- 1) The application is still improper due to the failure to identify and have signatures from all easement holders: the City knows about the easements: it's a major part of the potential sale contract
- 2) The Applicant does not have a legal or equitable interest in the subject property: the applicant is a party to an executory contract; at the time the application was submitted and as of today -provided any legal authority that suggests the applicant has the rights and status for a valid application--the fact the part of the form that allows for agents/designees was left blank and "not a
- 3) Several of the easement holders did not receive a mailing providing notice of this hearing as required by Evanston Ordinance 6-3-57(c): "Mailed Notices Required: The City will provide inclusive of public roads, streets, alleys and other public ways whose addresses appear on the current tax assessment list as provided by the City." Did the City attempt to c

I ask that the procedural issues--which moot any substantive discussion--be addressed before any other issues are addressed.

Again, I feel the City is forcing me to resort to litigation in light of this disregard (which appears to possibly be willful) to comply with controlling Evanston law.

Sincerely,  
Brian Mahoney

630-732-1945

On Thu, May 12, 2022 at 6:21 PM Brian Mahoney <brianmahoneyjd@gmail.com> wrote:

Mr. Cummings,

Thank you for the reply.

But I'm disappointed you:

- 1) Haven't followed up on your comment:

"You raise a valid point however with respect to the application not being signed by those who hold easements. The Law Department is not a part of the DAPR process, so we will need to i

Thank you for agreeing that the point is valid. Did the Law Department in fact investigate the issue? If so, what did that investigation show?

- 2) Haven't cited a single case or statute which would support a view that the Land Use Commission can proceed on an application that clearly does not comply with Evanston ordinances a

Yet again, I ask that you provide any case or statutory authority that you believe supports the Land Use Commission allowing this application to proceed.

I think it's fair to say most people would interpret your unwillingness to provide any such authority as a sign this is no such authority.

3) you referenced Evanston regulations that allow a property owners to appoint a designee or agent for purposes of pursuing a special use application but (1) failed to respond at all when I understand or acknowledge that the very existence of this regulation is in conflict with your view developers who don't hold title but are merely a party to an executory real estate contract he makes sense for non-owner developers, and it only make sense because they are not otherwise authorized to pursue special use applications. There'd be no need for a party with a recogr regulation addresses--as did your statement about this feature--the manner in which a developer can pursue a special use application. Had the property owner filed a special use applicatic

- 4) your refusal to further engage.

At this point I feel forced by the City to seriously consider judicial intervention. I will ask for attorneys' fees, costs, and compensation to the Estate, in large part based on the Law Departme the Law Department's failure to cite a single case or statute to support the City's decision to proceed with this application.

Further, I do not believe the City or its employees enjoy any immunity in this matter. First, this matter would not result in a tort claim by the easement holders so Illinois's Tort Immunity Act v employees to prosecute this special use application. (See 745 ILCS10/2-104. If the court agrees that the developer is not included within the plain language of the ordinance then goodbye governmental immunity; and 2) elaborated on the broad definition of a "taking" under Illinois law. Any "taking" by the City here will result in litigation, and any employee that acts contrary to

Aldersperson Suffredin,

- 1) I called you, I communicated with you via email: will you agree to talk with me?

- 2) I understand you are an attorney: do you have any thoughts on this matter?

Thank you,  
Brian Mahoney

630-732-1945

On Mon, May 9, 2022 at 5:02 PM Nicholas Cummings <ncummings@cityofevanston.org> wrote:

Mr. Mahoney,

I've responded to your previous emails to gather the necessary information to advise City staff. I will not engage in a debate via email on a matter that will be decided by the Land Use Cc

Respectfully,

**Nicholas E. Cummings**  
Corporation Counsel  
Law Department  
Morton Civic Center

City of Evanston

2100 Ridge Ave | Evanston, IL 60201 | (847) 448 - 8094  
ncummings@cityofevanston.org | cityofevanston.org



2021 All-America City | 2021 What Works Cities Silver Certified

On Mon, May 9, 2022 at 4:26 PM Brian Mahoney <brianmahoneyjd@gmail.com> wrote:  
Dear Alderperson Suffredin and Mr. Cummings,

May I please get a response to my email? (It's been two weeks.)

Per Mr. Griffith the Land Use Commission may address this at its first meeting in June.

Thank you,  
Brian Mahoney

630-732-1945

On Mon, Apr 25, 2022 at 2:07 PM Brian Mahoney <brianmahoneyjd@gmail.com> wrote:

Gentlemen,

Good Afternoon.

I'm writing to follow up on this matter.

First, Mr. Griffith, will the Land Use Commission be addressing this applica  
convenience. Thanks.

Second, Mr. Cummings, I wanted to address several issues:

1) Has the Law Department researched the issue of Evanston's regulatio  
application?"? The regulation reads: "All persons or parties which [sic] ha  
sign the application." As you know, easement rights are a special (admitt  
undr Illinois law. Further, the easement rights are indisputably equitable ri  
dispute on this issue: the easement holders were not identified and none :

2) With regard to the issue you raised regarding parties' rights to use des  
sections in the application form for this project where any designee or age  
computer screen it appears someone marked up "does not apply" on the 1  
trust you now agree the question of designees or agents is not applicable  
believe this issue has potential applicability here.

3) While issue 1) above is dispositive to show non-compliance in the app  
issue of a putative equitable right on the part of the developer in the conte  
Supreme Court (citing earlier supporting authority) clearly and unequivoca

It is definitely established by decisions of this court that the vendee under property covered by the contract. (*Budelman v. American Ins. Co.* 297 Ill. Ins. Co. v. *Caldwell*, 187 id. 73; *Langlois v. Stewart*, 156 id. 609; *Chappe*, 247 (Ill. Sup. Ct. 1925) *Capps* held that a buyer (vendee) with an executor sufficient to obtain property insurance. More recently, a federal judge re law and precedent to again deny an insurance claim of the buyer to an ex (S.D. Ill. 2007) once again denied the assertion by a buyer to an executor equitable--to be entitled to purchase property insurance. Solely in the co beneficiaries) Illinois has recognized limited property rights, but only as (1962), addressed only a dispute among the contracting parties and bene parties and those claiming through them." *Id.* at 449. The Supreme Cour of the seller and we concern ourselves in this opinion only with that issue among the contracting parties and their beneficiaries. Illinois's limited a the parties, and only to allow equitable remedies such as partition and sp solely contractual in nature and "at law" and therefore can typically only l

Finally, while the seller here is tax exempt, if the seller paid taxes which e between the execution of the contract and the recording of a deed transfe purposes prior to recordation of title transfer. Evanston could not pursu have equitable or legal rights cognizable by the City pursuant to Illinois l; taxes because he doesn't have interests in the property sufficient to creat forth in the zoning ordinance at issue.

Please let me know of any legal authority the City is relying on in this ma

Finally, Alderperson Suffredin, further to the voicemail I left you last wee and my concerns/issues relating thereto.

Thank you,  
Brian Mahoney

630-732-1945

On Tue, Apr 19, 2022 at 5:40 PM Brian Mahoney <brianmahoneyjd@gmail.com> wrote:  
sorry: it send while still typing

On the Disclosure Statement addressing designees the words "Does not apply" appear to be marked: looking at it on a computer screen PDF it appears someone drew a rectangle  
Please check the original and then please let me know if you have a different understanding.

Thanks,  
Brian

630-732-1945

On Tue, Apr 19, 2022 at 2:30 PM Nicholas Cummings <ncummings@cityofevanston.org> wrote:  
Your logic presumes a conflict between the buyer and purchaser rather than a third party and the purchaser. Nevertheless, do you have anything to suggest that the seller in this

The Property Owner(s) may, at their discretion, designate another person as Applicant to act on their behalf in processing this application. In that case, the designated Applicant

Respectfully,

**Nicholas E. Cummings**  
**Corporation Counsel**  
 Law Department  
 Morton Civic Center  
 City of Evanston

2100 Ridge Ave | Evanston, IL 60201 | (847) 448 - 8094  
[ncummings@cityofevanston.org](mailto:ncummings@cityofevanston.org) | [cityofevanston.org](http://cityofevanston.org)



2021 All-America City | 2021 What Works Cities Silver Certified

On Tue, Apr 19, 2022 at 11:34 AM Brian Mahoney <[brianmahoneyjd@gmail.com](mailto:brianmahoneyjd@gmail.com)> wrote:  
 Mr. Cummings:

Please consider this way of looking at the issue of the nature of the developer's interests in the subject property.

Imagine a dispute arose between the developer and the church and the parties wound up in court.

If the developer asserted it had a claim premised on equity and sought to call upon the court's equitable powers the court would indisputably rebuff that analysis. The court w

Turning to a legal claim, the court would similarly reject any claim by the developer that it has a title interest in the property or that it could properly state a property damage or potential claims the developer could make against the church at this time. The court would view any dispute between the two are governed by the contract--as simply and onl

Respectfully,  
 Brian Mahoney

630-732-1945

On Mon, Apr 18, 2022 at 10:01 PM Brian Mahoney <[brianmahoneyjd@gmail.com](mailto:brianmahoneyjd@gmail.com)> wrote:  
 Mr. Cummings,

Thanks again for another quick response: much appreciated.

With respect, your reference to "client's" is not correct: my sister, long-time Evanston resident Kate Mahoney, named me Executor of her estate: I do not have clients: I repre

With respect, contractual rights and equitable rights are quite different. Some jurisdictions divide their courts into those that handle equitable claims and those that handle le contractual claims) used the maxim "never the twain shall meet" to clarify that legal claims (most definitely those stemming from a contract) are absolutely NOT claims soun

Here, the developer has no equitable claim--no adverse possession, no right by consent or use of prescription. The application makes clear he has no title, but is instead a

At this time the applicant's rights are only contractual, and only against the seller. He cannot state any count or cause of action sounding in equity.

I'm not aware of any case, or statute, or any law that deems a party to an executory real estate contract with contingencies to have legally cognizable equitable rights under

If this is no case or other authority then the City is disregarding a clearly worded ordinance without any legal grounds.

It's certainly true that people have interests, but not the interests used in the statute: the precise legal term of "equitable interest" means an interest that can be enforced by Department's overly broad interpretation of "equitable interests"--so clearly at odds with the context and meaning of the ordinance.

Finally, with regard to your "precedent" argument:

- 1) your point assumes the City will prevail, which seems a bit cavalier since I don't believe the Law Department can cite a single case to support its broad definition of what f
- 2) I couldn't care less about precedent. The odds I'll be an executor dealing with a strong easement in the face of behavior like the neighbor-seller, the buyer-developer, and
- 3) the City should be very concerned about precedent. What if there is litigation and we're assigned a judge who believes statutes "mean what they say and say what they and is inclined to make the City follow the law to the letter? What if Evanston supporting a pre-school for wealthy parents doesn't make sense to her in the context of Evans

Thanks,  
 Brian

630-732-1945

On Mon, Apr 18, 2022 at 7:04 PM Nicholas Cummings <[ncummings@cityofevanston.org](mailto:ncummings@cityofevanston.org)> wrote:

I certainly understand your concerns and needs to protect your client's interests and understand you will do what you feel is necessary, including litigation, to protect those

As far as the City's historical and continuing interpretation that contracts for the purchase of real property are an equitable property interest, as you know equitable interes the purchase price to secure the transaction, the buyer has an equitable interest in the property and the seller has an equitable interest in the promised purchase money. will only lead to this principle being reinforced by a court, since equitable interests are only enforced by courts.

Respectfully,

**Nicholas E. Cummings**  
**Corporation Counsel**

Law Department  
Morton Civic Center  
City of Evanston

2100 Ridge Ave | Evanston, IL 60201 | (847) 448 - 8094  
ncummings@cityofevanston.org | cityofevanston.org



2021 All-America City | 2021 What Works Cities Silver Certified

On Mon, Apr 18, 2022 at 6:37 PM Brian Mahoney <brianmahoneyjd@gmail.com> wrote:  
Mr. Cummings,

Thank you very much for the quick response.

I very much appreciate your comments about the easement holders being integral to any special use application as set forth in Evanston's rules.

I also appreciate your commitment to advise the Land Use Commission and City staff with regard to this matter. I read the Ordinance and the rule/regulation/procedure

With regard to your first point, however, I have several questions: First, you agree the City and its employees are bound by the Ordinance and its specific language, right authority you believe supports such a position? Third, doesn't the Law Department's interpretation render the Ordinance a nullity, mere surplusage? As you well know, opining that the ordinance can be ignored because compliance is somehow impossible is it? If so, on what authority? Fifth, the Law Department hasn't/isn't opining the doctrine would justify rendering the ordinance null and void--mere words with no import? Is there any legal authority that would support such a position?

Thank you for your time and consideration of this matter.

I truly and vehemently want to resolve this matter without resort to litigation (for myriad reasons) but as Executor will feel duty bound (due to the extremely deleterious it development.

Further still, in the unfortunate circumstance the Estate feels compelled to sue I will seek an award of attorneys' fees because as I understand it as of now (and I will see contra to the City's interpretation.

Thank you,  
Sincerely,  
Brian Mahoney

630-732-1945

On Mon, Apr 18, 2022 at 2:12 PM Nicholas Cummings <ncummings@cityofevanston.org> wrote:  
Mr. Mahoney,

Thank you for your email. First, the Law Department has always treated contracts for the purchase of real property to be an equitable interest in the property. Devel permits or other variances from the City, the sale becomes useless.

You raise a valid point however with respect to the application not being signed by those who hold easements. The Law Department is not a part of the DAPR proces

Lastly, your email asks something I don't believe this department has the authority to do--unilaterally invalidate something before a public body of the City. After the L authority to force our client(s) to take a particular action, especially a public body made up of residents appointed by the mayor and affirmed by the City Council.

Respectfully,

**Nicholas E. Cummings**  
**Corporation Counsel**  
Law Department  
Morton Civic Center  
City of Evanston

2100 Ridge Ave | Evanston, IL 60201 | (847) 448 - 8094  
ncummings@cityofevanston.org | cityofevanston.org



2021 All-America City | 2021 What Works Cities Silver Certified

On Sun, Apr 17, 2022 at 4:04 PM Brian Mahoney <brianmahoneyjd@gmail.com> wrote:  
Dear Brian and Alexandra,

Further to my discussion Thursday with Brian, I write to reiterate objections I made at the Design and Project Review ("DAPR") hearing on April 12th, to ask for Cor

**FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

An application for two special use approvals was submitted to DAPR concerning a proposed development of a private, for-profit child care/pre-school facility at 343

The applicant does not own the property at issue. The application specifically states the owner of the property is a church, and the contract for the proposed sale is

When I raised the issue of ownership interests of the subject property at the April 12th hearing the applicant had the opportunity to rebut my stated understanding t

A 12-unit Co-Op Housing complex abuts the subject property. The Co-Op and its shareholders, and each of them, hold recognized, perpetual easement rights. The contract--indeed they are a material term and contingency in the contract for the proposed sale, were brought to the attention of DAPR representative Mr. Griffith, a

At the April 12th hearing I informed the DAPR Committee of (at least) two procedural deficiencies discussed herein and the easement issue more broadly. The Co

**APPLICABLE CITY OF EVANSTON ORDINANCE, RULES, REGULATIONS, PROCEDURES**

The applicable Evanston Ordinance reads as follows:

**6-3-5-4. - INITIATION.**

An application for a special use permit may be filed with the Zoning Administrator by the owner or lessee of the subject property or other person having a l

**6-3-5-3. - AUTHORITY.**

The application form itself incorporates this Ordinance, and further specifies that all persons with property right in the subject property must sign the application:

2. Who can submit an application?

The applicant must either own, lease, or have legal or equitable interest in the subject property, or must be the representative of such a person. /

**DISCUSSION**

**1) The Applicant Was Not Entitled To Submit The Application Because He Did Not and Does Not Have a "Legal or Equitable" Interest in**

Ordinance 6-3-5-4 could not be clearer: only persons with a "legal or equitable interest in the subject property" may file an application with regard for proposed sale included in the application--that the applicant did not have a present, extant "legal or equitable interest in the subject property" contractual provisions regarding the easement rights of the Co-Op Shareholders. The application was therefore void *ab initio*.

Further still, at the DAPR Hearing I raised the issue of whether subsequent to the application the applicant acquired title in the subject property. Second, the obvious inference from the applicant's refusal to address this issue is that he does not today (never has, and did not have at the tim

**2) The Application Was Deficient On The Additional Grounds That It Did Not Comply With The Requirement That "All Persons" With O**

As you both will recall from your law school "Property" class, under Illinois law easements are indeed property rights, albeit circumscribed, that c meets the requirements to be recognized under Illinois law as implied, prescriptive, by necessity, and pursuant to pre-existing use. Further still, t other documents going back far in time. It is beyond peradventure that the Co-Op Shareholders have ownership interests in the property at law e

Pursuant to the Evanston-promulgated "Who can submit an application?" rule/regulation, the application is deficient and void *ab initio* on the add and did not sign the application, which therefore must be rejected

**CONCLUSION**

I respectfully ask the Office of the Corporation Counsel to rescind the Committee's vote of 4/12/22 on the matter; that the Office of Corporation C rejected.

I strongly and sincerely hope to resolve this matter with the Office of Corporation Counsel. I am loath to seek judicial intervention. But, please n on the value of those shares I will feel duty bound as a fiduciary for the beneficiaries of the Estate to seek a court ordering directing Evanston to

Further still, at the risk of addressing an issue prematurely, I wanted to alert the Office of the Corporation Counsel that any action with regard to t legal redress if any action the City of Evanston diminishes the value of the Estate.

Sincerely,

Brian Mahoney

630-732-1945

As Executor of the Estate of Catherine ("Kate") Mahoney





Meagan Jones <mmjones@cityofevanston.org>

Land Use Commission Public Comment

noreply@formstack.com <noreply@formstack.com>

Tue, Jun 21, 2022 at 3:41 PM

Reply-To: noreply@formstack.com

To: mmjones@cityofevanston.org, kashbaugh@cityofevanston.org, mklotz@cityofevanston.org



Formstack Submission For: Land Use Commission Public Comment

Submitted at 06/21/22 4:41 PM

**Name:** Brian Mahoney

**Address of Residence:** Executor of Catherine Mahoney Estate: [2538 Gross Point Road, Evanston 60201](#)

**Phone:** (630) 732-1945

**How would you like to make your public comment?:** In-person

**Provide Written Comment Here:**

**Agenda Item (or comment on item not on the agenda):** Kensington-Marlas special use application: I respectfully request that my procedural objections be heard first

**Position on Agenda Item:** Other: There is not a proper application before the Land Use Commission

[Quoted text hidden]