

1 CITY OF EVANSTON
2 ZONING COMMITTEE OF THE PLAN COMMISSION
3 CASE NO.: ZPC 07-05-M&T
4 RE: CENTRAL STREET ZONING REVIEW. To consider
5 amendments to Chapters 8, "Residential Districts," 9,
6 "Business Districts," 10, "Commercial Districts," 15,
7 "Special Purpose and Overlay Districts," 17,
8 "Landscaping and Screening," 18, "Definitions," 3,
9 "Implementation and Administration," 7, "Zoning
10 Districts and Map," and any other related sections of
11 the Zoning Ordinance.

12
13 Transcribed Report of Proceedings of a public
14 hearing on the above captioned matter, held October 3,
15 2007 at the Village Hall of Evanston, 2100 Ridge Avenue,
16 2nd Floor, Evanston, Illinois, at 7:05 p.m. and presided
17 over by J. Woods, Chair.

18

19 PRESENT:

20 J. WOODS, Chair

21 B. CREAMER

22 A. JACKSON

23 B. DUNKLEY

1 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. And I'm going to turn
2 it over to Bill, so.

3 MR. DUNKLEY: Good evening, everyone. This is
4 our second --

5 MS. JACKSON: Are we going to start with this
6 or are we going to start with --

7 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes, that's --

8 MS. JACKSON: Okay.

9 MR. DUNKLEY: And I'm going to immediately
10 turn it over to Arlova. We have a somewhat different
11 item on the agenda to start off with. We'd like to talk
12 about solar panels. And, so as to break things up, I'm
13 going to turn it over to Arlova and she's going to
14 introduce the issue.

15 MS. JACKSON: Maybe a year and-a-half ago the
16 Environment Board submitted text amendment to update and
17 substantially beef up our regulation of solar panels.
18 We held four public hearings at the Zoning Committee
19 from March through May. The full Plan Commission made a
20 recommendation at its June meeting. A draft ordinance
21 was presented to the Planning and Development Committee
22 and City Council in August of last year.

23 At the following meeting several citizens came

1 out and spoke against the proposed text amendment. Most
2 of their concerns were that the regulations were too
3 focused on aesthetics and appearance and not meeting the
4 goals of environmental sustainability. So the Council
5 held the items and referred it back to the Planning and
6 Development Committee.

7 At a November meeting of that Committee, Len
8 Sciarra of the Environment Board presented on the topic,
9 summarizing the process to date, the current text
10 language, and some concerns that the Board still had
11 with the proposed text changes. He also made some
12 suggestions as how the regulations could be changed.
13 So in the packet for this meeting I included a copy of
14 the draft ordinance, a copy of the Power Point slides
15 that were presented at that meeting, the minutes of both
16 the Committee meeting and City Council, and just a brief
17 overview of where we are.

18 At the end of that meeting the Planning and
19 Development Committee felt that, based on the concerns
20 raised by the Environment Board and other citizens, that
21 they weren't ready to act on the proposed text changes.

22 And they sent it back to the Zoning Committee for
23 further discussion. So that's why we're here today and

1 talking about it again.

2 I'm going to actually turn it over to Len to
3 summarize or, you know, discuss the changes that we
4 could hopefully agree upon.

5 MR. SCIARRA: All right, so, I guess we'll, I
6 mean, how should we proceed? I mean, there's a couple,
7 I mean, obviously there's some stuff we could strike or
8 add or, I mean, I don't know. I mean, I think the
9 problem with last time, that, you know, there was a
10 little bit of concern that, of aesthetics, like you
11 said.

12 And when the City Council got it they were
13 like, you know, aesthetics is sort of subjective. And
14 you know, some people might like looking at solar
15 panels, some people might not. And so that's sort of a,
16 you know, how do you guys want to deal with that?

17 I mean, ultimately, you know, if the
18 Environment Board had their say, we would say, hey, put
19 solar panels anywhere. And they should be subject to
20 accessory structures. And you know, and they're short.
21 You can put them on the front of the house or on the
22 back of the house.

23 MS. JACKSON: Well, looking at your slides,

1 you had specific changes that were proposed. But there
2 wasn't any supporting text. So I don't know if you
3 were --

4 MR. SCIARRA: Well, I mean, I was just looking
5 through striking out, you know, thinking what we would,
6 we would change there.

7 MS. JACKSON: Okay.

8 MR. SCIARRA: I mean, really, like here.
9 Let's just, you guys have the text --

10 MS. JACKSON: Yes.

11 MR. SCIARRA: -- that has the strikeouts and
12 the underlines. Who do we have on the Committee,
13 though? Last time they asked who it was and I, you guys
14 don't have any name tags. So I have no idea who I'm
15 responding to. So who's on the Committee now?

16 MS. JACKSON: I really, just --

17 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Who's on the Committee now?

18 MR. SCIARRA: Or just what you, what do you
19 have for names? Just so that I have a record of --

20 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Jim Woods.

21 MR. SCIARRA: Jim, okay.

22 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Chair, Planning Commission.

23 MR. SCIARRA: All right.

1 MR. CREAMER: And I'm Bob Creamer,
2 C-r-e-a-m-e-r, from the Zoning Board.

3 MR. SCIARRA: Okay.

4 MR. DUNKLEY: I'm Bill Dunkley, the Zoning
5 Administrator. I'm not technically on the Committee.

6 MR. SCIARRA: So what I was thinking is, I was
7 just looking at this right now. I think everything's
8 pretty good up to page six. So that would be Section --

9 MS. JACKSON: C?

10 MR. SCIARRA: 6-4, 6-4-6-8, Special
11 Regulations, C, yes, C, yards. Okay, so, the first
12 thing is, item C1: Solar collectors must be set back a
13 minimum of five feet from the principal facade. The
14 slope for the -- buildings and -- beyond the hip rafter
15 of -- building closer, may be located closer to the
16 front of the facade of the -- building if they are not
17 visible from the street at the front property line.

18 So what I was thinking, we'd just say --

19 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Slow down, slow down, slow
20 down.

21 MR. SCIARRA: Yes. It's --

22 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Say that again. Where is
23 this?

1 MR. SCIARRA: It's this -- one that's, this
2 one should be set back. And it's the C1, I think.

3 CHAIRMAN WOODS: 6-4-6-8-C --

4 MR. SCIARRA: One.

5 CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- one, okay.

6 MR. SCIARRA: Yards, yards. So maybe we
7 modify that to say something like, flush with the, flush
8 with the principle facade. And then call it a day.

9 What I was just thinking now, how do we treat,
10 like, porches and stoops? Because you may, there may be
11 instances where they would have a solar collector that
12 would form an awning off of a building. But if your
13 building is already, you know, if you're in your front
14 yard setback, like how you treat like an awning or
15 something that's sticking out from the building as part
16 of that front yard setback. So that will be the only
17 issue that we have to figure out what to do if we had
18 like a solar collector that was sort of sticking out
19 from your building.

20 MS. JACKSON: Shouldn't it really be, can it
21 extend within 10 percent of the required yard?

22 MR. SCIARRA: Front yard, -- yard setback?

23 MS. JACKSON: Yes.

1 MR. SCIARRA: So I mean, that's the only thing
2 I can think of is, that's not too likely, really. But,
3 I mean, it's something we should probably, and so
4 basically strike all that, not visible from the street.

5 So something like either, flush with the principal
6 facade or, I think people would even be okay, three feet
7 back from the principal facade, or something like that.

8 So, that's the first thing.

9 Then the next thing we would change would be
10 on D, item D.

11 MR. CREAMER: Could you walk us through that a
12 little more slowly? Those of us who don't have this
13 memorized.

14 MR. SCIARRA: So, okay, so --

15 MR. CREAMER: So how would you change
16 paragraph one?

17 MR. SCIARRA: I would strike the entire
18 paragraph and replace it with the text, flush with the
19 principal facade, or --

20 MS. JACKSON: Or --

21 MR. SCIARRA: -- was subject to provisions
22 of --

23 MS. JACKSON: Yard obstructions.

1 MR. SCIARRA: -- yard obstructions.

2 MS. JACKSON: But for side and rear, the
3 minimum three foot is acceptable.

4 MR. SCIARRA: I think that's probably a, --

5 MS. JACKSON: Okay.

6 MR. SCIARRA: -- not a bad, I think,
7 especially because houses are so close in Evanston.
8 It's probably a good thing to, sort of not encourage too
9 much junk to be stuck on peoples' houses, you know. He
10 said they wouldn't do any good anyway if you're, I mean,
11 if your solar --

12 MS. JACKSON: So close.

13 MR. SCIARRA: -- panels you need to see the
14 sun.

15 MS. JACKSON: Yes, yes.

16 MR. SCIARRA: All right, so, something like,
17 something to the tune of that. That's not the exact
18 words. But something to the tune that we would be --

19 MS. JACKSON: So basically just, they should
20 meet the --

21 MR. SCIARRA: You could really push it up to
22 the front of your building if you had to.

23 MS. JACKSON: Okay, but, would it be simpler

1 to say that they had to meet the yard requirements?

2 MR. SCIARRA: Yes. I mean, that's what
3 Seattle does.

4 MS. JACKSON: Okay.

5 MR. SCIARRA: So, I think maybe --

6 MS. JACKSON: But then for people, or for
7 properties with non-conforming setbacks, either they'd
8 have to push it back or --

9 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Let's say the house was set
10 back 40 feet from the street.

11 MS. JACKSON: They're going to put it 27 --

12 CHAIRMAN WOODS: There are places where that
13 happens. And you can put them, you can put solar panels
14 as a free-standing installation in your front yard.

15 MR. SCIARRA: Well, can you, how about this?
16 Can you put a shed in your, if you had your house set to
17 -- I got a house on my street with setback 40 feet. Can
18 someone put a shed --

19 MS. JACKSON: We could in the, it's already in
20 the Accessory Structure Table. So we could, where, if
21 you look on page four.

22 MR. SCIARRA: Right, that table on, okay.

23 MS. JACKSON: So we could remove basically the

1 F, that allows it to be located in a front yard?

2 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well --

3 MR. SCIARRA: Well, I don't know. There's a
4 lot of front yards where you want to have it, you know.

5 MS. JACKSON: Okay. Or we could, we have a
6 similar regulation for, I want to say, fences, where
7 they can't be between the front wall of the building and
8 the front property line. So it, it at least has to be
9 in line with, with the front facade.

10 MR. SCIARRA: Yes, I think something,
11 something like that.

12 CHAIRMAN WOODS: That sounds reasonable to me.

13 MR. SMITH: What about sculptures?

14 MR. SCIARRA: About what?

15 MR. SMITH: Sculptures.

16 MR. SCIARRA: Sculptures? Can you put them in
17 the front yard?

18 MR. SMITH: I don't know.

19 MR. SCIARRA: Ornamental light stands, you
20 can.

21 MS. JACKSON: Yes, you can. Permanently
22 anchored lawn furniture. If you want to --

23 MR. SCIARRA: Awnings and trellises.

1 MS. JACKSON: Yes. No, don't get into --

2 MR. SMITH: Awnings and --

3 MR. SCIARRA: See, looking at these two,
4 awnings and canopies, projecting no more than five feet
5 from the exterior wall.

6 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, I think that's fine.
7 We could say it, like awnings and canopies projecting no
8 more than five feet from the exterior wall.

9 MS. JACKSON: Okay.

10 MR. SCIARRA: So then the next thing we would
11 change, or I think we would want to change, is under
12 Section D, Sub-section 1, Sub-Sub-section A? Solar
13 collectors located on sloped-roof buildings that face
14 front or street yards, this is what it says now, facing
15 front or street yards, may not extend higher than the
16 ridge, must be parallel to the pitch of the roof, and
17 extend no more than six inches higher than the roof
18 surface on which they're located.

19 That was what we found pretty restrictive.
20 Because it did, especially on a hip roof, it doesn't
21 leave you a lot of surface area. And so, looking at the
22 Seattle code again, they had like, four feet above the
23 ridge, which seemed a little bit more, and looking at

1 some of the picture of the installations, seemed more
2 what is sort of within the realm of, of technology.

3 And particularly it's a problem, not so much
4 if the roof is facing south, but if you're putting your
5 panels on like a side, where's the little diagram? If
6 you look at the sketch up on the 3-D model, the little
7 sketch up models I did. They're probably better if, do
8 you have a Power Point presentation?

9 MS. JACKSON: Yes.

10 MR. SCIARRA: Yes. See, this is more,
11 probably of where it became an issue. Because on a hip
12 roof and you're on the side, you start to, need to get
13 above the ridge a little bit to start to get, or even,
14 yes, you start to get a little bit of those little
15 corners above.

16 So I was thinking four feet. Four feet or
17 five feet would be a more reasonable number. And then
18 striking the, must be parallel to the pitch of the roof,
19 because that just messes everything up. Because most
20 roofs aren't 42 or 37 degrees. And then extend no more
21 than six inches higher than the roof surface. Again,
22 that made no sense. Because if the roof is not the
23 right angle, it's not the right angle.

1 MS. JACKSON: So you want the --

2 MR. SCIARRA: So I would change A, and change
3 A, solar collectors located on slope-roofed buildings
4 that face front or street side yards. So it's the front
5 of the house or the side of the house, may not extend
6 higher than five feet above the ridge, or something like
7 that. Again, subject to the overall, now we have, now
8 remember we have an overall restriction that you can't
9 be higher than the maximum for that zoning district. So
10 for example, you can't be, in no case would you be able
11 to stick these collectors, you know, on top of, if
12 you're already maxed out at, I think it was 319 or 35
13 feet?

14 MR. CREAMER: Thirty-five feet.

15 MR. SCIARRA: No, we're not going to be
16 sticking these things even higher. So there's an
17 overall limiter, you know, on that.

18 MR. CREAMER: I'm not an engineer, but five,
19 four or five feet above the roof, that turns it into a
20 sail in the right kind of wind. Are we happy that these
21 are properly anchored other than --

22 MR. SCIARRA: You think it's a hazard?

23 MR. CREAMER: Right. Is this going to end up

1 in your neighbor's living room? Like if we had some
2 weather like we had last August?

3 MR. SCIARRA: Well, Evanston has more solar
4 collectors than almost any other city in the state. I
5 didn't hear of any in the last storm that we had, I
6 didn't hear of any that flew off anybody's roof. But
7 that's, you know, that's only a survey of like, 66
8 installations. So it's by no means a scientific survey,
9 but --

10 MR. CREAMER: But I don't know that we have
11 any that are sticking up.

12 MR. SCIARRA: Oh, there's --

13 MS. JACKSON: Well, currently we don't, we
14 don't regulate that.

15 MR. CREAMER: We don't know.

16 MR. SCIARRA: We don't know. So I --

17 MS. JACKSON: So, it's not --

18 MR. SCIARRA: I mean, I imagine, if there are,
19 I mean, I just know that there's a couple I've seen,
20 there are a couple that are flat to the roof and there
21 are a couple that are sticking up, you know. But it's
22 not like we have any on Sherman Plaza, you know. Most
23 of them are in, --

1 MR. CREAMER: Fair enough.

2 MR. SCIARRA: -- most of them are in 30, 20 to
3 30 feet off of grade.

4 MS. JACKSON: Chair, Chair Wood? We have a --

5 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

6 MS. JACKSON: -- raised hand.

7 MR. BILANDIC: May I volunteer a response,
8 please?

9 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Sure.

10 MR. BILANDIC: And there are requirements for
11 the kind of roof you put on any protective wall.
12 They're defined in the code. And I don't care who the
13 individual is, whether it's a -- or -- directly, there
14 are requirements attached, that's in and defined in the
15 internet building code --

16 MR. CREAMER: Okay, well that's helpful.
17 Thank you.

18 MR. SCIARRA: Just like the plumbers, maybe
19 the last time we were discussing this, is the whole
20 issue of the mechanics of it and should the city require
21 them to pull a plumbing permit. And so there are, I
22 think there's a myriad of streets that these are covered
23 under other parts of the building code that, because you

1 don't, do you need to pull a permit?

2 MS. JACKSON: Yes.

3 MR. SCIARRA: Okay. But does it get
4 inspected?

5 MS. JACKSON: Usually not. Because they come
6 in as water, you know, water heater permits or something
7 that we wouldn't necessarily know it's going to --

8 MR. SCIARRA: Okay. So, then the next thing
9 we would change is on sloped-roof, B: Solar collectors
10 located on sloped-roof buildings that face side and rear
11 yards may not extend more than, again, we've changed
12 that to the four or five feet that we agreed on there.

13 And then the last thing we would change, is it
14 on flat roof, which is Section 2, Sub-section B: Solar
15 collectors located on flat-roof buildings must not be
16 visible from any street-facing facade at the front or
17 street side property line. I, just strike it. I would
18 just strike it.

19 And then the rest of it, the rest of it is --
20 But that's kind of, I think, where this, that's the
21 sense that I got from the Planning and Development
22 Committee. I don't know if I could speak for them.
23 Probably can't. And where the Environment Board and

1 Energy Commission have sort of --

2 Where do we have the overall height
3 restriction, though? I didn't see, I didn't have it in
4 here. But is that in the very beginning? We ended up
5 taking that out.

6 MS. JACKSON: I think we did. Because we do
7 allow, I mean, if you look at height, number 2A, there
8 is a provision for flat-roof buildings, that they do
9 exceed by up to four feet.

10 MR. SCIARRA: So maybe we need to copy
11 language like that for a sloped roof. Because I think
12 when we said sloped roofs, we would not mean higher than
13 the ridge. We assumed that the ridge is never going to
14 be higher than --

15 MS. JACKSON: Right.

16 MR. SCIARRA: -- the allowable zoning. So we
17 would have to add similar language for sloped roof, that
18 they may not extend more than the maximum building
19 height by, again, either four or five feet, the number
20 we agreed to. So the language is parallel.

21 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, that's, --

22 MR. CREAMER: Well, wait a minute.

23 CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- that's what A says.

1 MR. SCIARRA: Yes, we say ridge. Well, I
2 guess the question, should we say ridge --

3 MR. CREAMER: No.

4 MR. SCIARRA: -- or the maximum building
5 height? We should probably say, I guess we should say
6 ridge. Because we really do mean --

7 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

8 MR. SCIARRA: You know, not that you'd ever
9 have anything higher than the ridge.

10 MR. CREAMER: Well, four foot higher than, or
11 four feet higher than the ridge is different than four
12 feet higher than the maximum building height.

13 MR. SCIARRA: Right.

14 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely.

15 MR. CREAMER: I don't think we want to go
16 higher than the maximum building height.

17 MR. SCIARRA: Regardless?

18 MR. CREAMER: Period.

19 MS. JACKSON: So what --

20 MR. SCIARRA: But I'm with you. I don't
21 think, if I had a one-story house in an R1 district and
22 I'm allowed to do my 35 feet, you wouldn't want someone
23 putting up a 35-foot, you know --

1 MS. JACKSON: Fifteen-foot.

2 MR. SCIARRA: Or 15-foot high, weirdo, you
3 know, panel thing. So I think the, the language is
4 ridge. Because then it ties, you want to tie the
5 collector somewhat to the structure.

6 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. But remember, the
7 ridge may also be above the maximum building height.
8 Because the maximum building height of a pitched-roof
9 building is not the height of the ridge.

10 MS. JACKSON: Yes. It's the midpoint.

11 MR. WRIGHT: Where is all that, the --

12 CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's in the Zoning Ordinance.
13 It's very clear.

14 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, I know. But I just want to
15 know where.

16 MR. DUNKLEY: It's in the definitions.

17 CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's in the definitions.

18 MR. DUNKLEY: Somewhere in the definitions.

19 MR. SCIARRA: All I know is it's two and-a-
20 half, it's like two and-a-half stories or --

21 MS. JACKSON: Thirty-five.

22 MR. CREAMER: Thirty-five feet. But 35 feet
23 is measured as a mean between the eave and the ridge.

1 MS. JACKSON: And the peak.

2 MR. SCIARRA: So, I think we should stick to
3 the ridge because --

4 MR. CREAMER: Yes, I think --

5 MR. SCIARRA: Well, the ridge is sort of going
6 to be the element up there that's going to control
7 everything. And so if we say we're --

8 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, you could also say, you
9 could say no higher than four feet above the ridge or --

10 MS. JACKSON: The maximum.

11 CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- maximum building height,
12 whichever is higher.

13 MS. JACKSON: Higher. I'm sorry. Higher.

14 MR. SCIARRA: That's better. Because then,
15 what that would do is, it would give flexibility to
16 those one-story houses where they may need a little bit
17 more flexibility because they're lower down, versus the
18 two and-a-half story houses where they've already built
19 up, they're above the tree line almost, and so they have
20 a much easier placement of the panels. No, that's good.
21 I like that. Because that then sort of covers the two
22 issues. Once you're above the trees, you have a lot
23 more flexibility. It's the smaller houses where there

1 may be a very particular patch of where the sun is,
2 where they need to sort of be very particular in the
3 placement of the actual collector.

4 MS. JACKSON: So for the flat roof, then,
5 should that be changed? Because as it's written now,
6 it's, they're allowed to exceed the maximum building
7 height. So it should be --

8 MR. SCIARRA: I think what Jim said, maximum
9 building height, or the maximum allowable in the
10 district, whichever's, whichever's higher.

11 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I'm trying to figure this
12 out. Because on a pitched-roof building where the
13 height of the ridge is above the maximum building
14 height, I think you want the solar panel to be able to
15 go up to the height of the ridge.

16 MR. SCIARRA: Right. Or a little bit higher.

17 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, I'm not even sure
18 about --

19 MR. CREAMER: We're not sure about the, if
20 you're a bit higher in that instance. If it's already
21 above 35 feet, that's why I'm wondering if it will go
22 any higher.

23 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. I'm wondering if it

1 isn't --

2 MR. SCIARRA: That's a lot easier.

3 CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- above the ridge or four
4 feet above maximum building height, whichever is higher.

5 MR. CREAMER: You lost me someplace.

6 MS. JACKSON: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay.

8 MS. JACKSON: I understood it the first time.

9 CHAIRMAN WOODS: The height of the ridge --

10 MR. CREAMER: Right.

11 CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- or four feet above the
12 maximum building height, whichever is higher. Because
13 if the ridge is above the maximum building height, --

14 MR. CREAMER: Right.

15 CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- then it goes to the ridge.

16 MR. CREAMER: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN WOODS: If the ridge is lower than
18 the maximum building height, then it can go four feet
19 above maximum building height. No, that' wouldn't make
20 sense. Four feet above the ridge, if below maximum
21 building height.

22 MR. CREAMER: Right.

23 MS. JACKSON: What was wrong with the --

1 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay, so --

2 MS. JACKSON: Four, may extend to four to five
3 feet above the ridge or the maximum building height.
4 Why don't we change it the other way?

5 MR. SCIARRA: Well, if we say maximum or
6 maximum building height, --

7 MS. JACKSON: Whichever is higher.

8 MR. SCIARRA: -- whichever's higher, then you
9 can still have a 15-foot high solar collector on the
10 one-story building. You know, because 35 feet is
11 higher.

12 MS. JACKSON: Oh, okay.

13 MR. SCIARRA: So what he just said is, if it's
14 four feet above the ridge --

15 MR. CREAMER: Yes, why don't we work with
16 four, and not four or five. Just four.

17 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Four feet above ridge if
18 ridge is lower than four feet, lower than four feet --

19 MR. SCIARRA: Maybe we can say this. Maybe we
20 can say this. In no case shall it be higher than the
21 maximum building may allow. So we start there and then
22 we sort of say something like, if the ridge of the
23 building is below that, then you can go four feet, you

1 know, if the ridge is less than, is 31 feet, then you
2 can, you know, you're sort of allowed to go up higher.
3 You know, start at 35 feet and then work your way down.
4 You know, maybe word the sentence that way.

5 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay, so how about this:
6 Solar collectors located on sloped buildings that face
7 front or side streets may not extend more than four feet
8 above ridge if ridge is lower than four feet below
9 maximum building height, or the height of the ridge, if
10 the ridge is higher than the maximum building height.

11 MR. SCIARRA: Okay.

12 MR. CREAMER: It works.

13 MS. JACKSON: There's got to be a better way.

14 MR. CREAMER: If you reverse the sentence, it
15 might be more clear, if you reverse that.

16 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, I'll let somebody
17 word --

18 MR. CREAMER: Arlova can make it elegant.

19 MS. JACKSON: Great.

20 MR. CREAMER: That's the concept.

21 MR. SCIARRA: But that's the idea.

22 MS. JACKSON: Okay.

23 CHAIRMAN WOODS: That's fine.

1 MS. JACKSON: So I'm back to flat roof.

2 MR. SCIARRA: No, because on flat roof it
3 shouldn't be parallel wordsmithing. Because
4 the --

5 MS. JACKSON: No. I know.

6 MR. SCIARRA: -- way the flat roof is, the
7 ridge, it's always, just like we should say, you know,
8 how high above the roof can we go?

9 MS. JACKSON: Okay. So, but I guess here it
10 says, it doesn't say that. It says, exceed the maximum
11 building height. And that's what we don't want.

12 CHAIRMAN WOODS: One-story building -- Twenty
13 for --

14 MS. JACKSON: So it's --

15 MR. SCIARRA: I think it shouldn't be more
16 than, you know, again, four feet.

17 MS. JACKSON: Four feet above the height of
18 the --

19 MR. SCIARRA: Four or five feet above the
20 roof.

21 MS. JACKSON: Okay.

22 MR. SCIARRA: Again, you're not going to do
23 it. I mean, no one, no sane person is going to, like

1 stick all this stuff up. But they might. I don't know.

2 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Let's say that the roof was
3 at the maximum building height. What would a standard
4 panel --

5 MR. SCIARRA: It's about four feet.

6 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay.

7 MR. SCIARRA: Because on a flat roof you have
8 more flexibility in terms of orientation. And then you
9 can, you know, instead of doing a tall panel, you can
10 flip it on the side and sort of stack them. Well, like
11 a flat roof, you can see the one on, the building that
12 Nate's doing on Lincoln Street. There's a --

13 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

14 MR. SCIARRA: You can see the panels, from
15 the, you can see the panels from the --

16 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Oh, yes.

17 MR. SCIARRA: And they stick up pretty high.

18 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. That's what I was
19 wondering, if it was four feet.

20 MR. SCIARRA: My suspicion's that might be a
21 little higher than four feet.

22 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, I think so.

23 MR. SCIARRA: But they're lower than the,

1 because it looks like a little penthouse or a little
2 like a stairwell. So obviously you can still below the
3 maximum building height unless you've got a variance for
4 that, for those with stair towers, so.

5 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, it's not, the city
6 could apply for the variance for the height of this
7 lower count too.

8 MS. JACKSON: So that's it?

9 MR. SCIARRA: Well, I don't know. So would
10 you guys -- Are you four feet or five feet? I mean, I
11 would need to research it before it meets the right
12 number. And I'm not exactly sure.

13 MS. JACKSON: Okay.

14 MR. SCIARRA: Because I know typical single-
15 family house you have 64-square feet of collector for an
16 -- system. And the panel, it's usually two panels.

17 CHAIRMAN WOODS: So that's 32-square feet.
18 And how wide are they?

19 MR. SCIARRA: Well, they're about as wide as a
20 person can reach over a table. Because that's how they
21 make them. They lean over a table and put the cells on.
22 So they're probably about five feet, maybe four foot
23 six wide. How big does that make them?

1 CHAIRMAN WOODS: It makes them seven
2 and-a-half feet. But on an angle?

3 MR. SCIARRA: But on an angle, I don't know,
4 probably around, could be around four, could be around
5 five feet. Hard to say.

6 CHAIRMAN WOODS: What's the typical angle?

7 MR. SCIARRA: Thirty-seven degrees.

8 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Thirty-seven degrees.

9 MR. SCIARRA: It's almost a -- triangle.

10 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Back to high school, Jim.

11 MS. JACKSON: Yes. I was not, geometry was
12 not my --

13 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Let's say five feet.

14 MR. SCIARRA: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think that'll do it.

16 MS. JACKSON: Now, I got a call just
17 yesterday.

18 MR. SCIARRA: We're striking B, we're striking
19 Section B?

20 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

21 MR. SCIARRA: Okay. All right. Deal.

22 MS. JACKSON: Something that this does not
23 address is, or maybe it does and I'm not noticing it,

1 but installations on garages? I don't know if we want
2 to have the same rules apply or --

3 MR. SCIARRA: I thought we had that in there,
4 like if somebody wanted to put it on the garage.

5 CHAIRMAN WOODS: You mean like that?

6 MS. JACKSON: Yes. I got a call --

7 MR. SCIARRA: Something, Sub-section --

8 MS. JACKSON: Well, that's ground mounted. So
9 that's --

10 MR. SCIARRA: Ground mounted or adjacent to
11 the principal structure. So I thought we were saying
12 that that would be a, wouldn't that be if it's on a
13 garage? Because that's not, it's sort of adjacent to
14 your principal structure?

15 MS. JACKSON: That I have envisioned.

16 MR. SCIARRA: And the ground mounted, --

17 MS. JACKSON: Yes.

18 MR. SCIARRA: -- it stands alone.

19 MS. JACKSON: Separate.

20 MR. SCIARRA: It's like a thing.

21 MS. JACKSON: Yes.

22 MR. CREAMER: Yes, I think if we're going to
23 deal with garages or auxiliary buildings, we ought to

1 say so.

2 MS. JACKSON: Yes. I got a call --

3 CHAIRMAN WOODS: So let's add that.

4 MS. JACKSON: Yes. As a section.

5 MR. SCIARRA: A new section or just add it
6 to --

7 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Add it to, actually it should
8 be a new section.

9 MS. JACKSON: Yes.

10 MR. CREAMER: Yes.

11 MR. SCIARRA: Because then you know there's
12 flat-roof garages and there's hip garages and there's --
13 Do we want all the same rules to apply?

14 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, assuming --

15 MS. JACKSON: The difference would be yards.
16 I would think the height rules would be the same.

17 Because the height, the difference would be the maximum
18 heights for accessory structures. But if we're just
19 saying it's, you know, four feet higher, then that's --

20 MR. SCIARRA: It would be four feet higher
21 than whatever --

22 MS. JACKSON: Exactly.

23 MR. SCIARRA: -- the existing structure is.

1 So like, are garages limited by, in height?

2 MS. JACKSON: Yes.

3 MR. SCIARRA: And so there's a separate, I
4 don't remember that, there's a whole separate thing
5 about how --

6 MS. JACKSON: And depending upon flat versus
7 slopes. They're different. --

8 MR. SCIARRA: All right. So this would be --

9 MS. JACKSON: I will come up with --

10 MR. SCIARRA: I think you should change G,
11 change G, we should stick it between F and G. So H
12 becomes I, G becomes H. Because those last two are sort
13 of, again, the way that the code reads, they should stay
14 last.

15 MS. JACKSON: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN WOODS: So this would be a new -- to
17 accessory structures. So they'll have to comply with
18 the yard requirements in the one zoning district and not
19 exceed the roof height, either ridge or flat roof on
20 four feet, or five feet or whatever?

21 MR. SCIARRA: Four feet for slope, five feet
22 for flat.

23 MS. JACKSON: Okay.

1 MR. SCIARRA: Okay. I think that would make,
2 I think that would make it --

3 MS. JACKSON: Better?

4 MR. SCIARRA: -- amicable to everybody.

5 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I have one question.

6 MR. SCIARRA: Sure.

7 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Given these four and five
8 foot things, in I for non-conforming, --

9 MR. SCIARRA: The new I?

10 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. Yes, sorry. New I.
11 Number three, add no more than seven feet of height to
12 the existing structure if it's non-conforming?

13 MR. SCIARRA: Yes. I don't know where that --

14 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Would you want that to say
15 four feet, five feet?

16 MR. SCIARRA: Well, you know, without going
17 out and measuring them, it's hard to say what typical
18 height is. You know, and looking at them from the
19 ground, it's hard to say.

20 MR. CREAMER: Where did the seven come from?

21 MS. JACKSON: I'm trying to --

22 MR. CREAMER: It was before my time.

23 MR. SCIARRA: My suspicion is it came from,

1 because we did this when Brendan was here from Solar
2 Service, my suspicion is that it came from him. Mr. --
3 installed almost, you know, 80 percent. --

4 MS. JACKSON: All of them.

5 MR. SCIARRA: -- yes, 90 percent, 99 percent
6 of the ones, you know, in northern Illinois. My
7 suspicion is that it came from him.

8 MR. CREAMER: That gives him a lot of
9 latitude.

10 MR. SCIARRA: But it's existing. I mean, --

11 MS. JACKSON: Yes.

12 MR. SCIARRA: You know, it's the six that are
13 existing. Do you see that? You said you, we might be
14 setting --

15 MS. JACKSON: To be consistent.

16 MR. SCIARRA: -- ourselves up for
17 inconsistencies.

18 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well this, no, this is, solar
19 collectors which cause an existing structure to be
20 non-conforming or which increase an existing
21 non-conformity may be permitted. So this is not just
22 talking about things that exist in the world today, but
23 things that could become existent, which is a bigger

1 concern, I think, then the ones that exist today.

2 MS. JACKSON: I think the concern was more
3 about location than height, that if you had anything
4 that had, you know, a non-conforming setback, not to
5 necessarily penalize the owner from being able to
6 install something.

7 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

8 MS. JACKSON: So that instead of having to go
9 through a variation process, they could, you know, come
10 to site --

11 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, but if in fact it was a
12 non-conforming, because of yard issues, why would the
13 height make any difference than the regular code?

14 MS. JACKSON: Yes, that's what I'm wondering.

15 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I mean, and if it is
16 non-conforming for height, I don't think we would
17 certainly want to exceed what we've already permitted on
18 a conforming use.

19 MS. JACKSON: Right.

20 MR. SCIARRA: Well, what if, like, for height?
21 So what if someone has an old, they got an old, I don't
22 know, one of the big houses that's too, you know, it's
23 in a normal district, but it's a big, three-story house?

1 So you're, you know, you're upwards of 35 feet and they
2 want to add solar collectors. So what they're saying is
3 that, what this is saying is that it can be no more, you
4 couldn't go more than seven feet above your already,
5 your 40-foot high building?

6 MS. JACKSON: Right.

7 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

8 MR. SCIARRA: What we were saying before is
9 that you may not even need to do anything because you're
10 already above the tree line, you're so high.

11 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. That's what I'm
12 saying. I'm not sure why this is the height that's any
13 different from the other heights.

14 MR. SCIARRA: And say you have a house where
15 you've got a, you know, two-foot side yard setback right
16 now and it's supposed to be three or something, three or
17 five?

18 MS. JACKSON: Five.

19 MR. SCIARRA: That's probably more typical a
20 case where you have a, you know, a small, you have a
21 one-story building, one-story house that's pretty close
22 to another two-story house and you have a pretty small
23 roof plate, the roof surface already. You may have to

1 stick that panel almost on, basically on your, you know,
2 right on the setback.

3 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Or actually put it in some
4 other location altogether.

5 MR. SCIARRA: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN WOODS: In their yard.

7 MR. SCIARRA: But if you're, or up to the, say
8 the, again, say the setback is three feet, but the --
9 house, the wall of your house is two feet. You may have
10 to put the panel at two feet instead of three feet. So
11 you would be increasing that non-conformity.

12 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, this is dealing
13 strictly with height, number three.

14 MR. SCIARRA: Yes, I'd say scratch it. I'm
15 with you. It seems, again, we're all, we're going to be
16 above that 35 feet. I don't think it's, I think we're
17 sort of in the clear.

18 CHAIRMAN WOODS: And I think we're --

19 MS. JACKSON: I'll try to go back and see if I
20 can find --

21 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Either eliminate or make it
22 agree with the language --

23 MS. JACKSON: Right.

1 MR. CREAMER: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- that we had proposed
3 elsewhere.

4 MR. CREAMER: Because we're going to get some
5 inconsistent results here and make non-conforming --

6 MS. JACKSON: Worse.

7 MR. CREAMER: -- structures even more --

8 MS. JACKSON: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, I just don't understand
10 why, if you're non-conforming in height, you give them
11 additional --

12 MR. CREAMER: Right.

13 CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- height above what somebody
14 else is allowed.

15 MR. CREAMER: Yes. Unintended consequences.

16 MR. SCIARRA: I think while we're on that I,
17 which is: Such collectors are designed, located and
18 screened so as to minimize visual, well, I guess it,
19 while still providing adequate solar access for the
20 collectors. I mean, either way that whole, if you have
21 a non-conforming situation, you're going to go to that
22 SPARK and you're going to --

23 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Talk about how it's located

1 and how it works and all that kind of stuff.

2 MR. SCIARRA: I think the point there is that
3 it's not a variance at that point.

4 MS. JACKSON: Right.

5 MR. SCIARRA: It's just, it's part of the
6 permit process through SPARK.

7 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

8 MR. SCIARRA: So if it makes it a little bit
9 easier it's, -- out a little here.

10 Okay, other than that, I think all the other
11 stuff is good. The fact that, you know, -- stable, all
12 that stuff, all that stuff is good. So what's the,
13 what's the plan?

14 MS. JACKSON: Well, I need to go back and make
15 some changes.

16 MR. SCIARRA: Okay. -- here or whatever?

17 MS. JACKSON: The 17th?

18 CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, I wasn't going to say the
19 17th.

20 MS. JACKSON: Oh, okay.

21 CHAIRMAN WOODS: What I was going to say is,
22 can we take it for the regular Plan Commission meeting
23 on November --

1 MS. JACKSON: Tenth.

2 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Tenth?

3 MS. JACKSON: Or 14th, yes.

4 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, whatever November 8th is.
5 November 14th?

6 MS. JACKSON: I think it's the 14th.

7 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. So we'll continue it
8 to the regular Plan Commission meeting on November 14th.

9 MR. SCIARRA: November 14th?

10 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

11 MS. JACKSON: Yes.

12 MR. SCIARRA: I may not be, that's --
13 the big conference in -- It's a reception.

14 MS. JACKSON: Okay.

15 MR. SCIARRA: I think it's the 14th up, the --

16 MS. JACKSON: Okay.

17 MR. SCIARRA: I think it's that week. It
18 might be the week before. But it's not in -- telling
19 you -- crashed --

20 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, my intent is to get it
21 on the regular Plan Commission meeting and thing so we
22 can vote on it and approve it and --

23 MS. JACKSON: All at once.

1 CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- move it to City P&D.
2 MR. SCIARRA: I had a --
3 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, I don't think we need to
4 talk about it.
5 MS. JACKSON: How about I get you a draft?
6 And then if you have --
7 MR. SCIARRA: Yes.
8 MS. JACKSON: You can just e-mail me --
9 MR. SCIARRA: I can send a -- to engineering.
10 MS. JACKSON: Yes. But you will review it
11 before it gets voted on.
12 MR. SCIARRA: Okay, fair enough. -- working.
13 Thanks for doing this version.
14 CHAIRMAN WOODS: And we --
15 MR. SCIARRA: I want -- appreciate it. --
16 Central Street.
17 MS. JACKSON: You're -- get in trouble.
18 MR. CREAMER: Yes, cover Central Street with
19 solar panels.
20 MR. SCIARRA: There you go.
21 MR. DUNKLEY: That's it. We don't, actually
22 don't --
23 MR. SCIARRA: Well actually, I just don't want

1 you to pay for it. You know, I'm done with this whole
2 -- papers all over the place.

3 MR. DUNKLEY: I don't think we, as yet,
4 mentioned solar panels in the Central Street ordinance.
5 But, who knows? It's early.

6 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Wait a second. Is it -- or
7 eclectic, funky, European village, small town --

8 MS. JACKSON: Right.

9 CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- solar collector character?

10 MR. SCIARRA: There we go.

11 MS. JACKSON: Take my lead.

12 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Move on.

13 MR. DUNKLEY: Right, okay. Good evening,
14 everyone. Okay, welcome everyone. My name is Bill
15 Dunkley and I am your Zoning Administrator. And I am
16 managing the Central Street Master Plan Zoning
17 Implementation project. And we are kind of in
18 mid-stream here. I'm glad to see you all tonight.

19 This is the second of really three more
20 workshop-oriented meetings on the Central Street zoning
21 work. And we are doing this to have a chance to talk in
22 detail and to get to know the code, the proposed code,
23 and to get all of our questions answered and our

1 concerns raised and to basically, to end up with a good,
2 robust district that does most of what we want it do.

3 This is work that has grown out of the Central
4 Street Master Plan, which was approved by Council many
5 months ago. And that plan calls for implementation
6 projects of many sorts. Zoning is one of them. It's a
7 key one. And that is the scope of the work that we are
8 intent on in this project. There are many things zoning
9 can do, many things that it can't do. But we're going
10 to try and get our, the zoning that applies to Central
11 Street, to encourage or at least permit many of the
12 things that the community would like to see happen as
13 documented in the plan.

14 Last week's meeting we focused on the west end
15 of the corridor. And I had some materials for you to
16 review. Thank you for the comments we have received to
17 date. This week I have a lot more. And I'll tell you
18 what is not yet in here. But there's a, I think the, at
19 least the, what we're proposing as the overlay district
20 for the length of corridor is kind of coming into shape.

21 And just few, kind of housekeeping things. I
22 mentioned my name. I also want to give you my contact
23 information right up front. I have some business cards

1 and I'll leave them out for you. But just, if you would
2 like to contact me, and I am the point of contact for
3 comments and questions and concerns on this work, my
4 e-mail, that's probably the best way, is bdunkley.
5 That's b-d-u-n-k-l-e-y @cityofevanston.org. And my
6 telephone number, if you want to jot it down is,
7 847-866-2930, 2-9-3-0. And, but e-mail's probably best
8 because then I have documented what your question is.
9 And I can get back to you, you know, possibly from -- I
10 can get back to you as soon as I can and have it on
11 record. So that's, that's one thing. All comments, all
12 questions are welcome.

13 I see some, some new faces here, I believe.
14 Yes? And if we could be kind enough just to let me
15 know, if you'll just raise your hand. Is this your
16 first meeting with, concerning Central Street? Just
17 three? There's -- Maybe four or so? Okay.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: My first meeting was the
19 zones meeting.

20 MR. DUNKLEY: With the Zoning Committee. Now,
21 you're involved with the planned development and all
22 that, yes, yes.

23 Well, I just want to kind of catch you up real

1 briefly. This process will take us actually through
2 January. And that's pretty much a best-case scenario.
3 We are hoping to have something to put in front of the
4 Zoning Committee two weeks from now. That's the, I'm
5 sorry, the 17th of October, will be our next meeting.
6 And at that point we've laid out a calendar that goes
7 through the Zoning Committee, then the Plan Commission,
8 then to the Planning and Development Committee of the
9 City Council, and finally to the City Council. And all
10 of that, of course, takes time. There will be plenty of
11 opportunity for more public input and scrutiny by
12 anybody who is, who would like.

13 And that calendar, and I do have that calendar
14 available for anybody who wants it. I'll post it along
15 with this information that will go on the website at the
16 end of, by Friday. It's all available. And it takes us
17 through the first City Council meeting in January.

18 There's a moratorium on new building
19 construction in the Central Street corridor and on Green
20 Bay Road. And that current moratorium has been extended
21 to the beginning of February. It's February 9th. So
22 that gives us a little bit of cushion to get some
23 zoning, some appropriate zoning in place before that

1 moratorium expires. That's one of the things that's
2 driving, that's driving our schedule.

3 It's looking like that has actually worked out
4 pretty well, getting that moratorium extended. But we
5 don't really want to have to go much further than that.

6 But that's a good amount of time. So I'm hoping we'll
7 have lots of comments and you know, good ideas, and lots
8 of input.

9 Let's see. Just a, kind of a housekeeping
10 note from last time. I said I would talk to the primary
11 consultants on the planned development. His name is
12 John LaMott. I have not yet done that. We've traded
13 several messages. And it's just been real schedule, a
14 real schedule challenge. But we know we have, we do
15 need to talk on some very specific items to go through.

16 What we talked about last week was questions
17 on planned development and allowing planned developments
18 or prohibiting planned developments, developing
19 allowances that go through, that go with that. And also
20 there was a request for information about the primary
21 stakeholders that were interviewed as part of the
22 planned development. So I have yet to get that
23 information. I do apologize. I am, we are working on

1 it. It's just a matter of coordinating two pretty busy
2 schedules.

3 Let's see. Also some other information, if
4 you could give me, just so I know who's here. I heard
5 that there were some members of the Central Street
6 business community that are here. If you are, could you
7 raise your hand? Yes. Could you just tell us what
8 business and who you are?

9 MR. FRITZLER: My name is Stuart Fritzler.
10 And I have the antique store at 1937 Central Street.

11 MR. DUNKLEY: Great.

12 MR. HUBBARD: I'm Max Hubbard from the Spice
13 House, 1921.

14 MR. DUNKLEY: Okay, great. Thanks. Welcome
15 and thanks for being here. I hope you, make sure you
16 sign in so we have your contact information.

17 I've also been in touch with the Central
18 Street Business Association. And it looks like I'll be
19 doing a short presentation at your November meeting. So
20 hopefully it'll be informative. And we'll get you some
21 information in advance as well.

22 Really look forward to having the
23 participation of the merchants. It's one of the, it's a

1 very difficult thing. It's rare that we see you folks.

2 So please tell all of your, all of your business
3 colleagues on this, on the corridor, that this will
4 certainly affect build out, certainly new construction
5 along the, along the corridor.

6 Anyone here who's an owner of a commercial
7 space, commercial property? No. And let's see. Who
8 here owns property in the district? Who knows that they
9 are going to be within either a re-zoning area or area
10 subject to the overlay? Anyone? Wow. Yes.
11 Possibility? Okay. If anyone has any questions, please
12 let me know. And I can tell you definitively are you in
13 or are you out.

14 Okay, some notes about the materials tonight,
15 the handouts. Two of them are pretty much, well, are
16 identical to material that's been handed out before.
17 There's the landscape format; Central Street Master Plan
18 zoning implementation from August that is an overview of
19 the scope of work that we are attempting here. It also
20 reproduces sections from the master plan itself,
21 particularly the zoning recommendations that were
22 contained in that plan that is our job to implement;
23 initial maps identifying the targeted areas for

1 re-zonings; and then the extent of the corridor overly
2 district, which we'll spend some time reviewing tonight;
3 and then some tables of information that came from the
4 plan as well.

5 The other piece is, you have these maps. They
6 were, I put them two up on a page. They're color maps.

7 There are only about 15. They were copies. I can make
8 more copies. And certainly we'll make the electronic
9 version available to anyone who wants it. Those show
10 the extent of the overlay district and the sub-areas one
11 through nine. You can recognize that sheet of paper
12 because it has the number 2A, Proposed Central Street
13 Corridor Overlay District, the west corridor on top and
14 then the east part of the corridor on the bottom. I
15 have an extra one here. And so if you would like a
16 printed copy of that, please let me know. Or I can send
17 you the electronic. But that information is the same.
18 It has not been changed. It's just provided for your
19 convenience if this is your first, if you haven't
20 received it.

21 New information that you have here are the
22 re-zoning maps, areas one through five. There are only
23 five targeted areas for specific base zoning, base

1 district re-zonings. I was trying to get them on just
2 one page a piece, but it turns out that area 2, which is
3 that area right, the area across from the park, it's
4 just too long and we couldn't get it on one sheet of
5 paper. So it's on four. But the purpose of these maps
6 are to show explicitly where are the boundaries,
7 proposed boundaries for these re-zoning areas.

8 For the most part we always try and target, of
9 course, property boundaries. Also we will run a zoning
10 boundary down the middle of a public right of way or an
11 alley. And in some cases, but only where we absolutely
12 have to, we'll run a boundary between, down, through the
13 center or through a part of an existing lot. We only do
14 that when there's a really, really compelling reason.
15 Because it's just, sometimes it's just not obvious where
16 that, what is being accomplished.

17 That happens in two places here, I believe.
18 And if there are others that need further data to define
19 them, please bring them to my attention. And there on
20 area 2B, and that is on the bank property on Central and
21 Green Bay. And the intent there, I think, is to
22 separate out the part in the bank property and the
23 parking lot property. And that's being identified

1 throughout the process. I don't think that's any news.

2 The other is on a very challenging map. And
3 that's the last one, number five. And that's around the
4 CTA station, proposed to be re-zoned from open space to
5 a big business district, B2. And the intent there is to
6 encourage and allow retail uses in close proximity to
7 the transit users, which is currently not allowed as a
8 designation of open space.

9 The problem here, the challenge here, is that
10 we have some crazy zoning lots. Along the tracks
11 they're very long. They don't seem to ever end, they,
12 except at lot lines, except at land lot lines. We have
13 a hospital there. We have open space. We have flood
14 plain, rather. And trying to find, to interpret that
15 square that's on the, it's in the plan for re-zone the
16 area around the CTA sub-station, was a challenge.

17 So I put a draft together here. And it does
18 do some split lot zoning, split, yes, split zoning, in
19 an attempt to give a decent depth to potential retail
20 use that is not in a flood plain. Usually you want to
21 see about a minimum of 50 feet and about 200 feet or so
22 off the corridor. With a train line and that right of
23 way there, that's a real challenge. And you certainly

1 don't want to cut off things like the parking garage at
2 its end. So it goes somewhat beyond the normal curve,
3 but certainly the south curve, where we do have some
4 retail that extends that over to the west just a bit and
5 may allow some, some additional retail if there, you
6 know, if there were an inclination by the community to
7 make the investment.

8 So that's going to be a challenge. And I
9 suspect we'll come back to that and do some, maybe some
10 reworking of that district. But that's --

11 MR. WRIGHT: Can I ask a question about that?

12 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes.

13 MR. WRIGHT: That northeast corner of that, is
14 that, is that what they were talking about spending the
15 -- re-landscape the -- building?

16 MR. DUNKLEY: I'm sorry. The northeast
17 corner?

18 MR. WRIGHT: Of area five.

19 MR. DUNKLEY: That, yes, that may well be
20 there, yes. They maybe want to exclude the whole north.

21 MR. WRIGHT: -- all south of Central, I
22 thought. But this is the idea of what's going to be
23 floating around above there with a, with that El station

1 there?

2 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. That's, this is going to
3 have to take, this is going to take some real, some real
4 work here. I tried to get it a little bit more specific
5 than just that floating square. But I think you may be
6 right. It may have been intending just the southern
7 portion of Central Street. And I certainly will bring
8 that up with our consultants, find out what's, what the,
9 what the primary intent was.

10 MR. SMITH: Were you working off their PDS?
11 Because their PDS are object-oriented and they've got
12 literally thousands of objects if you zoom in on that.
13 I don't know to what extent you can get there, but it
14 might show exactly what they were talking about.

15 MR. DUNKLEY: Well, they might have all the
16 text of the Zoning Ordinance in there. So I'll just,
17 yes, I'll definitely look at that. I didn't realize
18 they had leaked so much information to it. I think
19 I'll, yes, I think it's just a, it's been a square. And
20 sort of the, the specific boundaries are left as a test
21 up to the, to the Zoning Administrator.

22 MR. SMITH: I think -- you got part of the
23 fire station there, in the northwest part --

1 MR. DUNKLEY: That could well, yes, that could
2 well be. I've got to go out and walk the site
3 specifically. And we'll have to really bring this up.

4 CHAIRMAN WOODS: The lot line is right there.
5 That space lot.

6 MR. DUNKLEY: You're right. Yes. That's
7 gone.

8 So these maps will be made available, actually
9 all of it will be made available on-line. And if you
10 have questions or any of your colleagues or neighbors
11 have questions about what is the extent specifically of
12 re-zonings, these will go a long way towards answering
13 that. So that is the, that is the purpose here, to
14 just be explicit in terms of the boundary lines. So if
15 anybody sees anything that's drastically wrong, please
16 let me know. And we will come back to that number five
17 and firm that up.

18 Let's see. So I wanted to mention some of the
19 things that you will not see in the materials that we
20 have mentioned or that are listed, that are in the, the
21 zoning recommendations from the plan. Let's see. And I
22 have a list here. There are, first of all, we need
23 larger maps for the overlay district boundaries. The

1 map that is on here gives you an idea of the extent, but
2 it doesn't tell you specifically in terms of which
3 property lines and which, and where the boundaries are.

4 It gets a little confusing when you get to some of the,
5 what -- right of ways we have crossing. So those will
6 be forthcoming.

7 Also, there's been a lot of discussion about
8 planned developments and about elusive building
9 allowances and certainly an ability to exceed the
10 building allowances. That information is not in here.
11 I would hope to be getting that information in or at
12 least get a straw man, get a draft, for some type of
13 restrictions on larger developmental allowances than
14 what is specified in the code, at a minimum.

15 If worse comes to worse, what we'll do is, we
16 will just, we'll go ahead and include some text and
17 we'll see where that goes through the rest of the
18 legislative process. But that's going to take a little
19 bit of, kind of heavy thinking before so we can get
20 something that's reasonable in there.

21 I also have opinions from legal pending. And
22 I'd like to get that before getting any language in
23 there. That's again, been a matter of coordinating

1 schedules.

2 Other small, but very important items are knee
3 walls, the requirement for knee walls, which are those
4 kind of 18-inch to 22-inch walls underneath shop windows
5 along the major shopping portions of the street. Those
6 are identified as one way of helping articulate the
7 streetscape. And they are certainly appropriate for the
8 general style of streetscape development that exists on
9 Central Street.

10 Also, minimum retail depth. We talked about
11 somewhere in between 20 feet and 50 feet. I think it
12 was generally felt that 50 feet is maybe a little bit
13 too much to ask as far as depth. And 20 feet, in my
14 experience I've found, has been the absolute minimum
15 that we would want to ask for. So the answer's in there
16 somewhere as far as what is a reasonable depth. And so
17 I'm thinking somewhere in 35 feet is -- I think that
18 makes sense. That probably makes sense. But I'd like
19 to get some input back on that from retailers.

20 Other things you will not find, specifics on
21 bonuses. We talked about development bonuses that would
22 give some additional height or something else that is of
23 value in return for some of the things that the

1 community would really like to see as public amenities.

2 Parking is probably mentioned most often,
3 public parking. We started at the west end of the
4 corridor. And it was felt that that parking was not
5 really an issue. There was really not that great a need
6 out there by Crawford and Gross Point.

7 And we talked then about office space and the
8 possibility of providing -- or FAR bonuses for providing
9 a certain amount of office space, whether it be
10 professional office space or, not necessarily office,
11 you know, office buildings, but kind of smaller, maybe
12 Class B office space that's more neighborhood oriented.

13 And we don't have that in there yet. It's a
14 real challenge to find a good tradeoff that makes sense,
15 that's not giving away the farm, nor is putting
16 something in that's not, turns out to be not that
17 valuable. So I welcome any input on that. I'd like to
18 get some input from a marketing perspective as well and
19 see if we can get something reasonable, and certainly
20 any other suggestions about what the community would
21 like to see.

22 Certainly the first place we should do is go
23 back to the plan and see if we have anything documented

1 there. Because that certainly would be the easiest to
2 justify. So I do look forward to having that in as
3 well.

4 Let's see. Roof and general building
5 articulation was mentioned. What you'll find is there's
6 some text in the overlay district that has to do with
7 facade articulation. It has to do with delineating
8 floors, which is very, very important. You really know
9 the difference when that's not done. You get large,
10 blank walls that are very inhuman. You may not know
11 why, but in many cases it's because the architect or the
12 builder hasn't shown you where the floors start and end.

13 That can be done in a number of ways. And
14 it's also something that happens to be fairly
15 straightforward to review. It's not really subject to
16 that much interpretation. Either you delineate the
17 floors or you haven't. So part of my job is to make
18 sure that we have code that is administratable. And
19 that is one of the areas where I believe we can do a
20 good job administering it.

21 Once we get into architectural detail, such as
22 cupolas, other architectural forms, that become very
23 difficult without a Design Review Committee. And that's

1 an area I really would not like to get into because it
2 is a huge use of time. Not that that's a necessarily
3 bad thing. But it can also sometimes deter some
4 developments, good development.

5 So I'd like to talk more about that. That's
6 an area we have not gotten into, other than in the site
7 plan and Appearance Review Committee for only
8 non-binding review. Introducing that as requirements
9 into our zoning code is a place we don't want to go
10 lightly. So I'd like to, you know, have more discussion
11 about that, those sort of architectural details that
12 really are design oriented and would be difficult to
13 assess in an objective way. But that still way be
14 possible to get some of that in there. We just need to
15 do it the right way.

16 Let's see. I think that is, oh, okay, and
17 you'll also find streetscape standards. They're really
18 the first time that we in the City of Evanston have
19 identified standards for the pedestrian area that we
20 know we need to have in between buildings and street.

21 And what I think we need that we haven't put
22 in yet are some possibilities for variations for
23 individual properties that are redeveloped that exist

1 within a context that really does not yet, doesn't meet
2 those streetscape specifications. So we don't really
3 want, for instance, if all of the buildings are pulled
4 close into the street, have a facade that's pulled way
5 back. I mean, two, three feet, five feet, can add some
6 interesting articulation to the streetscape, but if it
7 becomes something that's unreasonable, we want a way of
8 being able to vary that. So I think that's something we
9 would probably want to put into the code as well.

10 So that's a list of everything that's not so
11 far in the district. And I guess at this point I'd take
12 any questions on any of those items before I do a, just
13 kind of a walk-through of the items that are in the
14 draft. No?

15 MR. WRIGHT: I'll save mine for when --

16 MR. DUNKLEY: Oh, but you can't save yours for
17 the very end. It's just not fair.

18 MR. WRIGHT: If you -- what you're doing.
19 You know, I'm willing to do it right now if you want me
20 to --

21 MR. DUNKLEY: Maybe we should save it for the
22 end.

23 MR. WRIGHT: I'm going to hold you to it.

1 MR. DUNKLEY: Oh, I'm sure we will. Okay,
2 well that's said. And Rich, I have no doubt that you
3 will not forget, not fully document all your, your
4 comments. So I know that they'll be there to review.

5 What I'd like to do now is to walk through the
6 text of the overlay district. Overlays here have a kind
7 of interesting designation. They all start with a lower
8 case o. So I took the liberty of naming this oCSC for
9 Central Street Corridor. And that would be added, this
10 district, if passed, would be added to Chapter 15, which
11 is where all of the overlay districts live, along with
12 some other special purpose districts. And this would be
13 number 14, sub-chapter 14.

14 And so you'll notice the first sub-sections
15 begin with one and two. Those are pretty standard. But
16 then they start off using just number X so that I don't
17 have to renumber every single time a change is made. So
18 that's why those are, those will be left until the very
19 end.

20 The first two pages are pretty perfunctory.
21 They just identify the district, what the district is
22 supposed to accomplish. Much of this text was taken
23 pretty directly from the plan.

1 How the district is applied, Section 2, really
2 that just says that this overlay district specifies
3 requirements that are in addition to the base zoning of
4 properties in the area. So for those who are not
5 familiar with overlays, they're a little bit different
6 from what we're used to in terms of R1, R2, B1, B2, C1,
7 C2. They apply on top of those base districts. So in
8 all cases except where it's specifically noted, these
9 items would supersede those items that are in the base
10 district.

11 We have the opportunity of not only making
12 things more restrictive, but in some cases making them
13 less restrictive. Usually it's the more restrictive
14 kind. Overlay districts are particularly good for
15 things like corridors where you want to try and ensure
16 consistent look and feel and consistent, consistency to
17 a corridor where that corridor consists of many
18 different types of zoning districts.

19 So we try and be as light handed as we can
20 with an overlay. Because it does require additional
21 interpretation. But that's kind of Overlays 101 for
22 those of you not familiar.

23 This overlay district has nine, as this point

1 we're proposing nine sub-areas. Those are primarily
2 based geographically and by the base zoning district of
3 the property. Those sub-areas are identified very
4 creatively by the numbers one through nine. And they
5 are detailed out in Section 4.

6 This would appear as an additional designation
7 to a property's zoning designation. Properties would
8 have not only their base zoning designation, such as,
9 let's say B1A, but they would also have a designation of
10 oCSC and then the identification of the sub-area.
11 There'll be no, not be equivocal at all. It would be
12 exact as to what the district, base district, and the
13 o sub-area, each property is within, that's not
14 interpreted, that will be the part of the ordinance. So
15 that's what those first three pages deal with, two
16 pages.

17 Pages three and four deal with uses. And
18 there's been some, there were some recommendations as
19 far as uses, but not a lot. Really sub-areas 8 and 9
20 are those that are very near the Ryan Field. And the
21 intent was to allow more active uses along Central
22 Street.

23 And so there is the suggestion that some

1 additional uses may be permitted in those areas,
2 particularly office, upper-story dwellings, type 1
3 restaurants, and retail. So comments on those are
4 welcome. Those are fairly restricted sub-areas. And
5 they're all right along Central Street itself.

6 On the next page are additional prohibited
7 uses. And it was, one of the recommendations is to
8 prohibit drive-thru facilities along the corridor. Now
9 this again is still up for comment. And if there are
10 specific sub-areas, specific places along the corridor
11 that you think are appropriate for drive-thru
12 facilities, then please bring that to my attention, to
13 our attention. Okay. And that is only identified for
14 those sub-areas that currently would allow drive-thru
15 facilities as part of their base zoning. So there is,
16 1, 2, and 8 currently do not. So we don't have to add
17 any additional prohibitions.

18 Okay, now, page five deals with height. And
19 height is such a, there's so many different aspects to
20 it. We've tried to include many, well, several
21 different requirements to get a specific needs or
22 desires of the community.

23 B and C are, B, column B is a transitional

1 height plane that I've talked about and now have some
2 graphics and some text to actually put in front of you.

3 C is stepbacks. And stepbacks are kind of the same
4 thing, but they're for a different reason on a different
5 side of the building.

6 So we have a few ways of being able to modify
7 building height to be able to make commercial buildings,
8 non-residential buildings, more, I should say,
9 friendlier to immediately adjacent lower-intensity
10 residential districts which we have all along Central
11 Street. And also so that we don't have any kind of sort
12 of canyon-ey street walls made by buildings that might
13 be, that have their height too close to the street.

14 We do want to provide some opportunity for
15 development and redevelopment. But we want to do that
16 in a way that's appropriate to the existing character
17 and to those things that we have all liked and loved
18 about Central Street. And the two, so far the tools
19 that we've talked about are, is a height plane and
20 stepbacks.

21 So, also we wanted to be consistent about
22 specifying a new building height restriction or a
23 maximum and also a number of stories as we've been doing

1 in some, in other zoning districts. So to have both of
2 those apply, and the one that would control is the lower
3 of the two.

4 So for instance, sub-area 4 would be a maximum
5 building height of three stories or 35 feet. So if your
6 building was at three stories, but it was 32 feet, then
7 that still is the maximum that you could go. You
8 couldn't put on a fourth story that was, you know, that
9 was whatever, six feet tall or seven feet tall. So
10 that's adding consistency.

11 The transitional height plane is, I want to
12 spend some time on that. And you have a page in the
13 back, the definition section, there are about, again,
14 about 15 colored pages that I put out. If you have a
15 black and white version I think it's equally legible.
16 But it's on page nine of the draft. And this shows the
17 way that this works.

18 One example, it's rarely used. Actually, it's
19 kind of tough to weigh in the 01 district. And it has
20 an elevation, see that diagonal line there, of 15
21 degrees, which is, which doesn't really allow much to go
22 on until you get about three or four hundred feet away
23 from.

1 But let me describe basically how this works.

2 This comes into play where you have a lower-intensity
3 residential district in R1, R2, or R3 district that's
4 immediate, that's adjacent to a higher-intensity
5 district. So if it was a B, B1A, B2, a C1, C2 district.

6 And the problem here is that we may have a real
7 encroachment on kind of the light and air of single-
8 family residences which are, you know, a maximum of 35
9 feet as a rule. We do have setbacks that are acquired.

10 But just that mass that is so immediately next door can
11 have a big effect on the enjoyment of one's property, of
12 one's home.

13 I've used this tool in the past. And it is,
14 it turns out to be a very, very useful tool, while
15 providing some flexibility for development in the
16 business or commercial district or mixed-use district.
17 And here's basically how it works. It's called a
18 transitional height plan. And it exists where, again,
19 where there's that adjacency. If all things go right,
20 it would minimize these and we'd have an intermediate
21 district, maybe a multi-family residential district.
22 But sometimes things don't work out that way.

23 So wherever any property in this overlay

1 district is adjacent to an R1, 2 or 3, we would have to
2 calculate a transitional height plane that extends over
3 the higher-intensity district and away from the single-
4 family district. And the angle that works best and is
5 also fairly straightforward to calculate is 45 degrees.
6 And that generally provides a pretty good level of
7 protection against sort of an immediate massiveness that
8 could result.

9 But you don't want to start that right at the
10 property line. Because then you'd have to go a real
11 good ways away before you can build really anything at
12 all. And what I've seen work well in other places is
13 that you, is to extend the maximum height of the
14 residential district that exists on one side and start
15 the plane from that height, but not start it at the lot
16 line. Move it back by the recorded setback of the
17 commercial district.

18 So that means that nothing higher than the max
19 height of the residential district can be built anywhere
20 near close to that district. And as you move further
21 away, it allows progressively more and more height. So
22 the net effect is to push the bulk of the commercial
23 district away from the lower-density residential

1 district and to allow adequate sun and light, sun and
2 air, around that residential district.

3 The way we would administer this is we would
4 ask the architect to provide drawings for any
5 development or any renovation work that involved height
6 or change in building height, to calculate that plane,
7 and to show to us that no structure exceeded, went
8 through that plane that extends off over the site. So
9 the net effect is the height comes down as it approaches
10 the lower-intensity district.

11 I also included text that covers the case
12 where we have an intervening alley. And that seems to
13 have been a point of contention very recently in a
14 number of cases. But this would also be in effect
15 whenever there was an alley between an R1, 2, or 3 in
16 this case, and any other district in this overlay
17 district. And the same rules would apply. We'd start
18 the calculation at the same place, away from the lot
19 line.

20 So, any questions or comments on the
21 transitional height plane? Yes.

22 MR. SCIARRA: You may want to, instead of
23 doing 45 degrees, look at the angle of the sun at the

1 spring and fall equinox.

2 MR. DUNKLEY: We pretty much, I mean, there is
3 a few degrees that are different. But it pretty much
4 covers it. The City of Portland is one that says,
5 really you have to calculate the angle of the sun. And
6 you cannot build a building that in any way impinges on
7 that light. That's really hard to administer. And it's
8 really difficult to do those calculations. And you know
9 what? For most properties in our part of the northern
10 hemisphere, 45 degrees works pretty darn well.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes, of course --

12 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: If you were to have 42
14 degrees northwest, -- the difference --

15 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes.

16 MR. WRIGHT: In the -- you mentioned for an
17 adjacent, adjacent kind of already refers to where the
18 public alley between -- or adjacent. If you're sort of
19 right next to the other lots, it's called -- If there's
20 a public -- adjacent. So it's, in our terminology, is
21 above or --

22 MR. DUNKLEY: Okay. Yes. -- to you know,
23 further add to the definition of adjacent. But if we

1 don't have to, then that's --

2 MR. WRIGHT: Was it left out with -- without
3 meaning to, which is the one where there's no --

4 MR. DUNKLEY: Right, yes. I'll remove, I
5 tried not to use that term. If I did, we'll take that
6 out. Thanks.

7 MR. WRIGHT: If you could --

8 MR. DUNKLEY: I'm sorry.

9 MR. WRIGHT: You need to use abutting and --

10 MR. DUNKLEY: Abutting and adjacent. We can't
11 just say next to. Okay, so it's all clear.

12 MR. HUGHES: In the R5 zone, the -- allow a
13 higher height?

14 MR. DUNKLEY: Would it allow a higher height
15 than --

16 MR. HUGHES: The transitional plane would not?

17 MR. DUNKLEY: No.

18 MR. HUGHES: Because it seems like the overlay
19 takes precedence over the --

20 MR. DUNKLEY: Right. Well, keep in mind we'll
21 have several different requirements for height. And
22 it's stated in here that none of them overrules any of
23 the others. All of them must be taken into account. So

1 the maximum height would be the lower of any of those
2 requirements.

3 MR. HUGHES: Okay.

4 MR. DUNKLEY: That's real fun when you have
5 two different boundaries that are, I don't know, you
6 have to calculate planes for. That's, that's fun. We
7 math types kind of have a ball. But usually it's pretty
8 straightforward to do that calculation.

9 Now on the other side, the street side,
10 there's recommendations for the use of stepbacks. And
11 this, stepbacks can have a pretty dramatic effect on how
12 you perceive building mass and perceive the kind of
13 street corridor. And it's really pretty simple. We
14 have a concept here we use in the downtown districts.
15 We call it a ziggurat setback. And it just means that
16 upper stories over a certain story are required to have
17 additional offsets from wherever we define it. But
18 those stories are required to be pushed back a little
19 bit from the street.

20 And it's, you don't actually have to push a
21 lot back to have much of a stepback, to have a --
22 effect. In fact I think we included the calculations on
23 the last page. Any of you who are interested and want

1 to pull out your high school trigonometry, I actually
2 got to use it this week.

3 And you can actually figure out pretty
4 precisely how much setback you need based upon the
5 number of floors, number of stories, and where are your
6 public spaces, particularly your pedestrian space, to
7 find out what sort of setback you need so that upper
8 story, that additional story, is not even visible from
9 most of the, at least the pedestrian area, at least the
10 sidewalk and parkway area. And it turns out that if you
11 use a nominal 10-foot story that it's about five feet, a
12 five-foot setback above the third story. And then that
13 fourth story is really not even seen from the sidewalk
14 area. Certainly the further away you go, the easier it
15 is to see.

16 MR. WRIGHT: Across the street or in the --

17 MR. DUNKLEY: No. That's on the same side of
18 the street. And you know, if you don't want to see it
19 all, don't, you know, you need a pretty big setback.
20 But if you --

21 MR. SMITH: Yeah, but on both sides of the
22 street there's nowhere to go to give yourself a --

23 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. That's why I specifically

1 said, you know, if you're on, in the pedestrian area on
2 that side of the street, it only takes really about five
3 feet to not be able to see that. And of course, yes, if
4 you go to the other side of the street, you'll be able
5 to see the upper portion of that.

6 MS. ANDERSON: If you're driving down the
7 street, where you going to get that -- if you already
8 have them?

9 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. The effect of having that
10 distance is pretty dramatic. Not having it rise in a
11 line of, like at the street wall, really, your
12 perception of the amount of mass that's there is very
13 different. And I'll try and find some examples that
14 maybe I can show through photographs. I don't think we
15 can do it through video or take you all on a tour.

16 But not being able to see the continuation of
17 that wall is probably the primary sort of determiner of
18 how you perceive the space. It's done a lot in, well,
19 I've seen it in Denver, in Boulder, certainly Vancouver.
20 Has anyone been to Vancouver? The west end of
21 Vancouver is an enormously dense district. It is denser
22 than you would ever think. And you never perceive it
23 from ground level because there are significant

1 stepbacks that are required at the third floor and
2 above.

3 MS. ANDERSON: How many stories are there?

4 MR. DUNKLEY: Fifty, sixty, seventy, towers.

5 MS. ANDERSON: Well, that's not even what
6 we're talking about.

7 MR. DUNKLEY: No, it's not. But I'm using it
8 as an example of the fact that --

9 MR. WRIGHT: I think we're talking about two
10 different things. You know, I think, you know, examples
11 he gives to you -- I put some numbers in that nobody
12 else has even looked at. But -- I think we're concerned
13 about not this -- you see from sitting or standing right
14 in front of the building that, you know, what's the --
15 to be on the roof or the street as you look down and as
16 you -- compared to what we have now. And I think, you
17 know, we're talking, you know, about the number of --
18 you know, a bit more and starting a bit lower. But you
19 know, some of them -- insufficient.

20 MR. DUNKLEY: Well, this is, yes, you know,
21 this is our first draft. So let's go in there. And all
22 ideas are welcome.

23 MR. SMITH: Just this afternoon I measured

1 today at 11 o'clock. And each additional story, and
2 this is small stories, but now introduced another
3 additional lane up the street. -- parking lane, two
4 traffic lanes, then another parking lane. Each time you
5 go up a story, the shadow creates this. So it's not
6 just one of the things that contributes to the sun's --
7 It is the shadow. One of the -- right now -- the
8 Central Street low-crime jewel district. Instead it's
9 very open in an area that's otherwise got a lot of trees
10 and a lot of, there's a lot of single-family or --
11 family unit homes.

12 MR. DUNKLEY: Right. Well, let's take a look
13 at specifically, you want me to look at north side of
14 the street versus south side? Obviously a big
15 difference. And this is the place where stepbacks can
16 really have an effect too. So, and we can do those
17 calculations. I've dusted off all of my trigonometry
18 skills. So, and you know, we have a fair amount of
19 precedent to draw on as well.

20 MR. SMITH: I have to ask just two more --
21 drive down Chicago Avenue right now. The building that
22 I use as an example in our August 22nd -- as near as I
23 can tell. But the visual impact is virtually

1 indistinguishable from the straight vertical wall.

2 MR. DUNKLEY: That's difficult to do. We'll
3 use that as a --

4 MR. SMITH: I'll concede. You know, I can do
5 -- standing right at the base of it, again, you won't be
6 able to see, you know, the upper stories. But I don't
7 know that that's the main determiner. Because people on
8 Central Street walk on both sides of the street.

9 MR. DUNKLEY: We also have some possibilities
10 with change of materials, with some way of, you know,
11 lessening the impact. So we, you know, like I said,
12 this is a starting point. We will take it from here.

13 MR. HILL: I noticed in areas 5 and 6, which
14 are both B2, you have different setbacks for those two
15 areas --

16 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes, and that was because, let's
17 see, the stories above which a setback would apply are
18 different. And so you have to have a wider setback if
19 you're third floor and above, versus fourth floor and
20 above, so that it's --

21 MR. HILL: You're talking about areas 5 and 6,
22 separating 5 and 6?

23 MR. DUNKLEY: Right. Yes.

1 MR. HILL: They're both B2.

2 MR. DUNKLEY: Right.

3 MR. HILL: Area 5 was a 7 above the second --
4 third, 6 as a 5 -- the third.

5 MR. DUNKLEY: Right. And that's --

6 MR. HILL: Why is that different?

7 MR. DUNKLEY: I think that's because the
8 pedestrian area is wider. Yes. The pedestrian area is
9 wider in sub-area 6. So I just, I really used that as
10 the determinate for the horizontal distance of public
11 area at which you wouldn't be able to see the stepback
12 story.

13 MR. HILL: The pedestrian area -- sidewalk?

14 MR. DUNKLEY: Sidewalk and parkway, yes. Yes.
15 So that was really just plugging in the different
16 numbers for that district. And again, when you come
17 back to that, does it make sense? Do we want to be, you
18 know, be consistent along the whole corridor? That's
19 maybe a little easier to explain and understand.

20 But since the pedestrian area was wider, the
21 intent was that we could make the stepbacks, should make
22 the stepbacks a little further so that, to basically get
23 at the same result, which at this point was aiming at

1 making the stepback stories unperceivable to, if you
2 were on the sidewalk or the parkway area.

3 MR. SMITH: I don't, I'll go on record as
4 saying I don't see the need to be consistent through the
5 length of the corridor.

6 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes.

7 MR. SMITH: It's over two and-a-half miles
8 long. It's not even the same type of geologic zone.
9 You're going from a sandy beach to, you know, slate
10 glass -- a little higher ridge.

11 MR. DUNKLEY: That is where we can go from
12 here. If we want to bring geologic zones into, we can,
13 we can do that.

14 MR. SMITH: You can make fun of it, Bill.

15 MR. DUNKLEY: I'm not.

16 MR. SMITH: But the fact is, down by Evanston
17 Hospital is, you know, nearly, I don't want to say
18 industrialized, but you've got huge vertical walls.
19 It's very institutional. And then, you know, you've got
20 this low-rise business district. And then you get into
21 a long stretch of multi-family that's set way back and
22 hidden by trees. And then we get into another low-rise
23 business district and they've got a whole bunch of

1 residential -- and -- primarily single-family houses,
2 town houses, duplexes, and so forth until we kind of get
3 into a quasi-agrarian --

4 MR. DUNKLEY: Well, I know you've got several,
5 you know, many comments on the changing character of the
6 corridor. So let's see if we can bring some of that in
7 to this whole structure in a way that makes sense. So,
8 yes.

9 MR. SMITH: Each of these areas, it's a very
10 ambitious project. And so I respect the task that's in
11 front of you. But you could spend, you know, the entire
12 time and process just on one of these sub-areas if you
13 wanted to.

14 MR. DUNKLEY: Oh, yes. We could. Yes, we
15 could. And that's, I'm trying to focus on those things
16 that are going to provide the most protection, give us
17 the most bang for the buck, really. Because you're
18 right. And especially when we get into architectural
19 detailing. We may never end.

20 MR. SMITH: Are we open for general comment
21 now? Or are we still on stepbacks?

22 MR. DUNKLEY: Well, there is actually, there
23 is stepbacks, pedestrian requirements, bicycle parking,

1 fenestration, and facade articulation to go through.
2 But I feel like I'm talking lots of -- If you want to
3 take comments, we can do that.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have a comment, another
5 comment on setbacks.

6 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes.

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'd like you to keep in mind
8 -- and setbacks, don't just think that people passing
9 up and down the street in their cars -- But -- homes,
10 the single-family homes that are -- the way that those
11 buildings -- Setback doesn't matter. We can see the --
12 wall.

13 MR. DUNKLEY: Right. And that's the, just
14 before we talked about stepbacks, I spent some time
15 describing this other concept, which was the
16 transitional height plane. And that does a pretty good
17 job about keeping the mass away from the single-family
18 districts. And you're right. We have those. We have
19 them right next to the commercial properties. So we
20 need to make sure that's not a, that doesn't overwhelm
21 the residential properties that are there. So, yes,
22 point well taken. Yes, ma'am?

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So on that transitional

1 plane, would you change the -- development condominiums
2 -- R1 district.

3 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That fourth, third and
5 fourth, fifth stories are set back -- And then you have
6 a -- So it's not, we're not very deep on the lots. The
7 building's going like this and I --

8 MR. DUNKLEY: Well, it means that, you know,
9 if you project out, first you go back the setback
10 distance, which you would have to do anyway. So let's
11 say there's a, you know, a 15-foot setback. And I'm
12 just throwing that number out there. You'd go back the
13 setback distance, up the distance of the height
14 requirement of the residential district, the lower-
15 intensity district, the R1, 2, 3, R1, 2, or 3. And then
16 from that point, which is back into the commercial
17 property, from that point, if you extend a plane 45
18 degrees from there so it slopes up, you know, in a one-
19 for-one basis, every foot out is a foot up, then nothing
20 can protrude through that plane.

21 So that limits the height, to start off at the
22 normally 35 feet and moving up from there. So you
23 couldn't get to five stories, you know, until you're at

1 another, say, 25, 30 feet further away. And that would
2 depend on the specifics of the site. So yes, if you
3 have a shallow site, you may not be able to even get up
4 to whatever the allowable height is.

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So would that transitional
6 and the stepback not be -- something that, and I know we
7 have to talk about the site plan allowance projection,
8 but would that be something that is not able to be
9 considered for -- or they can't --

10 MR. DUNKLEY: Well, there's been a lot of call
11 for kind of reigning in the ability to grant excessive
12 site plan allowances as part of a planned development.
13 And we're going to see what we can do there. Now that
14 would pretty much cover any, cover all planning
15 developments in the corridor.

16 So I can't say that any one thing, it wouldn't
17 be possible to vary that. So we're going to look at
18 more kind of a blanket kind of reigning in of that, of
19 the whole planning development thing. We'll see where
20 we go with that. But I'm willing to move forward on
21 that.

22 MR. BILANDIC: Within the parcels by Central
23 Park, suggests the need for arcades.

1 MR. DUNKLEY: For? I'm sorry.

2 MR. BILANDIC: Arcades -- more useful.

3 MR. DUNKLEY: I was going to put arcades in,
4 but, and I will if you all feel that that's, I know
5 we've had some, we've had one development, several
6 developments that have had some marginally successful
7 arcades. And they can be really bad if they're not done
8 well.

9 MR. BILANDIC: Some of them can be really
10 good.

11 MR. DUNKLEY: They can be very good. And
12 arcade is where you have, where the building extends out
13 over the public sidewalk.

14 MR. BILANDIC: No. Not over. To the lot
15 line. Not what you think. That's what I mean by an
16 arcade. The building doesn't exceed, go on the public
17 plane. It's on private property. And an arcade is
18 then, it's portioned below, generally to give a --

19 MR. DUNKLEY: So, you know, you're saying an
20 extension of the sidewalk underneath the building.

21 MR. BILANDIC: That's right.

22 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. So whether it's, you know,
23 regardless of whether it's private property or public

1 way, it's the ability to, it's having a covered
2 sidewalk, really, for that the building extends over.
3 You usually see it in warm climates, although there are
4 some examples here. And it has to be done right. If
5 your pillars are too large and the space is not done
6 with a good enough volume over the sidewalk, it can be
7 very dank and not a pleasant place to be.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That was in --

9 MR. DUNKLEY: We have plenty, yes. And I do
10 have some language that I'd like to, if you're all
11 interested and feel that that's an area where we really
12 need some protection that addresses arcades and what the
13 requirements should be. And it was my next, the next
14 thing to sort of, to add, but didn't want to really over
15 complicate.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Are -- and such other
17 projecting elements in the public space considered
18 zoning?

19 MR. DUNKLEY: Well, both zoning and, could
20 also be controlled by the sign ordinance, which is kind
21 of a closely-related cousin of zoning. But yes, they do
22 generally count these, over the public right of way are
23 limited.

1 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay, time out for one
2 minute. Has everybody signed in? Okay. Anybody who
3 came late, if you could give names to the court reporter
4 so that we can know who all is here. That would be very
5 helpful. Because when people speak, he needs to be able
6 to ultimately identify them.

7 The other issue that we have is, this is being
8 recorded in order to create a transcript. And people
9 from the back of the room can't be heard on these mics.
10 So we, if somebody's going to speak, they need to come
11 up.

12 COURT REPORTER: Or stand up and then speak
13 loudly like a --

14 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, it's certainly not
15 anybody else's fault. It's just something that's a
16 technical issue that we need to address.

17 MR. DUNKLEY: Okay.

18 MS. HENNIGAN: Can I just have a question
19 answered?

20 MR. DUNKLEY: Certainly.

21 MS. HENNIGAN: My name is Connie Hennigan.
22 And, can you hear me?

23 MR. DUNKLEY: You're welcome to come on up if

1 you want.

2 MS. HENNIGAN: I just want to ask a question.

3 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes.

4 COURT REPORTER: Yes, I can hear you if you
5 speak up.

6 MS. HENNIGAN: All right. Setbacks are coming
7 back on ground level. Stepbacks are, is it all the way
8 around the building?

9 MR. DUNKLEY: It's, what's proposed here is
10 just the front facade. You really --

11 MS. HENNIGAN: What's that all the
12 neighbors --

13 MR. DUNKLEY: Well, it doesn't. But that's
14 the other thing. That's the transitional height plane.
15 That exists in the other direction. So between the two
16 of them you're pushing the mass of the building towards
17 the center of -- that lot. So --

18 MS. HENNIGAN: I don't think I understand what
19 this transitional height plane is. That's not the 45
20 degree angle?

21 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. That's that.

22 MS. HENNIGAN: Okay.

23 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. If someone has a better

1 term for it, I'm up for it. That's kind of a lot of
2 words to say. But I can't think of any, a better way
3 of --

4 PARTICIPANT: How about a rear setback?

5 MR. DUNKLEY: Well, --

6 CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, it's not really, though.

7 MR. DUNKLEY: It's not a setback.

8 MS. HENNIGAN: I just needed to know what it
9 meant.

10 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes, that's it. It's that plane
11 thing, that.

12 MS. HENNIGAN: Thank you.

13 MR. DUNKLEY: It's this. We'll use semaphore.

14 MR. SMITH: Jeff Smith. I don't want to
15 create the impression that we, by we I mean the Central
16 Street Neighbors Association, is fighting the plan. I
17 want to stress that everything we're doing and
18 suggesting is with the goal of trying to do the -- to
19 its implementation.

20 Before we get too far afield, I wanted to go
21 to your purpose statement. And Richard Wright has
22 drafted a substitute purpose statement which basically
23 takes and reiterates the master plans goals straight

1 from the master plan. I understand if you're trying to
2 paraphrase, but it ends up subtly, but I think
3 significantly, changing the purpose of the district.

4 For example, I mean, we totally agree that
5 preserving existing retail character and scale in fact
6 might even be a better way of saying sustaining and
7 enhancing Central Street, which is the primary goal of
8 the master plan.

9 But if you, your second point, encourage
10 mixed-use developments, really doesn't appear as an
11 overall phrase that's a goal of the master plan and is
12 kind of at odds with what drove the whole plan, which is
13 even referenced in the plan that it arose out of concern
14 of massing and scale, etc.

15 MR. DUNKLEY: Okay, the --

16 MR. SMITH: The problems that are perceived on
17 Central Street, probably developments have all been
18 mixed-use developments by and large. And that, it's not
19 only the physical and visual aspect of it, but the fact
20 that it's the mixed-use developments that tend to drive
21 out independent retail and result in dead end storefront
22 space, not because they don't have windows, but because
23 they've got windows where the blinds are closed because

1 they're not truly retail. They're offices or the like.

2 So I would suggest, first of all, that we take
3 a substitute purpose statement or perhaps merge them to
4 some degree.

5 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. I'll look at that. I want
6 to make clear that the zoning tools that we have here,
7 the purposes of, the purpose of this district is not
8 identical to the purpose of the plan. This text was
9 taken directly from the zoning recommendations and the
10 urban design recommendations of the plan, not from the
11 overall plan purpose.

12 Now, many of those statements could be
13 perfectly acceptable -- as well. But I don't want to
14 imply that we will be able to do some of the things that
15 we can't do. So it may be a subtle difference. But
16 this purpose statement applies to this district. Why do
17 we have this overlay district?

18 MR. SMITH: well, because, it's not like we're
19 stepping back from something. We're actually, if we
20 make that purpose, we're going beyond what the plan said
21 it was going to do. It's really changing the
22 orientation.

23 Because throughout the visioning workshop

1 there was no clamor for let's have more mixed-use
2 developments. I mean, that just, that just didn't
3 exist. We were shown that. We were given that. We
4 were given Hobson's choice of, do you like big condos or
5 small condos? Do you like five-story condo buildings
6 all residential or do you want five-story condo
7 buildings with one row of residents of retail at the
8 bottom?

9 But it really didn't come to -- union. There
10 weren't merchants standing up clamoring for it either.
11 And there weren't property owners standing up clamoring
12 for it. There was a couple --

13 MR. DUNKLEY: I'd be glad to look through what
14 you suggested and see if, how much maybe we can
15 incorporate.

16 MR. SMITH: -- next to this development doesn't
17 even appear in the preliminary plan.

18 MR. WRIGHT: Let me say, but I think it's a
19 small thing. What we're all, and again we're all, it
20 really is just purpose language. And I think the
21 overall purpose of that in the zoning code, I think you
22 kind of give an overall vision sort of thing, right?

23 And I realize that what you put in here, I see

1 where it came from. It came from kind of, sort of
2 design guidelines of -- And that part is actually kind
3 of, it's that -- part and then later sections of what
4 you've drafted here, which I think, you know, I think
5 you've done a very good job so far. And that's my
6 comment. But I think, I just, I think a lot of this is
7 a very good structure.

8 But the purpose thing is really a, more the
9 overall vision for it. And this is actually much longer
10 than the uniform --

11 MR. DUNKLEY: It is. Yes, it is.

12 MR. WRIGHT: And I have no problem with that.

13 But if you take the purpose, there is a purpose part of
14 the plan that kind of, this is the direct quote from
15 that I think, that I think fits a lot better.

16 MR. DUNKLEY: I think we're, I don't really
17 want to spend much more time on this. It's, it's not
18 going to amount to a hill of beans, really. And I'll be
19 glad to just cut it down to bare bones if it's going to
20 really let us focus on the most essential stuff.

21 MR. WRIGHT: No, I like the -- of the plan. I
22 like -- you know.

23 MR. DUNKLEY: I'll do what I can to see if I

1 can incorporate as much as what, of what you suggested.

2 That won't be a problem.

3 MR. SMITH: Well, maybe you should reassure
4 us, though. But the concern I have and that some others
5 have is that at a minimum we want to end up with
6 something that doesn't make things worse. We thought
7 that the whole idea of this planning process would be
8 something that, you know, really sets some guidelines
9 and some controls and makes things better and allows
10 things to evolve the way that would please the
11 community.

12 And I don't think anybody wants to end up with
13 their legacy being that, you know, hey, what happened to
14 Chicago Avenue, that people now think was a mistake.
15 Let's do that to Central Street too.

16 But there, if you don't take out all these
17 little details that, you know, don't amount to a hill of
18 beans, at the time you look back and they're all in
19 there and it can, future people are going to look back
20 in making, you know various decisions under variances or
21 you know, some of the -- site development laws for a
22 49-story building on Central Street. And they'll say,
23 well, --

1 MR. DUNKLEY: I'll, I'll try and --

2 MR. SMITH: -- they said we're trying to
3 encourage multi-use development. So --

4 MR. DUNKLEY: I, I, okay, I will do what I
5 can. Frankly, taking it from the text of the plan
6 recommendations for the zoning are about as verbatim as
7 you can get. And I will err on the side of just cutting
8 this way back if this is going to engender a lot more
9 discussion about the purpose statement. Frankly, it has
10 a very minor role in our zoning administration.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: May I just say, may I just
12 say that that's not entirely true, I think. Because
13 when we go through the Planning Commission hearings and
14 developers are up there with their big plans, we state
15 specifically, it says in the purpose statement that this
16 is what we want. So I think that's where we're coming
17 from. It's, they will quote this.

18 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. Like I said, I'd be glad
19 to go through it. And I probably can incorporate most
20 of the text that's here. We'll have a darn long purpose
21 statement, but we'll have it in there.

22 MR. WRIGHT: If this is the statement -- a
23 different -- You know, I'd like to, you know, there's a

1 number of things, a number of comments from what I had
2 here that all, that all surround a certain issue. And
3 that's, it follows up on what we discussed last week.

4 And we were discussing the west, the west, you
5 know, I think it's area 6. I think we have here, if I'm
6 correct, here's area 6 on the far west end there. And
7 we were talking about having the overlay specify, and --
8 in a number of places in here specify even though it's,
9 the base district is B2, the overlay pretty much makes
10 it a B1A in terms of you know, the B1A uses, the B1A
11 yard requirements. We're a little bit different in
12 back.

13 MR. DUNKLEY: Right.

14 MR. WRIGHT: The B1A lot size is 900-square
15 feet. But -- would be -- And I also think one of the
16 zoning changes, you have it in the overlay here, but it
17 might be, you mentioned this before, it might be better
18 to just to kind of go ahead and add that height change
19 and be wide. Go ahead and put it into the base, be
20 wide. Because it's only the B1A that exists up here in
21 this area. And so it's probably better just to put that
22 35 feet or three stories into B1A itself, you know,
23 without letting the -- just kind of saying, for some

1 reason this is 40 feet. And now it's down to 35 in the
2 older number. That's, either way it's going to have
3 a --

4 But when you're talking maximum, you know,
5 kind of having this be B1A with a lower 35 feet, but
6 then, instead of -- I think you called it a bonus.

7 MR. DUNKLEY: Right.

8 MR. WRIGHT: You know.

9 MR. DUNKLEY: Right.

10 MR. WRIGHT: I actually kind of found last
11 week another new zoning provision that was. We have an
12 incentive -- provision in there. It's kind of modified
13 in here. It says that, it's a much more restrictive
14 thing. It's not like a STA. It's much more
15 restrictive. It says, you'll get the extra story.
16 You'll get the extra 10 feet, extra story if you put in,
17 we're talking -- you know, substantial space for small
18 offices.

19 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes, right.

20 MR. WRIGHT: And we thought it was a good idea
21 to ask if we could. And I think it's a matter of, you
22 know, and I kind of -- to the height, the height overlay
23 in that area actually is, you know, down to the B1A

1 height.

2 MR. DUNKLEY: Right.

3 MR. WRIGHT: But you get the bonus up to what
4 you have in your table if you do the office thing.

5 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. Yes, I, don't get the
6 impression that I don't think it's a good idea anymore.
7 I think it's a fantastic idea.

8 MR. WRIGHT: You just haven't worked it in
9 here yet, I know.

10 MR. DUNKLEY: Right.

11 MR. WRIGHT: Okay.

12 MR. DUNKLEY: There is some questions about
13 office, which Jim, it is a brilliant idea. But we have
14 to make sure we have a basis for that. That if it's
15 come out of left field, we're going to have to justify
16 it. We're going to have to find some way of putting it
17 in there.

18 MR. WRIGHT: But I think -- that said the
19 residential of that height would be pretty much of a
20 problem there. The -- went across the street and so on.

21 The other thing is, that the same idea we've
22 talked about, and I've put it in here in the, you know,
23 in the various sort of, same sort of places, for that,

1 for the Chase Bank Epco site. In fact, I mean, this is
2 just me talking right now, but I think we might actually
3 want to include the entire Chase Banking lot and not
4 split that, not split that lot. And put it in with the,
5 you know, keep it in the B2. But, you know, again, have
6 the overlay bring it down to the B1A.

7 But say, you know, you get the extra, you
8 know, if you had the good setbacks, if you have your
9 sort of angle things and so on, if you had your
10 articulation, and like I said, you can get the extra
11 story, you can get the extra 10 feet if we have
12 substantial public parking there, which is going to be
13 critical, especially if that site's redeveloped. You
14 can't use Chase Bank's parking lot when you want a soda.
15 So the same idea --

16 MR. DUNKLEY: You're not using the parking
17 lot, are you?

18 MR. WRIGHT: You know, so the same idea there
19 of, you know, of exactly the same thing. You know, in
20 both sub-areas 5 and 6, you know, kind of have,
21 basically kind of fill in all the sort of, you know,
22 there's a few differences in uses. There's a, you know,
23 different lot size or a little bit different rear yard

1 and so on. Build those all into the overlay. But then
2 say you get certain parts of that back up, mainly the
3 height.

4 MR. DUNKLEY: That's really what's of
5 interest, yes.

6 MR. WRIGHT: Bring the height back up in
7 return for the substantial public parking.

8 And the same thing in sub-area 9. We talked
9 before about, I thought we were trying to get rid of the
10 sort of sub-area 8 and 9. And I put things in -- We
11 really don't want to have these increased uses in those
12 areas without any guarantee of public parking structure.
13 The whole idea of the, trying for the public parking
14 structure. So I think it would be the same thing there.

15 You allow these additional uses only, you
16 know, in exchange for somebody who can build a public
17 parking structure. And you know, even a public parking
18 structure they showed in the plan wasn't four stories,
19 45 feet. It was three stories, 35 feet. And that's
20 only area 9.

21 And you want to say that these additional uses
22 are subject to the height limitation. Otherwise, you
23 put the additional uses in there without changing the

1 height limitation, all of sudden they can do, you know,
2 mixed-use, whatever -- they have, to 140 feet they're
3 allowed or something? You know, so, I know that it's
4 not what you intend. But that's the sort of thing.

5 And sub-area 9 now, with it's base of 01 and
6 T1, actually the old one has that sort of -- It's --
7 could be anything, right, which is still in here. The
8 T1 has the least severe restrictions also. So it's
9 going to be a major change to that area there.

10 MR. DUNKLEY: Right. And I agree that some
11 restrictions of, along Central Street and possibly in
12 return for public benefit would make sense.

13 MR. WRIGHT: I think for sub-area 8 we should
14 just drop the entire, you know, in terms of the -- in
15 here. That's the one that, it's not a return for
16 anything. Nobody will push for that. Just kind of keep
17 it out of the -- for that.

18 MR. DUNKLEY: I'll look into that and see
19 what's --

20 MR. WRIGHT: I think on the transitional
21 height plane, I think you want to include, if it's
22 adjacent to R1, R2, R3 or R4. R4 is the same height.
23 R4 is just town houses and you know, are two and-a-half

1 stories, 35 feet.

2 MR. DUNKLEY: That's a possibility, yes.

3 MR. WRIGHT: You know, include that in there.

4 And you haven't got your pedestrian area yet. I think
5 that's a great job in the pedestrian -- I think that's
6 really very good. But I think you want to specify that
7 as being, you know, adjacent to the curb rather than
8 between the curb and the facade. Because even if you
9 add on -- for the 10 feet, that's still not as much as
10 required to the front yard in some of these areas.

11 MR. DUNKLEY: Right. That's why, yes.

12 Residential areas are going to be --

13 MR. WRIGHT: And also number one. Also number
14 one is 27 feet back. So I put a number of those things
15 in here.

16 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes, that's, yes that's, I know
17 that's a wrinkle that we've got. We're going to have to
18 find out.

19 MR. WRIGHT: You know, there's other things in
20 here. I've enclosed those that are the major sort of
21 things that I wanted to -- Plus the alley, the alley for
22 the -- thing. And making, you know, -- requirements
23 somewhere in here.

1 MR. DUNKLEY: That, yes. That, we're going to
2 hold off on. Because that's being handled in a city-
3 wide fashion, zoning-code wide fashion.

4 MR. WRIGHT: And then you know, and then more
5 substantial articulation right here. It's all in here.
6 I'll let you read it and --

7 MR. DUNKLEY: Okay. Okay, great.

8 MR. SMITH: I wanted to add a couple data
9 points that we've learned recently. We've been meeting,
10 both informally and actually at a formal meeting for the
11 Central Street Neighbors, with the Central Street
12 Merchant's Association. There was a rumor going around
13 about two weeks ago that retail leases were being
14 canceled or were not renewed and that multiple
15 properties were being bought up in the Crown Jewel --
16 redevelopment.

17 And again, the plan that everybody signed off
18 on and bought into shows no redevelopment in both the
19 Crown Jewel from Hartrey to Prairie. And there's, when
20 they're talking about appropriate mixed-use development,
21 it says in key locations in the plan. And then
22 identifies, etcetera. No central locations were
23 identified in the plan itself within the Crown Jewel.

1 We were able to determine that that rumor was
2 false as we heard. But subsequently we learned, or I've
3 learned, that in fact there are leases that are not
4 being renewed. And the reason being that the properties
5 are going to be sold. And this is properties that
6 nobody probably wants to see redeveloped with any
7 height.

8 Prices that are being asked are not consistent
9 with small, diverse, eclectic retail. In fact, the
10 prices would nearly dictate that we'd have to redevelop
11 at such a high square footage cost that it would drive
12 out existing merchants.

13 You drive up and down Central Street right
14 now, there's at least four Edward Jones offices. I
15 don't think it's because there's that much pedestrian
16 demand for stock broker services. It's because land is
17 being, is basically being warehoused. So, and --

18 MR. DUNKLEY: And what's your suggestion
19 regarding the zoning?

20 MR. SMITH: My suggestion, that's one of
21 reasons that we feel that we really need to, that we
22 need to be as aggressive as possible, but consistent
23 with the fair treatment of property. And that's why we

1 need a, what we call the B1B district in the Crown
2 Jewel. And that we need to, where it's recommended that
3 there's, to go from B2 to B1A, that that be done as
4 well. Because there are offsetting development areas in
5 the plan to which we can steer development.

6 But that's not the area that we want it done
7 in. But it would be an unintended consequence or
8 failure to down zone consistent with what community
9 passion asks for.

10 MR. WRIGHT: Just as reference point, I called
11 that sub-area 4B, 4B instead of B1B.

12 MR. DUNKLEY: Are you suggesting that
13 development and the ability to redevelop a site be
14 somehow prohibited?

15 MR. SMITH: No.

16 MR. WRIGHT: No. You're talking about, you
17 know, again, a somewhat lower height we talked about.
18 You know, so that -- so that at least if it's
19 redeveloped, there's some chance of keeping the
20 independent retail merchants we have along there.

21 If we lose, you know, if we lose, you know the
22 -- We can lose all the -- The plan talks about unique,
23 small-scale retail. That's the whole goal of the

1 planned --

2 If we don't have some restrictions on there
3 and still don't have a redevelopment in my --
4 development, kind of still say, the guy who comes in
5 here is going to do something that's going to still be
6 affordable to the small independent merchants. And then
7 we're going to lose the Spice House. We're going to
8 lose the bakery. We're going to lose all the sort of
9 things that people love having there. And we're just
10 going to have a row of subways down below --

11 MR. DUNKLEY: Okay, I guess, are we, are we
12 really in immediate danger here? I mean --

13 MR. WRIGHT: That's the --

14 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes? It's the --

15 MR. WRIGHT: People are now not having --

16 MR. DUNKLEY: Okay, I'd like to see some data
17 on that.

18 MR. WRIGHT: Developers are coming in and
19 contacting owners and trying to say, you know, as soon
20 as the moratorium comes off, the way it is now, we're
21 going, we're going to move.

22 MR. SMITH: You made an extremely interesting
23 assertion, Bill, last -- we were doing that about the

1 relationship between zoning and development, saying that
2 zoning doesn't cause development. And so I did a lot of
3 research on that in the interim. And I think it's, it
4 is gray, but there is definitely some sort of a cause
5 and effect.

6 And the literature, to the extent that it's
7 out there, that I've read, indicates that where down
8 zoning occurs in a mature town, as opposed to a green
9 field or where you can expand on the perimeters, that
10 what happens is that you somewhat retard the inflation
11 and land value of the areas being down zoned. And you
12 increase the value of adjacent or nearby areas that have
13 not been directly affected by the down zoning. So for
14 -- the up zones.

15 MR. DUNKLEY: All right, let's --

16 MR. SMITH: But, so the relevance of that is
17 that in the -- we don't have the zoning map here, but if
18 you look at the Central Street corridor, and we all know
19 that it's surrounded by huge swats of R1, right? Okay?
20 That R1, we were already in an overlay district.

21 The single-family home owners were down zoned
22 by first the moratorium that was put on and then a
23 monster house. You can only go so big now. You can

1 only go so tall in relation to your neighbors. And it's
2 possible that unwittingly we spurred speculative land
3 values and condominium development by making it harder
4 to put up a giant, you know, single-family house or
5 something in the R1 district. I'm not sure. But the
6 point is, is that --

7 MR. DUNKLEY: I'm not sure either.

8 MR. SMITH: The point is that there does seem
9 to be some relationship, what we do will have
10 consequences. We want to make sure that the
11 consequences are those we want.

12 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. I'd be, love, if you want
13 to give me a reference on that. Or the material you've,
14 I'd love to read it. It's somewhat hard to find what
15 you're speculating on to be actionable. But certainly
16 it's a good theory to go through.

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can I just make an
18 observation? I think it's kind of related. -- my
19 business is not -- Highland Park. Many people know
20 Highland Park is, downtown has gotten very well. They
21 put up a lot of condos in the last decade. But they put
22 them on the periphery.

23 Central Street in Highland Park is doing very

1 well. And it's maintained its character. It's -- The
2 village -- There's an open area. -- Square just as we
3 have -- parking. And it's worked out very nicely. --
4 people who live in the condos have someplace to walk.
5 It also helps to keep parking pressure off of the
6 shopping district.

7 So I think that's something to think about. I
8 think the village proposal is a very good one,
9 particularly with trying to focus -- Green Bay Road.
10 It's definitely not a walking street.

11 MS. ANDERSON: Highland Park has a very very
12 large underground parking lot, right?

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: They had -- block off --

14 MS. ANDERSON: For retail.

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's relatively recent.

16 MR. HUGHES: I'm Jim Hughes. I'm very
17 familiar with Lake Forest. I even lived there at one
18 time. And as I can remember, all of its condo
19 developments were -- on the north side. And there are
20 new condos going up. There have been a number of -- in
21 that area. -- retail in with that, not mixed-use. And
22 the downtown area is -- two-story perspective throughout
23 that --

1 MR. DUNKLEY: Other comments? Okay, we're
2 going to make a --

3 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Can I make one --

4 MR. ERD: I guess, is there, are we getting to
5 this sheet? Are we getting to this speaking sheet? Is
6 that why you're asking for comments?

7 MR. DUNKLEY: Well, I don't --

8 CHAIRMAN WOODS: We've been doing this in a
9 very informal manner. I don't know why there's a sign
10 up sheet actually.

11 MR. DUNKLEY: The sign up sheet is there so
12 that we know how to contact you and distribute any
13 updates. Sorry if there's any mis-communication.

14 MR. ERD: Just a second. If you were to send
15 George and I to represent the 50-some businesses on
16 Central Street, most of which are west of Green Bay.
17 And we have been involved in the planning process since
18 the beginning of the year.

19 We sent a letter to the Common Council, our
20 association. And the Central Street Association sent a
21 letter to the Common Council and John Lamott at -- But
22 you know, we never sent it to you guys. So here's a
23 copy of that letter.

1 MR. DUNKLEY: Okay, great.

2 MR. ERD: And it's just for your information.

3 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes, yes.

4 MR. ERD: You know, to let you know that the
5 business community has been involved in the process.
6 And I can understand why none of this stuff has filtered
7 through you guys.

8 MR. DUNKLEY: Well, yes, that's part of it.
9 It's also, my experience is it's really hard to get you
10 folks to come out. But you're busy running businesses,
11 so.

12 MR. ERD: But that's just a copy of the letter
13 for you. And then there's just two paragraphs that our
14 association has asked me to read to the zoning people.
15 And that's that we're glad that you're letting us go on
16 record tonight and that we feel that canyonization of
17 certain areas at Chicago and Main or on Central up
18 around Bleechwood in Central Park are examples that we
19 should try in this process to avoid.

20 Lack of the setbacks discourages walking.
21 We've been talking about that. Lack of adequate parking
22 discourages shoppers from outside the area.

23 Our experience as merchants shows that mixed-

1 use development, kind of going back to what Jeff said,
2 can harm existing businesses. You know, the much higher
3 rents drive out the one-of-a-kind shop, which is then
4 replaced with a national chain or bank or a nail salon
5 or another coffee shop. What was once a destination
6 shopping area now becomes like a homogenized block -- as
7 any other.

8 And then lastly, the members of our
9 association for the most part agree with the Central
10 Street Neighbor's Association in our mutual goals of
11 preserving the character and the charms of the
12 neighborhood. And we're urging the Zoning Council to
13 support zoning which respects the nature of the
14 community.

15 And then just as a personal sidebar to finish
16 up, my lease on Central Street will not be renewed. And
17 the owner of the property wants \$985,000 for 1,600-
18 square feet, one story. And when I told him I was
19 interested in buying it, he mentioned that price. And I
20 said, well, certainly no user of this building could
21 afford that number. And he said, that's okay, Don. He
22 said it won't be a user. We have developers that have
23 contacted us.

1 CHAIRMAN WOODS: How big is the lot?

2 MR. ERD: It's 25 feet wide by 68 feet deep.

3 MS. JACKSON: Right. Sixty-eight feet deep?

4 MR. ERD: Yes. And, and --

5 CHAIRMAN WOODS: And does he own adjoining
6 properties?

7 MR. ERD: The neighbor, Millie Fiori and
8 Symphonies, are owned by one owner who lives in Florida
9 who's 85 years old, has also been contacted by the state
10 developers.

11 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Sure.

12 MR. ERD: So it's pretty clear on this October
13 3rd that the Spice House and Symphonies and --

14 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Are all the lots --

15 MR. ERD: -- and Millie Fiori are the next
16 casualties in this.

17 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Are all the lot there 68 feet
18 deep?

19 MR. ERD: Correct. Well, there's a little bit
20 of an angle, but it's the same depth. And then that end
21 lot, because of the alley being on a -- Thanks.

22 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Thank you.

23 PARTICIPANT: Where it stepped over 500,000-

1 square foot --

2 MS. JACKSON: What'd you say?

3 PARTICIPANT: 500,000-square foot is what he's
4 asking.

5 MR. DUNKLEY: I'm actually on your November
6 agenda. So I'll be talking to folks. Yes, me too.

7 MS. GERSTON: I'm Terry Gerston. I live on
8 2624 Prairie. And I actually share an alley with these
9 wonderful business people. So I'm very distressed to
10 hear that.

11 But I also note that developers or someone
12 representative of them has even been ringing doorbells
13 of single-family homeowners on Prairie because of the
14 condo building not, went through before the Central
15 Street planning process ever got going. I imagine
16 that's why. And hope to develop other lots for people
17 to sell. We don't know what that is for. But I imagine
18 it's condo-ization.

19 And because at one time, I've been on that
20 block for 21 years, even saw up until about two years
21 ago, three quarters of them, the homes. It is an R4
22 district, but the -- of the homes were single-family,
23 not multi-family. There are, there have been some --

1 family units for a long time.

2 But it looks like, you know, the developers
3 are circling our area, supposedly the Crown Jewel and
4 the residential properties -- So you know, this isn't
5 speculative on our part. This is something that's
6 happening right now. Thank you.

7 MR. WALSH: If I might comment. A very good
8 example of how zoning does drive development. Because
9 the zoning on Prairie, as she said, is R4. And though
10 it's a predominantly single-family home lot and there
11 are developers, since the Prairie Avenue condominium is
12 under way, I think developers are coming, contacting
13 the --

14 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. But it's not the R4 itself
15 that's, you know, that's driving the development.
16 There's a lot, there's locational specifics about the --
17 It's a great location. There's all sorts of things that
18 are into the mix. And I don't want to spend a lot of
19 time debating my little quip about the fact that zoning
20 actually doesn't make anything happen.

21 Because there are just as many R5 districts
22 around that have been up zoned to R5 in order to attract
23 development that have not attracted any development

1 whatsoever. So you know, there are a lot of things that
2 go into the equation. I just really wanted to dispel
3 the notion that we can make development happen by
4 re-zoning. So --

5 MR. WALSH: It's -- not have over development.

6 MR. DUNKLEY: Oh, you can prohibit whatever
7 you want. Zoning's very good at that. A very big
8 part, yes.

9 MR. WRIGHT: Well, those things along Prairie,
10 I mean, I hope that's not the case. You know, I can
11 understand why they would. The developers know how
12 pretty easy it was to get the C1 changed to R4 and build
13 a max for the building there that's not very attractive.

14 MR. DUNKLEY: Was there a reason?

15 MR. WRIGHT: To B2, trying to get -- re-zoned
16 to B2. You know, it happened just a year and-a-half
17 ago. And we know the developers are being -- brokers
18 and stuff and so on. It's pretty easy to just up and
19 re-zone in Evanston. And that's why the prices are
20 being, you know, altered and such. I think if they got
21 it, we can get it for a re-zoning.

22 MR. DUNKLEY: Okay, shall we move on to,
23 through the end here? At least to -- press to try and

1 reach the last few remaining districts. Good comments.

2 MR. HUGHES: I have a couple comments. One of
3 my concerns has always been the use of ground floor
4 space. And I would like to find a way within the zoning
5 overlay or whatever to restrict how much of the ground
6 floor area can be used for parking. And as well as some
7 of these other miscellaneous uses like office, financial
8 institutions, by making those things special uses as
9 opposed to as-of-right uses.

10 MR. DUNKLEY: Having special uses on the
11 ground floor?

12 MR. HUGHES: Yeah.

13 PARTICIPANT: Well, probably another option is
14 to use an overlay district requiring the generation of
15 sales tax.

16 PARTICIPANT: You can't require somebody
17 to --

18 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Nobody -- that would generate
19 sales tax. You got to have sales. But if you don't
20 have those kinds of sales, then you can't generate tax
21 of any kind.

22 PARTICIPANT: That has been used in other
23 cities and towns.

1 MR. WRIGHT: I think in relation to Jim's
2 point, I think the point you made earlier, Bill, about
3 the you know, 20 feet, 50 feet, that's the sort of
4 thing. And the plan talks about 50 feet, right?

5 But I think we talked before about, you know,
6 and I -- then the sort of, maybe something like
7 requiring 50 percent of the building footprint drawn
8 vertically from the light to the point. You know, has
9 to be actually used for retail and -- commercial has
10 been used. And that would do a number of things. Make
11 sure it really is generating retail and other -- uses.
12 And also I think it would handle something that I think
13 that we've been worried about and that Jim's been
14 worried about.

15 We've even talked about maybe requiring --
16 parking. But if you require that much of the core space
17 to be, you know, retail and commercial, anything big's
18 going to have to go underground, both the parking and --
19 So it kind of kills two birds with one stone.
20 Especially if you can also -- tandem parking.

21 PARTICIPANT: You can't.

22 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, and frankly, I don't
23 have a problem personally with tandem parking for

1 residential uses. What I have a problem is the idea
2 that tandem parking can work universally for everything.

3 And somehow --

4 MR. WRIGHT: I guess if they want it, we
5 wouldn't mind. It's up to them. That's really --

6 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Exactly. That's more of a
7 market-type situation. And if it's underground I really
8 don't care.

9 I mean, the building that got built on Prairie
10 to the south, the little slim building that's sort of
11 set back, it's parking is interesting if you go in the
12 garage. It's a challenge, I think, for the people who
13 live there. But they knew that when they bought into
14 that building. And you know, so they live with whatever
15 it is. I mean, you can barely get your car in, turn it
16 around, do anything in that space. But they paid
17 obviously good money for those condos. And it's a nice
18 building. So I really don't care then. Because the
19 parking is basically below ground.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's below ground, plus it's
21 very few units.

22 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's like 47 units.

1 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. Well and, like I
2 said, but more than anything, it's below ground. So
3 it's out of sight.

4 MR. SMITH: While we're talking about --

5 CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's not occupying all that
6 ground floor space.

7 MR. SMITH: I'm sorry. I didn't mean to jump
8 in.

9 CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, that's okay.

10 MR. SMITH: While we were talking about uses
11 there were a number of things that came up in the
12 visioning that somehow just never seemed to make it in
13 under permit or at least special use.

14 There could be and probably should be more
15 destination activity generator-type of uses such as
16 entertainment. Right now we, you know, there's no place
17 to hear music on Central Street. That, that would be
18 one.

19 Indoor recreation should probably be a
20 permitted use rather than a special use. Because you're
21 surrounded by R1. And it's ridiculous that all the moms
22 have to drive their kids, you know, somewhere else to
23 take them to a laser, you know, or paint ball or

1 whatever, ski ball.

2 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Believe me, these aren't
3 going to be on that street anyhow.

4 MR. SMITH: The point is, especially if you're
5 talking about shared parking, I mean, shared parking is
6 -- unless you pay actual uses that you'd be better
7 alternating between nighttime activity and daytime
8 activity. So we ought to have, if we're going to be
9 encouraging that type of appropriate development, we've
10 got to be looking at, you know, the types of things that
11 for example, all the uses I've just mentioned. You
12 might have kid's uses at birthday parties during the
13 day, but then, you know, like --

14 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right, right. So at least --

15 MR. SMITH: -- like young adults at night.

16 MR. DUNKLEY: Make those uses that are, that
17 can share parking, at least make them, you know,
18 available.

19 MR. SMITH: Right. I have to drive --
20 martinis at -- I want to go play to go and play some
21 laser tag.

22 CHAIRMAN WOODS: You might have to walk up
23 Green Bay to do that. I don't think it's going to

1 happen on Central Street.

2 PARTICIPANT: -- targets over on the street.

3 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Even if no development
4 happens that real estate is way too valuable for that.

5 MR. DUNKLEY: I'd like to just walk us through
6 the remaining couple of pages here, then, so we can take
7 questions.

8 Page six is the definition of the pedestrian
9 area. And it's pretty straightforward. It essentially
10 says we need a sidewalk and a parkway. A parkway
11 includes a parkway and street furniture zone. It's okay
12 to have benches, trees, mailboxes, other things in that
13 space.

14 But the clear zone, the sidewalk zone, really
15 should be clear. And -- such as doorways, doors should
16 not encroach into that. That in itself can help us,
17 articulation of store front, which can be, can work
18 pretty well for the pedestrian space.

19 But really this section just requires those
20 elements. It hasn't been, there hasn't been a real need
21 to require them, fortunately, for the City of Evanston.

22 It's a part of our urban tradition. It would be
23 hopefully unthinkable to build anything without sidewalk

1 and pedestrian access. But I have been in many places
2 where that is not the case, where you actually have to
3 require not only pedestrian entrances, but require them
4 to be unlocked.

5 Also I have added, let's see, Section E.
6 Well, sub-section D prohibits you know, infringement
7 upon the visibility triangles at corners. We definitely
8 don't want to make turning more dangerous for cars. In
9 addition, E, this is really the best we could do at this
10 point. We can not require utilities to be buried, but
11 we can ask that everybody make commercially reasonable
12 efforts, be made to put them underground or to the rear.
13 That's, I don't think we have a --

14 MR. WRIGHT: Why can't we require it be
15 underground to the rear? I don't see why you can't
16 require that.

17 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes, we can, we may take that
18 discussion off line. It's an extraordinarily --

19 MR. WRIGHT: I mean, nobody has them in front
20 now that I know of.

21 MR. DUNKLEY: Right. Yes. And so we may
22 actually want to strike this piece. This actually may
23 not be that much of an issue. But it's very expensive

1 to require underground utilities. And you also have,
2 generally you have to retrofit a building so it can even
3 accept underground utilities. It's --

4 MR. WRIGHT: Did you say underground or rear?

5 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. So let's --

6 MR. WRIGHT: Let them have them underground.

7 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes.

8 MR. WRIGHT: I think it's a good thing. It
9 should be a must.

10 MR. DUNKLEY: We'll need to, I'll need to
11 bring in engineering and public works on this.

12 MR. HUGHES: -- or the public way?

13 MR. DUNKLEY: I'm sorry.

14 MR. HUGHES: These are cable for --

15 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes.

16 MR. HUGHES: A plus B is a public way. Is
17 that correct?

18 MR. DUNKLEY: Generally, yes. It is not
19 necessarily strictly right of way. But yes, it is a
20 public way. But the street is also --

21 MR. HUGHES: -- uses the facade. You measure
22 from the facade to what I'm suggesting is the arcade.
23 It would give you more public -- if the owners of the

1 property -- You don't think that's a tradeoff, then?

2 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. That's, yes. And let's,
3 let me look into that and see what we can pull in as far
4 as allowing arcades. And, you know, well-designed
5 arcades.

6 MR. WRIGHT: This is what I mentioned before,
7 that you actually don't want to have it be between the
8 curb and the facade. You want it to just about the curb
9 because otherwise you're going to make a -- front
10 yard --

11 MR. DUNKLEY: Right. Now F is meant to really
12 kind of avoid one of the problems with specifying strict
13 build to lines. And that is that you end up with a
14 street wall that is completely undifferentiated, which
15 can be pretty dull.

16 And actually having even a change of one or
17 two feet as you go from building to building or even
18 part of a building to another part of the building, --
19 in particular, having that kind of change in width makes
20 the shopping experience, walking experience, just the
21 general environment, makes it more interesting and
22 generally more comfortable.

23 So as far as an optional setback area, I

1 included language that would allow there to be an
2 additional amount of width between the sidewalk and the
3 -- the side of the building. It can be a very useful
4 space. It can be used for outdoor display of
5 merchandise as long as it's left outdoors. Certainly
6 restaurant seating. Public art benches. Additions to
7 the public space can help make a corridor more friendly
8 and more pedestrian oriented, so.

9 MR. SMITH: This would permit interior
10 courtyards too.

11 MR. DUNKLEY: Do we want to permit interior
12 courtyards? I don't see how this in itself permits
13 interior courtyards, but --

14 MR. WRIGHT: Does the underlying base zoning,
15 the way it works now, are they not allowed to go back
16 more than certain distance? I thought they could make,
17 they had to be back a minimum of three feet. Is there a
18 maximum limit for that?

19 MR. DUNKLEY: I'm not sure if we have
20 specifics build to, required build to, but --

21 MR. WRIGHT: And if they -- back as far as
22 they want --

23 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes, you generally are.

1 MR. WRIGHT: So I'm -- to ask, you kind of say
2 you can't go back more than 10 feet or not. Because it
3 doesn't say that.

4 MR. DUNKLEY: Well, yes, they could have --

5 MR. WRIGHT: It doesn't say that.

6 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes, the question is, you know,
7 if you're, is why an additional setback if you can't
8 park there? Generally once you prohibit parking from in
9 front of the building, there's not very much of an
10 incentive to pull the building further back. It's been
11 my experience.

12 MR. WRIGHT: I think it's a good idea. I
13 think you use a -- this may --

14 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. And the point here is just
15 to underscore the fact that there is, you know, that
16 it's not intended to provide, actually blocks sidewalk
17 and parkway -- throughout the corridor.

18 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Actually B1A currently says
19 three feet for a corner property or property comprising
20 40 percent or more of the block width or three feet or
21 the lesser of three feet or depth on same public right
22 of way of existing street facades of principal buildings
23 on abutting properties if it's less than 40 feet. So --

1 MR. WRIGHT: But that's the minimum, right?

2 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well --

3 MR. WRIGHT: It's the minimum.

4 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

5 MR. WRIGHT: And --

6 MR. DUNKLEY: We're going to have to bang our
7 heads against that one.

8 CHAIRMAN WOODS: You're right. You're
9 correct.

10 MR. DUNKLEY: That's a good one.

11 MR. SMITH: You might want to consider -- Is
12 Carl Bova here? He's brought up the point multiple
13 times that perhaps the point of reference, because of
14 the curb, tends to meander on Central Street, might be
15 lot line.

16 I realize that would be, you know, a change
17 from what's written in the -- If the -- is 14 feet,
18 etcetera. But the curbs do meander. And if I could
19 have a frame of reference -- in working out the square
20 feet.

21 Frankly I thought that there was an expansion
22 of the -- But actually, other than that 2935 Central
23 building that people perceive because it does stick out

1 over the sidewalk. Because the lot line actually is
2 further, a lot closer to the street than people think.

3 By and large things are around 14 feet. And I
4 know down by Swan Cleaners it's exactly 14 feet. At
5 Great Harvest it's either 13.6 or 14 feet depending if
6 there's actually a two-step curb, depending on, measure
7 it in front of -- Music and Dancing Bear, it's 14 feet,
8 maybe two inches. Or it could be four inches. And
9 pretty much the whole stretch of the Crown Jewel --
10 14 foot -- is exactly the same. Not widening the
11 sidewalks --

12 CHAIRMAN WOODS: With the exception of
13 Central/Central Park.

14 MR. SMITH: But we are sustaining.

15 CHAIRMAN WOODS: With the exception of
16 Central/Central Park and that kind of area.

17 PARTICIPANT: And -- street.

18 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I'm not holding my breath.

19 MR. DUNKLEY: Okay, the last several sections
20 have to do with --

21 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I've got a few things I'd
22 rather have my tax dollars get spent on first.

23 MR. DUNKLEY: Required bicycle parking, bikes

1 racks, also known as. One for every 20 automobile
2 parking spaces that are required with a minimum of three
3 and no more than 50 being required. It's hard to
4 imagine that large of a development. And this is a code
5 that was, Texas borrowed. But that tends to work fairly
6 well, one to 20. If it's really felt that we might want
7 to bump that up, we could do within what's reasonable.

8 And the other thing I think that's very
9 important is to require that bicycle parking spaces be
10 closer, be as close as the closest automobile park,
11 automobile space. Many times they'll be kind of tucked
12 away in the back of a parking lot or the back of a
13 property where they're not visible. And if you don't
14 see it, you might as well not have it. Because
15 bicyclers generally won't go hunting around for a bike
16 rack that's off in the corner of a --

17 PARTICIPANT: You want to have it more visible
18 to discourage theft.

19 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. Exactly right. So
20 appropriate places in the parkway, that is identified as
21 one of the uses, the street furniture uses. But you
22 want it to be as close to the entrance as you can.

23 Fenestration is a fancy way of saying windows.

1 Yes?

2 MR. SMITH: I see where it says 50 spaces. Do
3 you mean 50 bike spaces?

4 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes.

5 MR. SMITH: Okay. You might want to clarify
6 that. Because I looked at that and wasn't sure what
7 the --

8 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. Yes. Ma'am?

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- train station on Central
10 Street. -- got bike racks. You really can't ride your
11 bike on Central Street in any of that area. So I don't
12 know if you're talking about filling all that in or --

13 MR. DUNKLEY: No. No, really we're just
14 talking about putting in bike racks.

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just in that area where they
16 can't ride?

17 MR. DUNKLEY: No.

18 PARTICIPANT: How do you think they got
19 to --

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- on Harrison. I would
21 just like to say that it's, the train station has been
22 there over a hundred years. And why now is this being
23 driven to be so built up? What is, I guess I want to

1 know what is driving that. And is it always about
2 money?

3 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I'll give you my
4 understanding of why it's being driven.

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN WOODS: And that is, real estate is a
7 means of making money. And there is in our society a
8 very strong movement towards transit-oriented
9 development. People enjoy living next to public
10 transportation.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: All right. I guess I'm
12 thinking of all the new buildings that have gone up. I
13 can honestly say there's probably four people that I
14 know of that are using the train as opposed to driving
15 to work.

16 I guess I'm thinking also, how many condos?
17 We already have 747 condos, new and used, we sold in
18 Evanston. And they're still not, you know, being sold.
19 And we still don't have enough parking. I guess that's
20 part of it. So I'm thinking, do we need that much more,
21 any more buildings? The merchants are behind this other
22 -- by the way.

23 And also the other thing is, what John said

1 about the owners, most of the owners, I would say 90
2 percent of the owners that own the buildings on Central
3 Street do not live in Evanston. So to them it's not
4 going to be a concern whether or not, you know, the
5 money will be there. And as you said, developers, as
6 you said, will, there going to be there for the money.

7 So just so you know that we feel that we're
8 behind the Central Street visioning and Central Street
9 Neighbors because on Central Street the traditions still
10 run deep. So we'd like to keep it similar. And that's
11 all I have to say at the moment.

12 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Thanks.

13 MR. DUNKLEY: Okay. I can kind of wrap up via
14 exclamation point here by saying fenestration is just
15 windows. You want to have a certain amount of windows.
16 They activate the street front. We don't want to have
17 blank facades.

18 Measuring linear fenestration is a good way of
19 ensuring. Requiring a certain minimum amount of
20 fenestration is a good way of ensuring that we get that
21 type of environment, that permeability of store front.
22 Sixty-five percent tends to work out pretty well. I've
23 seen cases of 75 percent. That's really too much. We

1 can go lower than that and it doesn't really have the
2 type of effect you want.

3 So I've seen, my experience, that makes for a
4 good store front, especially for the sort of 1950s type
5 of buildings that we have a prevalence of with knee
6 walls and significant glass.

7 MR. SMITH: What about corners? What about
8 corner --

9 MR. DUNKLEY: What about corners?

10 MR. SMITH: Are we going to require windows on
11 the side streets that --

12 MR. DUNKLEY: That's a good point. I thought,
13 I had thought about including such a requirement for
14 non-residential space. And I don't have a problem with
15 that. I think it would be a good idea.

16 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think you could require for
17 maybe some distance. But you can't require the whole
18 thing or otherwise, like, for example, the bakery would
19 have a problem.

20 MR. DUNKLEY: Right. So maybe --

21 CHAIRMAN WOODS: There'd be no place for the
22 kitchen.

23 MR. DUNKLEY: I mean, certainly when you turn

1 the corner and have a blank wall, that's really not a
2 great situation. We might want to require that there be
3 some permeability, but maybe not the same as the primary
4 store front. So I think there could be a middle ground
5 there. Because, yes, you would need, that generally
6 you're going to put other uses on the interior that
7 might restrict that.

8 But we do want to make sure that windows are
9 clear glass. And that, we'll have to go into the sign
10 ordinance to find out how we regulate, for instance, you
11 know, signs put on windows, to make sure that we're just
12 not, they're not obscured by signs and shades and all
13 that.

14 MR. SMITH: I don't think it's a real problem.
15 I don't think anybody's going to pay \$500 a square foot
16 and then put up a brick wall.

17 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes.

18 MR. SMITH: Maybe.

19 MR. DUNKLEY: And the last item is facade
20 articulation. And that's really limited to two things
21 that are fairly easy to identify and to administer. One
22 is requiring that no facade go for more than 20 feet on
23 ground level without any kind of intervening door or

1 window.

2 And secondly, that we actually put something,
3 some demarcation between the stories of buildings. It
4 makes a big difference on our main store front streets
5 that they be articulated in some way, the levels being
6 articulated with, and the examples are: -- cornice
7 lines, even paint. But it's easy to recognize when it's
8 not done and when it is done and to require that there
9 be something architecturally to make that
10 differentiation.

11 MR. SMITH: Could I make a suggestion there?
12 I think your statement, which you say you looked at,
13 your list and purpose statement is more comprehensive
14 than what is listed here. And you're suggesting an
15 overlay district more limited.

16 And in particular I don't think -- should
17 count. -- for those that don't know, they're a
18 different color row of brick, which I think has been
19 overused and will be seen in the future like leg warmers
20 are now seen, as some artifice of the late '90s and
21 early 21st century. And people then driving by and
22 going, oh, there's another candy stripe building. It
23 must have been built in 2005.

1 CHAIRMAN WOODS: That actually wouldn't be
2 called -- Strict architectural definition. -- requires
3 a projection.

4 MR. SMITH: Well, it's become used too. Maybe
5 strictly in the original, it probably was. But now it's
6 being used, it's being applied to different color -- and
7 things. It's not enough.

8 If you want to require articulation, that may
9 be a real easy way of doing it, is just to set a minimum
10 standard deviation from facade. And then give the
11 architects free reign to do whatever they want to it.
12 Well, maybe not triangles and things that can hurt
13 people, but, you know, a combination of right angles and
14 -- You could make a list of possible things that they
15 could use and say, it's up to you, but make it
16 interesting.

17 MR. WRIGHT: Some -- would be nice. But the
18 other way, if you just use the windows and the
19 cornice -- and -- you can distribute a pretty --

20 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes, and it's not going to be
21 possible to banish blandness. It's got to be there
22 every now and again. We'll do our best. But we also
23 want to make sure that we can review and administer this

1 code in a way that --

2 MR. HUGHES: You could use, you can have two
3 building and wrap around Prairie, on the two sections of
4 Prairie. So if we apply articulation criteria on
5 Central, we should continue to look inside of Prairie on
6 -- Joe's building there. That's certainly one, where
7 the eye care center is.

8 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. Very good point. Very
9 good point.

10 MR. HUGHES: The one with the --

11 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes. And yes, I've seen code
12 used to good effect that, you know, requires treatment
13 on --

14 MR. HUGHES: I think maybe also where the
15 Great Harvest bread company, that could be a -- and then
16 also a -- It provides an entryway to Central Street,
17 that building does.

18 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes.

19 MR. HUGHES: All three of those buildings
20 provide sort of a -- atmosphere if you consider all the
21 design --

22 MR. SMITH: Bill, do you have a timetable on,
23 the reason, apparently, that we're not putting -- or

1 similar requirement in here for sustainability, which is
2 something that there was a real strong demand for that,
3 I think, throughout -- I understand the reason that's
4 not in this is because we're going to attempt again,
5 maybe a city-wide effort at that. Do you have a
6 timetable for that?

7 MR. DUNKLEY: I'll check back with the person
8 who's leading that coordination effort. And there's a
9 lot, you know, once you really start discussing what are
10 the implications, especially of adopting a standard
11 that's still changing. Public entities move slowly.
12 There's probably a good reason for that.

13 Need is being driven by the private sector.
14 We want to hitch our wagon to something that we may,
15 that all of a sudden may change. It's something we
16 really have to consider.

17 So there's a lot of good dialogue that's going
18 on right now about the way to do that. As it turns out,
19 need has gotten far more attraction than anyone would
20 have ever expected purely through the efforts of the
21 private sector. And in many ways, in many senses
22 there's a, well, there's a sense of maybe we ought not
23 to mess with this if it's really starting to work, so --

1 MR. SMITH: My suggestion would be, if we're
2 on, say, a two-year track, you know, before we get
3 something done city wide, but what we're doing now, if
4 we hope to have in -- by January or February, maybe
5 Central Street should be a model. The community would
6 certainly support it.

7 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes, I think it's moving faster
8 than that. So I'll get you a status on that and see
9 where we are.

10 MR. SMITH: I -- on the east side. It's also
11 another street that has a --

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Right. It's part of the --

13 MR. SMITH: Right.

14 MR. DUNKLEY: Okay, thanks. Okay, I guess
15 I've reached the end of the material I wanted to go
16 through. Lots of good comments.

17 We're going to put this material all together
18 into one document and have it available on the web. And
19 certainly if anybody would like copies, send me an
20 e-mail and I'll be glad to shoot one back to you.
21 Distribute at will. And we'll get these comments and
22 those additional sections that I identified up front.
23 We'll get you some draft materials to look at as soon as

1 possible.

2 I have business cards up here if anyone would
3 like to take one with them. At this point --

4 PARTICIPANT: Chapter 2, there is no --

5 MR. DUNKLEY: I think --

6 CHAIRMAN WOODS: We are adjourned.

7 (Whereupon, the hearing in the
8 above-titled cause was
9 concluded at 9:48 p.m.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23