

1 CITY OF EVANSTON
2 ZONING COMMITTEE OF THE PLAN COMMISSION
3 CASE NO.: ZPC 07-03-M&T
4 RE: WEST EVANSTON ZONING CHANGES. Consideration of
5 amendments to Chapters 8, "Residential Districts;" 17,
6 "Landscaping and Screening;" 18, "Definitions;" 3,
7 "Implementation and Administration;" 7, "Zoning
8 Districts and Map;" and any other related sections of
9 the Zoning Ordinance.
10 CASE NO.: ZPC 07-05-M&T
11 RE: CENTRAL STREET ZONING REVIEW. Consideration of
12 amendments to Chapters 8, "Residential Districts;" 9,
13 "Business Districts;" 10, "Commercial Districts;" 15,
14 "Special Purpose and Overlay Districts;" 17,
15 "Landscaping and Screening;" 18, "Definitions;" 3,
16 "Implementation and Administration;" 7, "Zoning
17 Districts and Map;" and any other related sections of
18 the Zoning Ordinance.
19 Transcribed Report of Proceedings of a public
20 hearing on the above captioned matter, held August 22,
21 2007 at the Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue,
22 2nd Floor, Evanston, Illinois, at 7:14 p.m. and presided
23 over by J. Woods, Chair.

1 PRESENT:

2 J. WOODS, Chair

3 S. OPDYCKE

4 A. JACKSON

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay, I'm going to call to
2 order the Zoning Committee, the Plan Commission meeting
3 of August 22, 2007. We have two items of business this
4 evening. The first item is ZPC 07-03-M&T, West Evanston
5 Zoning Changes. The second is ZPC 07-05-M&T, Central
6 Street Zoning Review. And we're going to roughly split
7 the evening in two. And I think we're going to only
8 spend an hour and-a-half on each so that we will get out
9 of here at 10 o'clock tonight.

10 So for the West Evanston Zoning Changes, what
11 we're going to do first, Arlova's going to talk about
12 some of the concerns that were raised last time and
13 address some of those things. And then she'll have
14 Susan talk about some of the other stuff since then.
15 So, Arlova.

16 MS. JACKSON: Good evening. Can everyone hear
17 me? My name is Arlova Jackson. I'm the Zoning Planner
18 for the City of Evanston.

19 This is our second public hearing for the West
20 Evanston Zoning Changes. The first one was held August
21 1st. This is a meeting of the Zoning Committee of the
22 Plan Commission, which is the sub-committee of the Plan
23 Commission that hears text and map changes to the Zoning

1 Ordinance.

2 So at some point when we get to a decision,
3 this Committee will be making a recommendation to the
4 Plan Commission, which will discuss it some more. And
5 the Plan Commission then will be making a recommendation
6 to City Council. So the ultimate decision-making
7 authority for map amendments and text amendments is with
8 City Council.

9 This process is the public hearing process to
10 allow public comment and deliberation to the
11 recommending bodies and ultimately to the decision-
12 making bodies.

13 The last time we had a staff presentation and
14 a short presentation by our consultant about the West
15 Evanston planning process and previous planning
16 processes. That led to the recommendations that were
17 discussed in the public notice. We had a question and
18 answer period with public comments, some requests for
19 additional information.

20 Outside on the table there were a couple of
21 pieces of information. One is a staff memo dated August
22 16th where I attempt to address the concerns raised at
23 the last hearing. There's also a memo dated August 17th,

1 which has a table which compares the R4 and the R3
2 residential districts, and a third memo dated January
3 19, 2007, which talks about the proposed changes to
4 Gilbert Park. Finally, there's another staff memo from
5 Susan Guderley dated August 17th, which she'll talk about
6 in a minute.

7 Couple of comments from the last meeting
8 regarding the public notice that was sent. Amendments
9 to the map and/or text of the Zoning Ordinance require
10 three forms of public notice. One is a mailed notice to
11 owners of property within 500 feet of any property being
12 affected. The second is a published notice in a
13 newspaper of general circulation. And the third are
14 posted signs on the property.

15 The notice for this hearing was posted in the
16 Evanston Review on July 12th. Approximately 742 notices
17 were mailed to taxpayers of record for properties within
18 500 feet of the areas affected. And three signs were
19 placed in locations within the master plan area.

20 At the last meeting some attendees felt that
21 rental residents, who wouldn't normally be notified, may
22 not have had an opportunity to hear about it. We got
23 some addresses from residents and sent additional

1 mailings out. And I handed out about a dozen or so
2 packets of information that were also to be distributed.
3 So that is what has been done to date.

4 For the discussion about Gilbert Park, there
5 was some, there were some questions about the existing
6 zoning designation and if it was changing. Currently
7 Gilbert Park is zoned R5 General Residential. So the
8 master plan is not proposing to change this designation.

9 What the plan shows is redevelopment of the area for
10 residential use and the creation of two new park areas
11 to make up for the difference.

12 Currently Gilbert Park is approximately 31,000
13 square feet with about 18,000 square feet devoted to
14 active recreational space. The proposal creates two new
15 parks, one that's approximately 17,800 square feet and
16 another that is approximately 16,600 square feet, for a
17 total of around 34,000 square feet, which actually
18 increases the total amount of park space that's
19 currently here today. The memo that's with the staff
20 report goes into greater detail about how the parks are
21 laid out.

22 There were also questions about the impact of
23 the zoning change and the creation of either non-

1 conforming uses or non-complying structures. I failed
2 to mention, there was a one-sheet memo entitled,
3 Re-zoning, that's also out on the table that has some
4 frequently-asked questions about re-zonings and what
5 that could mean for your property.

6 Generally speaking, I tried to define and
7 provide examples of non-conforming uses. Non-conforming
8 uses are generally uses established prior to the
9 effective date of the Zoning Ordinance which do not
10 conform to the use regulations of the district in which
11 it's located. So that might include, because the Zoning
12 Ordinance was last updated in 1993, that would be any
13 use that was legally established prior to 1993. That
14 may change if and when proposed base zoning district
15 changes are proposed.

16 If the base district changes and a current use
17 becomes non-conforming, the use is allowed to remain
18 indefinitely. It doesn't mean anyone has to tear
19 anything down or stop operating. They can make repairs
20 and maintain the property, however, you would not be
21 allowed to enlarge the use or expand.

22 And if for some reason the use is not
23 continued, if it goes out of business, if it's a

1 residential unit that's vacated, if it's not in use for
2 12 months, it expires. So as long as it continues, it
3 can stay forever. The proposed changes would only
4 affect redevelopment of the property if it was torn down
5 purposefully or if it's abandoned.

6 Similarly for non-complying structures, that
7 structure's constructed, legally constructed prior to
8 the effective date of the Zoning Ordinance that don't
9 comply with all of the zoning regulations. So that one
10 includes things like setbacks, building lot coverage,
11 floor/area ratio, height. These are buildings that were
12 built prior to 1993, as most of the buildings in
13 Evanston were, that were not subject to the same
14 regulations that are in place now.

15 So if it's a legal use, so if it's a single-
16 family house that has a three-foot setback instead of a
17 five-foot setback, if it were torn down completely, it
18 could be rebuilt with the same three-foot setback. You
19 just can't increase the level of non-conformity. So you
20 can't build it with a less than three-foot setback, if
21 that makes sense. If five is required, you can't go any
22 worse than what's there today.

23 Our Zoning Ordinance goes on to differentiate

1 between uses that are non-conforming and complying
2 versus non-complying structures. I can go into that if
3 people have questions. It's unnecessarily complicated.

4 The West Evanston Plan proposes to simplify
5 that and simply allow non-complying structures to be
6 maintained so long as 50 percent of the total floor area
7 remains intact. So they're just applying a simple
8 number. If it's damaged or something happens, as long
9 as 50 percent of the area is preserved, the use can be
10 maintained.

11 Exemptions, excuse me, exemptions to that
12 would include single-family homes and buildings that are
13 historic structures that keep their street facade,
14 meaning any single-family home that exists could be
15 rebuilt regardless of what zoning change is proposed.

16 The other issue that was raised, excuse me,
17 was the recommendation to re-zone quite a portion of the
18 master plan area to the R4 district versus the R3 zoning
19 district. Several attendees expressed the desire for
20 the less dense zoning district.

21 What I did in the memo was try to provide a
22 side-by-side comparison of the two so that everyone
23 could get a sense of what the differences were. In

1 terms of uses, they're largely the same except the R4
2 district allows for townhouses and multi-family
3 buildings, whereas the R3 district only allows single-
4 family detached and two-unit buildings in terms of
5 residential buildings.

6 For special uses there's quite a few
7 institutional-type uses that are allowed in R4 versus
8 R3. Community center, retirement home, long-term care
9 facility, so on and so forth.

10 For lot size, which would result in density,
11 the R4 district is less restrictive. For two-family
12 dwelling units the lot size requirement in the R3
13 district is 3,500 square feet per unit. In the R4 it's
14 2,500 square feet per unit. So for a two-unit building
15 in the R3 district, you'd need 7,000 square feet. In
16 the R4, you'd only need 5,000.

17 The height requirements are exactly the same.

18 The yard requirements vary slightly. For the
19 rear yard for a residential building in the R3, the
20 requirement is 30 feet. In the R4 the requirement is
21 25.

22 For non-residential structures, the side
23 yards, there's a five foot difference. And for the rear

1 yards, the same five foot difference.

2 For building lot coverage, the R3 actually has
3 a higher allowed building lot coverage. It's 45 percent
4 in R3 versus 40 percent in R4. And consequently, the
5 impervious surface area is the same. The impervious
6 surface area if we go to R4 is actually less than R3.
7 It's 55 percent that's allowed versus 60 percent.

8 And lastly, in the R3 district all newly
9 created parking areas must be accessed from the alley if
10 the lot is actually served by an alley. In the R4
11 district there's not a requirement that you use an alley
12 to access off-street parking.

13 That's the main points that I'd like to cover.
14 I don't know if Susan wants to talk. And then we'll
15 take questions at the end. Okay.

16 MS. GUDERLEY: As Arlova mentioned, there's
17 another memo, there was a memo out on the table that I
18 prepared. This memo addresses specifically some of the
19 questions that came up with regards to the proposed R5A
20 zoning.

21 The memo notes that the proposed, the changes
22 that we are, that were proposed for this zoning hearing
23 to change the R5A in that area of study area that is

1 roughly defined by Green Bay Road on east, Emerson
2 Street on the south, and the western edge of the former
3 railroad right of way, arose out of the discussions from
4 the Canal at Green Bay Road planning process, which ran
5 basically between 2000 and 2003.

6 This discussion of this, the R5 zoning, was a
7 very divisive one amongst the participants of the
8 planning process. Opponents to the current R5 zoning
9 express the concern that this designation conflicts with
10 their sense that this area, although many of the units
11 have been converted to two or more units, still resemble
12 single-family structures. Those same opponents also
13 were very much opposed to the maximum height permitted
14 by the R5 district, which is 50 feet or five stories.

15 Proponents, those who supported the R5, the
16 current R5 zoning, noted that to change the R5 zoning to
17 something less would decrease greatly, greatly decrease
18 the property values of many of these properties. And
19 they also noted that to, to down-zone this area would
20 make it more difficult to, to develop affordable units.

21 At the request of the then alderman, the
22 development, there was a development moratorium placed
23 on this area to allow time for discussions as part of

1 the planning process to develop a zoning that would try
2 to find common ground between these two sides.

3 After numerous discussions, what was the
4 compromise that was crafted was the proposed R5A zoning.

5 This district would retain all the R5 regulations with
6 regards to lot, width, lot area insofar as unit
7 generation, but would reduce the maximum permitted
8 height from, down from 50 feet to a maximum of 42 feet.

9 And this 42 feet, the figure of 42 feet, was arrived at
10 by analysis of all the structures there. And that is
11 the tallest building that is currently there, the
12 tallest mean height of the existing structures. So
13 that's where the 42 feet came from.

14 At our last meeting there was again calls to
15 consider down-zoning to either R4 or R3. And, you know,
16 my memo notes that this basically revisits many of the
17 same discussions that we had at that time regarding
18 property values and affordable units and creation of
19 non-conforming structures.

20 Since the adoption of the Canal-Green Bay Road
21 report, however, the Zoning Ordinance has been amended
22 regarding maximum permitted heights in residential
23 districts. Since that time the ordinance has been

1 changed to now grant that any building or structure that
2 was legally existing and conforming with the zone's
3 building height requirement, they are granted the status
4 of legally permitted structure or use, not a legal
5 nonconformance, which means that any building within the
6 R5 zone that is there right now, up to and including 50-
7 feet tall, may, in either the case of being accidentally
8 destroyed or intentionally destroyed, could be rebuilt
9 to the same height.

10 So, in a sense, that, what that currently does
11 is, guarantees current property owners who have a legal
12 height to rebuild their existing buildings to that
13 height. And so that the remaining, the only remaining
14 zoning district standard that has the greatest impact
15 upon their property values, is the minimum lot area,
16 which, from which they can determine the number of units
17 they can have in their structure.

18 On my memo I displayed two tables. The first
19 table is a subset of what Arlova's memo shows, basically
20 displays the minimum lot requirements for each of the
21 residential districts, R3, R4, and R5. And the second
22 table displays the count and zoning status of the
23 existing dwelling units under each of those three

1 zonings.

2 The memo notes that the area currently
3 contains 86 structures, which include or which, in which
4 there are 174 dwelling units. Currently under the
5 current R5 zoning, seven of those residential structures
6 do not conform with the R5 zoning, meaning that they
7 have, they exceed the number of units that would be
8 permitted under the R5 zoning to the tune of about 20
9 dwelling units.

10 Nevertheless, even with those seven units in
11 excess of their permitted units, under R5 that, this
12 area under R5 zoning could actually produce 197 or
13 another 23 units. Because there are a number of lots
14 that are either vacant or do not, have not been
15 developed to their full potential.

16 Under R4 zoning there are a total of 24 non-
17 conforming structures or 28 percent of all of the 86
18 structures that contain a total of 55 non-conforming
19 dwelling units. The minimum lot requirements for this
20 zone would also reduce the total number of dwelling
21 units achievable in this area by about 10 percent, down
22 from 174 to 156.

23 While the R5, R4 zoning permits the same mix

1 of units as R5, none of the existing lots as they are
2 currently subdivided could, could house more than three
3 dwelling units under the R4 zoning. Of course this
4 could be changed if two or more units, two or more lots
5 were put together and created a larger zoning lot. But
6 that's not the case right now.

7 And under R3 zoning 75 of the existing
8 dwelling units, or 43 percent of them, are, would be
9 non-conforming. Also about 42 percent of the 86 units,
10 or a total of 36, would be considered non-conforming
11 structures. There could only be a maximum of 113
12 dwelling units permitted on these same lots under R3
13 zoning. And under the zoning, as Arlova mentioned, only
14 single and, single-family units and duplex units are
15 permitted.

16 I just would like to add, Arlova correctly
17 summarized the discussion of Gilbert Park insofar as the
18 replacement, the two parks in Sub-Area 1 replacing the
19 Gilbert Park area. But our consultants also total up
20 the total of park space in the total of the master plan.

21 And in addition to those 34,000 square feet in Sub-Area
22 1, there's another 20,000 square feet in additional
23 parks, as well as about another 30-some thousand in a

1 greenway trail that stretches basically from Lake Street
2 up to Church Street.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Excuse me, I have a
4 question.

5 CHAIRMAN WOOD: Okay.

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: In your outline in the --
7 and Ms. Jackson talked about -- referenced zoning and
8 everything. There is really no definition as to what --
9 overlay zoning, how does that work and what all does
10 that imply? So if you could speak to that, I would
11 appreciate it.

12 (Inaudible response.)

13 MS. ESTER: Hi. My name is Betty Ester. And
14 I stay at 2114 Darrell.

15 And my question is, in the material that was
16 handed out giving definition as to what zoning is and
17 what Ms. Jackson and Mrs. Guderley went through, they
18 did not address the issue of overlay. And I would like
19 for them to explain how overlays work and all of, and
20 its whole implication. Because somewhere I read in
21 something on the internet for the city site says that it
22 could be carried over into some other area or not. So
23 if you could explain as to exactly what is it meant by

1 an overly district of zoning.

2 MS. JACKSON: An overlay district is a zoning
3 district that, if you think about it, is meant to layer
4 over an existing district. So it may have regulations
5 or requirements that are more restrictive or less
6 restrictive.

7 But it's meant to apply to a specific area
8 often for a particular corridor or a particular part of
9 town where there's a, you're trying to achieve a
10 particular goal. So the more general use categories
11 don't get at everything that you're, you're trying to
12 accomplish.

13 So the overlay may be focused on design or not
14 unusually, not so much use, but sometimes you want to
15 allow particular uses and particular locations without
16 changing the base zoning district without making such a
17 drastic change.

18 So we currently have, I believe, three overlay
19 zoning districts. We have one that's, we use for the
20 hospitals, as a hospital overlay zoning district.
21 There's a redevelopment overlay zoning district. And
22 then there's one that we've actually never mapped. It
23 was created, but it hasn't been mapped anywhere.

1 It would be the same process as a zoning
2 change. So if you want to add an overlay over a base
3 district, there's a hearing process which is, you know,
4 partially why we're here now. It can be mapped anywhere
5 the city feels it's appropriate.

6 And if you want to make amendments, it's the
7 same process as a text amendment or map amendment that
8 we do for all of our base districts. It's just meant to
9 refine, or narrow in some cases, what's permitted for a
10 particular property to achieve a particular goal.

11 For this process the overlay could apply to
12 the entire master plan area if that's what the Council
13 decides, if that's what this Committee recommends and
14 what the Council decides. Or we could say, you know,
15 the overlay should only go for the industrially-zoned
16 property or it should only go for this corridor. It's
17 completely up to the Committee, the Plan Commission, and
18 the Council to discuss and make decisions about where
19 it's appropriate and where it would make sense.

20 If it's adopted, we don't necessarily have to
21 map it right away. It just gives an option in the
22 future for a site where it makes sense. Obviously it
23 was designed for the West Evanston Master Plan area. I

1 can't imagine it being used elsewhere, but I suppose
2 that's possible.

3 MS. GILES: My name is Priscilla Giles. And I
4 guess I have a question on that then. With this re-
5 zoning that is, that's not, that, we're here for a
6 meeting and yet, and still we're not, we don't know
7 what's going to happen. And that's not up to us to make
8 this decision.

9 What benefit does the, is this re-zoning going
10 to be for the 5th ward who were promised when this was
11 brought to our attention the first time that this would
12 be a benefit for the residents that were living in the
13 5th ward? What is the, what benefit do we get from this
14 re-zoning?

15 MS. JACKSON: Well, the re-zoning is the
16 recommendation. The re-zonings proposed are based on
17 the recommendations from a planning process that took
18 place that was aimed at being pro-active in determining
19 how the area's going to be redeveloped. And so instead
20 of reacting to proposals from developers, the city
21 decided to take a look at this land that probably is not
22 going to be, is not feasible to be used anymore for
23 industrial purposes, and figure out what they'd like it

1 to be, what's the best use of it.

2 So the plan process took place. A plan was
3 proposed and adopted. The re-zoning is simply the
4 vehicle to implement the objectives in the plan so that
5 it has some teeth, so that when proposals come through,
6 the strategies and objectives and desires that are
7 talked about in the plan are actually given some weight
8 and people are required to comply with them. So it's
9 given a little bit more certainty about what type of
10 development to expect.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I don't feel that's
12 answering the question.

13 MS. JACKSON: I don't know what more to say.

14 (Question from audience member.)

15 MS. JACKSON: I can't give you guarantees
16 about what proposals may come, but --

17 MS. GILES: What are the benefits for --
18 Should I come back up there and say that you need --

19 MS. JACKSON: I guess I don't understand what
20 you're --

21 MS. GILES: Maybe the question is just too
22 simple. I would like to know, since it was brought to
23 the West Evanston, I guess, by the city, was brought to

1 the, the people of the, of West Evanston, that, I mean,
2 I just can't, we were asked what we would like to see to
3 make it better. We asked for jobs. That was the main,
4 I think that was the main thing.

5 So with this, this redevelopment, I'd like to
6 know how is it going to benefit the people who are there
7 now. Is it going to, are these new structures with the
8 new zoning going to price out the people who are there?

9 Are they going to be unable to remodel, to rebuild?
10 Are their taxes going to go up so that they will not be
11 able to stay in the community? Are their children,
12 grandchildren, going to be able to live in the community
13 that they were raised in?

14 I mean, what benefits does this have for the
15 people who live here now? Not the new people who are
16 coming in, but the people who more in the meeting asked,
17 being asked how this was going to benefit what we'd like
18 to see? And whatever industry, whatever businesses that
19 are already there, why do they need to leave if this is
20 what we asked for, that we'd like to have jobs, we'd
21 like to have industry, we'd like to have people, a place
22 for people to work? What's the benefit of this re-
23 zoning for the people who are there?

1 MS. JACKSON: Well, I think the re-zoning is
2 meant to attract development that the city wants in the,
3 in the area. And the current zoning was seen to not be
4 adequate. And so when you have an area that has land
5 that's zoned for a use that's not being attracted to the
6 area, it could have all sorts of negative impact. So if
7 you have vacant properties that can't be redeveloped,
8 that has a negative impact.

9 So the changes, I think, are designed to
10 attract the type of development that the city wants, to
11 provide opportunities for new development, not just to
12 benefit new people, but to provide a more stable
13 community.

14 It's hard to look in a crystal ball and say
15 this zoning change is going to have this numeric impact
16 on a given area. We put the tools in place to attract
17 the development that we want. I don't know if --

18 MS. GUDERLEY: I'll just add, I think Arlova
19 hit the nail on the head when she said that both because
20 of the Canal-Green Bay Road planning process and also
21 because of the discussions surrounding the West Evanston
22 TIF, there was a lot of discussion about some of the
23 uses that are leaving. We are not having, we are not

1 encouraging industry to leave. What we're observing,
2 though, is that some industry is leaving.

3 And as Arlova mentioned, rather than waiting
4 for a large, and most of these industrial uses are
5 large, involve large parcels of property, so rather than
6 wait for a situation where a large land owner sells, a
7 developer comes in and proposes, has his own individual
8 proposal to develop that site, the city involved
9 residents, many of you, property owners, and businesses
10 in a planning process that asks them to look ahead
11 before developers were there, before there was a
12 specific development, and ask people to say when and if
13 these businesses leave. When and if they leave, not
14 we're making them leave. When and if they leave, what
15 would you like to see here?

16 And we had three months of neighborhood
17 meetings where that was discussed. And we had workshops
18 and we had consultants working with residents to develop
19 these plans. The benefit from this plan is that rather
20 than waiting for a heated, kind of eleventh hour
21 discussion over a specific development proposal that is
22 proposed by a developer, this plan involved the
23 community in discussions as to what they wanted to see

1 built there.

2 It is not, it was not a job space plan. From
3 the beginning we talked about it. It is a land use
4 plan. It is a design plan. It is an urban design plan.

5 When it was adopted the Council asked us also, asked
6 staff to also look at measures that the city can take in
7 terms of encouraging affordable housing, encouraging
8 jobs, and encouraging ways to counter gentrification.
9 And that is also underway right now.

10 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I'd like to add one more
11 thing to what Susan said. I think one of the concerns
12 of the city is that if an industrial or commercial use
13 leaves town and sells the land to a developer. We
14 looked at each and every parcel as it comes before us as
15 an individual project. And rather than thinking of it
16 as we are trying to now, holistically and develop a
17 master plan that involves things like streets that
18 continue through the neighborhoods and things like that,
19 that we don't think of things as isolated little islands
20 unto themselves, but there is an overall vision for the
21 neighborhood rather than dealing with each individual
22 project as it comes and having none of them tie into or
23 relate from one to another.

1 MS. WILLIAMS: Can you hear me? I attend
2 church at 1321 Foster. And I was born and raised in
3 Evanston. My name is Nicole Williams.

4 When I look at this plan and the great
5 question that was asked, what are the benefits when you
6 have allowed nine flats, six flats, five flats, the
7 people who occupy those buildings generally have a less
8 sense of community. They don't necessarily care about
9 the property, let alone their neighbors. They just live
10 there. They have not vested interest into the
11 community.

12 So when you say this benefits us or benefits
13 the community, actually when you create these new
14 streets and there's only one way in or one way out, I
15 ask you to consider the City of Chicago. They are
16 actually redeveloping all of the projects. And there
17 are definite areas in the City of Chicago where they
18 created a new street and it's actually a trap. You
19 create a huge park where there's only a one-way street.

20 What do you think is going to occur there when
21 there's one way in, one way out and we can monitor that?

22 The police officers will have a hard time monitoring
23 the activity that occurs in large parks where there is

1 basically what I would consider a triangle.

2 If you study and if you look at large
3 metropolitan cities where you have large numbers of
4 apartment buildings, there are no community members
5 there. The owners of that property more than likely do
6 not live in a nine-flat building. In a two-flat usually
7 the owner, usually the owner probably stays in one of
8 them.

9 But when you build or create a plan that
10 encourages the area to be more dense and more populated
11 with people who have no vested interest, the benefits
12 are outweighed by the costs for police officers, rapes,
13 murders, burglaries, you ask it, it's there. It's
14 there.

15 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Miss, I have a
16 question. What would you do? Are you saying we should
17 do nothing with this, this expanse of land? Do
18 absolutely nothing? And that includes the industrial
19 property that is, that has been used for industrial
20 purposes?

21 MS. WILLIAMS: That's a very extreme, you're
22 asking an -- that's very extreme.

23 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Nicole.

1 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: That's what you're
2 suggesting.

3 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Nicole, are you suggesting
4 that what you're opposed to is the six flats and the
5 nine flats?

6 MS. WILLIAMS: I didn't hear you.

7 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Are you opposed to the six
8 flats and nine flats?

9 MS. WILLIAMS: Because the people who occupy
10 those buildings do not have a vested interest in the
11 community.

12 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Can I make one comment on
13 that?

14 MS. WILLIAMS: Sure.

15 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think that largely depends
16 on the price point of the units.

17 MS. WILLIAMS: It's going to be a, it's not an
18 apartment?

19 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Just because it says
20 apartment building doesn't mean it's an apartment. It
21 could very well be condominiums.

22 MS. WILLIAMS: Usually your, your large, if
23 you say it depends on the price of the dwelling unit,

1 most land, the tenants that some of the landlords may
2 seek might actually be those who are not actually paying
3 the rent. And so when those people steal, meaning
4 someone else is paying their rent, so I don't want to
5 offend anyone here, but if they have Section 8 tenants
6 that come in that's guaranteed rent money, they still
7 don't have any vested interest in the community. That's
8 my point. So when you get a nine-flat building, you
9 think everyone there is going to care?

10 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Let me ask staff a question,
11 okay? Because we've said six flat, nine flat, whatever
12 building, flat sort of conveys to people that it's not
13 owned, individually-owned units. But I don't believe
14 that that's the case for what's being proposed here.

15 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think, I think that that's
17 going to be up to a developer ultimately to decide. And
18 my guess it, based on land value, that these will be
19 owned units.

20 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. Okay. That, that could
21 be. I mean, I'm looking at --

22 CHAIRMAN WOODS: And so --

23 MS. WILLIAMS: I'm looking at a diagram.

1 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I, yes, I understand that.
2 And that's why I want to get to whether it's an issue of
3 terminology that's leading us to a certain set of
4 expectations versus what may in fact be reality. And
5 obviously at this point we just don't know what reality
6 might be. And maybe we need to make things clearer.

7 MR. GARRISON: Daniel Garrison. I live in the
8 5th ward and I'm a co-chair of the 5th ward development
9 committee that reports through our alderman here.

10 My question relates to the, what's recently
11 now been pointed out, that a lot of the new development
12 is going to be on former industrial property. It is for
13 many axiomatic that former industrial property is going
14 to have abatement issues and huge abatement costs
15 because of petroleum distillates and whatever else
16 that's been dumped into the ground and buried over the
17 generations that it has been put to that use. My
18 question is, who is going to pay for this abatement?

19 MS. JACKSON: An individual property owner
20 would be responsible for the environmental remediation.

21 MR. GARRISON: The purchaser or the vendor of
22 the property?

23 MS. JACKSON: The owner. Whoever --

1 CHAIRMAN WOODS: That's to be negotiated
2 between buyer and seller.

3 MR. GARRISON: And how is the abatement cost
4 to be determined?

5 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, abatement costs have to
6 be taken care of by either the buyer or the seller. And
7 that all of the abatement is governed by Illinois
8 Environmental Protection Agency. There are very strict
9 standards for clean up of sites.

10 MR. GARRISON: And those standards would be,
11 will be observed at the time of the transfer of the
12 property? Because whether property is affordable for a
13 buyer is going to hang a great deal on what the
14 abatement costs are going to be.

15 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely. And that's why I
16 say, it's up for the negotiation between buyer or
17 seller. To have a transfer of property you have to have
18 a willing buyer and a willing seller. That's why
19 they'll negotiate it.

20 Just like when you go to look at a house that
21 you want to buy. Before you actually go to, you know,
22 final closing and things like that, you have a home
23 inspection done, there are certain things that get

1 identified, and you go into a negotiation with the
2 seller relative to, is there something you can take off
3 the price.

4 So on an environmental, on a industrial site,
5 a buyer is going to make sure that there's a full
6 environmental assessment done of that site. And then
7 they are going to negotiate their price that they're
8 willing to pay based on the cost, either if they're
9 going to do it themselves or the land may be more
10 valuable if the seller is going to clean it up
11 themselves.

12 MR. GARRISON: But the buyer or the seller
13 assume that responsibility --

14 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely.

15 MR. GARRISON: -- before it is given
16 development. For, for example, how is it --

17 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Before it can be developed,
18 it will have to be cleaned up. That doesn't mean that a
19 buyer can't buy the property and let it sit for some
20 period of time.

21 MR. GARRISON: Yeah. That's turned out to be
22 a huge issue for the actual redevelopment of this former
23 property. And as far as I know, no one's talking about

1 it, except to say that it is somebody else's problem.

2 CHAIRMAN WOODS: No.

3 MR. GARRISON: And I think the problem is the
4 city's problem.

5 CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's not the city's problem.

6 The city has, bears no responsibility to clean up these
7 sites. They did not --

8 MR. GARRISON: No. They don't bear
9 responsibility, but they have the problem.

10 MS. JACKSON: If, you mean if, if
11 ultimately --

12 CHAIRMAN WOODS: The city in, in general
13 terms, yes. The community --

14 MR. GARRISON: Yep. Right.

15 CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- has a problem.

16 MR. GARRISON: Right. But we're talking about
17 community problems here tonight and that's one of them.

18 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely. But again, a
19 property has a certain value based on the potential for
20 its development and the cost of that development. And
21 that's why, you know, maybe the land isn't worth what
22 the, what the seller would think it's worth.

23 MR. GARRISON: Right. Right.

1 CHAIRMAN WOODS: But, by and large, if there
2 are motivated developers, it gets worked out.

3 MR. GARRISON: Thank you.

4 MS. MOSS-MASON: Good evening. My name is
5 Beverly Moss-Mason. I live in the nineteen hundred
6 block of Dewey. And in the area I think that this, the
7 property behind my house is included, I have two
8 questions.

9 The first question, has that property, is that
10 still property for sale or has that been sold? Or do
11 you know, the Bishop-Freeman area in through there,
12 that's an industrial site that, is that property still
13 up for sale?

14 MS. JACKSON: To my understanding, the
15 property, there is a, --

16 MS. MOSS-MASON: A bid on it?

17 MS. JACKSON: -- a developer who is working
18 with the current owner in a purchase agreement. But I
19 don't know at what stage --

20 MS. MOSS-MASON: Okay. There's no done deal.
21 Okay.

22 My second question is to the gentleman in the
23 gray suit. And you asked a question to someone, one of

1 the young ladies, what would you do with that? What
2 would you do with that?

3 I must apologize. I did not attend the
4 developing meetings. And I knew they were existing, but
5 my life was in another direction. However, I think it's
6 wonderful revitalizing. I'm real excited. I'd like to
7 see a change. And I'm, I'm all for it. And I would
8 like to make a suggestion. And perhaps I would be
9 willing to work very hard on making some of this happen.

10 And I will, when I pass by this evening, I
11 will call the Bishop-Freeman. I did call about three
12 months ago, left my name and number, and he didn't call.
13 Because I wanted to, the idea first came to me at that
14 time. And it's been with me for a long time. But I
15 would like to see something our city needs for our
16 youth.

17 We have a problem in Evanston with our, our
18 youth, our children from the age of nine to 15, nine to
19 17, 18. It's dormant. And they've turned to the
20 streets, sex, and drugs because we do not recreate them
21 right. We educate them very well. We have wonderful
22 educational facilities here, but we don't recreate them
23 well.

1 And I'm going to kind of put emphasis on our,
2 our American-African community where we need to
3 recreate. Our kids don't move, they don't dance, they
4 don't do anything other than the streets. They don't
5 read write. Their scores are down. And if they
6 recreate, it's part of life.

7 I would like to see a multi-cultural unit in
8 that area there that provided types of cultural
9 recreation that our kids need. We need a skating rink.
10 Our kids need to move, dance, sing, feel. Bu Ku is
11 wonderful. I'm so happy with that. And that all adds
12 part in.

13 And this isn't only for African-American, but
14 it's for our entire community at that age. To include
15 within that area, -- works wonderfully there across the
16 street. So I'd, I'd like to see that. And I'm going to
17 investigate in the cost. And then I'll contact, try
18 Oprah, Tiger, and Michael Jordon, and see what we can
19 do. And the community. Because I think that we need --

20 And I'm, I think it's wonderful that we have
21 redevelopment. It's absolutely necessary. But we need
22 to provide for that age, our youth. Thank you.

23 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: If the area that you're

1 talking about is R4, I'm not sure that it is, but if it
2 is, there is a provision under a special use for a
3 community center. So there would be no prohibition
4 against having a community center at, at that site.

5 MR. ELLIS: My name is Cameron Ellis. I live
6 at 1239 Leon Place.

7 I have kind of a quick yes or no question.
8 And that was, in reading the consultant's reports, my
9 understanding was the form-based design code or the
10 form-based zoning was to be implemented throughout this
11 TIF district and the consultants were, where the
12 consultants, the area that they were looking at and
13 addressing.

14 My question is, if that form-based design code
15 or form-based zoning code goes into effect, will the
16 developer be able to come in, and under TUD
17 arrangements, get variations or a variance to those
18 zoning codes as they now can do with the standard
19 zoning?

20 My chief concern, regarding especially either
21 the vacant or industrialized property which we're all
22 speculating on turning over to residential or some other
23 use at some point is, when I look at places like 1930

1 Ridge which is zoned R5 and has allowances that are
2 grossly in excess of R6, including number of units,
3 density, setback, and so forth, I look at the Cyrus
4 Project at Hines Lumber which I believe was zoned at R4,
5 somebody correct me if I'm wrong, they had variations
6 and variances granted in excess of R5. They have a lot
7 coverage which is in excess of R6. The R6 limit is 65
8 percent. They are closer to, excuse me, R6 is 65
9 percent limit. They are closer to 75 percent. I
10 believe it was .74.

11 And I want to know, if you do the form-based
12 zoning code, are you going to remove that avenue for
13 developers to use? Because otherwise I feel this whole
14 process is just a farce. Because the property we're
15 talking about developing is huge. And it's only going
16 to be large developers coming in to do it. And you know
17 the PUD process is going to be an automatic unless you
18 remove that. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I gather, you know, you're
20 opposed to it. And I think it's fair to say that the --

21 MR. ELLIS: I'm sorry. I am in favor of the
22 form-based design --

23 CHAIRMAN WOODS: You're opposed to PUDs being

1 allowed?

2 MR. ELLIS: Yes, yes --

3 CHAIRMAN WOODS: And my understanding of the
4 current proposal is that planned development is not
5 contemplated for this area. Therefore the only
6 variances you can get would be the normal variances from
7 a normal zoning process, as opposed to a planned
8 development which allows increased density and
9 development. And obviously, the allowances in terms of
10 heights and stuff like that. So, for example, rather
11 than --

12 (Question from audience member.)

13 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. Rather than taking a
14 parcel that currently would show 13 town homes on it,
15 let's say, somebody couldn't come in and propose an
16 apartment building of eight stories on that lot. What
17 they would be able to do is come in and say, we really
18 need two feet off of the setback on the side yard
19 property line or we're going to do a slightly different
20 dorm or configuration or any of those more "normal"
21 zoning variance kinds of issues. You know, get, get
22 those percentage differences in terms of lot coverage
23 and things like that that anybody can get or apply for

1 on a house, for example.

2 However, I will say that you better continue
3 to be a part of this process as it moves forward.
4 Because I think that issue needs to be addressed with
5 City Council.

6 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: I second that. I don't
7 think we contemplate PUDs in this area. But that has
8 not been settled yet. So if you're opposed to PUDs,
9 keep the heat on.

10 MS. PAYTON: Hi. My name is Tina Payton. And
11 I live at 1122 Emerson and have several pieces of
12 property here in the 5th ward.

13 I first want to state that I did not receive
14 notice, not for this meeting, not for the last meeting,
15 and not for any of the meetings before. And the only
16 reason I'm in attendance of many of the meetings,
17 because I hear it through the grapevine, not because I
18 was properly notified. And I am within 500 feet. We
19 have a property at 1507 Emerson, which is at Emerson and
20 Jackson. And I never received notice.

21 Also I want to know, which I asked during the
22 West Side planning process, who's paying for these new
23 streets and alleys? And I never got an answer.

1 Infrastructure, lights, and everything. And I'm
2 assuming it's the city, the taxpayers, as normal.
3 Because they would never answer the question of who's
4 paying for this.

5 And I went back and I looked at my original
6 West Side planning flyer and it says three to four
7 stories for apartments or anything. And, you know, you
8 say, oh yeah, that's, you know, what this is going to
9 be. And now you're in here saying that it's going to be
10 something else.

11 And I've attended not only these meetings, but
12 Central Street. And when Central Street people came in
13 and they said they didn't want five stories, they
14 demanded only three and four stories, that's what they
15 got. And that's what we want. And we're not getting
16 it.

17 And then you say, which I asked before, and
18 they say apartments. They keep putting apartments on
19 this six flats and so forth. When I asked a long time
20 ago during the planning process, I said, well, are these
21 really going to be apartments? Well, we just title them
22 apartments. But most likely they'll be condos because
23 we cannot afford to make them apartments because we

1 would have to charge \$2,000 a month for rent.

2 And so you say a low income. Who is that?

3 Not \$2,000 a month. And they won't be able to afford

4 apartments nor these units that you say will be

5 \$400,000. So please answer the questions that I've

6 asked repeatedly.

7 MR. SUTTON: Carlis Sutton, 1821 Darrell.

8 My first concern is I, like two gentlemen, I

9 would like to see development. But your question should

10 be answered more appropriately.

11 Why can't development fit the current zoning?

12 Why do we have to have development that is in direct

13 opposition to what the residents want and is direct

14 opposition to the character of our community, which is

15 in direct opposition to us maintaining our own homes in

16 this community?

17 You're going to speed up gentrification.

18 We're going to pay for the sewers. We're going to pay

19 for the extension of the streets. That nobody of my

20 color will be able to afford to buy a \$400,000 town home

21 or to move into these units.

22 So my concern is that you tell us about form-

23 based zoning and you mention that form-based zoning, 90

1 percent of it when they first started, requires citizen
2 participation and meeting the needs of the citizens.
3 Then you come with R5, which is in total opposition to
4 everything we've been requesting, the elimination of
5 businesses without even contacting people.

6 I'm really concerned. And I'm glad a couple
7 of my alderman are here too. Because I need to know,
8 who is going to stand up for us? Why do we have to come
9 to these meetings and currently remind you that we're
10 not going anywhere, that we're going to be here as
11 property owners as long as we can stay?

12 And you may try to get rid of us. But you're
13 not going to do it this particular process. Either you
14 live up to the letter of the law by giving us
15 notification, secondly, coming up with some plans that
16 are more compatible with what we think our community
17 ought to look like, or we're going to continue opposing
18 very, very vehemently anything that you propose like
19 this that's going to change the character and the
20 content and not only that, the ability for black people
21 to remain in Evanston.

22 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Carlis, Carlis, if I
23 may, I have a question for you.

1 MR. SUTTON: Yeah.

2 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: The area that is
3 currently zoned R5, --

4 MR. SUTTON: Um-hum.

5 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: -- that allows 50-foot
6 height there. Do you want that area to remain R5 with a
7 50-foot height?

8 MR. SUTTON: No.

9 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: I thought you --

10 MR. SUTTON: No. The area I was talking about
11 was originally zoned R3 and R4. There's very, very
12 limited area in our zone, R5, in the 5th ward. If the
13 majority of the 5th ward is R3 and R4, not R5. The
14 overlay was all R5, which got rid of businesses, which
15 got rid of R3, which got rid of R4. That was my
16 concern, Mr. Opdycke.

17 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: I guess I misunderstood
18 you. I thought you, you wanted the existing zoning to
19 remain intact.

20 MR. SUTTON: No. Compatible. We're talking
21 about form-based zoning, okay? And when they mentioned
22 earlier that the buildings that they're proposing are
23 not in contradiction to any existing building. The only

1 building in the 5th ward that's 50 feet tall is Blake
2 Robinson, which is a recent addition. There are no huge
3 complexes in the 5th ward of six units and nine units.
4 They don't exist.

5 And the fact that you're going to introduce
6 these. And at the price that you're introducing these
7 too. And the effect that we're going to have to pay for
8 the infrastructure because we're within 500 feet.

9 Every developer that we talk to says they
10 can't afford to improve the streets, to put in street
11 lights, to put in traffic lights, that it would not be
12 practical for them to develop. So the current tax
13 payers, who are already very belabored to trying to
14 maintain their homes and their, we're going to be
15 burdened. Those especially within 500 feet.

16 So there is no benefit to us, as someone has
17 said. It's a burden to us, a complete burden to us.
18 And I wish the city would address that in some way, that
19 we could get all these buildings that have gone up to
20 Optima. We were told, oh, when these high-rises go up
21 it'll lower your taxes. You'll have a better income
22 living. I have not benefitted from that one bit.

23 Thank god since the total assessment of the

1 city has gone up, our properties will naturally
2 appreciate. Okay, with these buildings coming in, they
3 will automatically depreciate and at a much higher rate.

4 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Excuse me. Just one
5 moment. Are you opposed to the R5 being re-zoned to an
6 R5A?

7 MR. SUTTON: I don't have my map with me right
8 now.

9 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Which is 40, which is,
10 which is --

11 MR. SUTTON: What area are you talking -- Just
12 give me the streets and I can tell you.

13 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: It's north of Emerson.

14 MR. SUTTON: Okay.

15 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Wesley is on sort of
16 the east flank. And Ashland's sort of on the left
17 flank.

18 MR. SUTTON: Yeah, right. That's --

19 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Now that's currently
20 R5.

21 MR. SUTTON: -- in that area.

22 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: But it's R5 right now.

23 MR. SUTTON: No. I thought where Robinson's

1 bus is R5? That's commercial.

2 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: No, that's on the south
3 side of Emerson, right?

4 MR. SUTTON: No, no. Where he's keeping that
5 car lot now is on the north side of Emerson.

6 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: That's R5.

7 MR. SUTTON: That's currently R5? It's not
8 commercial?

9 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: No.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: They changed it.

11 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: No. Actually we're
12 the, it's I2.

13 MR. SUTTON: Thank you. Thank you. I know
14 it's not R5.

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: He said the park was R5.

16 CHAIRMAN WOODS: The park is R5. And, and
17 one, two, three blocks to the east is largely R5. Yes,
18 you're correct, Carlis. From Robinson's parking area to
19 the east of there, the park, that is all R5, including
20 all the way up to Leon, what it would sort of line up
21 with Leon Place a little further east. So, on the other
22 side of Green Bay.

23 MS. ESTER: Could I say something? The R5A,

1 do you have to go back --

2 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: You have to take the
3 microphone, Ms. Ester.

4 MS. ESTER: Okay. The R5A came out of the
5 West Side planning, the neighborhood West Side planning,
6 which was the Green Bay, all of those streets in there.

7 That was the 18 months where the community was going
8 through that.

9 Okay, at the final review, as Susan had
10 stated, that's where the R5A came into with 42 feet.
11 Because when that process was going, the community and
12 the alderman at that time, Alderman Joe Kent, wanted it
13 to be downgraded to an R3 to be in the same order as the
14 rest of the 5th ward.

15 But when the people that wrote the final draft
16 and everything, they came to a decision that it should
17 be R5A, 42 feet, that did not come back to the community
18 for the community to address. But since they told us
19 the 42 feet was three-story buildings, we accepted that,
20 that there would be no five stories over there from
21 Green Bay to Dewey. Or is it Ashland? Wherever the,
22 the little park that shows that it's the R5.
23 So, we don't have any problem with the R5A if it is 42

1 feet and if that is what it's going to be.

2 Now with the other park came the West Side
3 Master Plan, which is supposed to be the form-based.
4 They told us that they took the zoning height from the
5 neighborhood plan, which was 42 feet. Well, in some,
6 37. But nothing no higher than 42 feet, which was three
7 stories. And that's what we said we could accept.

8 MR. CAHILL: My name is John Cahill, 1515
9 Church Street, Cahill Plumbing and Heating.

10 I'm here really to ask a question, or a couple
11 maybe, and maybe some redefinition on behalf of myself
12 and the Uchtman family who own National Awards next to
13 me.

14 And I was not at the last meeting. I was on
15 vacation. And it seems that things change. But I like
16 to hear it from the horse's mouth, so to speak.

17 As you know, I've been at many meetings for
18 the last year. We've been at some staff meetings where
19 there was going to be another staff meeting before a
20 city meeting. These meetings don't always happen.

21 As you know, we're now zoned I2. We've been
22 there 30 years at this address. We've been in Evanston
23 117 years. And we really plan on staying here. And

1 you've been very kind in saying, you can stay as long as
2 you'd like.

3 The only thing that's of concern to me now is
4 I see that we are listed as R4 on the map. But I've
5 been assured, as the Uchtmans were assured verbally,
6 that as long as we stay there and we, we would be able
7 to improve our property, we'd be able to, if I want to
8 rebuild Cahill Plumbing or if I want to, whatever I
9 might want to do. Or I might want to sell to another
10 contractor some time in the future, that we'd be allowed
11 to do that.

12 But when I see the zoning R4 and we're green
13 on the map, I just want to be assured verbally and in
14 writing, as do the Uchtmans, that that will stand and
15 that I won't have any more surprises in the future. I
16 mean, I expect that.

17 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Susan? Susan?

18 MS. GUDERLEY: Mr. Cahill's correct. The
19 plan, the plan itself, the master plan notes in writing
20 that uses that are there currently, such as Cahill
21 Plumbing and National Awards, the city welcomes them to
22 stay and wants them to stay.

23 But we've moved onto -- The plan has been

1 adopted. And that stands. So what we're talking about
2 now is the underlying zoning that would apply not to
3 your operation, but when you would want to sell to
4 something other than another contractor.

5 Arlova went through some of the discussion of
6 non-conforming uses and non-conforming structures. And,
7 you know, if you would want to run through that again,
8 we can do that. But essentially as long as you, you are
9 capable of selling to another contractor, I mean, as
10 long as the use isn't discontinued, it can continue on
11 as long as you would like to operate or a subsequent
12 owner would want to operate that.

13 You can make improvements to your building.
14 You can expand your building. And if it were destroyed
15 more than 50 percent, the current Zoning Ordinance would
16 not allow you to build. However, the overlay
17 regulations that I proposed with the form-based code
18 does permit the city to make a determination as to
19 whether or not a certain building could be rebuilt. And
20 certainly you've got that option to call on if, if that
21 were to happen.

22 But as Arlova said, there's a great percentage
23 of units or structures in the city because of the age of

1 many of our buildings and the age of many of our lots
2 when they were subdivided that are non-conforming. And
3 I don't know to what extent that's a problem, but --

4 MS. JACKSON: You know, I've staffed the
5 Zoning Board of Appeals and I would say 90 percent of
6 the cases that we see are for variations to, for
7 properties that have some non-conforming characteristic.

8 So as long as, you know, I don't want to reiterate, but
9 as long as it continues, it -- The problem is if it's
10 abandoned or discontinued for more than 12 months. And
11 then even with the overlay you still have the option to
12 ask Council for a special review.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I wanted to know are we
14 paying to institute the particular structure -- three or
15 four stories -- apartments really apartments or are they
16 condos or low-income and that sort of thing? --

17 MS. GUDERLEY: I'll take the units first. The
18 building types that are proposed by the overlay, the
19 zoning overlay, don't make any mention as to tenure,
20 meaning whether it's ownership or renter. Certainly
21 there is a need for rental properties. But as the
22 Chairman mentioned, as you're aware as part of the
23 planning process, we had a market study analysis of, or

1 real estate market analysis of the area.

2 And as you pointed out, because of taxes and
3 other things, rental properties would need a serious
4 subsidy to be affordable. However, because we do allow
5 for a variety of unit types, everything from small lot
6 single family to town homes, single family attached to
7 multi, to small flats, six flats and nine flats to
8 apartment buildings, we wanted to provide a range of
9 unit types so that developers could construct something
10 other than large, expensive single-family homes. And
11 these are likely to be because of land prices likely to
12 be condo units.

13 Some of the developers we've talked to are
14 interested. And we also now have an affordable housing
15 ordinance in effect so that a percentage, is it 10
16 percent, of developments must be affordable units. So
17 that, we're looking at developers that would have to do
18 that. That's for planned developments.

19 In addition, in regards to the streets, when
20 we're talking about large parcels such as this, it's
21 typical that a developer is, when you have a subdivision
22 ordinance, which we do not right now, subdivision
23 regulations usually make all public improvements.

1 That's everything from streets, sewer, water, are the
2 responsibility of the developer.

3 That being said, because this area is an area
4 that hasn't seen development, we do want to attract on
5 some of these sites that, as Mr. Garrison pointed out,
6 are currently abandoned, industrial, and possibly
7 contaminated. The city would consider, and is
8 considering, assisting with TIF monies if they're
9 available on some of these properties to assist in
10 developing these, these public improvements.

11 MS. PRUDDEN: The process seems to be to get
12 in line. So I did sign up to speak and I'm in line.
13 Lucille Prudden, 2000 Green Bay Road, Buffalo Joe's.

14 I have a couple things to say. And I, I
15 appreciate all the comments that have followed me. And
16 many of you are very eloquent.

17 There was a final draft in March of 2004. And
18 one of the objectives too was to encourage business
19 growth, to provide services, and provide local
20 employment. I feel that that's something we've been
21 doing since 1989 and 1984 at our other location.

22 About 15 to 20 years ago there was a survey
23 conducted by the city that on Green Bay Road on the

1 corner of Green Bay and Foster, there were about 24,000
2 cars that passed by locally every day. I feel that that
3 is definitely something to encourage the business
4 climate of the area.

5 So that leads me to my question as to the, who
6 determined the boundaries of these maps? And I find it
7 rather unusual that the boundaries go down Green Bay
8 Road, turn on Foster, go around the gas station, and do
9 not continue on Green Bay to Emerson. And I did bring a
10 disc to show this. But I understand this is set up for
11 someone else's use. So I do feel in a somewhat degree
12 that we're being singled out. And my concern is that
13 what is the point of making us a Residential 4?

14 The lady that was here last week said they
15 spoke to the businesses affected when you switched from
16 this neighborhood study, which is not available as a
17 handout today, to the new zoning which would, proposal,
18 which would make us an R4. We own the majority of that
19 property and we were never approached, nor were we, was
20 it discussed with us.

21 Now, in the writeup that has been proposed in
22 the large Evanston proposed plan, Buffalo Joe's is
23 listed. The action, the task, is free to negotiate, to

1 assist in land assembly at Foster and Emerson. And the
2 specifics are multiple land use owners control the land
3 at the northwest corner of assembling the land for
4 future redevelopment. This is the first time we've
5 heard that that would be necessary, to take our land for
6 future redevelopment.

7 Now, these are some of the questions that have
8 come up in this conversation today. And one of the
9 ladies that spoke said, one resident just wanted to know
10 what in the, what will happen that will benefit the
11 people in the ward? And I guess my question is, this
12 certainly does not appear to me to be as a win-win
13 situation.

14 We provide jobs to people. We improve the
15 corner where we do business. And you might be wondering
16 why I am so upset. Yes, I can continue to do business
17 on this corner. But I cannot improve the corner any
18 further. And I think if you go to many businesses in
19 Evanston they can improve their locations. Our
20 buildings go back to the 1900s. They certainly need
21 improvement. I'll be the first one to admit that. But
22 now we're locked in. We cannot improve and nor can we
23 expand.

1 And if I were to show you these pictures that
2 I have on this disc, I don't really feel that my
3 property looks any worse. Matter of fact, I think it
4 looks better than the gas station, than Hecky's, than
5 the vacant property in between. And I wish I could show
6 you the pictures of the dumpsters right on Green Bay
7 Road in the City of Evanston. So if you're going to
8 talk about green space and making it look better, I
9 really can't buy all of this conversation.

10 And now you're going to tell me that it,
11 provided my place, if it burns down and I can build it
12 to that specification in 12 months, I can be in
13 business. No I can't be in business. Because I
14 probably cannot meet all the requirements of business
15 today. Nor can I meet the requirements of the business
16 I'd like to be in and be proud to be in. Thank you very
17 much.

18 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Susan, Susan, could you
19 address the issue of, of improvement on that, on that
20 site? Or Arlova?

21 MS. JACKSON: The property can be repaired and
22 improved. It can't be expanded. So the size of the
23 facility, you can't add structure. But a non-conforming

1 use can certainly be improved and maintained. It just
2 can't get any larger.

3 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: All right, now, is that
4 also true for the Cahill property?

5 MS. JACKSON: Yes.

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Do you guys know if there's
7 a thousand square feet -- I'm sure you know.

8 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: What property are you
9 talking about, sir?

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: 3000 Green Bay Road, Buffalo
11 Joe's.

12 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Oh.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: A thousand square feet.

14 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: All right.

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I do not -- we are seeking
16 right now. We are opposed right now to all the studies
17 that we're paying for through Residential 4 --

18 MS. GILES: I hate to call color, but, you
19 know, this is. We were asked when we had the meeting.
20 We asked for jobs. We asked for betterment of the
21 people who lived in the community. And this is just a
22 slap in the face.

23 And it's the same thing that happened on

1 Emerson Street when our group of ministers attempted to
2 buy the YMCA on Emerson and were told it was not for
3 sale. That property is still sitting. And yet you're
4 saying, if property goes 12 months without being used
5 and it's forfeited for whatever purpose you, the city
6 may decide. That property is, and probably not, it
7 probably has an owner. I think it's about, slated for
8 redevelopment.

9 But why is it that we cannot redevelop? Why
10 is it that the city picks and chooses who can and who
11 cannot when we already, when we have something in
12 existence and we'd like to improve it?

13 MS. HUDSON: My name is Roberta Hudson. I
14 live at 1941 Dewey Avenue.

15 I attended some of the meetings when we first
16 started. And I'm a little disappointed at the city for
17 saying redevelopment of the West Side is what they want
18 to do. And I see the headlines in the newspaper, The
19 City Redevelops the West Side. And yet all I see being
20 developed is nothing but housing, which is something we
21 need less of. Because we need more opportunities for
22 our youth to develop. You have to develop the --

23 Developing property is not developing the West Side

1 of Evanston. I'm sorry. And that's all we see in the
2 papers, that they are developing the West Side. Housing
3 is something that we need less of with the problems that
4 we have.

5 When I was coming home today from work
6 Fleetwood Jardin is closed. Six youth sitting on the
7 corner. Young kids. Bicycles. Nothing to do, nowhere
8 to go. And where are the people that you're going to
9 put in this area? Where are their kids going? There's
10 nothing here for the, for the city youth.

11 I'm just appalled that all the city can think
12 of is putting housing in Evanston. Evanston is a great
13 place to have a tech center, a skills center, a learning
14 center for our youth. There's no reason for them to
15 fall to drugs and the, and the problems that we're
16 having on the street. There's no reason for it.

17 There's greed from people who have property who
18 want to make as much as they can off of the, off of the
19 people here. We're not developing. We're not
20 benefitting from anything that this development is going
21 through. And the city knows it.

22 We can't even find out who owns the property.
23 I understand it may be a blind trust someone's trying

1 to hide. If you're going to take the land and develop
2 it at our expense, we should know who these people are.

3 We should know that this land is, is a flag for red on
4 the real estate, in their real estate lots, deals that
5 they have.

6 There's something more that the people don't
7 know about, about this land that suddenly the city is so
8 interested in developing for a few developers who are
9 going to make it all the way to the bank with the
10 mortgage people, with the people who are real estate
11 people. These are the people who are going to benefit.

12 It's not the community.

13 And when is the city going to realize that
14 they have to do more than develop land just for housing?

15 I, I still say that we had a moratorium. Joe Kent was
16 our alderman. And we fought to have a moratorium so
17 that our height would not be, our zoning would be no
18 more than R3, which is in uniform with all the houses
19 around there.

20 And suddenly these apartment complexes arise.

21 Right on Foster Street. And anyone who's been around
22 there knows the problems we're having with traffic,
23 noise, and everything else. We do not need this in our

1 community.

2 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Is there anyone here,
3 I'd like to return to the Buffalo Joe's question, is
4 there anybody here that would oppose the Buffalo Joe's
5 block? And that is to say, Buffalo Joe's on Foster
6 Street north on Green Bay, would oppose that area
7 remaining C2? Because it is now proposed for R4.
8 What's the rationale for the change there? And what,
9 who are those who, who oppose that area remaining C2?

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: No one. Everyone --

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: When we did the meetings and
12 everybody got together and looked at the pictures and
13 everything, everyone agreed they wanted businesses all
14 along Foster and Simpson and Emerson and Green Bay. We
15 all wanted jobs and businesses there. We agreed to
16 maybe having condos on the second floor or the third
17 floor, but we didn't want to go R4. Nobody did. None
18 of the tables agreed on that. At least I don't remember
19 any.

20 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Well this had to come
21 from someplace. What was the rationale?

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: They did it on their own.
23 They said pick A, B, C. If you don't like it, go home.

1 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- and then this was changed
2 to R4 without our knowledge, without our consent or --

3 MS. JACKSON: That, that particular --

4 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well that's why we're here.
5 You know, we want to talk about these things.

6 MS. GUDERLEY: The reason, Leslie couldn't be
7 here today. But one of the discussions that we had in
8 terms of follow up on last meeting was that that
9 particular area which she was, well, we did talk about
10 in terms of the design of the plan, was to put, make
11 sure that residential areas no longer had as many
12 conflicts as they currently have with regards to being
13 across the street from your industrial uses or
14 commercial use.

15 The reason that area was proposed for R4 with
16 a cluster of town homes was that if that continues as C2
17 under its, or if it's redeveloped as C2, if Buffalo
18 Joe's, when and if they decide to sell for another
19 commercial use, that likely will be redeveloped so that
20 either they'll be parking or loading right opposite
21 houses on the west side of Wesley.

22 Again, the plan is not, is not going to affect
23 existing uses. It's meant to govern the properties, the

1 properties when they're sold for redevelopment. That
2 means that when Buffalo Joe's sells and no longer wants
3 to conduct business there, if it's zoned as C2 when --

4 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, Susan, I beg to differ a
5 little bit.

6 MS. GUDERLEY: Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Because the reality is, you
8 have impacted their business. Because they can't expand
9 or improve their business in its current location. So
10 they can't reinvest in their property in a way that
11 transforms it from its footprint today to a new
12 footprint.

13 MS. GUDERLEY: But if they were to sell it to,
14 for --

15 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I understand.

16 MS. GUDERLEY: Okay.

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Why do I have to sell it?

18 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I understand your issue,
19 believe me. Believe me. I've got to admit, I've got a
20 problem with this. Saying to John Cahill or to Buffalo
21 Joe's that they can't improve their property by changing
22 the square footage of their building and building
23 different seems incomprehensible to me.

1 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can I say something at some
2 point?

3 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Is there a way within the
4 overlay district that we can change the rules?

5 PARTICIPANT: Absolutely.

6 ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: I think what we have here
7 is some confusion. And I think that our own, our own
8 people, okay, there's a difficulty in communicating the
9 history and the intent, right? I think, you know, some
10 of us need to go back to some more discussions.

11 The starting point for all of this is the
12 Cyrus Hines development. When that development was
13 going up some of the residents came together and said,
14 wait a minute. What's the limitations here? You know,
15 where are we going? How far can we go? What's
16 dictating how far we can go?

17 And at that time we really, the plan
18 development didn't set any kind of, of limitation within
19 which these developers could build. And so people
20 speculated that, look, when Cahill or National Awards
21 goes on the market, then developers can do whatever they
22 want to do almost unless there are some plans put in
23 place that limit the height and the zoning, density for,

1 the density for these areas. And so that's why a number
2 of parcels were looked at to determine how far can you
3 go and what are the housing types that is allowed within
4 certain zoning limitations.

5 For example, in R4 you can do town homes. And
6 so people wanted to maintain that kind of flexibility.
7 And folks didn't want to go to R6. There was an issue
8 of adjacency between, you know, single-family homes and
9 land that may be developed like Tapecoat. So that was
10 the beginning of that process.

11 And also I know that some people have raised
12 that now that we have a TIF proposed, we need to do some
13 thinking, some planning, or integrate what we already
14 have and expand it in the areas within the TIF.

15 So if we approach the process from that
16 standpoint, that it is really about looking at what
17 limitations we impose on future developments. Not so
18 much that we are saying to Buffalo Joe's or we're saying
19 to Cahill, okay, that we are really inviting people to
20 come in and buy their properties. But we're saying, if
21 in the future you have development, you cannot go above
22 X height, X density.

23 Okay, then the residents would be at greater

1 ease to understand what might come in the future when it
2 comes. Because the city doesn't have the capital to go
3 and do any of these developments. It would be on a
4 future developer to come in and do that if they wished
5 to do so.

6 Because Hines was not residential, yet it is
7 now residential. Because there was a planned
8 development proposed. You know, people went through the
9 policy that's established by the city and they got
10 something developed there. I mean, it may not be to the
11 liking of everybody there who's in the city, but that's
12 the reality.

13 Now, I think that the problem with how we're
14 presenting this is to say to those who own commercial
15 property that you cannot build the same kind of property
16 if it's either for 12 months or if it's burnt down
17 etcetera, etcetera. We need to remove that edge. See,
18 if we remove that, then I don't think people who have
19 that kind of specter --

20 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely.

21 ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: -- that there is a threat,
22 that this discussion is threatening to their ownership
23 or their plan or their vision. That's not what's

1 intended. And if it's how we are presenting it, then we
2 are being dogmatic in the way that we approach zoning.

3 That may be, that may be what zoning
4 administration does. But I'm saying that that's not the
5 intent. We do not want to communicate this kind of
6 specter --

7 CHAIRMAN WOOD: Absolutely.

8 ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: -- to anyone. And let me
9 just say this about the issue of whether or not we're
10 building to try to push people out. I think that what
11 happens is that because the city itself does not own
12 land, what the city can best do is to try to set some
13 limitations. And so by setting some limitations we can
14 control some of the things that happen.

15 If, what I had said at, at, at one of our
16 meetings, if there is a section, a segment, a
17 neighborhood that is dissatisfied with the proposal
18 that's been put forth, that particular neighborhood
19 ought to re-sit down and rethink and try to come up
20 with, with new initiatives. Now, on new, on new
21 initiatives.

22 But in the meanwhile, what people ought to
23 understand is this: that if, while we are doing nothing,

1 if somebody comes and they buy a certain, you know,
2 stretch of land, okay, and they come before the city and
3 they go through the process that the city has in place,
4 we at that time, we will be lagging behind what the
5 developer will be proposing to do. So I think we have
6 to try to understand the process, try to see if we can
7 discuss our vision, and see what we can put in place.

8 Finally, and I'm going to sit down, with
9 regards to initiatives for youth, I agree that we do
10 need to do a lot more. Last year the Council voted to
11 put money in the budget to get a Director of Youth
12 engagement, right, in order for that individual to one,
13 make sure that the youth are connected with the services
14 that we already provide. Secondly, to also try to look
15 for new initiatives, connect, better connection with the
16 high school, try to get more training programs. There
17 is some discussions about an apprenticeship program
18 going on with the local unions.

19 I don't have anything of quality to give you,
20 but I will say quantitatively, we're making progress in
21 that light. And because of other initiatives that have
22 been taken in, that have taken, that have taken place,
23 people for example, at Church Street Village hired

1 community builders, young men and women who used to
2 stand outside on the corners selling --

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: But have they finished? --

4 ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: No, no, wait, wait a
5 minute. Okay, so what you're saying is, okay, you did a
6 good thing, but now you don't have provisions to keep
7 doing it. You're right. And that is why, you're right.
8 And that is why new initiatives are being discussed.
9 And so we should take into account any criticism that is
10 raised. But you cannot throw the baby out with the bath
11 water. You cannot relegate it to an absolute, as if
12 nothing is being done.

13 Bu Ku's was built by community builders. And
14 there's a proposal, I believe, that will come before
15 CDBG, the Community Development Block Grant Committee,
16 to have maybe these builders and more young men engage
17 in the process of rehabbing some of the homes in the
18 city that may need some assistance, etcetera, etcetera.

19 So, you know, I'm not saying that we are
20 there, but I think that we have to not look at things in
21 a sense, an absolute way. You know, and I think we need
22 to sit back down, and I'm going to sit down, but we need
23 to meet again to re-examine some of the concerns.

1 And you know, the, the fear of gentrification
2 is real on that side of town. Central Street may not
3 have those concerns. And so we, and so we understand
4 that. And I think we have to be more patient in trying
5 to walk through the process and see if we could get
6 something that is positive and for everybody.

7 So I don't think, I don't think this is over.
8 I think this is --

9 CHAIRMAN WOODS: You're absolutely correct.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have a question --

11 ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: I don't know if I'm
12 allowed to answer.

13 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Alderman, go ahead.

14 (Question from audience member.)

15 MS. HUDSON: You mentioned some of the things
16 you want to propose for the youth. And you're talking
17 about apprentice program, apprenticeship program. But
18 what will these youth be really doing? Will they just
19 be doing the back work, moving bricks around, and labor
20 jobs that they, really no challenge to them?

21 What we were saying is, we need a learning
22 center, a skilled tech learning center where, you
23 know -- I don't know if you remember, but we had a town

1 hall meeting with the District 202 and 65
2 Superintendent. We had a lot of educators and board
3 members at that meeting.

4 And we indicated then that we need to expand
5 beyond the, the high school at least two years for
6 specialized training and tie in with Oakton College to
7 get certified, to train these youth in skills that those
8 youth who won't go on or won't be able to go to college,
9 they'll have, they'll become productive citizens.

10 They'll become productive citizens where they can
11 learn skills like being a florist or, or processing
12 food, learning to process. This is the type of center
13 that we would like to see over there where the planning
14 is for this housing. We don't need more housing in that
15 area.

16 ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: Here's --

17 MS. HUDSON: And I have one more question.
18 I've been told that it's a done deal, that this housing
19 is going to be there and that we're here just to blow
20 off steam and that it's a done deal and there's nothing
21 that we can do about it.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is that true?

23 ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: You know what? Tapecoat

1 is not owned by the city. So the city cannot do with
2 Tapecoat what it wants. Mr. Woodheimer has a contract
3 on, to purchase Tapecoat. So, and he's been listening
4 to our proposals and the boundaries and the limitations.

5 And he too probably feels constrained by what is being
6 proposed here.

7 So there is no done deal about nothing.
8 Because if we perceive something to be a done deal, we
9 dis-empower ourselves in terms of what we can do, what
10 we can influence.

11 This is not the meeting for the
12 skills/learning center that you're suggesting. But I
13 share your vision in that too. And I'll share with you
14 some private discussions that I've had with a couple
15 other people who some funds to try to establish a
16 foundation for vocational training for some youth on an
17 ongoing basis.

18 We can meet to talk about and plan and see how
19 we could make that happen. But to make that happen,
20 okay, to me is part of private money and to come to the
21 Council meetings and to continue to press that, just
22 like we pressed the injection of the trees, so that we
23 get to the point where some of that money could be

1 allocated so we could do what we have to do. Because
2 right now, last year we allocated \$150,000. We need
3 more money allocated for the youth.

4 Okay, I know that there is another matter on
5 the agenda. I just wanted to say to the Committee, if
6 you could just, if you could just give us more time for
7 further discussion, you know, so that we could hammer
8 out these things, I think, I would appreciate it. Okay?

9 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think we are in total
10 agreement on that. And my purpose was only in raising
11 that there must be a way to allow these gentlemen who
12 own businesses that the city values to be able to
13 continue their use and improve their properties within
14 this proposal.

15 ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: Right. And to have peace
16 of mind that they continue.

17 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely. We have another
18 part of this meeting tonight. And so we're going to
19 continue the matter of West Evanston to a date certain
20 of September 5th. And We're going to start that meeting
21 at six o'clock.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I think it's too early.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could we do it --

1 CHAIRMAN WOODS: All right. For the community
2 we're going to start the meeting at seven o'clock.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.

4 MS. ESTER: Excuse me.

5 CHAIRMAN WOODS: P.M., 7:00 p.m.

6 MS. ESTER: Could I say something?

7 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Do we need more time?

8 ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: I think there needs to be
9 more time. And there needs to be another discussion
10 where people sit around the table and try to see what,
11 what it is that we understand and what modifications we
12 need, as opposed to coming in, engaging in a hearing,
13 you know, -- at this point.

14 CHAIRMAN WOODS: That would be great.

15 MS. ESTER: Excuse me. Before you end I have
16 one statement I would like to make for this record
17 tonight. And this is kind of in response to some of the
18 things that Alderman Baptiste said when he said that the
19 people east of Hines came and said they was concerned
20 about what was going to happen to Hines.

21 The people west of Hines already had worked
22 on and had a plan in place when the Council, the full
23 Council, approved a TIF and approved our neighborhood

1 study plan, said that we would go back and sit down and
2 redevelop that full plan. That has not happened. We
3 have been disengaged from that process.

4 We have been treated inferior to the other
5 communities that had study area. The Southeast Evanston
6 community had their planning study. When they did that,
7 they had a paid facilitator. When the West Side was
8 supposed to have theirs, it was promised that there was
9 \$50,000 to pay an organizer to facilitate the community
10 in pulling that together. That did not happen.

11 We had people from the planning community,
12 from the Planning Commission, that -- staff to run some
13 of those meetings. And what it turned out to be,
14 starting out with community people, resident, line up
15 with more business than community people.

16 You did, they did the Central Street. They
17 paid to have a facilitator. They did downtown. They
18 paid to have a facilitator. We did not get the same
19 treatment. We demand the same treatment.

20 CHAIRMAN WOODS: That is not true. There is a
21 consultant who is on board, actually two consultants in
22 the West Evanston --

23 MS. ESTER: No. You're missing the point.

1 What I said, the West Neighborhood Planning Study, what
2 we did for 18 months, was with the planning staff.
3 Everybody else, when they went through their planning
4 stuff had paid staff.

5 When the city wanted to do something to a
6 small section, they paid someone to come there and to
7 tell us what we was going to have. Not ask, tell. So I
8 resent people saying to me that I was asked and I was
9 told, said, had input. I had changed that design on
10 there, put single-family house, and the man that was
11 paid by the city said I could not do that. So I did not
12 have the same opportunity.

13 As Tina said, my voice had been discounted.
14 And I want that on the record. The people east of Hines
15 came after we did. We met for 18 months. They was
16 concerned about one section they had, then the city
17 jumped on board.

18 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay, Betty, we understand.
19 And obviously you're now on the record. And there's
20 going to be continuing opportunities.

21 And based on the alderman's suggestion, we're
22 going to continue this as a item to the September 12th
23 Plan Commission meeting where we will identify a date

1 certain to have a continuation of these meetings. So
2 that will allow staff time.

3 MS. JACKSON: I don't know that we're having
4 it September 12th because of the religious holiday.

5 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I thought we are.

6 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Yes, I think we are.

7 CHAIRMAN WOODS: That's where we'd left it,
8 the last I heard.

9 MS. JACKSON: Okay.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: What is the date again?

11 CHAIRMAN WOODS: September 12th at 7 p.m. It
12 will not be discussed as an item other than to identify
13 when the next meeting will be. That will allow staff
14 time to determine the plan of how to go forward from
15 here.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Did you say September 5th?

17 CHAIRMAN WOODS: September 12th. Not the 5th,
18 no. Sorry.

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can you define what we're
20 doing on the 12th again?

21 CHAIRMAN WOODS: The 12th, all we're doing is
22 identifying the date for the next meeting to discuss.
23 But in the meantime, staff will be coming up with a plan

1 for how to go forward to maybe take into account the
2 alderman's suggestion about meetings to look at and
3 examine some of the issues.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And what about the people?
5 Are the, I mean, the staff is going to do this. What
6 about the people?

7 CHAIRMAN WOODS: The consultants are going to
8 be involved in the process.

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: What about the people?
10 Because the consultants made the decisions before. What
11 about the people who live there?

12 CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, no, no. The staff is
13 going to come up with a plan to involve the people to go
14 forward, okay?

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Excuse me. But, is there
16 any notice being sent out? Because I didn't get a
17 notice for either of these. And everybody keeps talking
18 about notice. Then it's 500 feet, used to be a
19 thousand. I'm 500 feet and I didn't get a notice
20 anytime. So I'm asking, you know, they keep slipping in
21 these meetings.

22 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I understand everybody's
23 concern about notice. And I will tell you that I have

1 seen the lists. I know that city staff does everything
2 they can possibly do. And I'm sure if you talk to city
3 staff you can see the list.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. My name never comes
5 up. And we've been here a long time. And the building
6 in discussion that's very close, 1507, my family has
7 owned for 38 years. And I can't imagine --

8 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Please take this up with city
9 staff.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, I keep taking it up
11 with city staff and they keep saying they sent me a
12 letter, which is a lie. Please record that.

13 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I understand that the
14 Commission is a voluntary body that makes
15 recommendations to the City Council. That's all we do.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: If that's the -- I volunteer
17 to, if flyers are made, I volunteer to pass them out.
18 And I came three days in a row to get the flyers to pass
19 out. And I was told that they had not been made, there
20 would be a push to get them made for yesterday. And
21 when I came yesterday, they still hadn't come. So I
22 volunteered already. I don't know --

23 COMMISSIONER WOODS: I don't know.

1 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And I guess I know because I
2 was here last time. Because I did not get one either.

3 COMMISSIONER WOODS: Right. Okay, we're going
4 to take a three-minute break and then we are going to
5 take up Central Street.

6 (Off the record.)

7 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

8 MR. DUNKLEY: If I could just ask a point of
9 order about how you'd like to proceed. My name is Bill
10 Dunkley. I'm the zoning administrator with City of
11 Evanston. I was with you the last, well, with all the
12 Central Street zoning implementation meetings. I'm glad
13 to be here again with you tonight. Thank you for
14 coming. Thank you for waiting for this portion of the,
15 of the show, this portion of the hearing.

16 We ended last time with, I believe we were in
17 the middle of public comment. I don't think we'd
18 finished the list. I can begin. There are some, I can
19 at least walk through the materials that were handed
20 out, take any questions on them. I'll identify anything
21 that is new or changed and to kind of give a general
22 overview of where we are. And then if you'd like to
23 continue with questions, we can do that. Just want to

1 see how you'd like to proceed.

2 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, Bill, let me just step
3 back for a minute. My understanding of the way we're
4 generally going right now is that you're kind of
5 developing a framework for this to go forward. And what
6 you're looking for is input from folks as to, is that
7 the right direction, you know, should something be
8 tweaked or changed or modified, serious objections to
9 it, whatever, so that you can have a better framework
10 from which to go forward and develop a, a complete
11 zoning proposal.

12 MR. DUNKLEY: Right, right.

13 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay.

14 MR. DUNKLEY: Let me, let me go ahead and give
15 a general, give the overview of where we are. God, it
16 feels like it's a million miles between here and there.

17 And we've responded to some of the things I think we
18 saw.

19 The last meeting some of the things that were,
20 we thought might have been clear, but were not as clear
21 as they could have been, and really tried to be as
22 precise about what was being proposed as possible.

23 You can't, we can't be equivocal on this

1 business of zoning. You have to be, you have to say
2 exactly what it is you're, is being proposed, and know
3 what exactly it means. So what I did was, I took the
4 opportunity to write up this quick first page of, what
5 the heck are we doing here? And that is primarily under
6 the scope of work.

7 We are implementing the zoning recommendations
8 from the plan, Central Street Master Plan. I know this
9 is, for a lot of you this is just common sense. But we,
10 sometimes you get bound up in where we are and go, try
11 and go a whole bunch of different places. But that
12 really gets us nowhere.

13 Now the Central Street Master Plan, and you
14 all know it, it's all been adopted by Council. It makes
15 recommendations in many areas. They are not only
16 zoning, although of course, from my perspective, zoning
17 is the most important. But it also makes
18 recommendations in terms of capital projects, in terms
19 of community development, all sort of things that are
20 necessary to realize the goals of what's, of the stuff
21 that's in the plan.

22 Because zoning is only one part of that, it's
23 our job to figure out the best way to do that. And the

1 best way is not necessarily the thing that, that
2 achieves necessarily the, all of the objectives in the
3 zoning recommendations, although we certainly want to do
4 that.

5 We also have to weigh other things, such as
6 the cost of doing that, the ability of our processes in
7 our communities and all, the ability of the city to
8 absorb that. And there are a number of things to take
9 into account. Of course, our resources as well, which
10 aren't infinite.

11 Section three of the plan is the master plan.
12 Item D is the zoning, or the zoning recommendations.
13 And those are reproduced for you, albeit a little bit
14 tiny. Those of us who are in our mid-40s are starting
15 to see why this is an issue. But I wanted to make sure
16 that everybody had their recommendations as spelled out
17 in the plan, as identified and voted on and adopted by
18 the City Council. Now, Section D, it doesn't look like
19 there's a lot there. But boy, there's a heck of a lot
20 in that, especially with the, with the map part of the
21 recommendations.

22 Now, there are other parts of the
23 recommendations not specifically under zoning. They are

1 kind of front end. They sort of come before the zoning
2 recommendations. And they are Sections A, B and C,
3 which are called Building Envelope, Sidewalks, and
4 Design Guidelines. Some of those can be implemented
5 using zoning tools. And I've been involved in doing
6 some of that before. Some of it can't. Some of it, we
7 can try to get some of it, but many of them need to take
8 other tools. You just can't do it through zoning. But
9 some of them we can.

10 And I think after we talked last time, there
11 was a real desire to see as much of that, you know, kind
12 of baked into the zoning as we could. So I'll try to
13 bring my experience and the experience of our staff here
14 to bear on making as much of that happen as we can.

15 Our approach is, as I said, this is a, it's a
16 discovery period. We learn more about, we learn all
17 kinds of things, more about, from property owners who
18 maybe have only been a part of the process for now at
19 this point, about development plans. We learn more
20 about, in detail, about relationships of one property to
21 another, things we didn't have time for during the
22 planning process.

23 And that's what we're all about. We will

1 build a consensus on how to proceed with our zoning
2 implementation. And it will be just like a -- consensus
3 that we work through. It will not be perfect. It will
4 never end if we shoot for that goal.

5 The changes, just like as was explained in the
6 West Evanston effort, the changes to the ordinance, both
7 map amendments and text amendments, will be realized
8 through the regular process that we use for every other
9 zoning change regardless of where it originates. So
10 there will be opportunity for, rather, be notification,
11 opportunity for input, and all of the required
12 deliberation that we've come to expect by all our city
13 bodies up to the City Council, which is where these
14 decisions get finalized, at least for zoning matters or
15 re-zoning matters.

16 I put in a blurb here because it's, it is
17 something I felt some tension on the last time, and that
18 was we do have a somewhat imposed time line. And it
19 does behoove us to get something good and something with
20 teeth and something that's meaningful in place by the
21 time our building moratorium expires. That's why we put
22 the moratorium in place.

23 However, we do have this option. And I know

1 what you're going to say. You'll say, oh, the rest will
2 never happen. But we do have the option of a phased
3 approach. And that is get the important stuff, get the
4 85 percent done. And then follow along with the rest,
5 okay. And I was certainly, would push for that and
6 would put all my efforts into making that happen. I
7 wouldn't lead you down a path to say, we'll just get the
8 first part done and we'll follow along with the rest.
9 I'd make sure that that gets planned and executed.

10 The other thing that was very very important
11 and I just really want to make sure that we're clear
12 about this. It was asked, well, are these going to be
13 re-zonings or is there going to be an overlay district?

14 And the answer is, we're proposing that there are both,
15 that we really need both of those things to accomplish
16 the types of recommendations that have been made. So
17 we're looking at targeted re-zonings. And I was very
18 explicit in the maps, the new maps that are put in here,
19 about what is proposed to be re-zoned and what is not.

20 And we also are looking at and proposing a
21 quarter wide overlay district that, through which we can
22 make very specific changes to either requirements or
23 restrictions. In some cases we can actually, we can add

1 some possibilities. We can do a lot through zoning,
2 through an overlay district. The nice thing is that
3 it's, it is location specific. And therefore, we can
4 decide that, we can decide the specifics for, for our
5 Central Street corridor.

6 So the next few sections, as I said, are the
7 master plan recommendations. They are taken straight
8 out of the plan document. And I won't walk through
9 those because I know you've all seen them already.

10 The next two maps we produced in black and
11 white. I think they work pretty well. I wish they were
12 a little darker. But these also I'll make available
13 electronically to anybody who wants them. We'll put
14 them on the website too. They're actually in color.
15 They're really nice in color. But they work in black
16 and white too.

17 1A and 1B are the recommended changes to the
18 base zoning. So these are re-zonings, or as we call
19 them in zoning-ese, map amendments. And there are four
20 areas that are proposed. Not four properties, but four
21 areas. I'm sorry. Once again, five areas. There's
22 four on 1A and one on 1A. And those are taken from,
23 printed directly from the recommendations. But I also

1 added some of the text because we kind of forget why
2 we're doing this. So I added some of the text about why
3 is this re-zoning being recommended. And we'll come
4 back to those. I know there's been some question there
5 about some possible tweaking.

6 Map two are 2A and 2B, the west part of the
7 corridor and the east part of the corridor. This is the
8 other piece, the other tool, which is the overlay
9 district. And that covers most of the corridor.

10 There are sub-areas that are identified.
11 Number one through nine, we gave them hopefully
12 descriptive names. They generally correspond to the
13 underlying base zoning districts. And those give us the
14 ability to target slight changes in height, to add
15 restrictions, to, in particular to require that the
16 whole corridor have a similar street scape as it gets
17 developed in over time or as properties get, get
18 updated.

19 We want to make sure that there's adequate
20 pedestrian space, that it's a comfortable place to be.
21 That's one of the goals, is to preserve that kind of
22 pedestrian-oriented quality of the corridor. And
23 because of the different underlying zoning districts,

1 which all have different requirements, sometimes that's
2 difficult to have happen just by itself. So that's one
3 of the benefits, real benefits we can get over a common
4 overlay district. So we can use this as we need to for
5 our specific, corridor-specific purposes.

6 And the next several pages are just our tables
7 that identify by sub-area each of those nine sub-areas
8 that are shown on the maps. The recommendations on
9 height limits in many cases, well, in all cases where
10 the heights change, it's actually brought down to be
11 more appropriate for that corridor. We try and list
12 what the current limits are as well.

13 Another addition, which is going to be
14 helpful, especially to folks who are trying to develop
15 under this code is, we're adding not only, well, if
16 there's a -- a foot, a feet maximum to height -- for
17 instance that say -- Let's find one that doesn't have
18 one. There it is. Sub-Area five, which we've called
19 mixing speed, which is actually based on B2.

20 The current code on B2 allows you to develop
21 up to 45 feet high. It does not list a number or a
22 number of stories, which many of the others do. So we'd
23 like to add that as well. So it would remain 45 feet,

1 but it would be 45 feet or four stories, whichever is
2 lower. That brings it into consistency with, makes it
3 consistent with the other districts. And it makes it a
4 lot easier for, for developers in particular to know
5 what they can do and what they can't.

6 The second table is what we're calling a
7 pedestrian zone. With, this is that 14 feet that is
8 kind of, you sort of see throughout the recommendations.

9 It's not actually a setback. Because a setback is the
10 distance from the property line to your, you know, your
11 buildable area. In many cases this is not the property
12 line. It's the distance from the curb to the front of
13 the building.

14 It happens to be an extremely important area.
15 Many pedestrian advocates would say this is where life
16 happens. It happens in this zone and it happens from
17 three to eight feet up off the ground. So it has to be
18 handled pretty, pretty well. Want to make sure there's
19 an adequate width, that there is, that the sidewalk
20 width is appropriate for the types of uses, that there's
21 adequate separation from traffic, that there's street
22 furniture, street trees, all those things that, that
23 make this corridor pleasant and can contribute to making

1 it even more pleasant.

2 So that's focused on the pedestrian zone. Now
3 we have some, we have some work to do here. We need to
4 sit down and talk about the elements of that zone, which
5 is on the next page, Pedestrian Zone Elements.

6 We say 14 feet, but we don't actually define
7 how that should be divided up into sidewalk crews zone,
8 into parkway, and something else that I've called
9 additional facade setback, which turns out to be a very
10 important element in, for instance, if you're planning
11 to allow outdoor dining, some tables, or even display of
12 merchandise during business hours on the sidewalk. You
13 want to have some space to do that. And that is a way
14 to allow that. So we'll come back. When we start
15 looking at the details we'll come back and focus in,
16 focus in on that and, and get the specifications in
17 there.

18 The other table, Parking and Access, really
19 applies mostly to the C1, those set of areas based on
20 C1. C2, actually. There's no C1 after, if the re-
21 zonings are done as identified. But those base
22 districts do things like allow -- parking in the front
23 yard and other stuff that's more suburban oriented and

1 is really not that appropriate for the Central Street
2 and the immediately surrounding corridors. So we want
3 to add some, some restrictions on parking. We also want
4 to encourage shared parking.

5 We want to perhaps require shared access where
6 it's feasible and curb cuts. I've seen a lot of success
7 with them being pretty draconian about limiting the
8 number of curb cuts that are allowed onto the major
9 street unless they are, unless there are really
10 extenuating circumstances.

11 And then the last page is all TBD. If you
12 flip over. And that is kind of a catch-all. I've
13 called it, Other Urban Design Elements. These are
14 several recommendations that come from the non-zoning
15 recommendations, that A, B, and C.

16 Many of these, the ones that I've identified,
17 I have familiarity with and I know that can be affected
18 through zoning code. Certainly building stepbacks,
19 that's on upper floors, to remove the mess of a building
20 from directly on the street.

21 Fenestration, that's a, that's a architectural
22 term for windows and doors. I'd rather call it windows
23 and doors. But fenestration keeps popping out. That's

1 all it means. And, but it's very important. Because it
2 helps to activate our shopping streets and our
3 pedestrian corridors.

4 New walls, also a way, that's been identified
5 as a way of identifying store fronts and retail areas
6 along the main corridors, specifying minimal retail
7 depth, is something certainly that can be done,

8 Facade articulation, that's the last one
9 there. That's a tricky one. There are elements that
10 can be controlled through zoning that we can, we can
11 review against. There are some things that are more
12 difficult to enforce, but certainly can have some, some
13 pieces of that addressed through this, through the
14 overlay district.

15 So it's all TBDs. These are the areas that I
16 believe we can include some elements of our zoning
17 overlay. There may be others. I'm open to suggestion.

18 I really want to thank the Central Street
19 Neighborhood Association for doing a very diligent job
20 of going from A to Z and back again in giving us lots
21 and lots of feedback. And we're going to work through
22 all that. And we've made some of that available for
23 you tonight in the handouts. If you didn't get a copy,

1 let me know and I'll get you one. We're also going to
2 see if we can post all this stuff on the web.

3 So, with that, I am actually not going walk
4 through that, that handout. It's available for you and
5 I want to make sure everybody knows what is under
6 discussion so that everything's above board. But these
7 are the types of things that we are going to be, will be
8 looking at and walking through. It's going to take some
9 time. But we think it's worth it. That's all I have
10 prepared.

11 Some things that have happened in the interim:
12 We have talked to several property owners, many
13 property owners; we've answered a lot of questions,
14 we've had a lot of general questions about what's going
15 on; we've learned a fair amount about the area; we have,
16 oh gosh, let's see, what else have we done? And we've,
17 oh, we've also sat down with a few constituents, not
18 that many. I suspect we'll have some more in the next
19 few weeks.

20 But we're at the point where we're ready to
21 kind of roll up our sleeves, I think. And if the
22 community, if the Committee feel that this is a
23 reasonable framework, then I propose we start filling in

1 the blanks and start really putting the meat on the
2 bones, I guess. And let's, you know, get down to
3 business of making this, the zoning implementation, a
4 reality and having it make a difference.

5 Yeah, into the mic.

6 MR. WRIGHT: I don't want to make comments,
7 but just try to make sure about a few things.

8 MR. DUNKLEY: What is your name? You have
9 one.

10 MR. WRIGHT: Excuse me. Richard Wright.

11 MR. DUNKLEY: For the record.

12 MR. WRIGHT: Richard Wright, Hartzell Street.

13 And I see that the, the map now put the south half of
14 the Chase Bank building back into B2, whereas the map
15 last week had it as, as part of the --

16 MR. DUNKLEY: Yeah, yeah, that was a clerical
17 error.

18 MR. WRIGHT: -- as part of the other lower
19 area on Green Bay. And then in Sub-Areas 5 and 6, you
20 had recommended before, last week, in those, 40-foot
21 height. And now you're 45 feet in both of those.

22 MR. DUNKLEY: I'm sorry. You're saying it was
23 40?

1 MR. WRIGHT: In Sub-Area, in Sub-Areas 4 and 5
2 you had --

3 MR. DUNKLEY: Four and five, 5 and 6.

4 MR. WRIGHT: Four and five or 5 and 6. Excuse
5 me. Four and five.

6 MR. DUNKLEY: Okay, 4 is --

7 MR. WRIGHT: Four and five. Last week you
8 said in both of those limit -- Excuse me. I'm sorry.
9 Five, okay, 5, and is it 6 also?

10 MR. DUNKLEY: Five and 6 would --

11 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, 5 and 6. Last week you
12 said limit height to 40 feet, parenthetical B2 is 45.
13 But now you've got it back up to 45 rather than 40. Is
14 that intentional?

15 MR. DUNKLEY: Okay, I'll research that. I,
16 it --

17 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I can tell you that the
18 original master plan document showed it as 45 feet. In
19 fact, when Bill changed it to 40 feet, I questioned why
20 it was different than what was in the master plan
21 document.

22 MR. WRIGHT: We had hoped it was intentional,
23 recognizing there wasn't a --

1 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I understand. But I think it
2 was actually just an error.

3 MR. WRIGHT: Okay, so that's due to, okay.
4 All right.

5 MR. DUNKLEY: I did go, before putting this
6 back, I went back to the plan recommendations and --

7 MR. WRIGHT: So the intent was to have it
8 match what the initial recommendation of the plan was?

9 MR. DUNKLEY: Right.

10 MR. WRIGHT: Okay.

11 MR. DUNKLEY: Yeah, that's where we're
12 starting.

13 CHAIRMAN WOODS: He was in a big hurry.

14 MR. WRIGHT: And then the other thing is that
15 some of these things are kind of confusing because we're
16 talking about different areas within the same sub-area.

17 And there's a new, we kind of just noticed
18 there's sort of a new Sub-Area 7 that wasn't in the plan
19 at all before. That kind of in the far west on Old
20 Orchard and, and Gross Pointe, I guess is what it is.
21 If you go to the map 2A, the very far west, that Area 7,
22 I don't think it's ever been part of the plan before.

23 And you know, I don't think we have any big

1 objection to it being, begin there. But you do say, for
2 one thing, I just noticed, you say no parking in front.
3 Whereas, that's where the Aquarium Building, I think,
4 is now that has all sorts of parking in front.

5 MR. DUNKLEY: Yeah, that's, would be a non-
6 conforming use, yeah. Yeah, I think that's always been
7 intended to be, to have recommendations on that, that
8 strip of Green Bay there. I don't have the materials
9 that were handed out last week. If anyone does, I'd be
10 glad to --

11 MR. WRIGHT: I think that that has never been
12 in the plan before. But, you know, just to point that
13 out.

14 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Bill, I have one question.
15 And it comes out of the fact that Stuart and I met with
16 Larry Widmayer on Saturday and we walked through a good
17 portion of sort of the Crown Jewel area, south of the
18 Crown Jewel area, north of the Crown Jewel area, and
19 then east of the tracks.

20 Particularly north along Green Bay, the master
21 plan shows consistently kind of almost a continuous
22 driveway connection of parking lots behind commercial
23 buildings set to the street, which in an ideal world

1 seems great. The thing is, that there is no alley back
2 there today. There clearly is a utility easement that I
3 think runs along the property lines of the units facing
4 Green Bay and the units facing the residential street.
5 So I would imagine that there's some chance that through
6 the kind of working with utilities and the land owners,
7 you could develop some sort of drive along the
8 utilities. But that involves other kinds of issues.

9 The real concern, though, comes in, okay,
10 right now just north of the Enterprise Rent-A-Car
11 there's a house that's basically all boarded up. If
12 someone were to buy that property and wanted to develop
13 it today, the idea of shared parking and all those kinds
14 of things, I just don't know how that actually gets
15 implemented. Particularly if you look at that lot and
16 you try to put a driveway to get behind the building,
17 you'll end up with virtually no building.

18 MR. DUNKLEY: Yeah, I'm not familiar with that
19 particular site, but I will be. So I can't answer your
20 question.

21 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. It was just something
22 that --

23 MR. DUNKLEY: There's all kinds of practical

1 matters that get in the way of this stuff, --

2 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely.

3 MR. DUNKLEY: -- but also things we can take
4 advantage of. The illustration of the, you know,
5 universally-accessible parking area is, you know, if
6 you're going to illustrate something, you might as well
7 illustrate the best you can find. That may happen. I
8 doubt it will happen to that extent. However, it can
9 certainly happen in localized extents by encouraging or
10 allowing shared accessways. Certainly you don't want
11 every property there with its own curb cuts on Green
12 Bay. That would be a traffic nightmare.

13 So we have been doing some of this. We can do
14 more of it. It won't occur to that degree. But every
15 property that we can get to share access to rare
16 parking, the safer our walkers will be.

17 CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's obviously a laudable
18 goal. I don't have any question with that. It's more
19 the issue of practicalities, of how we get there, and
20 all that kind of stuff.

21 MR. DUNKLEY: Yeah, we'll, we'll be blatantly
22 opportunistic.

23 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Clearly the parking condition

1 that exists south of Domicile, at the photography studio
2 where basically you have the opportunity to drive in off
3 Green Bay and then to get out of the parking, you have
4 to back onto Green Bay, is --

5 MR. DUNKLEY: That's, that's --

6 CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- not good.

7 MR. DUNKLEY: Yep. Yeah, that's going to be a
8 challenge there. That's a tough thing to turn around,
9 but --

10 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Anyway, it was just something
11 that, as we walked around, we were like --

12 MR. DUNKLEY: I will research the Sub-Area 7
13 question. And I will, if it's a consensus that is not
14 addressed by the plan, and there are occasions where we
15 can, you know, read things in different ways, but if we
16 feel it is not, I will take that out. We will not be
17 adding stuff to this that is not recommended in the
18 plan, okay?

19 CHAIRMAN WOODS: The other question that I
20 have relates to, I guess it's Sub-Area 6, which in the
21 master plan identifies a series of three-story
22 buildings. And the zoning allows for four-story
23 buildings. And I'm just wondering why the difference

1 between the recommended zoning and the illustrated
2 master plan. And it's probably something that you have
3 to research.

4 MR. DUNKLEY: I'm sorry. So that's Sub-Area
5 6?

6 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Sub-Area 6, the Crawford-
7 Central intersection. And like I said, I'm not exactly
8 sure, but like the illustrated plans that are in the
9 master plan, they all show three-story buildings.

10 MR. DUNKLEY: Um-hum. To the renderings?

11 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. With the parking behind
12 and all that kind of stuff. And the zoning, though, the
13 recommended zoning allows for four stories. And it's
14 just a question of, you know, why there's a mismatch
15 there in that particular location.

16 MR. DUNKLEY: Well, any, any, you know,
17 rendering is, you know, is a possibility, and in some
18 cases intended to show more of the urban design
19 relationship to the street or relationship of buildings
20 to each other or degree of mixed-use or all sorts of
21 things. In, very rare do we get areas that are built
22 out to the, to the zoning, zoning.

23 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Although history would not

1 necessarily say that that's true in Evanston.

2 MR. DUNKLEY: We could fly over to the other
3 side every now and again, you know. But I recognize
4 that is a big concern.

5 MR. WRIGHT: Actually, Jim, that, that
6 question came up in the Zoning Committee meeting before
7 the public hearing. You know, and the -- people were
8 there and we asked the same question.

9 And the whole planning process, we was pretty
10 clear on no more than three stories there. And it said
11 three stories. And if you remember the answer they gave
12 was something about a different use. But I can't see a
13 different use in B2 versus B1A that you'd want to have
14 there. So that was the only explanation they had for
15 why they put B2 there rather than B1A.

16 MR. DUNKLEY: I know. That's a, that's a
17 good question. And we will, we'll work our way through
18 it. And we'll either justify it, that that's, that
19 makes sense, or we'll, we'll look at an alternative.

20 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think some of the issue
21 comes down to the actual practicalities of developing
22 four-story buildings --

23 MR. DUNKLEY: Absolutely.

1 CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- on some of those
2 properties, as well as the ones on Green Bay. Because
3 by the time you look at the lot area and giving over a
4 certain amount to parking and all those kinds of issues,
5 it's pretty hard to, to have enough parking to actually
6 have enough, be able to support a four-story building.

7 MR. DUNKLEY: So we will go back to the
8 marketing study that was done. And yes, I have learned
9 there's big differences between one story and two story
10 and three story and four stories.

11 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Mr. -- do you have any other
12 questions?

13 MR. DUNKLEY: Did you have a question?

14 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think what we want to do
15 is, we're actually going to go back and pick up kind of
16 the list from last time just in case there were people
17 that were on that list who now are here that had to
18 leave last time.

19 So those two people who were that was Joe
20 Frank or, and I, again, I'm going to butcher the name,
21 Danal Fuentes? Okay.

22 So we have one more sheet that we didn't get
23 to last time. And I notice that one of those people was

1 Mr. Hughes. So first off, Gail Hacker? And then Barb
2 Rakley?

3 (Question from audience member.)

4 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. Somehow we didn't get
5 that. Okay. And so the people who signed up tonight
6 are, are Jeff and Jim. So Jim, you seem to be ready to
7 go. Or do you want to have Jeff speak first?

8 MR. HUGHES: I think Jeff should speak first.

9 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. And just so we make
10 certain, is there anybody else who wants to speak
11 tonight? Not that we necessarily have to be all that
12 formal.

13 MR. SMITH: I think we're kind of working as a
14 tag team here actually.

15 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay.

16 MR. SMITH: Where do you want me, Jim?

17 MR. HUGHES: Right there is fine.

18 MR. SMITH: Okay. Okay. While he's setting
19 up, let me just say that tonight is my wedding
20 anniversary. But due to being here, it'll probably be
21 my last.

22 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I was going to say, first it
23 was vacation, now wedding anniversary. You are dead!

1 MR. HUGHES: I can send something.

2 MR. SMITH: For a zoning gig.

3 MR. HUGHES: I'll send something.

4 MR. SMITH: Before Jim get started, just to
5 respond to some of the things that Bill said, we agree,
6 the Central Street Neighborhood's Association, for the
7 record, Jeff Smith, 2724 Harrison, Central Street
8 Neighborhood Association agrees that zoning is the most
9 important part of this process. So we've been saying
10 that repeatedly.

11 We basically applauded the plan when it was
12 presented conceptually, saying we'll work out the teeth
13 when we get to zoning. When it went to the Council we
14 said the same thing, okay, we're not going to raise, you
15 know, get down to details there, we'll wait until we get
16 to zoning. Because we think that most, maybe not all,
17 but the large majority of our concerns can be
18 implemented through zoning, not just what's in Section
19 3D and maybe not even just what's in the other sections
20 that Bill identified with things like transit-oriented
21 density or pedestrian-friendly.

22 I think our organization generally believes
23 that in Evanston, what can be built, will be built and

1 that it's not a question of if, but when. And that as
2 regards Central Street, it would probably be sooner
3 rather than later. And that that belief is why we have
4 a moratorium in place right now, if we didn't think that
5 there was a likelihood that there would be a building
6 going on.

7 In deference to some of our friends on the
8 West Side, we haven't gotten everything we've liked up
9 here either. And it's been a very rapid process of
10 planning. And part of it's been a response to the fact
11 that some of the ugliest buildings in Evanston have come
12 up, we think, in our turf. And certainly there was
13 plenty of controversy over things like the theater
14 project.

15 What we hope to do with some of our
16 suggestions is fill in some of the TBDs in the last
17 sheet. And the context in which we do it has been
18 largely laid out in previous statements which we've made
19 orally and in text. So I won't, I won't reiterate all
20 of, all of those tonight.

21 We think that this Committee knows pretty much
22 where we're coming from and our general concerns. And
23 we've made, we ask that our statements that we've

1 submitted by e-mail and the five-page memorandum this
2 week, the eight-pager a week ago, etcetera, again be a
3 part of the record.

4 One fact that I want to mention before we get
5 started is that we've done some further study on
6 traffic, getting it from city websites. You have to dig
7 a few layers deep to find it. But again, we're dealing
8 with an area that's already fairly heavily developed.
9 It's not developed to the maximum density, but it's in a
10 sea of residential. And you've got narrow arteries of
11 business that are, almost never have vacancies. And so
12 there's a high density rate.

13 I think this Committee might even be surprised
14 to know that, of the intersections studied in Evanston,
15 there's a higher traffic counts at Prairie and Central
16 and at the other Central Street intersections than there
17 are at Sherman and Church.

18 MR. DUNKLEY: What are the dates of those
19 studies?

20 MR. SMITH: That was what, 2006.

21 MR. DUNKLEY: Our's, the one that was done at
22 Sherman and Church is, I think, 2002.

23 CHAIRMAN WOODS: 2002 for Sherman and Church.

1 MR. DUNKLEY: Okay. That's, that's --

2 CHAIRMAN WOODS: And the Central Street was
3 2006.

4 MR. DUNKLEY: Yeah, they, they go stale pretty
5 quickly, but -- And if you could give me a copy of the,
6 more length --

7 MR. SMITH: Right. But it's --

8 MR. DUNKLEY: -- to what you were saying, that
9 would be great.

10 MR. SMITH: -- the point. And they're even
11 higher if you start looking at the, at the north-south
12 angled arteries like Green Bay or Gross Pointe. But the
13 point is, there's a lot of traffic. We feel, I think,
14 correctly so, that it's at a critical point. It is
15 certainly during the rush hours.

16 The first point we want to address is to
17 clarify where we're coming down on site development
18 allowances. And just to run through the existing
19 situation, we've given this out. Have you given this
20 out in handout, Jim?

21 MR. HUGHES: Yes. I think everybody has a
22 copy of this on the --

23 MR. SMITH: I don't know if you can, I don't

1 know if you can read this spreadsheet, but, as it is up
2 above. And I apologize to those in the audience who
3 can't. But this is basically going through what the,
4 it's sort of a summary of what the zoning height, and
5 dwelling unit, lot coverage, and floor-area ratio stats
6 are for the various zoning districts, starting with R1
7 and moving through the R districts through the B
8 districts to the C districts, and then even O, U and T.

9 And as you can see, if you go down from the
10 first bank of rows, which has what are the enumerated
11 site development allowances, you see that there are
12 certain percentages that are allowed in excess of the
13 standard zoning. And these translate, for example, in,
14 in R1 to going up to 47 feet, in R5 to going up to 62
15 feet, whereas we tend to normally think of R5 as being a
16 50-foot building and R1 as a 35-foot.

17 But with enumerated, so-called site
18 development allowances, if it's a planned development,
19 it can go to 47 or 62. And the same type of ratio's
20 attained throughout the other districts. That in B1,
21 the 40-foot height limitations become 52. In B1A the
22 40-foot, again, become 52. And in the C districts they
23 can go up to 60 feet, although there's some floor-area

1 ratio requirements that restrict that as well.

2 The problem is, then, you're up, there's
3 another set of, of allowances beyond those allowances.
4 And what has happened in our experience in Evanston is
5 that people coming in making bids or people looking to
6 sell are basically looking at the site development
7 allowances as the "real" zoning restrictions, that you
8 can always get your site development allowance if you
9 come with a big enough project.

10 Ironically, the bigger the project, the more
11 likely you are to be a planned development. And then
12 that triggers the site development allowances. So you
13 get rewarded for being bigger. And you get to be bigger
14 if you're bigger.

15 Then, on top of that, if you can get the
16 approval of six City Council people, there's an
17 ordinance, 6366, by which there's almost unlimited
18 authority to exceed these limitations as long as you
19 meet some, one or all of some listed criteria, the
20 criteria of which are so broad that any good lawyer
21 could drive a truck through them. They basically boil
22 down to if it's pleasing or reasonable to a majority of
23 the City Council, then there's no limit on what can be

1 built anywhere.

2 So our position is that one element of the
3 Central Street corridor overlay, to give real meaning to
4 this plan, should be to eliminate site development
5 allowances.

6 Now, this is a picture. We're going to show a
7 couple illustrations of why we think we need some of the
8 things we're going to ask for. This is a view taken in
9 March. It doesn't show the street at its best, but it
10 does show how wide open it is. Looking approximately
11 from Symphonies Restaurant at the alley and looking back
12 west at part of what we're calling the Crown Jewel
13 District as it exists today, or at least in March and it
14 hasn't changed then, as you can see, it's predominantly
15 low-rise. There is one building that's three stories,
16 although it's, it's gabled and that third story is
17 really more of an attic.

18 If you look at the next picture, that's a
19 three-story building. It's actually an Evanston
20 building. It was built in Evanston, not in Soviet
21 Russia. But it's got a setback above the second floor.

22 So it would fit into current B1A or even proposed under
23 the plan, modified lowered B1A zoning. We think this is

1 an example of why we think even modified B1A is too much
2 for this strip of Central Street. And --

3 CHAIRMAN WOODS: You've got a problem with
4 that building?

5 MR. SMITH: You know, I don't want to get too
6 subjective here. I hope you have no personal
7 relationship to the architect or developer. It's a, you
8 know, I would personally put a diamond vision on it so
9 it could have a running ticker. And then the people on
10 their strollers in Independence Park could watch sports
11 or read the stocks.

12 CHAIRMAN WOODS: We could have a walk-in
13 theater.

14 MR. SMITH: Right, right, right. We could
15 show movies there.

16 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Park.

17 MR. SMITH: For the people in the park.

18 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I can't wait to see what's --

19 MR. SMITH: Okay, I'm speaking for the record.
20 Because irony and sarcasm don't often translate into
21 written transcripts that was ironic and sarcastic.

22 CHAIRMAN WOODS: They don't.

23 MR. SMITH: Anyway, a building of this length

1 probably would trigger a planned development, simply
2 because of the mass of it. Although, if the units were
3 big and luxurious enough, it might not even meet the 24
4 unit trigger.

5 That's one example. I would like to hand out
6 another example, which we didn't have time to put on
7 our, our slide show. But if Jim, you could hand these
8 out to Mr. Dunkley, the two commissioners, and then
9 perhaps circulate the rest amongst the audience.

10 What you'll see here is a similar overlay that
11 I've done. And I apologize. This, the one that you're
12 seeing up on the screen, across from Independence Park,
13 is probably a little closer to the street than what
14 would be allowed. My Photoshop skills are not perfect.

15 This next one is a little better I think. And
16 this is again, superimposes another type of building, a
17 four-story building that has recently been built in
18 Evanston down near Main and Chicago. And it
19 superimposes it and shows what it would be like to put a
20 as of right B2 building on what's now currently the
21 Christian Science Reading Room or the Blue Stone Café,
22 at least one of those properties of which has been
23 floated for, for sale.

1 Again, we think that this is something that
2 the community would regret if it happened, that it shows
3 what can be done. As of right, it shows that the type
4 of development that is done in Evanston. I'm not
5 particularly criticizing this development, although I
6 think it, just putting different colors of brick in
7 doesn't convert something into what's usually called
8 architectural detail. It has a relatively modernistic
9 mall-like appearance.

10 So I'm going to briefly run through, then, our
11 responses to the -- Is that the next thing?

12 MR. HUGHES: We're going to go through the
13 chart. It's the next slide up. And I'll take you
14 through that.

15 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: May I, may I ask you a
16 question? You're, you're asking that site allowances be
17 eliminated?

18 MR. SMITH: Correct.

19 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Does it come down to
20 the fact that you do not trust the judgment of the City
21 Council?

22 MR. SMITH: No. Because first of all, City
23 Council personnel can change. And I think it's wrong to

1 make decisions based on individuals who are in one place
2 at one time.

3 And in fact, eliminating site allowances still
4 allows for some flexibility in the process because you
5 could always change the Zoning Ordinance. The
6 legislative process does allow for some flexibility. It
7 doesn't make what's in place immutable if somebody comes
8 along with a really good idea. What it does is, it, is
9 it, it slows it down somehow.

10 I think what's happened with the site
11 allowances being perceived as the defacto real limits is
12 that it, it has created a situation where if you want to
13 develop, you try and line up all your ducks first, which
14 means you go to one or more alderman first and the
15 package gets put together before it's presented to the
16 public so that the public perceives it rightly or
17 wrongly as something that's being foisted upon them.
18 And it tends to move along before a lot of people even
19 know that it's happening. And I think it ends up
20 creating a dynamic that drives development towards site,
21 site development allowances.

22 With respect to this plan, with respect to
23 this particular corridor, the point I want to underscore

1 over and over and over again is that we have not been
2 taking the ultimate confrontational approach. We're
3 taking the classic political approach or the way, say, a
4 divorce lawyer approaches, you know, some cases. We
5 would come in and say, we don't want anything over one
6 story. We don't want anything over two stories. And we
7 would, you know, kick and scream, etcetera, and then try
8 and force it down some kind of compromise.

9 What we've done instead here is try and put
10 ourselves into position, look at all the points of view,
11 and see what's realistically possible. And we've cut to
12 the chase and come up with what we think is actually a
13 reasonable compromise position recognizing that what
14 we're accepting under here would still allow the massive
15 development on Central Street to be doubled or tripled
16 over the existing built environment. Even if we got
17 every single thing that we're asking for, which is
18 basically a compromise position, you can have lots and
19 lots of development on Central Street. But we think
20 it'll be limited to what's appropriate.

21 Now in order to make sure that it doesn't go
22 beyond that, you eliminate site allowances. And that
23 creates certainty for everybody in the future. It

1 eliminates this game of speculating on and the bets on
2 what the City Council will or won't do. Because it's
3 somewhat, to some extent, it ties you to the mast. It
4 says don't tempt me. You know, you don't have to get
5 tempted. It's, it's a way of giving this plan teeth.

6 And I think it's something that there's a lot
7 of, there was a lot of support for it at the visioning
8 sessions. At least one, and I believe two or more
9 alderman, have expressed support for or expressed the
10 idea that it, it's part of the problem that why zoning
11 doesn't mean anything anymore. And it's, I think, had
12 some support from some of the consultants if I, if I
13 recall their comments correctly.

14 The idea was we're going to put a plan in
15 place that sticks. And I think the people of the
16 community are expecting that what was planned is what's
17 going to, what Central Street is going to end up looking
18 like some time in the future. That's kind of a long
19 answer to your question, but -- MR. WRIGHT: If
20 I can just add, actually, I mean, I don't know if you
21 were at the visioning process and planning process at
22 all, but Lamont said repeatedly when people kind of
23 said, well, what about planned developments, what about

1 what's going on with kind of all the, the site
2 allowances, Lamont said no planned developments.

3 That's the whole, that's the whole idea of
4 this plan. This is the limit. You can't go beyond
5 this. You know, there are no planned developments. And
6 you know, and that were to kind of mean it's basically
7 no site allowances.

8 And we learned from the theater project, you
9 know, what you kind of learn is that, what happens when
10 you have these site allowances is, people that own
11 property, especially people who can kind of afford to
12 wait for a while, they have the rental from the Sony
13 income and so on, he said I'm not going to sell it
14 unless I get the money for what it's worth given the
15 site allowances.

16 And then what it means, the developer kind of
17 comes in, has to pay that amount of money. The
18 developer then kind of tells the Plan Commission and the
19 Council, we can't afford to give you any of the design
20 guidelines for a planned development. We can't give you
21 any of them. We'll give you a minimal contribution to
22 the housing fund. We can't give you any of the things a
23 planned development is supposed to give. We can't

1 afford to do it. In fact we can't even afford to give
2 you all the parking we're supposed to have. We'll
3 pretend that we're not going to have a restaurant here.

4 You know, so, it's a, it's a catch-22 game
5 where the site allowances have become a way in which
6 people have now come to accept in Evanston. The
7 developers and the people who own the properties, that's
8 what the property's worth. They don't take the base
9 zoning as what the property's worth. They take the base
10 zoning plus the enumerated allowances of what it's
11 worth, which just piggybacks and drives the whole thing,
12 you know, to be totally uncontrolled.

13 So you know, we've had the aldermen in our
14 area kind of said, you know, that they're tired of this
15 sort of happening also. And they don't want to have to
16 keep fighting these things over and over and over again,
17 site by site.

18 The idea of the plan, and Lamont said it
19 several times in the planning process, the idea of the
20 plan: this is the limits, that's it. A developer comes
21 in and wants more than that, you say tough, that's the
22 plan.

23 MR. SMITH: So it's not a matter of

1 distrusting the City Council, although we've been
2 frequently surprised at some of their actions. It, some
3 of my best friends are, are elected officials and
4 alderman. It's a matter of eliminating it, a dynamic
5 that we think has become unhealthy. And the site
6 allowances, in our opinion, are the single largest cause
7 of controversy and delay that keeps us here and you here
8 and the City Council, you know, up making decisions at
9 two in the morning and --

10 CHAIRMAN WOODS: If we didn't have planned
11 developments, a lot of our job would go away. You'll
12 all have more time.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We'd like to play the --

14 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I understand.

15 MR. DUNKLEY: If I could ask a question just
16 to test this. If this was, and I was not involved
17 during the plan effort. I was, I was somewhere else in
18 another geography. But if the, basically the consensus
19 builder, the prime author of the plan under the
20 recommendations, repeatedly said that development
21 allowances were just, you know, not a good idea, really
22 not a good idea, as you say, and if they are, it was
23 seen as such a high priority, why is it not in the

1 recommendations? This is a big thing. If it's not in
2 the recommendations, we got to find some good compelling
3 new reason to do it. Because in some cases it means
4 we're changing the plan. So I don't, I'm not expecting
5 an answer right now. Just, we need to answer that
6 question.

7 MR. SMITH: Well, again, this has been a very
8 rapid process --

9 MR. DUNKLEY: How long did it take to develop,
10 to publish the plan?

11 MR. SMITH: Maybe it was a typo.

12 MR. DUNKLEY: It's possible. It's not out of
13 the question.

14 MR. HUGHES: One comment. We were --

15 MR. DUNKLEY: It could be something that's so
16 important it didn't get mentioned.

17 MR. HUGHES: We were, we have discussed form-
18 based zoning. And nobody really well understands that.
19 But it seems like something that would offer more
20 concrete guidelines.

21 MR. DUNKLEY: That's for sure.

22 MR. HUGHES: And throughout the process,
23 throughout this process, we have asked for teeth in this

1 outcome. And until we address the issue of the site
2 development allowances, we don't see it.

3 MR. DUNKLEY: I mean, I'm not saying I
4 disagree with you. I'm just saying it is, it is
5 significant by its absence.

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You know, you'll be -- to
7 realize that we weren't trying to say, well, instead of
8 three stories we want two stories and instead of four
9 stories we want three stories.

10 MR. DUNKLEY: Yeah. We could be in violent
11 agreement. It is just setting a precedent of, of
12 working on some implementation, that piece that is not,
13 that is really not called for in the plan. That gives
14 us a blank check to do anything. And it really casts a
15 doubt, a shadow. Yeah, we'll find out. We'll find out.
16 Just --

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Does that make you part of
18 the district by district zoning. I mean, if that's --
19 there's nothing --

20 MR. DUNKLEY: Yeah. Oh we'll draw -- on the
21 map for this, on this one. And we'll get to the bottom
22 of it. I just want to make it a very clear statement
23 that we are bound by what's in the plan even if it, even

1 if everybody agrees it should have been there. Boy,
2 this went through a rigorous process.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Maybe we are bound by what's
4 in the plan. Because if the City Council had still said
5 we approved the plan, shouldn't the zoning parts go into
6 the plan?

7 MR. DUNKLEY: Right. Right. Well, you know,
8 no sir, we are bound by the plan.

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- We're not bound by the
10 plan.

11 MR. DUNKLEY: I would have to disagree with
12 that. We are, within reason, we are --

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- from the City Council.

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can I ask you a question
15 just briefly on why we're not --

16 MR. DUNKLEY: Yeah, you need to speak into the
17 mic, please. Mic is your friend.

18 MS. RAKLEY: Barb Rakley, R-a-k-l-e-y. I
19 would just like to speak briefly to your question.

20 I was very involved in the visioning workshops
21 as to why the site development allowances, which are as
22 we all agree just crucial, are not in the plan.

23 My view and I will, you know, welcome

1 disagreement from my fellow -- board members, in the
2 Evanston Zoning Code it, the site development allowances
3 are very, very, very technical. I mean, you have to
4 spend hours, and those of us who are attorneys have
5 spent hours and hours and hours with the zoning code to
6 pick out the many, many sections dealing with site
7 development allowances. Granted, there's only one
8 section, the one that Jim or Jeff mentioned, and
9 exceeding the site allowances. But there are probably
10 20 provisions in the code regarding what I'll call
11 enumerated site development allowances.

12 My own feeling, and I'll welcome challenge
13 from anyone in the room, is that it was not addressed at
14 the visioning workshop because that level of detail and
15 difficulty and obtuseness and "unavailability" to the
16 general public, it was just not, it was just not done.

17 I mean, people were sort of struggling. You
18 know, these are not, generally the people who came to
19 the visioning workshops, you know, were generally not
20 lawyers, were not zoning experts.

21 Nobody, to my recollection, brought up site
22 development allowances as this huge problem. I think
23 it's something that's emerged very recently where people

1 are realizing it's a huge problem. And I apologize for
2 the length of my comment.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Those people you referred to
4 are what they call --

5 MR. DUNKLEY: Could very well be. The phrase
6 prohibit planned developments would certainly --

7 MR. HUGHES: Planned unit developments or
8 planned developments was discussed.

9 MR. SMITH: Right. And we, as we evolved our
10 own, you know, knowledge of it, most of us not being,
11 you know, zoning people by trade, stopped referring to
12 it as planned developments. Because planned
13 developments themselves are not the problem. It's the
14 site allowances that are granted to planned developments
15 or, or otherwise.

16 MR. DUNKLEY: I don't mean to belabor it. I
17 mean, we do have other things too, that you probably
18 want to talk about. But I just --

19 MR. SMITH: In the ideal world, if we had
20 enough time, if we weren't laboring under a moratorium
21 that we'd all like to see over with, we would have had
22 the whole plan go through at once. And we said we
23 didn't want it to go through piecemeal. We understand

1 why it did. And basically what the City Council said,
2 you know, we like the concept. Now send it back to
3 zoning to figure out how to implement it.

4 MR. DUNKLEY: It's always done that way.

5 MR. SMITH: And our organization's position is
6 that one way of implementing the plan that everybody
7 seems to like conceptually as an overall, although
8 there's some tweaks, one way of implementing it is by
9 eliminating the site development allowances for the plan
10 area.

11 MR. DUNKLEY: So if I could paraphrase, you
12 are opposed to site development allowances?

13 MR. SMITH: I think that's a fair statement.

14 MR. HUGHES: I think that's a fair statement
15 too.

16 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Can I ask one question, one
17 related question? And I don't want to belabor planned
18 development allowances too much longer. But I wonder,
19 are there any circumstances under which specific
20 allowances for a specific zone for certain specific
21 public benefits could be foreseen?

22 MR. SMITH: There are always exceptions. It's
23 dangerous to let the exception drive the rule. But I

1 think that we may even be edging towards that in a
2 couple of our recommendations for specific sub-areas.

3 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. And I'll come flat
4 out and say what I'm talking about. B2, right along
5 Green Bay. If B2, you could see public benefit of
6 being, allowing, say, some number, some percentage
7 beyond the required parking available for use by the
8 public on that site or those sites, --

9 MR. HUGHES: That's in our plan. That's in
10 our recommendation.

11 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I'm just trying to make it
12 part of the public record here, that you would allow you
13 to get, say, an additional story, but no more.

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's precisely what the --

15 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. I just want to make --

16 MR. SMITH: I suppose you could call that a
17 site development allowance. And so perhaps we'd be
18 amending the site developmental.

19 MR. DUNKLEY: Usually called an incentive.

20 MR. SMITH: Call it whatever you want, but
21 it's --

22 MR. DUNKLEY: And I highly recommend we look
23 at them. We have, we have gotten ourselves muddled up

1 in semantics between planned development variation, site
2 development allowance. In many ways we are --

3 MR. SMITH: Yes.

4 MR. DUNKLEY: Our thinking is, is just very,
5 it's gotten confused. We need to kind of straighten it
6 out. But I think we're very clear, the point you're
7 making, this, the possibility of the blank check, the
8 skies the limit literally, is, could be a community
9 destroyer.

10 MR. SMITH: There are a couple of specific
11 sites and then a couple of sub-areas where we
12 particularly identified a tradeoff that might want to be
13 made between, you know, what, what we would otherwise
14 oppose, in exchange for a public benefit. But the way
15 to play that game is to make sure that you don't give it
16 away going into it. Otherwise --

17 MR. DUNKLEY: Absolutely.

18 MR. SMITH: Otherwise there's no, there's no
19 bargaining position for, for the city or the community.

20 MR. WRIGHT: I mean, I think we're going to
21 come back to it in the chart, but I think, and it's what
22 Jim was referring to also, and now that the, now that
23 the south half of the Chase Bank is back into B2, we

1 would include that as well as the C2 area below it. And
2 our recommendation is that be B1A rather than B2, but
3 allow a site development allowance of an extra story, an
4 extra 10 feet, whatever, but only if you have the
5 substantial public parking for the area.

6 MR. HUGHES: Okay, I think we're done with
7 SDS. I'd like to take it from here to the next page. I
8 think it's page seven in your handout.

9 This is a version of the part that Bill handed
10 out from CSNA from this week. There've been some late
11 nights. We've had a lot of discussion. Some of us
12 maybe can go home tonight, maybe not. My best to Susan,
13 by the way, Jeff.

14 And we went through this piece by piece. Each
15 sub-area, we looked at our position, we looked at the
16 position of the plan, we looked at Bill's plan. Because
17 Bill's plan differed from the zoning recommendations on
18 a few points. And we looked at what we felt we could
19 support. And this is, this is the result of that
20 discussion.

21 And you'll be happy to hear that Areas 1, 2, 3
22 and 4, we support. Generally we support the overlay
23 concept and most proposed overlays. But in general we

1 feel there needs to be further restrictions and teeth in
2 the plan or else we're going to have up-zoning here. So
3 when we get down to the highlighted area here, the first
4 one is an Area 4 and it is the B2 on Central from 1920
5 Central to 2200. That's roughly Heart Eye Music to the
6 Care Dental Service, which is the Landmark Building on
7 the south side of Central. That area has been defined
8 as the key area of Central Street, the village.

9 It is recommended today to change from B2, 45
10 feet, four stories, to B1A, 35 feet, four stories with
11 14-foot setbacks and 20 at the corners. Our
12 recommendation is unique from that. We would like to
13 see that changed from B2 to a B1V with a 30-foot limit,
14 2.5 stories and 14-foot setbacks above the first floor.
15 Twelve-foot setback above the first floor, right.

16 It is predominantly a one-story area today.
17 It is bounded by open park space. When you walk it, you
18 have a feeling that you're in the open. If you look at
19 the rest of the neighborhoods around Central, it's very
20 tree covered. We have residences. You don't see the
21 sky.

22 When you get down to Central Street, it's
23 different when you get to this area. It's a highly

1 successful area. And we think it's a vintage low-rise
2 shopping district from the 1900s to the 1950s. And it's
3 unique in that respect. And we'd like to keep it. And
4 that's why we're recommending this.

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: What could be allowed
6 there --

7 MR. HUGHES: On the next page we have an Area
8 4 that we also support. That's the area B2 on Central
9 from roughly 1700 to 1919. That's roughly Trujillo's to
10 Prairie Joe's at Prairie on the north side of Central.
11 That goes across Green Bay. We support the change there
12 to B1A, 35 feet, three stories.

13 Area 5, Sub-Area 5, that was 40 feet. That is
14 now 45 feet and four stories per Bill's changes today.
15 We think that should change from B1 to B1A to be
16 consistent. I'm sorry. C1 to B1. Right. We would
17 support B2 in this area only on the condition of public
18 parking at either the Chase Bank site or something along
19 and approximate to that area. We think this constitutes
20 an up-zoning as it stands. We don't want to do that.
21 It's a dangerous intersection that we want to avoid the
22 canyonization we've spoken so often about.

23 Area 6 --

1 MR. WRIGHT: Before you go on, Jim, while
2 we're on that, this is the area we were just talking
3 about. We'd also want to include now the south half of
4 the Chase Bank being B2 to B1A. I'm not sure, I think,
5 I think Bill was going to check to see if that's a one
6 lot or if trying to divide the Chase Bank lot would be,
7 you know, split zoning and a lot, which wouldn't be a
8 good idea.

9 But, whatever. That said, the part of the
10 Chase Bank lot, the south part, should be included in
11 our recommendation here for this Area 5. And it is a
12 major -- because it now is a C2 that only has a 1.0 --
13 and no residential. So to allow even a B1A of 35 feet
14 and three stories and 2.0 -- is major, major up-zoning.
15 It greatly increased density and traffic in an area
16 that already has very bad traffic problems.

17 And I think the reason you want to go with the
18 B1A rather than the B2, even with the additional height
19 and to have a site allowance for the additional height
20 for the parking, it's because also, if you recall, B2
21 brings additional uses, which may not be appropriate for
22 this area. And B2 brings in the much lower 400 square
23 foot lot size per residential unit, as opposed to the

1 B1A 900 square foot lot size per residential unit. So
2 there's many a good reasons to have that B1A and then
3 have the site development allowance to try and get the
4 parking in there which is necessary, especially if the
5 Chase Bank lot is redeveloped and is gone. That's the
6 only parking in this area now.

7 So, and this plan is just totally negligent in
8 making no attempt to do anything realistic about parking
9 and traffic. Just totally negligent. And this is the
10 only area you can really realistically think about doing
11 something.

12 MR. HUGHES: Okay. The next area. Oh, I
13 should point out that, from the chart that Bill had and
14 handed out earlier, we've added to this chart the
15 overlay changes in use and the overlay changes in lot
16 size and -- Because we found ourselves discussing these
17 issues and those context as we looked at these changes.
18 And they helped us with these decisions. Because we
19 could see what, what the nature of the change, more what
20 it would be like when we saw the -- and the actual lot
21 size change.

22 Area 6, this was discussed earlier. It was
23 mentioned that this is a three-story area. We saw it as

1 even lower than that. It's, so why up-zone it? We
2 don't think it should be up-zoned. We should say, say
3 this would go from C2 t B1A also.

4 Area 7, we're neutral on that one out by Old
5 Orchard. The Area 7 that is C2 on Green Bay north of
6 Central. That recommendation is change the C2 height
7 from 45 feet to 45 feet and four stories with lots of
8 parking and driveway access restrictions. We again
9 think we should change the height on that, not the
10 actual underlying zoning from 45 feet to 35 feet, three
11 stories. In line with B1A, but in line now, underlying
12 zoning, with the car-oriented nature of that commercial
13 area. It is a budding, single-family residences. And
14 we like the overlay ideas, but we're again not sure how
15 they're going to be implemented in that area, the ideas
16 of parking and driveway access.

17 Area 8, we don't think there should be any
18 changes to Area 8 or 9 without a commitment to the
19 parking structure that Northwestern is being proposed to
20 build on their property.

21 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I don't think we're proposing
22 that Northwestern build a parking lot.

23 MR. HUGHES: Then we don't see a need for

1 changes there.

2 CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, but what I'm saying is, I
3 think the details of who's building the parking lot
4 remain to be worked out.

5 MR. HUGHES: I'm certain they are. And with
6 that uncertainty, we didn't see a need to make changes
7 there today. There are single-family homes behind the
8 area that would be in the overlay --

9 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Just, just remember the
10 underlying zoning allows for 125-foot tall university
11 building there.

12 MR. HUGHES: We know that. And we don't see
13 Northwestern taking their parking today for what they
14 have done already to Ryan Field, the enhancements
15 they've made.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: This doesn't change that,
17 the underlying zoning --

18 MR. HUGHES: I understand that. I'm just --

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You said this allows it
20 to -- residential.

21 MR. HUGHES: I'm just --

22 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Under any circumstances the
23 university's not giving up its right to do what it wants

1 to do and is allowed to do on its property.

2 MR. HUGHES: Okay, moving on. The last slide,
3 page nine, are the general non-residential overlays,
4 which would be applied to all non-R districts in the
5 plan area. We would like to see these written into the
6 overlay as a general requirement: the minimal building
7 setback of 14 feet from the curb and 20 on the corner;
8 upper story setbacks; 18-foot alley width.

9 And that would also apply to a residence
10 overlay. We would recommend there also be a residence
11 overlay. I don't have a separate slide for that. A
12 minimum 50-foot depth of commercial space simply for
13 viability. We've seen too many proposals that would
14 violate what is the norm, we think, along Central
15 Street. And that is about a 50-foot depth.

16 Required allocation of building walls,
17 articulation of building walls facing streets and
18 residence, that's also a residence overlay requirement.

19 Sustainable development, including LEED silver
20 certification, both business and residence, we have it
21 in that as well.

22 Substantial underground parking, at least one-
23 third of the parking, especially if parking required is

1 greater than 50-foot of the ground floor. This would
2 limit the need for additional height and it would make
3 the first floor commercial space commercial and not
4 parking.

5 Lastly, eliminate site development allowances.

6 And they were enumerated by Jeff. The enumerated
7 allowances, then also the allowances that are available
8 under 6366, the authority for unlimited allowances. And
9 we went through why we wanted to do that. There's still
10 available variances and ordinance changes to allow for
11 some flexibility for the developer.

12 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Just a question, or
13 actually --

14 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- a series of questions.
16 The minimal building setback of 14 feet from the curb.
17 And I believe the 20 feet is on the side or the side
18 street really. Right. On the side street, right. My
19 concern or issue with that, if we take, for example, the
20 Crown Jewel area and it was decided that someone was
21 going to redevelop a single lot, do we really want the
22 face of the building to differ from the frontage of all
23 the other buildings that are currently existing today?

1 MR. DUNKLEY: There are ways to build in.

2 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I understand. I'm just
3 trying to, I mean, it's set as an absolute up there.
4 And I just want to know if it's an absolute in your mind
5 or can we do what we've done with B1A, which is to say
6 that, with the exception of corner lots and a building
7 that takes up a greater than a certain amount of
8 frontage within a block, then you conform, if it doesn't
9 do those things, then you conform to the face of the
10 adjoining, or the average of the face of the adjoining
11 buildings, which -- that section of Central Street in
12 fact, are flush.

13 MR. HUGHES: I'd like to see us have a
14 guideline that was more than a guideline and something
15 that had some --

16 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

17 MR. HUGHES: You'd get proposals back that
18 might look like mindscape where buildings are set back
19 off the front and they integrate very well with the
20 streetscape.

21 There are other things you'll see on West
22 Central. Right around Swan Cleaners the setback is
23 greater than it is just a little bit to the west, which

1 is again, greater than it is a little bit further west.

2 It's a very gradual setting back around that
3 corner, almost like an opening up as you come to the
4 corner. That's a very creative use of setbacks. And we
5 certainly wouldn't object to that.

6 But we need a number that works very well with
7 seven-foot sidewalks if we have that minimum. If we
8 have a 10-foot sidewalk, what do we have? A four-foot
9 setback. You know, there's not a lot more to talk
10 about.

11 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Understood. I just, what I'm
12 trying to understand is, let's say, Foodstuffs isn't
13 there tomorrow and somebody's redeveloping that site.

14 MR. SMITH: It's a real good question and one
15 that I actually thought about. We just didn't have time
16 to start getting into all the possible exceptions.

17 The idea behind the setback is on the
18 assumption that there's going to be larger and taller
19 developments. So the setback is in response to that.

20 If somebody came in and said, I want to
21 rebuild Foodstuffs and it's only going to be one and-a-
22 half stories or it's going to be one story and I'm going
23 to have a significant setback, well, because, again,

1 you're under the site development allowance. It's not a
2 planned development. It's a single lot in the scenario
3 you propose.

4 Are we going to force somebody to have the
5 only jagged tooth thing on the Crown Jewel? No.
6 They'll come in, they'll ask for a variation, they'll
7 get it.

8 Or you could put it into the B1V district.
9 Because I think that's the place where it would be most
10 appropriate to allow a little more, a little less
11 sidewalk.

12 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, quite frankly, that's
13 the only district I'm really talking about at the
14 moment.

15 MR. SMITH: There's a couple different ways to
16 approach it. And again, we're not looking to be, you
17 know, dictatorial and rigid. But by and large, I think
18 the idea is that the recommendation should be more than
19 just a hortatory guideline. Let's make it stick on the
20 assumption that at some point there will be
21 redevelopment. Certainly in all the other areas. Maybe
22 not in the Crown Jewel if it's, if it's restricted
23 enough. But everywhere else, the economic pressures and

1 incentives are there and the incentives to make it tall.

2 So if you're going to make it tall, move it back.

3 CHAIRMAN WOODS: The next question I have is,
4 you get the minimum 50-foot depth of commercial space in
5 multi-use buildings. And without thoroughly analyzing
6 each and every lot --

7 MR. SMITH: Actually, Jim's done a lot of
8 that. That's where, that's where it came from. He
9 actually went and knocked on doors, went inside stores.
10 I don't know if he had a tape measure.

11 MR. HUGHES: What we did is we took the city's
12 graphic system and measured it.

13 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. What I'm wondering
14 is, is there a better way to put forward the basic idea,
15 which I think is to allow for predominant use of the
16 ground floor as retail? And by that I mean some
17 percentage, which I think was in some of your notes from
18 the last meeting, as well as to limit the amount of
19 ground floor space that can be used for non-retail uses,
20 particularly parking and access to parking.

21 MR. SMITH: I think actually that in our text
22 version of this we signify as an alternative that we
23 require 50 percent. In the first version we said ground

1 floor. But we've changed that to building footprint
2 because we don't want to suggest that 50 percent of the
3 lot should be devoted to, to parking, but the building,
4 50 percent of the building footprint, at least be a
5 commercial space.

6 MR. WRIGHT: You could have, you know, kind of
7 the lesser of 50-foot depth or 50 percent sort of thing
8 as a requirement. But you know, I think the idea is to
9 kind of make sure that there is substantial viable, you
10 know, retail along this area and not the sort of things
11 we've seen in a couple of developments where it's just a
12 facade in front with a --

13 MR. HUGHES: And the best way we thought to
14 find that out was to just measure the buildings that
15 were there today and the ones that were very successful.

16 CHAIRMAN WOODS: And it may work. I was just,
17 I mean, to me the thing I'm more concerned with is that
18 the predominant use of the ground floor is the retail.

19 MR. HUGHES: Yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN WOODS: And that if there is use for
21 automobile-type things on the ground floor, it is for
22 commercial parking requirements and access to
23 residential parking at a sub-ground level.

1 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah, you know, I point out that
2 the 50-foot depth is in the plan, you know, as sort of a
3 feature.

4 MR. DUNKLEY: Yeah, I think we need to pull in
5 a disinterested retailer into this discussion. Because
6 there may be things we're not, we're not seeing.

7 Something like that, a 50-foot minimum, can
8 backfire. So we should make sure that we have the right
9 formula there. But I agree it should be probably a bit
10 more flexibility and teeth as well.

11 MR. SMITH: It's unfortunate that we haven't
12 had more input from the, the Central Street merchants,
13 but I --

14 MR. DUNKLEY: You'll never get it.

15 MR. SMITH: I've heard some characterizations
16 of them. But I have been talking with some of the
17 individual merchants, including some of them who've been
18 active in the organization. And I had a conversation
19 today and they said in particular, they're concerned
20 about density. Because so many of them are destination
21 retailers.

22 I know that the downtown consultants came out
23 with this study saying that density is great for retail.

1 Well, it depends on whether, what type of retailer you
2 are.

3 If you're a bakery, where you put up, put in a
4 hundred more residents and they're all walking by you
5 every day, it's a great thing. If you're the map store,
6 and you know, people don't buy a map every week unless
7 they've got some sort of cartographic fetish. And
8 people, you know, aren't going to, you know, they come
9 to the spice store three, four times, you know, a year.

10 The same with antiques. And there's a
11 significant antique and art community on Central Street.

12 A lot of them are of the "unique, eclectic" retailers,
13 are destination types who are concerned about density.
14 Unfortunately nobody's gotten really to make that, you
15 know, a presentation, although it came up at a number of
16 the tables individually during the visioning sessions.

17 But is part of what informs our point of view.

18 Because although our membership is largely residents,
19 we cherish the independent retail. And I hope that's
20 come across.

21 MR. HUGHES: And we have spent, I would say, a
22 good man week visiting along Central, the retailers,
23 going to their meetings, Carol, Bill, Marge, Mary

1 Therese, myself, and encouraging them to get involved in
2 the planning process primarily.

3 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. But yes, I'm just
4 trying to frame some stuff. So that if Bill goes
5 forward and starts to develop stuff, if he finds another
6 way of essentially achieving the same aim that, through
7 his knowledge of other zoning techniques and things like
8 that, that there, you know, there's flexibility here.

9 MR. DUNKLEY: Well, I'd like to suggest that
10 what was suggested in the West Evanston Plan, we need to
11 do at least once. And that is, we need a workshop
12 format rather than a --

13 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

14 MR. DUNKLEY: -- public hearing, public
15 hearing format.

16 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, I'm actually quite
17 certain that given the circumstances why we're in a
18 public hearing at this point. Because it seems like
19 we're more in the process of developing the zoning
20 proposal, as opposed to we have a zoning proposal that
21 we're having public hearing on.

22 MR. DUNKLEY: We're here.

23 MR. HUGHES: The very last statement on our

1 slide is, form-based zoning is recommended in the plan
2 approved by the Council.

3 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. And you know, from
4 that standpoint --

5 MR. HUGHES: And that recaps the rest of the
6 discussion, where our expectations are.

7 CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- of those people who have
8 thoroughly examined the West Evanston Zoning Proposal,
9 details aside, the development of the form-based code
10 stuff in that, I think, is really well done in terms of
11 doing a lot of the things that you're concerned about in
12 terms of stepbacks and articulation of walls, percentage
13 of wall that can be, you know, that must be glass. And
14 certain, you know, -- percentage of wall that can't be,
15 you know, beyond which can't be solid, all those kinds
16 of things, horizontal lines to define bases, all, it
17 does a really great job of, I think, creating the kinds
18 of things that I hear people saying that are desirable
19 to them.

20 MR. WRIGHT: And it may be that they could be
21 more particular here if there were time. But I think
22 that we were somewhat happy. And it seemed like, you
23 know, even with sort of the C1, C2, C4, whatever it was

1 in the plan itself, if you put those in, it's clear you
2 have to have a certain amount of articulation.

3 We don't want to try to constrain the
4 architecture of builders and so on, --

5 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

6 MR. WRIGHT: -- but it's clear that, you put
7 in those sort of things, you kind of say to the
8 developer, there has to be some articulation here, you
9 know?

10 CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's an issue that there
11 needs to be a certain kind of, certain articulation.
12 It's not saying that it has to be traditional or modern
13 or anything else, --

14 MR. HUGHES: Exactly, exactly.

15 CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- stylistic preferences
16 aside.

17 MR. DUNKLEY: Just as a practical matter,
18 there are a lot of benefits to form-based coding. I
19 would highly suggest we let one project be on the
20 bleeding edge first.

21 MR. WRIGHT: We don't need, we don't need
22 anything more than what we had up there. That's our
23 kindergarten form-based zoning, you know? Because I've

1 looked at a lot of the plans too. And they are
2 incredibly complex. You know, we're talking here about,
3 that's our idea of at least this much form-based zoning
4 for here.

5 MR. DUNKLEY: Well, it has to be consistent,
6 consistently done across the city or we'll end up with
7 big problems, so --

8 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah. So we're talking about
9 consistent across North Evanston here.

10 I just wanted to add, on these last, the last
11 three areas that we're at here, a few things, seven,
12 eight, and nine. You may, you know, I think Jim
13 mentioned why we wanted to have that area north on Green
14 Bay be 35-feet, three stories rather than the
15 recommended 45 feet, four stories. So I think it just
16 adds the four-story limit. Because if you do have, just
17 as in other areas you have, even though it's R4 and R3
18 behind there, it's pretty much single-family, you know,
19 type of homes or maybe, you know, two adjacent sort of,
20 you know, two flat, whatever you kind of call it, sort
21 of thing.

22 Plus, it really doesn't restrict development
23 there at all to go down there. Because again, the -- is

1 only a 1.0 -- So nobody's going to go up that high
2 anyway unless they're going to build a spire in that
3 area. You know, so it protects the residences behind
4 them without taking away anything in terms of any
5 potential development.

6 And then the last two areas, you know, we are
7 indeed very much concerned at the fact that you know,
8 that the underlying zoning is not being changed. And
9 yet we're adding on these substantial uses, residential
10 and other sort of things, and cultural, without any
11 requirement we get the whole reason that we have,
12 especially in one area, for changing the zoning.

13 The whole idea of this one area was to get
14 that parking structure. And if you don't get the
15 parking structure, there's no real reason to allow this,
16 all this increase uses that Northwestern can make
17 without getting a parking structure. I mean, there
18 should be no increased allowances, what they can do,
19 especially 125-foot tall residential.

20 You know, there should be some sort of
21 specific plan that comes up before you do anything to
22 this area. You have a specific proposal that comes up
23 and the developer comes to the city and kind of says,

1 okay, now we want this at the university, now we want
2 this re-zoned. There's no reason to do it unless and
3 until we have a specific proposal for that area.
4 Otherwise, you're giving away all the usage, you're
5 giving away all the zoning, with no guarantee of getting
6 what you want to have there, which is always what we've
7 talked about during the whole plan process is, the only
8 reason for this is to get a parking structure.

9 And it doesn't need to be as tall as what's
10 said here, 45 feet or whatever it is sort of thing. The
11 plan itself shows, I think, only a three-story
12 structure, something like that. One level could be
13 underground. It should be no more than 35 feet tall.

14 Because what you're doing now is, the back
15 part of that, the T1 part right now is a transitional
16 university zone. It's specifically designed to protect
17 the residences behind it. It's specifically designed
18 with all sorts of limitations, including only two-and-a-
19 half stories, 35 feet. So to kind of allow this sort of
20 thing to go in now and kind of, we're going to change
21 that to be 45 feet, you know, with all these sort of
22 uses, is actually kind of getting rid of the protection
23 that the T1 zone was meant to implement. So that has to

1 be kind of very carefully thought out and I think
2 nothing done there unless you have an actual project in
3 mind.

4 And we think the same thing on the other side.
5 You know, the opposite side, the U2 sort of zoning over
6 there. Again, there's no reason to kind of keep the
7 underlying zoning and then say, well, we'll let you do
8 not only all the athletic stuff you can do now, but you
9 can now put up an 125-foot dorm.

10 Nobody besides Lakota during the whole plan
11 process that we know was pushing for putting anything
12 there. The immediately nearby residents that came to
13 the meeting last week said we don't want anything there.

14 It's not a viable sort of retail area there.
15 You know, there's no reason to put anything there that I
16 can see at all. What the rest of us kept saying
17 throughout the planning process, this little bit of open
18 space we have along there, keep it. But make them fix
19 it up, make them landscape it, you know. But keep the
20 open space along there. So we see no reason for 8 and 9
21 unless those come, either or both of those, as part of a
22 particular negotiated proposal, you know, and change the
23 zoning at that time to allow a parking structure.

1 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: If I may, what do you
2 contemplate insofar as underground parking in the Crown
3 Jewel area?

4 MR. SMITH: There's really not a lot of room
5 for it. Right now the, there's the municipal parking
6 lot across the street from the library more or less.
7 And some members of our organization actually were in
8 favor of making that an underground parking lot.

9 The Chase Bank site is used as sort of a
10 outlaw public parking site by a lot of neighborhood
11 residents even though it's supposed to be only for bank
12 customers. But I guess you could go and check your ATM
13 balance and now you're a bank customer. But that would
14 be the only other real logical site unless somebody were
15 to buy out a number of parcels so --

16 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Well these general
17 comments here, applying to non-R districts, I guess I
18 don't understand why you -- Are you asking that the
19 overlay district include a requirement for substantial
20 underground parking?

21 MR. SMITH: Well here again, we've streamlined
22 our, the way we phrase our recommendations a little bit
23 in order to make them more presentable. The idea is to

1 have, require underground parking in those situations
2 where substantial parking would be required.

3 Obviously if you're putting in a dry cleaners
4 or something and you're only required to have three
5 spaces, we're not saying you got to put two of them
6 underground or one of them underground.

7 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Essentially what you're, what
8 you want to do is, like for the theater development
9 site. You want to put that residential parking below
10 ground?

11 MR. SMITH: Exactly.

12 MR. WRIGHT: I think actually that what Jeff
13 submitted tonight in the five-pager has something kind
14 of like that. It kind of says that you'd require a
15 substantial underground parking, for example, a third,
16 for any development for which the required parking
17 constitutes more than half of the building footprint.
18 So that would leave out any of the sort of, you know,
19 small developments along Central Street. It would be
20 kind of, it would be something that required quite a bit
21 of parking.

22 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: All right, well that
23 then explains it.

1 MR. SMITH: Our earlier draft said, we
2 referred to any development that has substantial parking
3 requirements. And that was a little vague so we tried
4 to put a number to it. You know, let's put a trigger on
5 it.

6 MR. HUGHES: You can only go so deep. We
7 recognize that, you know. It's a swamp west of Ridge
8 and sand east of Ridge.

9 MR. SMITH: If there are no further questions
10 for me, I'll take my leave. All I wanted to do was
11 leave you again with the images of what could be built.
12 And again, that's why our focus is on zoning. You
13 know, at the risk --

14 CHAIRMAN WOODS: You only have an hour and 15
15 minutes left o your anniversary so --

16 MR. SMITH: Yeah. At the risk of channeling
17 Rod Serling, imagine if you will, you know. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I'm looking for a
19 recommendation from our zoning administrator as to how
20 to proceed from here. Because it does seem like the
21 public hearing nature of these meetings is somehow
22 premature.

23 MR. DUNKLEY: Well, I'd suggest that we, if

1 there --

2 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Could we go back to regular
3 Committee process? Workshop process?

4 MR. DUNKLEY: I think that workshop form is
5 certainly one session I would really, I think we'd get
6 great value out of that. I really think there is, at
7 this point, we need to roll up our sleeves and fill in a
8 lot of blanks and talk about the real specifics about
9 what we're about to get into. And I don't think that we
10 can work those out in this very kind of formal setting
11 so --

12 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. So what would your
13 recommendation be as to the public hearing that has
14 opened?

15 MR. DUNKLEY: I don't think I'm willing to put
16 a time frame on right now. But I think with a little
17 bit of fresh consideration we can have one pretty
18 quickly. I think that the next time we get together in
19 this sort of format should be to review something that
20 is substantially whole.

21 CHAIRMAN WOODS: So would you recommend
22 closing this public hearing?

23 MR. DUNKLEY: I can't say --

1 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Then can we recommend
2 continuing this public hearing to a date certain of
3 September 12th, at which time we will continue it to some
4 other date?

5 MR. DUNKLEY: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I've got to continue it to a
7 date certain.

8 MR. DUNKLEY: No. I do, I think we need to
9 time box ourselves because we'll get more work done that
10 way. But I do think that we do have to have a different
11 format in the interim until we come back.

12 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Sure. And so perhaps on the
13 12th we'll have an idea of format and timing of a
14 workshop-type meeting.

15 MR. DUNKLEY: Yeah. We want to make sure we
16 bake in enough time for review, for public review,
17 before we --

18 CHAIRMAN WOODS: That's what I'm saying that,
19 maybe you'll have a recommendation on the 12th for a time
20 line.

21 MR. DUNKLEY: Absolutely. I can do that.

22 MR. WRIGHT: Well is it possible to have a
23 workshop before the 12th?

1 MR. DUNKLEY: What you doing tomorrow morning?

2 No, wait --

3 MR. WRIGHT: But you know, or we can meet, we
4 can meet and talk with you, you know, separately,
5 whatever sort of thing.

6 MR. DUNKLEY: Yeah. We'll just have to think
7 about the right way of doing that, yeah. Certainly, you
8 know, I want to sit and spend some time with Central
9 Street Neighbors because, just to understand what you've
10 done.

11 But there probably needs to be a little wider
12 format workshop, then.

13 MR. WRIGHT: Yeah.

14 MR. DUNKLEY: It's more --

15 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Jim and I have lives
16 beyond Central Street too.

17 CHAIRMAN WOODS: And West Evanston and
18 downtown and 708 Church and anything else you want to
19 think about. And the miscellaneous other things that
20 Arlova has on her list of zoning things that need to be
21 addressed.

22 Yes.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just a question of

1 clarification about the -- 12th day. I know at seven
2 o'clock there is Plan Commission hearing on the downtown
3 proposed tower.

4 CHAIRMAN WOODS: These items that we talked
5 about tonight will be on that agenda. We're not even
6 certain at this point whether that is going to be more
7 than a 15-minute meeting. Because there is the issue of
8 a Jewish holiday. And the developer may have elected to
9 have the meeting actually take place on the 20th or some
10 other date.

11 So we will be meeting on the 12th. At least
12 Stuart and I will be meeting on the 12th. It may just
13 be to continue everything to another meeting and maybe
14 have some of these preliminary, just concepts of time
15 lines and when we're going to actually meet on these
16 other issues. Because at the moment it's still a little
17 bit confusing.

18 And with that, I move that we be adjourned.

19 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Adjourned.

21 (Whereupon, the hearing in the
22 above-titled cause was
23 concluded at 10:50 p.m.)