



Melissa Klotz <mklotz@cityofevanston.org>

Comment RE: Omnibus item before LUC tonight

1 message

gcole09 <gcole09@gmail.com>

Wed, Apr 13, 2022 at 3:38 PM

To: jnyden@cityofevanston.org

Cc: mklotz@cityofevanston.org

Hi Johanna,

Hope you are well. I saw this item in a recent news post and took a look as my employer (Lake Bluff) is currently reviewing our planned development standards. As you know, I generally refrain from being involved in zoning issues in Evanston, but I was confused by this proposed standard for planned developments that is under consideration tonight:

4. The property owner would suffer a particular hardship or practical difficulty as distinguished from a mere inconvenience if the strict letter of the regulations were to be carried out.

This looks like a standard more appropriate to variations than to planned developments. Indeed, if a planned development met this standard (i.e. could demonstrate a hardship), I'm not sure why they would need to go through the additional complexity of a planned development approval rather than simply seek a variation. In other jurisdictions with which I am familiar, a "public benefit" standard is more common. This example is taken from Lake Bluff (with emphasis added) but I believe I saw similar during my time in Kansas City as well:

10-14-4: AUTHORITY TO MODIFY REGULATIONS:

A. Authority: Subject to the standards and limitations in this section, the board of trustees, as part of an approval of any PCD, may modify or waive any provision of this code or of the village's subdivision ordinance as they apply to an approved PCD.

B. Standards: No such modification or waiver may be approved unless the board of trustees shall find that the proposed PCD:

1. Will achieve the purposes for which PCD may be approved pursuant to section 10-14-1 of this chapter;
2. Will not violate the general purposes, goals, and objectives of this code and the village's comprehensive plan;
3. Will result in a development providing compensating amenities to the village. "Compensating amenities" means features not otherwise required to achieve compliance with the standards of this code or other applicable village codes and ordinances, including, without limitation, such things as public art; plazas; pedestrian walkways; natural habitats; increased landscaping; buffering or screening; enhanced streetscape; enhanced pedestrian and transit supportive design; underground parking; and similar features. Compensating amenities must be proposed as part of a PCD application, and all compensating amenities, whether public or private, must be developed and constructed at the applicant's expense; and
4. Subject to the standards set forth in this subsection, a compensating amenity may be in the form of a cash contribution. If the board of trustees approves a cash contribution in lieu of a compensating amenity, then the contribution must be made by the applicant to the village prior to the issuance by the village of any permit authorizing construction related to the project. The contribution will be designated by the village specifically as funding for a compensating amenity of the type described in subsection B3 of this section. The board of trustees may approve a cash contribution only if: a) the project site is inadequate for any physical on site compensating amenity as a result of its size, shape, or other topographic feature, b) there is no immediate need for a compensating amenity on public property abutting or adjacent to the project site, and c) there is a compelling and appropriate compensating amenity, as determined by the board of trustees, for which a cash contribution can be designated.

[...]

I would suggest that something like this would be more appropriate as a way to handle how much a planned development can deviate from the underlying zoning rules. I also believe the issue contemplated by #4 has previously been at issue in Evanston and may be advisable to address at the time of these revisions.

Finally -- I understand from your memo that these are stopgap amendments, but I also hope that Staff will return to these standards further after a new Comprehensive Plan is adopted. There are substantive issues that could be included in these standards. For example, in Lake Bluff, we are considering language that highlights types of public benefits desired from developers, such as: differentiated housing styles, complete streets, historic preservation, recreational areas that are open to the public, and stormwater BMPs beyond those required.

As always, thank you for reading and for your service.

Best,

Glen Cole, AICP
Evanston, IL
gcole09@gmail.com
(816) 585-7429



Meagan Jones <mmjones@cityofevanston.org>

Land Use Commission Public Comment

1 message

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

Tue, Apr 12, 2022 at 8:42 AM

Reply-To: noreply@formstack.com

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



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

Submitted at 04/12/22 9:42 AM

Name:	Chris Dillow
Address of Residence:	1316 Oak
Phone:	(773) 610-6678
How would you like to make your public comment?:	In-person
Provide Written Comment Here:	
Agenda Item (or comment on item not on the agenda):	Connection's for the Homeless' use of the Margarita Inn
Position on Agenda Item:	Other: Proponent of a more thorough and inclusive process

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

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

