PLAN COMMISSION
Wednesday, April 9, 2014
7:00 P.M.
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, City Council Chambers

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: March 12, 2014

3. NEW BUSINESS

   A. TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCE 14PLND-0019
      Consider a text amendment, pursuant to City Code Title 6 Zoning, to discuss the zoning definition and land use regulations for Micro-Breweries.

   B. TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCE 14PLND-0020
      Consider a text amendment, pursuant to City Code Title 6 Zoning, to discuss the zoning definition and land use regulations for Aquaponics.

   C. MAIN STREET STATION 14PLND-0021
      TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT (TOD) PLAN AND STUDY
      The TOD Plan is focusing on the CTA (Purple Line) and Metra Main Street Stations in Evanston. The plan is intended to enhance multi-modal mobility between the Main Street Stations, the Main Street Business District and surrounding neighborhoods. The proposed improvements for the Main Street station and the study area will be presented.

4. ADJOURNMENT

The next regular Plan Commission meeting is scheduled for WEDNESDAY, May 14, 2014 at 7:00 P.M. in COUNCIL CHAMBERS of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.

Order of agenda items are subject to change. Information about the Plan Commission is available online at: http://www.cityofevanston.org/plancommission. Questions can be directed to Damir Latinovic, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner, at 847-448-8675 or via e-mail at dlatinovic@cityofevanston.org.

The City of Evanston is committed to making all public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. Any citizen needing mobility or communications access assistance should contact the Community and Economic Development Department 48 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting so that accommodations can be made at 847-448-8683 (Voice) or 847-448-8064 (TTY).
MEETING MINUTES
PLAN COMMISSION
Wednesday, March 12, 2014
7:00 P.M.
Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Council Chambers

Members Present: Scott Peters (Chair), Jim Ford, Lenny Asaro, Colby Lewis, Carol Goddard

Members Absent: Terri Dubin, Seth Freeman, Richard Shure, Kwesi Steele,

Associate Members Present: David Galloway, Stuart Opdycke,

Associate Members Absent: none

Staff Present: Damir Latinovic, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Mark Muenzer, Director of Community Development
Mario Treto, Assistant City Attorney

Others present: Judy Fiske, First Ward Alderman

Presiding Member: Scott Peters, Chairman

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chairman Peters called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M and explained the general meeting procedure, schedule, agenda items, time limits on public testimony and opportunities for cross examination of witnesses. Chairman Peters concluded the opening statement by saying that the Plan Commission forwards a recommendation to the City Council which makes the final determination on any matters discussed by the Plan Commission.

Chairman Peters introduced Carol Goddard, the new member of the Plan Commission.

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: February 26, 2014

Upon a question by Chairman Peters for any corrections, Commissioner Ford stated he is not sure why Scott Bernstein, president of the Center for Neighborhood Technology was listed under “others present”. Additionally, Commissioner Ford noted two minor corrections on page 10 of the draft minutes.

Commissioner Opdycke thanked staff for the comprehensive minutes but noted such detailed minutes may not be necessary because the City posts the video of the meeting on its website. Commissioner Ford noted that he prefers the detailed summary of the minutes. Commissioner Asaro stated that based on his interaction
with some of the residents, people are more likely to watch the meeting than read the minutes.

Chairman Peters suggested to postpone the discussion on how the minutes should be prepared for the end of the meeting.

Commissioner Lewis made a motion to approve the minutes as corrected. Commissioner Ford seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken and the minutes were approved by voice call 4-0 with Commissioner Goddard abstained.

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. PLANNED DEVELOPMENT 14PLND-0004

1515 Chicago Avenue

Tom Blunk of Janko Group, LLC/Quadrangle, LLC, developer of the proposed project, has applied for a Special Use for a Planned Development in the D4 Downtown Transition District (Zoning Code Section 6-11) to construct an 8-story, 85-ft. tall extended stay hotel. The proposed hotel would include 114 rooms and 35 open parking spaces. The applicant seeks Site Development Allowances for the parking setback for the open parking lot in the rear of the property. In addition, the applicant may seek and the Plan Commission may consider additional Site Development Allowances as may be necessary or desirable for development of the proposed hotel. The Plan Commission makes a recommendation to City Council, the final determining body for this proposal.

Mr. Damir Latinovic, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner for the City, provided a brief overview of the project and the staff report memo. Mr. Latinovic noted that as one of the conditions of the approval staff is recommending the applicant convert the ground floor hotel restaurant/bar space to a normal commercial/restaurant space open to the public. The addition of the commercial space open to the public is necessary and vital for continuity of the retail street wall and benefits the pedestrian environment and vitality of the downtown. Mr. Latinovic also noted that one of the other conditions of note is a requirement for the petitioner to install no-right turn sign at the intersection of the alleys which would prohibit any trucks servicing the building to make southbound movements. Instead all trucks would have to exit the site on Davis St.

Mr. Latinovic concluded the presentation by stating the project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Design Guidelines for Planned Developments. The project meets all zoning requirements except for the three minor site development allowances which staff believes are necessary to make the project feasible and achieve the proposed public benefits. Staff recommends Plan Commission make a positive recommendation to the City Council with the conditions outlined in the staff report memo.

Commissioner Lewis asked for the intent of the required five-foot setback for the open parking spaces. Mr. Latinovic explained the required setback was likely placed in the ordinance to achieve adequate separation between the parking lots and lot lines where one could install landscape screening or a decorative fence for screening. Mr. Latinovic added that there is no required setback for buildings or enclosed parking from any lot line.
Upon a question by Commissioner Opdycke on future snow removal, Mr. Latinovic explained this question was brought up by staff and surrounding residents at the neighborhood meetings and the question may be better answered by the developer.

Commissioner Opdycke stated that he has to leave early and wanted to provide his thoughts on the project. He stated that generally he is in favor of the project and would encourage the Commission to approve the project. He also stated he supports all conditions as outlined by staff except for the 2nd condition regarding the need for yet another restaurant. He also suggested adding another condition that would require the developer to pay for the repaving of the alleys. He believes overall the project is a good addition to the area.

Chairman Peters swore in all individuals that will be providing testimony during tonight's meeting.

Mr. Gregg Graines, of DLA Piper, the attorney for the applicant introduced his team and invited the applicant Tom Blunk to provide a summary of the project.

Mr. Tom Blunk of Janko Group, LLC/Quadrangle, LLC., the applicant, provided a summary of the proposal. Mr. Blunk mentioned that he is a resident of the City and as such this project has a special meaning to him. He provided a summary of the nature of an extended stay hotel and how it differs from a typical hotel. He explained that they have a letter of intent from Hyatt House for the project. He mentioned that they also plan on renting some parking spaces off site even though they meet the zoning requirement for parking on their property. Mr. Blunk mentioned they are not asking for any financial incentives. The three development allowances for parking setbacks are minor. The project will bring 200 construction jobs and 25 permanent hotel jobs.

Mr. Blunk stated they will add over 100 guests daily which will provide critical vitality to the area where now the site is vacant. The building will have 3-5 deliveries a week. The previous 12,000-sq. ft. office building on the site included 35-40 parking spaces, many of which had direct access off of the north-south alley similar to their proposal.

Mr. Blunk then discussed the plan to remove the existing Elm tree in rear of the property to accommodate the construction of the building. He also indicated that they are willing to donate towards urban reforestation fund for the loss of the tree or install a new 9” tree (25’-30’ high at the time of installation) in the southeast corner of the site, in coordination with the adjacent property owner to the south. This option would eliminate one required parking space and would therefore require approval of an additional development allowance for the number of parking spaces provided. Mr. Blunk stated they held two neighborhood meetings and met twice with local architects and Alderman Fiske in addition to numerous conversations with city staff to come up with a design of the building and site that was to everyone’s liking.

Devon Patterson, design principal for Solomon, Cordwell, Buenz, the architect for the project, provided an overview of the design of the building. He provided a summary of the design changes over time based on different meetings with staff and area residents and architects. The exterior of the building would be all brick of reddish color with metal panels and stone base elements.
Mr. Blunk concluded by saying that based on resident input they will add signs to parking stalls accessed off of the alleys to prevent any oversized vehicles to be parked there.

Upon a question from Chairman Peters on snow removal, Mr. Blunk stated they will have a plan for their site and would be happy to spearhead a coordinated snow removal effort. December, January and February are the slowest months of the year, so one or two of the parking spaces could be used for snow storage during winter months.

Upon a question from Commissioner Ford, Mr. Blunk stated the code requirement and their proposal accounts for staff parking in the 35 parking spaces on the site.

Upon a question from Commissioner Lewis on the brick and other materials, Mr. Patterson explained the exact colors and material types and sizes are not finalized yet at this point. He also went over the types of aluminum windows proposed.

Commissioner Asaro asked what the concerns by Ms. Klotz were when the project went in front of SPAARC where she did not vote in favor of the project. Mr. Latinovic stated Ms. Klotz was concerned about the proposed parking spaces that have direct access off of the alleys.

Upon a question on public benefits, Mr. Latinovic stated the public benefits should be finalized before the project is presented to the City Council.

Upon a question from Mr. Asaro, Ms. Judy Fiske, First Ward Alderman, provided an overview on the meetings that took place with the applicant. She explained there are still concerns with the project regarding the alley usage, the setbacks and regarding the elm tree in the rear and she hopes these can be resolved during the project review process.

Mr. Asaro clarified he was not inquiring for personal point of view from the Alderman, but rather the position of the Alderman as it reflects the constituents she is representing.

Upon a question from Mr. Galloway, Mr. Patterson stated they have not selected the final color or the materials for the window frames.

Linda, Damashek, 1318 Judson Ave, asked about the samples of materials, to which Mr. Latinovic stated he will provide the material samples that have been submitted after the break.

Upon a question, Mr. Latinovic stated the property is not located in a TIF district.

At this time, the Commission took a ten minute break.

After the break, Chairman Peters swore in the individuals that will be providing testimony during the meeting.
Ms. Kristine Westerberg, 525 Grove, president of the 525 Grove condominium association is representing the Hinman/Grove neighbors who border the site to the south and east. The residents have concern about the proposed parking setback from the north, south and east lot lines, which is a necessary buffer between the commercial and residential properties. Adjacent buildings to the east are setback from the alley. The columns of the proposed building would extend up against the east lot line which would contribute to increased congestion along with the proposed 0-feet parking setback. The proposed setback along the south property line also eliminates the existing tree which is about 60 feet tall.

Ms. Westerberg proceeded to show the slides of the proposed building with the required setbacks and what impact that would have on the proposed building and surrounding alleys and properties. She also proceeded to elaborate on the construction concerns that the neighbors have.

Mr. Mike Taft, 1508 Hinman, president of the Evanstonian co-op apartments at 1508 Hinman Avenue provided his construction background and 45-year experience. He stated that this is an extraordinarily dangerous site for construction. Mr. Taft explained and provided slides of the porous asphalt paving including examples from Bayfield, Wisconsin.

Mr. Taft further testified that the existing Elm tree in the rear is quite healthy in his opinion. The area around the tree does not have any concrete backfill but has a good topsoil. Saving the tree would afford the hotel guests staying on the south side of the hotel to enjoy the tree and perhaps even listen to a Baltimore Oriole singing in the morning. Observing the five-foot setback would save the tree.

Upon a question from Mr. Galoway on the life expectancy of permeable asphalt, Mr. Taft testified that it is much greater than standard asphalt. It lasts much longer, it does not crack and ice does not form on it.

Mr. Galoway asked if the porous asphalt is used what impact would that have on the detention requirements? Mr. Latinovic explained that the petitioner has not been required to provide full stormwater engineering documents and calculations at this point that specify the size and type of all stormwater detention areas and infrastructure. Typically, the project is required to provide on-site stormwater detention and must show that the rate of stormwater runoff will not increase from the current rate.

Upon a question what impact a green roof would have on the stormwater detention requirements, Mr. Latinovic explained that such measures do have positive impact on the amount of stormwater infrastructure that is needed.

Upon a question, Mr. Latinovic clarified the required setback for buildings and enclosed parking is 0 ft from all lot lines.

Mr. Howard Voeks, 1516 Hinman Ave, stated he appreciates the efforts the applicant and his staff have done to this point, especially positioning the building on the site so that it preserves some views. The extended stay hotel is also a great idea. Mr. Voeks proceeded to show pictures of the alley to indicate a narrow passageway. He also
mentioned that the Zoning Ordinance states the structure should provide suitable transition between commercial and residential zones. He urged the Commission to require the applicant to modify the plans to move the building off of the north-south alley in the back.

Commissioner Asaro asked what happens when a truck is blocking the alley? Mr. Voeks stated that residents typically ask truck drivers to move so people can access and pull out of their parking spaces. The alley is more like a street than an alley and there is not much room to maneuver. Upon a question, Mr. Voeks stated that it is a 20-ft wide alley and theoretically there is enough room for two vehicles to pass by each other.

Commissioner Lewis asked about the depth of the parking spaces on adjacent properties to which Mr. Voeks specified they are deeper than the requirement.

Upon a question, Mr. Latinovic clarified the properties in the rear are zoned R-6 and the required building setback from their rear property line is 25 feet.

Ms. Elizabeth Hayford, 1508 Hinman Ave, stated they are all concerned about the passage in the alley. There is still more work to be done on this proposal.

Mr. Sandeep Ghaey, 1509 Hinman Ave, is the owner of the adjacent wine shop, and asked about safety measures during construction. There is concern about vibration for their wine cellar. He further expressed concern about sidewalk access during the construction. The preference would be not to shut down the sidewalks during the construction. Mr. Ghaey offered a suggestion to make the north-south alley a one-way alley.

Ms. Jeanne Lindwall, 625 Library Place, stated she is an urban planner by trade and would like to speak about the importance of setbacks. For busy alleys setbacks are essential to allow appropriate room for passing by. Over the years there have been numerous projects where developers have been asked for additional setback buffer. She encouraged the Commission to be sensitive to the need for appropriate setbacks.

Mr. Eugene Turek, 525 Grove St, said Davis Street is a very busy two-lane street and he does not think trucks will be able to safely exit onto Davis St., especially when the construction of the addition at North Shore Hotel starts. There would be a lot of traffic using the same alley.

Upon a question, from Mr. Turek, M. Blunk answered there are two handicapped parking spaces proposed as it is required by Code.

Mr. Bill Schermerhorn, manager of 531 Grove Street, said theirs is the only property that is adjacent to this site. He is in favor of the project because of the big picture benefits the project will bring. The previous owners parked the cars on the site right off of the alley, sometimes 4 cars deep. The existing tree in the rear is right on the property line. The tree will most likely not survive the construction. Mr. Schermerhorn concluded the project has a ton of upside for the community as a whole.
Mr. Gregory Hughes, 2737 Central St., stated in his opinion the development is a first class development. He used to work for the company that occupied the building that was previously located on the site. They parked right up against the alley and never had any problems.

There being no further public comment, Chairman Peters closed the public participation part of the hearing.

Mr. Graines provided the closing testimony and reminded the Commission that their full team is here and able to provide answers to any questions.

Ms. Goddard asked about vibration monitoring. Mr. Blunk stated there will be a construction management agreement and they will do foundation survey of the building to the south to make sure they will not negatively affect surrounding properties. He also stated the foundation piers will be drilled into the ground and will not be pounded in as it may be usually associated with deep foundation piers.

Chairman Peters asked if the project will comply with other ordinances and Mr. Blunk confirmed.

Chairman Peters invited the discussion by the Commission members.

Commissioner Ford stated the architect has done a marvelous job. The positioning of the building is good and having the walls come in and out is a wonderful design job. He stated preserving the tree and constructing the building of this size will be impossible. The tree will not survive. But Commissioner Ford stated the tree should be replaced. Regarding the parking, Commissioner Ford stated he would be willing to entertain a revised design that shows reduced number of parking to gain some setback off of the alley. But by and large the project makes sense at this location.

Commissioner Galloway stated he could not think of a better use for this site. It will provide the maximum amount of street pedestrian activity and a minimum amount of site generated vehicular traffic. It will also add to the local retail market. The architecture is splendid. The massing and east-west orientation is great. Every little detail does add to the quality of architecture and adds benefits. The first floor layout is smart and highly logical. Commissioner Galloway did say he is a bit uncomfortable with the stone coping that tops the 2nd floor terrace. He also stated his preference for the brick is the first option presented in the project binder. It would add the greatest amount of variation and detail considering that this would be utility size brick. Commissioner Galloway encouraged the applicant to select the metal that has very low reflectivity.

In regards to the setbacks, Commissioner Galloway stated part of the urban living is being engaged with surrounding residents and business owners regarding the use of the alley. He does not believe there is a problem that needs to be solved, but signs could be posted to encourage drivers to move forward in the parking spaces off of the alley as much as possible.
In regards to the tree, Commissioner Galloway believes the tree will not survive the construction. He would encourage exploring the options to provide additional landscape amenities instead.

Commissioner Goddard stated the project is a fabulous idea. She likes the site plan and the fact that the tower does not take up so much space. She is not concerned about having a full service restaurant on this site. There are plenty of restaurants downtown Evanston.

Upon a question from Commissioner Goddard, Mr. Latinovic stated the east-west alley is a one-way eastbound alley now, but drivers do not always follow that. That is why staff is recommending the applicant install additional traffic signage. Additionally, Mr. Latinovic stated that active loading and unloading in the alley is permitted. That is what the alleys are for. But the loading and unloading has to be active. If there is a truck parked in the alley and loading and unloading is not actively happening, residents are encouraged to call 311 and the City will come to enforce the parking restrictions in the alley.

Commissioner Goddard further said she is sensitive to the setbacks, but the project has too many other benefits to focus only on the setbacks. She stated she does not believe the Elm tree will survive the construction. The money and effort would be better spent on planting another tree somewhere else on the site or even somewhere else in Evanston.

Commissioner Lewis stated he also believes this is an ideal use and project for downtown Evanston. He does not believe there is a need for another restaurant. He believes this will become a source of pedestrian activity not a desert. Commissioner Lewis shares the concern about the construction activity. The tree issue could be resolved in many ways. A parking space could be lost to accommodate survival of the tree. However he does not believe that the tree will survive the construction. Overall, the project is fantastic.

Commissioner Asaro agrees with all the comments that have been made and supports the request. Someone is always going to be happy and someone is not going to be happy. Given the location of the site, the setback request is appropriate. He understands the position of the neighbors but given the location of the site he believes the proposed setback is appropriate.

Commissioner Asaro said he visited the other hotel by the developer and they make a good product. The fact that the developer is a resident of Evanston, he will be particularly mindful of the success of the project all the way through.

Chairman Peters stated, based on the comments by the Board, the 2nd condition in the staff memo regarding the need for the restaurant should then not be included in the motion. The other condition that could be added is that the project complies with all other applicable ordinances. Also, a condition should be added that the applicant installs signs prohibiting SUV parking for parking stalls that have access from the alleys. There should also be a snow removal plan acceptable to the City Council or their representative, such the City’s traffic engineer or the planning and zoning department.
Chairman Peters also stated there is no evidence to the viability of the Elm tree after the construction. He proposes a condition as part of the recommendation that the Council, if they choose so, can adopt, that the tree be saved and up to 3 parking spaces be eliminated to save it. If the tree cannot be saved, a new tree should be planted with a minimum 9 inch caliper. In summary, Chairman Peters stated, the recommendation would be positive with the conditions he mentioned but that the tree is not resolved and it is up to the City Council to address the tree.

Commissioner Lewis stated that the idea of permeable pavement is also very interesting to him.

Commissioner Goddard asked if anyone knows what the cost of porous asphalt is versus the regular pavement.

Mr. Graines stated his team does not have that number. Chairman Peters stated there was testimony that the short term cost is greater but the long term cost is not.

Mr. Blunk stated they have looked at porous asphalt in other projects and it does not replace the requirement for the detention basin.

Alderman Fiske stated porous concrete was installed on Davis Street by the City and it is working really well. She stated the idea of a condition to keep exploring the preservation of the tree is a good idea and is worth it. Evanston is the tree city.

Chairman Peters also stated the 20-foot alley functions as an alley. Some inconvenience is to be expected.

Mr. Graines provided a clarification on the applicant's position regarding the condition on keeping the tree. He stated they are open to explore ways to keep the tree, but losing any parking spaces in order to keep the tree does not work for them. From an operational standpoint they need every parking space they can get.

Commissioner Ford asked for clarification on the order of preference regarding the tree condition: first to explore keeping the tree, second to replace it with another 9" tree, or third to make a payment in lieu into the tree fund.

Chairman Peters clarified he did not mention the payment to the fund and he does not prefer any order. But the idea is for the Council, staff and the developer to come up with a solution that is feasible.

Commissioner Ford clarified that if such condition is included in the motion his preference would be that it includes the order he listed.

Chairman Peters invited a motion.

Commissioner Ford made a motion to approve the Planned Development request with the following conditions outlined in the staff report memo (without staff’s condition for the restaurant on the ground floor):
1. The proposed planned development for the extended stay hotel located at 1515 Chicago Avenue shall substantially conform to the plans and documents attached to this report.

2. The hotel bar and dining area located at the northeast corner of the first floor should be redesigned to accommodate a commercial/restaurant tenant space.

3. The petitioner must sign and agree to a construction management plan including but not limited to a construction staging plan prior to issuance of the building permit.

4. Prior to commencement of construction activities a foundation survey of all surrounding buildings should be completed and submitted to the city. Upon completion of all construction activities a final foundation survey should be submitted prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy to assure no structural damage was caused to surrounding properties due to the construction of the building.

5. The Planned Development ordinance should include a provision that any change to the use on the property must be processed and approved as an amendment to the Planned Development.

6. The vehicles and trucks servicing the building should not exceed 30 feet in length.

7. The following traffic signs should be installed in the east-west alley:
   a. A “one-way’ traffic sign should be installed at the access to the east-west alley on Chicago Avenue.
   b. A “no-right turn” traffic sign should be installed at the intersection of the alleys to prohibit any trucks servicing the building making the southbound movements, and
   c. A “do not enter” traffic sign should be installed at the intersection of the alleys to prohibit any vehicles going westbound in the east-west alley.

8. The north side of the first floor adjacent to the bar/dining area or a commercial/restaurant space should have operable windows to encourage sidewalk café-like environment and public interaction.

Commissioner Ford also stated to include the following conditions as expressed by the Chairman and the following order regarding the tree:

9. The applicant shall provide and comply with the snow removal plan for the alleys as acceptable to the City Council.

10. The proposal shall comply with all other applicable City ordinances.

11. The applicant shall install “no SUV parking” type of signage for all parking spaces with direct access off of the alleys.

12. The applicant shall explore ways to preserve the existing Elm tree in the rear, if feasible. If saving the tree is not possible, the applicant shall plant a new tree (minimum 9" caliper at the time of installation) near the southeast corner of the site. If neither of those two options are feasible, the applicant shall pay a contribution towards the Urban Reforestation Fund.

Commissioner Goddard seconded the motion.

Ayes: Commissioners Ford, Goddard, Asaro, Lewis and Chairman Peters.
Nays: None
Abstain: None
The motion was approved by a roll call vote 5:0

Chairman Peters proceeded to read each standard to confirm that the project meets all applicable standards for approval and is consistent with the Board’s recommendation. Chairman Peters asked if all members of the Board agree with his analysis of the standards and all members of the Board confirmed they do.

Chairman Peters invited the Board if they wish to discuss the style of the minutes.

There being no discussion, Chairman Peters stated Commissioner Freeman’s appointment on the Board expires on March 14, 2014 and he is currently serving as the liaison to the Economic Development Committee. So the Commission needs to elect a new active member to serve and fill the vacancy created after Marcy 14, 2014. Chairman Peters said if there is no other member that would like to serve, he would nominate himself. Commissioner Goddard seconded his motion.

A voice vote was taken and the motion to nominate Chairman Peters as the liaison to the Economic Development Committee was approved by voice call 5-0.

4. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion, Commissioner Asaro motioned to adjourn the meeting, and Commissioner Goddard seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Damir Latinovic
Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Community Development Department
Zoning Ordinance
Text Amendment

Micro-Breweries

14PLND-0019
Memorandum

To: Chair and Members of the Plan Commission

From: Mark Muenzer, Director of Community Development
Damir Latinovic, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner

Subject: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment
Micro-breweries – 14PLND-0019

Date: March 18, 2014

Summary
Staff recommends establishing a land use definition and zoning regulations for micro-breweries. Such facilities typically fall between a brewpub restaurant and a large scale industrial size brewery and are currently absent from the City’s Zoning Ordinance. Staff recommends allowing such uses as a permitted use in the M and I districts and as a special use in C and B districts.

Background
Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission Review
The proposed zoning ordinance text amendment to establish a land use definition and regulations for micro-breweries was presented to the Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission on February 19, 2014. During the meeting, the commission discussed a variety of topics including:

1. Production level of large scale breweries.
The Samuel Adams Beer Company often considered the largest craft beer company in the US produces approximately 2.5 million barrels of beer per year. MillerCoors brewery has eight large regional breweries each of which produces approximately 8-10 million barrels per year.

2. Need for the City to also establish land use regulations for large-scale breweries
The City of Evanston currently allows large scale breweries as a permitted light-manufacturing use in the industrial districts.

3. The micro-brewery regulations in Warrenville, home to two micro-breweries:
Two Brothers Brewing Co. and Rock Bottom Brewery.
The City of Warrenville defines a Micro-brewery as an establishment that produces up to 30,000 barrels of beer or ale per calendar year and allows it as a special use in the manufacturing district.
The Zoning Committee made a positive recommendation to the Plan Commission to establish the land use regulations for micro-breweries as presented by staff.

Proposal Summary
On January 10, 2014 the City received an application for a “nano-brewery” Common Culture at 825 Chicago Avenue. The proposed “nano-brewery”, as described by the applicant, is a small craft brewery operation with capacity to brew up to 21,000 Gallons (666 Barrels) of craft beer per year. The applicant will be selling the beer as a wholesaler to local residents or directly to local restaurants. Phase II of the business plan called for expansion of the business within the building to increase the production capacity up to 50,000 Gallons (1,587 Barrels)

The phase I of the proposed use is permitted as a Retail Goods Establishment. However, the expansion of the operation (i.e. Phase II) would no longer qualify as a Retail Goods Establishment. As such, staff identified the need for land use regulations for a small scale micro-brewery which is not associated with restaurants but is much smaller than a large scale brewery.

Types of Breweries
The local small-scale craft breweries are a relatively new type of use. Due to economies of scale in production, distribution, marketing and advertising, national and regional breweries have dominated the beer industry for decades. Starting in the 1980s small scale independent breweries emerged as a competitive market segment within the beer industry.

Since the turn of the 21st century, the demand for independent local products within the beer industry led to a significant rise of small-scale craft breweries as a new type of use. Since that time, local liquor codes and zoning ordinances have started adopting regulations to address the specific issues and potential impacts of these uses on surrounding properties. The general intent is to create regulations for smaller breweries to operate outside of industrial districts.

Generally speaking there are four types of breweries found across the country:

1. Nano-Brewery: A very small-scale production of craft beer with distribution to a limited area with beer production in very small quantities.
2. Brew-Pub: A restaurant that is also a brewery. The beer is brewed primarily for sale in the restaurant and bar.
3. Micro-Brewery (or Craft-Brewery): A small scale brewery with production limitation that usually does not exceed 30,000 barrels per year.
4. Regional Brewery: A large-scale brewery with annual beer production that usually exceeds 30,000 barrels

Existing Evanston Regulations
The current Evanston zoning regulations for the different types of breweries are summarized in the table below:
Current City of Evanston Zoning Regulations

| Nano-Brewery | Allowed as a Retail Goods Establishment In B, C, D and I1 districts.
| Brew-Pub | Allowed as an accessory use to restaurants which are permitted in B, C, D and I districts.
| Regional Brewery | Allowed as light-manufacturing use in RP, M and I districts.

The City of Evanston also relies heavily on its Liquor Code for specific regulations on craft beer production. The city’s Liquor Code includes 32 different liquor licenses including among others a specific definition and a license for a Brew Pub and a separate license for a craft-distillery and a craft-brewery.

The Liquor Code’s definition of a Brew Pub is:

**BrewPub:** *A manufacturer of beer only at a designated premises to make sales to importing distributors, distributors, and to nonlicensees for use and consumption only, who stores beer at the designated premises, and who is allowed to sell at retail from the licensed premises, provided that a brew pub licensee shall not sell for off premises consumption more than fifty thousand (50,000) gallons per year."

The Craft-Distillery license is primarily intended for the production and storage of spirits and alcohol other than beer with a limit of 35,000 gallons per year. The license further limits the amount and type of on-site sampling and prohibits the sale of alcohol for on-premise consumption.

The Zoning Ordinance includes a similar definition for a Micro-Distillery. The land use is defined as:

**Micro-Distillery:** *A facility that produces alcoholic beverages in quantities not to exceed thirty-five thousand (35,000) gallons per year and includes an accessory tasting room. A tasting room allows customers to taste samples of products manufactured on-site and purchase related sales items. Sales of alcohols manufactured outside the facility are prohibited."

The existing land use regulations for Micro-Distilleries are outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C-1</th>
<th>C1a</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B1-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro-Distillery</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* S - Special Use

The Craft-Brewery license in the Liquor Code authorizes on-site production and storage of beer in quantities not to exceed 930,000 gallons (30,000 barrels) per year. The license further limits the amount and type of on-site sampling and prohibits the sale of alcohol for on-premise consumption.
The Zoning Ordinance does not have a similar definition for a Craft- or Micro-Brewery. This type of use would be classified as a light manufacturing use which is allowed as a permitted use in the RP, M and I districts.

The production and consumption of craft beer is also regulated on the federal level by the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade bureau (TTB) through issuance of a license. The State of Illinois regulates production of alcohol through the Liquor Control Act by issuing appropriate licenses based on the applicant’s business model. The City of Evanston typically does not issue a liquor license until the applicant can provide a copy and confirm that he/she has already obtained federal and state required liquor licenses.

Other Municipalities
Most other municipalities also regulate the production and consumption of craft beer through either the Zoning Ordinance, Liquor Code or both.

A vast majority of municipalities rely on the local liquor code to define and regulate craft beer production. Similar to the City of Evanston, most liquor codes typically have separate definitions for brewpubs, micro(craft) breweries and larger scale breweries limiting them in size, production, on-site consumption and even size of sampling containers.

The majority of zoning ordinances in Illinois do not have specific definitions and land use regulations for micro(craft) breweries. Most surrounding towns, including Oak Park, Chicago, Naperville and Aurora generally allow restaurants with accessory breweries, a use commonly known as a brewpub, as a permitted use in business and commercial districts. Other types of small and large breweries are not defined but are generally allowed as permitted light-manufacturing uses in industrial and manufacturing districts.

The Village of Plainfield southwest of Chicago defines a micro-brewery as a facility for the production and packaging of malt beverages for retail and for wholesale distribution with a capacity of not more than 15,000 barrels per year. Similarly, the City of Warrenville defines a micro-brewery as a facility that produces up to 30,000 barrels of beer or ale per year.

Recommendation
Staff believes the Zoning Ordinance should include a separate definition and land use regulations for a Micro-Brewery to differentiate this type of use from a large-scale brewery production typically found in industrial districts.

Since the Micro-Distillery definition in the Zoning Ordinance is closely aligned with the Craft-Distillery regulations in the Liquor Code, staff recommends a Micro-Brewery definition that is closely aligned with the Craft-Brewery regulations in the Liquor Code. Staff recommends the following definition for a Micro-Brewery:

**Micro-Brewery:** A facility that produces fermented malt beverages on site in quantities not to exceed 930,000 gallons (30,000 barrels) per year and may include an accessory tasting room. Product sampling or retail sale as may be defined and regulated by Title 3, Chapter 4 of the City Code at the facility allows customers to taste samples of products manufactured on-site and purchase related sales items. Any sale of alcohol in the
tasting room or otherwise in the facility which is manufactured outside the facility is prohibited.

Since the anticipated impact of such facilities falls between that of a Micro-Distillery and a large-scale brewery, staff recommends allowing the Micro-Brewery as a Special Use in the same districts where the Micro-Distillery is allowed as a Special Use and also allowing them as a permitted use in the same districts where a light-manufacturing use (where a typical brewery would fall under) is allowed. As such, when an application for a Micro-Brewery is received in the C and B districts, a special use review and approval must be granted whereby specific conditions of each site and proposed business operation can be evaluated.

The proposed land use regulation is summarized in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C-1</th>
<th>C1a</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B1-A</th>
<th>MU</th>
<th>MUE</th>
<th>MXE</th>
<th>I1</th>
<th>I2</th>
<th>I3</th>
<th>RP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro-Brewery</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S - Special Use, P - Permitted Use

Staff recommends Plan Commission make a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposed land use regulations for micro-brewery establishments.

Attachments
Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission Draft Meeting Minutes 02.19.2014
Special Use application for Common Culture
Paragraph P and P-1 of Section 3-4-6 Classification and License Fees from the Title 3 – Chapter 4 of the Liquor Control Regulations
MEETING MINUTES
ZONING COMMITTEE OF THE PLAN COMMISSION
Wednesday, February 19, 2014
7:00 P.M.
Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 2403

Members Present: Richard Shure, Scott Peters, Jim Ford, Terri Dubin, Colby Lewis

Members Absent: none

Other Plan Commission Members Present: Stuart Opdycke

Staff Present: Damir Latinovic, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Mario Treto, Assistant City Attorney I

Presiding Member: Richard Shure, Chairman

Public present: Jessica Feldman, 450 Davis St.

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM
With a quorum present, Chairman Shure called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

2. MINUTES
Approval of November 20, 2013 Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission Meeting Minutes:

Chairman Shure stated that he wants the minutes to reflect that he opened the meeting and turned it over to Commissioner Peters.

Commissioner Peters motioned to approve the minutes as amended.
Commissioner Ford seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken and the minutes were approved with a voice vote 5:0.

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCE 14PLND-0006
Consider a text amendment, to City Code § 6-18-1 Definitions to discuss the zoning definition and land use regulations for Micro-Breweries.

Mr. Latinovic presented the staff report.

Upon a question from Commissioner Ford, Mr. Latinovic explained that the production level of nano-breweries varies from business to business because of their small scale, tendency to experiment with beers and do custom orders. The proposed
business at 825 Chicago Ave anticipates that their production will not exceed 21,000 gallons per year.

Chairman Shure pointed out that Micro-breweries could also have negative effects associated with odor and fumes, but acknowledged that Fire Prevention and Health Department inspect such facilities regularly. It is also important not to keep the timeline for the approval process very long.

Chairman Shure asked for the State of Illinois maximum for Micro-Distilleries, to which Mr. Latinovic explained the limit with the State of Illinois manufacturer’s license is 35,000 gallons.

Upon a question, Mr. Latinovic explained the Liquor license regulates the amount of beer produced in a BrewPub-type of restaurant that can be sold to outside distributors. Per City’s Liquor Code that amount is 50,000 gallons per year.

Upon a question by Commissioner Ford, Commissioner Peters stated the amount produced by a typical brewery like Sam Adams is probably tens of millions of gallons.

Commissioner Peters asked if it made sense to put in the definition that the applicant can ask for the Special Use application while they are waiting for the liquor license from the State and Federal Government.

Mr. Treto added that the City will not issue a Liquor License until the applicant receives the license from the State of Illinois.

Discussion followed.

Upon a question, Mr. Latinovic stated only one application for 825 Chicago Ave has been received, but staff anticipates other micro-breweries could come up in the near future.

Commissioner Lewis asked if staff thought about just amending the Micro-Distillery definition to allow for beer production, to which Mr. Latinovic stated staff did indeed discuss this, but opted not to do that as the intent of the Micro-Distillery regulation is just to allow for alcohol and other sprits which again matches the City’s Liquor Code and State Liquor Code. The proposed Micro-Brewery regulations also match the City’s Liquor Code for craft-breweries.

Upon a question on regulating the alcohol level of the product that is being produced, Commissioner Peters said that is not a land use question. Commissioner Peters also asked if it made sense to also define a typical regional brewery.

Discussion followed on the amount of water usage such facilities generate and how and where they could locate in Evanston.

Commissioner Ford stated he is concerned about adding addition regulations. Mr. Latinovic stated that a regional brewery is currently allowed as a light-manufacturing use such as Temperance Brewery on Dempster St.
Commissioner Lewis stated that the Sam Adams brewery produces 2,500,000 barrels a year.

Commissioner Opdycke stated he is in favor of confining the amendment to the proposal in front of the Commission.

Mr. Latinovic stated any brewery is currently allowed as a light-manufacturing use in the industrial districts.

Commissioner Lewis asked if the proposed use at 825 Chicago Ave is allowed to get commercial access off of the alley, which Mr. Latinovic confirmed.

Discussion followed on the tenants of the building.

There being no further discussion Chairman Shure invited a motion.

Commissioner Peters made a motion to approve the proposed text amendment as presented by staff.

Commissioner Ford seconded the motion.

The motion was approved by voice call: 5-0.

4. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Peters motioned for adjournment and Commissioner Ford seconded the motion. With all commissioners in favor, the meeting was adjourned at 7:50 pm.

The next meeting of the Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission is scheduled for Wednesday, March 19, 2013 at 7:00pm., in room 2403 of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue.

Respectfully Submitted,
Damir Latinovic
Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Community Development Department
SPECIAL USE
APPLICATION

CASE #:______________________________

1. PROPERTY

Address _________________________________________________________________

Permanent Identification Number(s):

PIN 1: _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ PIN 2: _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______

(Note: An accurate plat of survey for all properties that are subject to this application must be submitted with the application.)

2. APPLICANT

Name: ________________________________

Organization: __________________________

Address: _____________________________________________________________

City, State, Zip: ____________________________

Phone: Work: _______ Home: _______ Cell/Other: _______

Fax: Work: _______ Home: _______

E-mail: ____________________________________________

What is the relationship of the applicant to the property owner?

☐ same ☐ builder/contractor ☐ contract purchaser ☐ potential lessee
☐ architect ☐ attorney ☐ lessee ☐ real estate agent
☐ officer of board of directors ☐ other: ________________________________

3. PROPERTY OWNER (Required if different than applicant. All property owners must be listed and must sign below)

Name(s) or Organization: ________________________________

Address: _____________________________________________________________

City, State, Zip: ____________________________

Phone: Work: _______ Home: _______ Cell/Other: _______

Fax: Work: _______ Home: _______

E-mail: ____________________________________________

"By signing below, I give my permission for the Applicant named above to act as my agent in all matters concerning this application. I understand that the Applicant will be the primary contact for information and decisions during the processing of this application, and I may not be contacted directly by the City of Evanston. I understand as well that I may change the Applicant for this application at any time by contacting the Zoning Office in writing."

Property Owner(s) Signature(s) – REQUIRED

Date ________________

4. SIGNATURE

"I certify that all of the above information and all statements, information and exhibits that I am submitting in conjunction with this application are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge."

Applicant Signature – REQUIRED

Date ________________
SPECIAL USE
APPLICATION

CASE #: 420NA - 002

1. PROPERTY

Address: 825 CHICAGO AVE, SUITE #1R

Permanent Identification Number(s):

PIN 1: [11-19]-[401-0]-[19]-[0]-[0]-[0]-[0]

(Note: An accurate plat of survey for all properties that are subject to this application must be submitted with the application.)

2. APPLICANT

Name: CESAR AUGUSTO MARRON

Organization:

Address: 1314 WASHINGTON ST

City, State, Zip: EVANSTON, IL, 60202

Phone: Work: 518.698.6969 Home: Cell/Other:

Fax: Work: Home:

E-mail: cmarron@gmail.com

What is the relationship of the applicant to the property owner?

☐ same ☐ builder/contractor ☐ contract purchaser ☐ potential lessee

☐ architect ☐ attorney ☐ lessee ☐ real estate agent

☐ officer of board of directors ☐ other:

3. PROPERTY OWNER (Required if different than applicant. All property owners must be listed and must sign below.)

Name(s) or Organization: CHARLES HANG

Address: 820 DAVIS ST.

City, State, Zip: EVANSTON, IL, 60201

Phone: Work: 847.727.5346 Home: Cell/Other:

Fax: Work: Home:

E-mail: cchapp329@gmail.com

"By signing below, I give my permission for the Applicant named above to act as my agent in all matters concerning this application. I understand that the Applicant will be the primary contact for information and decisions during the processing of this application, and I may not be contacted directly by the City of Evanston. I understand as well that I may change the Applicant for this application at any time by contacting the Zoning Office in writing."

Property Owner(s) Signature(s) -- REQUIRED

Date: 1/10/2014

4. SIGNATURE

"I certify that all of the above information and all statements, information and exhibits that I am submitting in conjunction with this application are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge."

Applicant Signature -- REQUIRED

Date: 1/10/2014
5. REQUIRED DOCUMENTS AND MATERIALS

The following are required to be submitted with this application:

- [x] (This) Completed and Signed Application Form
- [x] Plat of Survey
  Date of Survey: ____________________________
- [x] Project Site Plan
  Date of Drawings: 1/9/2014
- [ ] Plan or Graphic Drawings of Proposal (If needed, see notes)
- [ ] Non-Compliant Zoning Analysis
- [x] Proof of Ownership
  Document Submitted: ____________________________
- [x] Application Fee
  Amount $703.16  Transcript Deposit Fee $150

Notes: Incomplete applications will not be accepted. Although some of these materials may be on file with another City application, individual City applications must be complete with their own required documents.

Plat of Survey
(1) One copy of plat of survey, drawn to scale, that accurately reflects current conditions.

Site Plan
(1) One copy of site plan or floor plans, drawn to scale, showing all dimensions.

Plan or Graphic Drawings of Proposal
A Special Use application requires graphic representations for any elevated proposal— garages, home additions, roofed porches, etc. Applications for a/c units, driveways, concrete walks do not need graphic drawings; their proposed locations on the submitted site plan will suffice.

Proof of Ownership
Accepted documents for Proof of Ownership include: a deed, mortgage, contract to purchase, closing documents (price may be blacked out on submitted documents).
- Tax bill will not be accepted as Proof of Ownership.

Non-Compliant Zoning Analysis
This document informed you that the proposed change of use is non-compliant with the Zoning Code and requires a variance.

Application Fee & Transcript Deposit
The application fee depends on your zoning district (see zoning fees). Acceptable forms of payment are: Cash, Check, or Credit Card. The $150 transcript deposit is applied to the cost of a court reporter. The City hires a court reporter to transcribe the Zoning Board of Appeals hearing- as specified in the Zoning Board of Appeals' Rules of Procedures. Applicants are responsible for the cost of the hearing transcript at a rate of $7.50 per page. (The $150 deposit is applied to that fee; final fees may result in a refund or additional charges). The final fee directly covers the cost of the court reporter.
6. PROPOSED PROJECT

A. Briefly describe the proposed Special Use:

SEE ATTACHED DOCUMENT "COMMON CULTURE NANOBREWERY"

APPLICANT QUESTIONS

a) Is the requested special use one of the special uses specifically listed in the Zoning Ordinance? What section of the Zoning Ordinance lists your proposed use as an allowed special use in the zoning district in which the subject property lies? (See Zoning Analysis Review Sheet)

YES 6-10-3-3. MICRO-DISTILLERY IS A VERY SIMILAR BUSINESS IN OPERATION, EXCEPT FOR DISTILLING, WHICH IS SPECIFIC TO A DISTILLERY.

b) Will the requested special use interfere with or diminish the value of property in the neighborhood? Will it cause a negative cumulative effect on the neighborhood?

NO, IT WILL MAKE THE AREA MORE ATTRACTIVE BY INTRODUCING A NEIGHBORHOOD BREWERY, MUCH LIKE A BAKERY WOULD.

c) Will the requested special use be adequately served by public facilities and services?

YES
d) Will the requested special use cause undue traffic congestion?

NO. THE LOCATION IS WELL SERVICED BY PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING ON CHICAGO AND MAIN STREETS.

---

e) Will the requested special use preserve significant historical and architectural resources?

YES. NO CHANGES WILL BE MADE TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE BUILDING.

---

f) Will the requested special use preserve significant natural and environmental features?

YES. NO CHANGES WILL BE NECESSARY TO NATURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL FEATURES.

---

g) Will the requested special use comply with all other applicable regulations of the district in which it is located and other applicable ordinances, except to the extent such regulations have been modified through the planned development process or the grant of a variation?

YES.
The Evanston City Code, Title 1, Chapter 18, requires any persons or entities who request the City Council to grant zoning amendments, variations, or special uses, including planned developments, to make the following disclosures of information. The applicant is responsible for keeping the disclosure information current until the City Council has taken action on the application. For all hearings, this information is used to avoid conflicts of interest on the part of decision-makers.

1. If applicant is an agent or designee, list the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of the proposed user of the land for which this application for zoning relief is made: Does not apply.

2. If a person or organization owns or controls the proposed land user, list the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of person or entity having constructive control of the proposed land user. Same as number _____ above, or indicated below. (An example of this situation is if the land user is a division or subsidiary of another person or organization.)

3. List the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of person or entity holding title to the subject property. Same as number _____ above, or indicated below.

4. List the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of person or entity having constructive control of the subject property. Same as number _____ above, or indicated below.
If Applicant or Proposed Land User is a Corporation

Any corporation required by law to file a statement with any other governmental agency providing substantially the information required below may submit a copy of this statement in lieu of completing a and b below.

a. Names and addresses of all officers and directors.
   Cesar Marron, Owner/Principal Officer
   1314 Washington st, Evanston IL 60202

b. Names, addresses, and percentage of interest of all shareholders. If there are fewer than 33 shareholders, or shareholders holding 3% or more of the ownership interest in the corporation or if there are more than 33 shareholders.
   Cesar Marron, Owner/Principal Officer 100% of Shares
   1314 Washington st, Evanston IL 60202

If Applicant or Proposed Land User is not a Corporation

Name, address, percentage of interest, and relationship to applicant, of each partner, associate, person holding a beneficial interest, or other person having an interest in the entity applying, or in whose interest one is applying, for the zoning relief.
A. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. What projects are eligible for a Special Use Permit?
Projects are eligible per zoning District. Please check the Zoning District to see if your proposed project is listed as a permitted Special Use per zoning District. The Allowed Uses by Zoning District handout is also another way to access information to see if your project is eligible to apply.

2. Who can submit an application?
The applicant must either own, lease, or have legal or equitable interest in the subject property, or must be the representative of such a person. All persons or parties which have an ownership interest in the affected properties must be identified and must sign the application. The Property Owner(s) may, at their discretion, designate another person as Applicant to act on their behalf in processing this application. In that case, the designated Applicant will be considered the primary contact, until the application is closed or the Property Owner changes the designated Applicant by contacting the Zoning Office in writing. *Standing* (§6-3-8-4):

3. How do I submit an application?
Applications must be submitted in person to the Zoning Office, City of Evanston, Civic Center Room 3700, 2100 Ridge Avenue. Our office hours are Monday through Friday (excluding Holidays) from 8:30 am until 5:00 pm. Evanston.

Applications must be complete, including all required documentation and fee.
Applications are not accepted by mail or e-mail.
Application materials cannot be returned.

4. What forms of payment are accepted?
Cash, Credit Card, Check.

5. Can I withdraw my application?
Yes, an application may be withdrawn any time prior to a vote.

6. Who has access to my application materials?
The application is a public document, and as such, may be reviewed by the general public upon request.

B. INFORMATION ABOUT SPECIAL USES

What is a Special Use Permit?

For each zoning district, the Zoning Ordinance identifies permitted uses (also called "by right" uses) and special uses which may be allowed depending upon the circumstances. In order to legally operate a special use, a property owner must apply for a Special Use Permit from the Zoning Office. The application is reviewed at a public hearing by the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA), which makes a recommendation to the City Council. The ZBA can also recommend conditions on a granted special use. The City Council is the deciding body for all Special Uses in the City of Evanston.
The Special Use Application Process

- The City reviews the project through a Zoning Analysis (applied for separately) and determines it is eligible to apply for a special use
- The Applicant files a Special Use Application
- The City publishes a notice of the hearing in the Evanston Review, between 15 and 30 days prior to hearing.
- The City posts a sign describing the public hearing on the property no less than 10 working days before the hearing.
- The City must mail notification of the public hearing to all properties that are within 500 feet of any point on the subject property. (The applicant is responsible for the accuracy of the list used by the City for mailing this notice. The applicant can either rely on a list the City produces through its Geographic Information System or produce his or her own list of the names and addresses of property owners within 500 feet of the subject property. The Zoning Office will send to the applicant its generated mailing list. The applicant should inform the Zoning Office if any names and addresses are missing.
- The City encourages all applicants to discuss their proposal with their neighbors prior to the public hearing.
- The Zoning Division will schedule the applicant to meet with the Site Plan & Appearance Review Committee; (SPAARC) which provides a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals.
- The ZBA recommends denial, approval, or approval with conditions of the application to City Council;
- The Planning and Development Committee of the City Council considers the ZBA recommendation and forwards it to the full City Council with or without a recommendation;
- City Council considers the ZBA recommendation and may introduce an ordinance granting the requested zoning relief;
- City Council may adopt an ordinance granting the requested zoning relief at the following or any subsequent City Council meeting.

The approximate time from when the Zoning Office receives a complete application to a decision is three to four months.

To recommend approval for a special use, the ZBA must find that the proposed special use meets all of the following criteria:

a) is one of the listed special uses for the zoning district in which the property lies;
b) complies with the purposes and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance;
c) does not cause a negative cumulative effect in combination with existing special uses or as a category of land use;
d) does not interfere with or diminish the value of property in the neighborhood;
e) is adequately served by public facilities and services;
f) does not cause undue traffic congestion;
g) preserves significant historical and architectural resources;
h) preserves significant natural and environmental resources; and
i) complies with all other applicable regulations.

Expiration

Within one year of obtaining a special use permit, the recipient must either obtain a building permit and commence construction, or obtain a certificate of occupancy and commence the use. City Council may extend this one-year limitation upon request.

CONTACT INFORMATION

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT – ZONING OFFICE

2100 RIDGE AVENUE, ROOM 3700, EVANSTON, ILLINOIS 60201

☎ 847-866-2930  ☎ 847-448-8126  📧 zoning@cityofevanston.org  🌐 www.cityofevanston.org/zoning
Common Culture Nanobrewery - Evanston's first Nanobrewery

Simple, flexible, community based, local.

Definition of Nanobrewery:
TTB(link): “very small brewery operations, are springing up across the country. Nano brewing is a result of the steady appeal for craft-brewed beers and the beneficiary of the growing home brewing movement.” [http://www.ttb.gov/beer/beer-faqs.shtml#b10]

Wikipedia (link): A nanobrewery is type of very small brewery operation, often culturally defined by a less than 4 US beer barrels (470 L) brew system. They are acknowledged by the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau (TTB), and are fully licensed and regulated breweries. Nanobreweries are often on task to grow into microbreweries or brewpubs. There are quite a few breweries and brewpubs that could have been described at one point in their history as nanobreweries, had the term been invented. One example is Dogfish Head, from Milton, Delaware. Sam Calagione started the company as a brewpub on a 10-US-gallon (38 L) Sabco brew system in 1995. As of 2010, it produced 75,000 US beer barrels (8,800,000 L) annually.

A list of nanobreweries is kept current by Hess Brewing Co., a nanobrewery from San Diego, California. As of December 2012, it lists 93 nano breweries operating in the United States and 51 in the planning stage. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Microbrewery#Nanobrewery]

Key distinction from Microbreweries and brewpubs: Nanobrewing is nimble, innovative, fun. The brewers’ small scale affords them an unusual degree of freedom to experiment. Smaller batches mean less risk; a high-concept beer that turns out badly is still a disappointment, but doesn’t blow a hole in a business plan. As a result, nanobreweries create some of the most intriguing and original beers on the market.

Business Purpose:
The idea of a part time nanobrewery started with the love of making truly great tasting, gourmet beers with the flexibility of a low cost, low investment endeavor, as well as a commitment to local production, sustainability, and local community. The scale of a nanobrewery allows for innovative ideas to be tried and marketed at small quantities, including historic recipes, ethnic recipes. The small scale also allows custom brewing for special requests, which is appealing to restaurants, pubs, and for special or private events.

As Evanston’s first nanobrewery, Common Culture will bring to our city the opportunity for anyone to request that something unique be made to order. The focus on historic and non-traditional recipes will also bring education to the community through events, media, discussions and classes and tastings at the brewery. More importantly, locals will be able to share unique recipes while learning about the history of beer.

Likewise, our interest in sustainable production practices and our plan to develop innovative small scale production systems will allow us to partner with other like-minded Evanston
businesses in developing unique opportunities for development and collaboration. Common Culture is a brewery built from homebrewers who naturally innovate every step of the way. Common Culture will create new processes and tools to make this a one of a kind sustainable and eco-friendly brewery.

Like the Farm-to-Table movement, local breweries are first and foremost sustainable by their essential local nature. By producing beer locally, and selling largely to the local residents of a community, much of the carbon-intensive refrigeration and transportation as well as packaging, etc. is avoided completely. Common Culture Brewing will capitalize on this by emphasizing local and direct sales within our community through refillable growler sales directly from the brewery, and keg sale to local restaurants. We would also participate and collaborate with the numerous other Evanston-based profit and non-profit organizations in promoting sustainable living options within our community.

Future Business Development and Growth
The further development of Common Culture would involve growing the brand and eventually expanding, as the market demands grow, with a tap room serving cask conditioned ales:

Phase I will concentrate in opening the brewery and start brewing Common Culture beer along with growler sales and special events once a month.

Phase II will be an expansion of fermenters and the addition of 2 more 7BBL fermenters, doubling brewery capacity.

Phase III will be the build out of a tap room on premise with the expansion of the space in the back of the brewery, which is currently being used as an office.

Business Capital and Brewery Facilities:
The simplicity of this venture lends itself to a fairly modest startup capital requirement. The needs for operation are also quite simple. A 1000 sq ft space will be enough to house:

- the 2 BBL brewhouse
- 2 7BBL fermenters
- 7BBL Brite tank.
- A refrigerated unit to store the finished product in 1/3 barrel kegs, 1/2 barrel kegs.
- A small office
- A sales area for filling growlers, sales transactions, etc.

The space at 825 Chicago has 1800 Sqft of warehouse space that will allow us to expand in the near future.

Brewhouse = $20,000
Brewhouse floor = $1,000*
Kegs and Growlers = $5,000  
Growler Fill Station = $1,000  
Walk-in Cooler = $3,500  
6-month rent: $10,800  
6-month utilities: $1,800**

**Total required: $42,100**

**Business Structure:**
Common Culture will be an S Corporation formed by 2-3 full partners with an equal share of the business, and 2-3 associates and will produce an estimated 21,700 Gallons of beer a year (700 BBL) with the following proposed share of the business:
- 50% Sold to restaurants, Bars, Special Events
- 50% Sold at retail (Growlers, Bombers, kegs)

**Business Location/operations:**
The location of Common Culture is key in creating a community-based business which attracts local people to an area that has many other small businesses. The proposed location is in the back of 825 Chicago St (unit 1R). This location is suitable for a brewery and a small tasting room. Since the brewery will be open limited hours during a few weekdays and Saturday, the public can access the brewery from public transportation (Purple Line/Metra Main st. stations) and via parking on Main and Chicago.

The public will be able to purchase 64oz growlers from the brewery as well as sample the beers in 2 oz samples (3 max per customer). The sale of sealed growlers for consumption off-site is a quick transaction for which customer can be in and out within 10 minutes. Common Culture will bring the city of Evanston a unique business that will promote the city, increase the vitality of the area, and provide citizens with something exciting.

The proposed weekly operations of Common Culture includes:

- **M-W:** Closed to the public. Operations may include cleaning, maintenance and brewing*

- **Th, Fr:** Open to retail 4-8PM (Growler Fills, Tastings, Scheduled demonstrations, Classes**, and other cultural and community-based events)

- **Sat:** Open to retail noon - 8PM (Growler fills, Tastings, Scheduled demonstrations). Brewing* will take place on Saturdays.

- **Sun:** Open to retail noon to 6 (Growler Fills, Tastings, Scheduled demonstrations, and other cultural and community-based events)

*Brewing consists of mashing and cooking the wort, transferring to fermentation tanks and
cleaning. It is a low noise operation, usually likened to making soup in a kitchen. A typical brew day is an 8-12 hour day. **Classes will be offered to teach the public about the history and the process of making beer. Promoting a healthy relationship with the practice of homebrewing and sourcing of local ingredients.**
SUBORDINATION OF LIEN
TRUST DEED to mortgage
or another trust deed
Form 82 R 6/98

This instrument prepared by:

CHICAGO TITLE LAND
TRUST COMPANY

File # 222-012

The above space for Recorders use only

WHEREAS, Leffingwell LLC, an Illinois limited liability company
as mortgagor by trust deed dated January 25, 2006 and recorded in the Recorder's
Office of COOK County, Illinois, on Oct. 24, 2007 as Document 0729733078
did convey unto CHICAGO TITLE LAND TRUST COMPANY, a Corporation of Illinois, as
TRUSTEE certain premises in COOK County, Illinois, described as follows:

(SEE LEGAL DESCRIPTION ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT "A")

to secure a note for Eight Hundred Thousand & 00/100 ($800,000.00) Dollars
with interest payable as therein provided; and

WHEREAS, Leffingwell LLC
as mortgagor by a Document,
as Document number 1200933044
did convey unto North Shore Community Bank
the said premises to secure a note for One Million Five Hundred Thirty Dollars
($1,530,000.00) with interest, payable as therein provided; and

WHEREAS, upon direction of the holder of the note secured by said trust deed, trustee
wishes to subordinate the lien of the trust deed first described to the lien of the instrument
secondly described.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the premises and of the sum of TEN DOLLARS
($10.00) in hand paid, the said CHICAGO TITLE LANDTRUST COMPANY does hereby
covenant and agree with the said Secured Party secondly herein described that the lien of
the note secured by said trust deed first described shall be and remain at all times a sec-
ond lien upon the premises thereby conveyed subject to the lien of the instrument recorded
as document number

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Said CHICAGO TITLE LANDTRUST COMPANY, as Trustee as
aforesaid, has caused these presents to be signed by its Assistant Vice-President, and
attested by its Assistant Secretary, and its corporate seal to be hereto affixed,

SEE BACK

AS RECORDED CONCURRENTLY HEREWIT
**First American Title Insurance Company**  
30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2220 • Chicago, IL 60602

**Borrower's Final Settlement Statement**

**Property:** 825 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, IL 60201  
Lot: 6

**File No:** C-2238621  
**Officer:** Clennie Hernandez/CH  
**New Loan No:** 3380004871-1  
**Settlement Date:** 12/15/2011  
**Disbursement Date:** 12/15/2011  
**Print Date:** 12/15/2011, 11:18 AM

**Buyer:** Leffingwell Building LLC  
**Address:** 825 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, IL 60201  
**Seller:** Refinance  
**Address:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charge Description</th>
<th>Borrower Charge</th>
<th>Borrower Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorney:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney Fee to Larry A. Sultan</td>
<td>10,608.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Loan(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lender: North Shore Community Bank and Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Loan - North Shore Community Bank and Trust</td>
<td>1,530,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax service - North Shore Community Bank and Trust</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood certification - North Shore Community Bank and Trust</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Diligence Searches - North Shore Community Bank and Trust</td>
<td>73.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Adjustment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title/Escrow Charges to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of IL Loan Policy Fee to First American Title Insurance Company</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Lender Escrow Fee to First American Title Insurance Company</td>
<td>700.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Policy-Refinance to First American Title Insurance Company</td>
<td>1,220.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage to First American Title Insurance Company</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub agreement recording</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment of Rents</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash (From)(X To) Borrower</strong></td>
<td>1,517,095.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>1,530,000.00</td>
<td>1,530,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Borrower(S):**

Leffingwell Building LLC

**By:**

[Signature]

By: Charles C. Happe, Guarantor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Principal Loan Amount</td>
<td>$1,530,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>$1,530,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CREDITS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,530,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Fee</td>
<td>$73.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Diligence Searches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Service Fee</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Cert.</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checks to Third Party Vendors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES/DEDUCTIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$193.40</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Disbursed to Title Company:</td>
<td>$1,529,806.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The undersigned hereby authorize and direct you to withhold and/or disburse the following from the proceeds of the above loan.

Borrower: Leffingwell Building, LLC, NY
By: [Signature]

North Shore Community Bank
By: [Signature]

*Funds received prior to closing*
Liquor Code – Selection

Craft Distillery License &
Craft Brewery License
CRAFT DISTILLERY licenses, which shall authorize the on-site production and storage of alcohol in quantities not to exceed thirty thousand (30,000) gallons for one (1) year after the effective date of Ordinance No. 17-O-13 and thirty-five thousand (35,000) gallons thereafter, the sale of such alcohol to persons of at least twenty-one (21) years of age for consumption off-premises, and on-site sampling of such alcohol. Sales of alcohol manufactured outside the facility are prohibited. Such craft distillery licenses shall be issued subject to the following conditions:

1. It shall be unlawful for a class P licensee to sell a container of alcohol for off-premises consumption unless the container is greater than or equal to three hundred seventy-five milliliters (375 ml) in volume.

2. Class P licensees may, during authorized hours of business, offer samples of the alcohol permitted to be produced and sold pursuant to this classification. Licensees shall not provide more than three (3) free samples, each of which shall not exceed one-quarter fluid ounce (0.25 fl. oz.), to any person in a day. Licensees may sell samples, but the volume of any sample sold shall not exceed one fluid ounce (1 fl. oz.) and the total volume of all samples sold to a person in a day shall not exceed two and one-half fluid ounces (2.5 fl. oz.). Licensees shall not provide and/or sell more than two and one-half fluid ounces (2.5 fluid oz.) of samples to any person in a day. Class P licensees must have at least one (1) BASSET-certified site manager on premises whenever offering samples of alcohol. Class P licensees must provide food service when offering samples of alcohol.

3. It shall be unlawful for the holder of a class P license to provide a sample of or sell any alcohol before the hour of 10:00 a.m. or after the hour of 10:00 p.m. on any Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday; before the hour of 10:00 a.m. or after the hour of 11:00 p.m. Friday and Saturday; and before the hour of 12:00 noon and after the hour of 10:00 p.m. on Sunday.

4. Every class P licensee must have a valid craft distillery license from the state of Illinois.

5. Every employee of a class P licensee who participates in the production of alcohol, pursuant to this license class, must be BASSET-certified.

The annual single payment fee for initial issuance or renewal of such license shall be $1,800.00.

The total fee required hereunder for renewal applicants electing to make semiannual payments, payable pursuant to the provisions of Section 3-4-7 of this Chapter, shall be $1,890.00.

No more than one (1) such license shall be in force at any one (1) time.

(P-1) CRAFT BREWERY license, shall authorize the onsite production and storage of beer in quantities not to exceed nine hundred thirty thousand (930,000) gallons (or 30,000 barrels) per year, the sale of such beer for consumption off-premises and onsite sampling and consumption of such beer by persons of at least twenty-one (21) years of age. Sale of beer manufactured outside the facility is prohibited. Such craft brewery licenses shall be issued subject to the following conditions:

1. It shall be unlawful for a class P-1 licensee to sell a single container of beer for off-premises consumption unless the volume of the container is greater than forty (40) ounces or 1.18 liters.

2. During authorized hours of business, class P-1 licensees may offer for onsite consumption samples of beer permitted to be produced and sold pursuant to this
classification. Licensees shall not provide more than three (3) free samples, each of which shall not exceed two (2) fluid ounces, to any person in a day. Licensees may sell for onsite consumption samples of the beer permitted to be produced and sold pursuant to this classification, provided the total quantity of the sampling package, regardless of the number of containers in which the beer is being served, does not exceed sixteen (16) fluid ounces.

3. Class P-1 licensees must have at least one (1) BASSET-certified site manager on-premises whenever beer is available for onsite consumption. Class P-1 licensees must provide food service whenever beer is available for onsite consumption.

4. It shall be unlawful for the holder of a class P-1 license to provide a sample of or sell any beer before the hours of 10:00 a.m. or after the hour of 10:00 p.m. on any Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday; before the hour or 10:00 a.m. or after the hour of 11:00 p.m. on any Friday or Saturday; and before the hour of 12:00 p.m. and after the hour of 10:00 p.m. on any Sunday.

5. Every class P-1 licensee must have a valid Class 3 Brewer's License from the State of Illinois.

6. Every employee of a class P-1 licensee who participates in the production and sale of beer, pursuant to this license class, must be BASSET-certified.

The annual single payment fee for initial issuance or renewal of such license shall be one thousand eight hundred dollars ($1,800.00).

The total fee required hereunder for renewal applicants electing to make semiannual payments, payable pursuant to the provisions of Section 3-4-7 of this Chapter, shall be one thousand eight hundred ninety dollars ($1,890.00).

No more than one (1) such license shall be in force at any one (1) time.

(Ord. No. 109-O-12, § 1, 10-22-2012; Ord. No. 65-O-13, § 1, 7-8-2013; Ord. No. 68-O-13, § 1, 7-8-2013)
To: Members of the Plan Commission  
From: Rich Shure  
Re: Water usage during beer brewing operations

One of the issues in reviewing a recent application of a proposed brew pub was their request to brew up to 900,000 plus gallons of beer. I was trying to put that amount into some kind of reference to which we could relate. I have done a bit more research on water usage since then. The numbers I will use are approximate as I have done some rounding off. It is their relationship to each other that is important.

All figures used were taken from the city of Evanston website for the year 2012.

The average daily usage per Evanston resident is 105 gallons of water. The usage was based on a census population of 74,486 equating to 7,800,000/gallons per day or 2.85 billion gallons per year. According to the water department they estimate home usage in Evanston to be 65% of the total usage. The total amount of water pumped and distributed to Skokie and other northwest communities is 14.55 billion gallons.

Full Sail Brewing Company of Wood River, Oregon is a leader in water conservation practices in brewing beer, claiming they have the process down to 3.5 gallons of water needed to brew 1 gallon of beer. The industry average is 6 to 8 gallons. If a brew pub in Evanston were to brew 900,000 gallons of beer annually at the 6 to 8 gallon/one gallon of beer ratio, it would use between 5,400,000 and 7,200,000 gallons of water or .19 to.27 of one percent of Evanston’s annual water usage or .037 to .049 of one percent of the total water pumped for distribution to Evanston and other suburbs.
Zoning Ordinance
Text Amendment

Aquaponics

14PLND-0020
To: Chair and Members of the Plan Commission
From: Mark Muenzer, Director of Community Development
        Damir Latinovic, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Subject: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment
        Aquaponics – 14PLND-0020
Date: March 17, 2014

Summary
Staff recommends adding the zoning land use definition for aquaponics establishments and recommends such establishments be allowed by special use in the B1, B1a, B2, B3, C1, C1a I1, I2, I3, MU, MUE and MXE Districts.

Background
The proposed aquaponics land use regulations were presented to the Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission on April 30, 2012 and May 16, 2012. On May 16, 2012 the Zoning Committee made a positive recommendation to the Plan Commission to establish a land use definition for the aquaponics and allow it as a special use in all B, C, I and M districts. The Plan Commission considered the proposed text amendment on July 11, 2012. Upon review, the Plan Commission agreed with the findings of the Zoning Committee and forwarded a positive recommendation for the text amendment to the City Council.

Since then, due to the priority of other projects and lack of any proposals for aquaponics establishments in the City, the proposed text amendment was never presented to the City Council. Because the official recommendation by the Plan Commission took place approximately 20 months ago, City’s legal counsel recommended presenting the proposed text amendment again to the Plan Commission before the proposal is introduced to the City Council.

Staff has not made any changes to the proposal since it was last heard by the Plan Commission.

Proposal Summary
Aquaponics is the symbiotic propagation of plants and fish in an indoor or outdoor recirculating environment that results in the harvest of said plants or fish. More simply, plants that are edible or may cultivate produce are grown, and the waste materials produced by the plants are sent to tanks that harvest fish that may also be edible. The
fish waste is then sent back to the plants and serves as nutrients to the plants. In essence, both the plants and fish feed off of each other and create a symbiotic relationship that cultivates a highly sustainable, often organic, clean product available for consumption. Many types of aquaponics setups are available and profitable, and include indoor systems that can locate in vacant warehouse buildings, as well as outdoor systems that can be open to the sky or include hoop-houses. (Images attached provide clarification on the varying types of aquaponics)

Currently, aquaponics is not a specifically regulated land use, and would therefore fall under the same regulations as livestock or agriculture, which are not permitted as primary uses within the city. An aquaponic system however is permitted as an accessory use in residential and nonresidential districts.

In the past, City staff has received inquiries from potential aquaponics businesses that would like to locate in Evanston. Because of the multitude of variables aquaponics establishments may have, approval of such businesses on a case by case, site specific basis is needed. This can be done adequately through the special use process in the B, C, I, and M Districts. As such, the aquaponics establishments can be given consideration based on the type of system, indoor or outdoor use, proximity to neighboring businesses or residences, and whether or not they are a compatible use in the proposed area. The special use process also allows the City to condition any special use permit to eliminate potential nuisance issues that may arise. Staff believes aquaponics establishments are not seen as compatible uses in the D, RP, or O1 Districts.

**Proposed Land Use Regulations**
Staff proposes the following land use definition:

**Aquaponics:** the symbiotic propagation of plants and fish in an indoor or outdoor recirculating environment that results in the harvest of said plants or fish.

The proposed land use regulations are summarized in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Regulations</th>
<th>Proposed Regulations</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquaponics</td>
<td>Special Use in B1, B1a, B2, B3, C1, C1a, C2, I1, I2, I3, MU, MUE, MXE.</td>
<td>Special Use required only when aquaponics is the primary use. Aquaponics is currently allowed in any district when deemed accessory use to an allowed primary use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City's Health Department does not intend to create specific regulations for aquaponics establishments. The Illinois Department of Public Health will be involved with aquaponics operations if an establishment processes the fish on site, or if any produce is processed or packaged on site. The Food and Drug Administration and Illinois Department of Natural Resources have regulations that all aquaponics establishments must follow as well.
Regulations in other Municipalities
Other municipalities, including the City of Chicago and City of Milwaukee, have zoning regulations in place for aquaponics. Chicago regulates aquaponics under the classification of ‘Urban Farms’ which are permitted uses in some B Districts, on rooftops of all D Districts, and indoors or on rooftops in manufacturing districts. Aquaponics establishments are also allowed in Chicago by special use in all C Districts. There are currently multiple aquaponics establishments throughout Chicago, including FarmTower Co. and Growing Power. Milwaukee has allowed aquaponics for nearly five years. The establishments are permitted in all residential and industrial zoning districts, as well as by special use in certain commercial areas. Milwaukee currently does not have any outdoor aquaponics establishments, likely because the climate would prohibit a year round establishment from flourishing. Milwaukee currently has one functioning aquaponics establishment within the city limits, another underway in the permitting process, and one potential user that is in the process of securing a site.

Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan
The use and regulation of aquaponics for sustainable farming of both fish and plants is a green alternative to traditional farming practices. Aquaponics fit well with the Comprehensive Plan and its goals and objectives. From a commercial perspective, aquaponics support the following goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan:

Goal: A clean and attractive environment that preserves natural resources and promotes health and a high quality of life.

Objective: Promote awareness of environmental issues and encourage practices that sustain a healthful environment.

Since most aquaponic fish and vegetables are consumed within a 60 mile radius of where they are harvested, the residents of Evanston stand to benefit from the fresh fish and organic produce. Specific zoning regulations for aquaponics will help Evanston achieve the positive goals and objectives sited in the Comprehensive Plan by encouraging green, sustainable farming techniques that will provide fresh, organic fish and produce to the community, while utilizing existing warehouse and/or industrial sites.

Recommendation
Staff recommends Plan Commission make a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposed land use regulations for aquaponics establishments.

Attachments
Images – Different Types of Aquaponics
Contact List for Existing Aquaponics Establishments
Plan Commission Meeting Minutes 7.11.12
Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission Meeting Minutes 5.16.12
Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission Meeting Minutes 4.30.12
Indoor residential aquaponics – hobby scale, ornamental fish

Outdoor residential aquaponics – pond and small garden scale

Aquaponics as a landscaping feature

Example of the floating island system with plant roots used in many aquaponic systems
Commercial greenhouse aquaponic system with floating islands

Indoor commercial scale aquaponic system with floating islands

Outdoor commercial aquaponic system with separated fish and plants – water is transported back and forth between the two

Indoor commercial aquaponic system
Existing Aquaponics Establishments in the Region

**Growing Power**
5500 W. Silver Spring Drive, Milwaukee, WI 53218  
Website: www.growingpower.org  
Contact: staff@growingpower.org  
Tel: 414.527.1546

Chicago Projects Office:  
3333 S. Iron Street, Chicago, IL 60608  
Contact: chicago@growingpower.org  
Tel: 773.376.8882

**FarmTower Co.**
2545 W. Diversey Ave, Chicago, IL 60647  
Website: www.farmtower.co  
Contact: info@farmtower.co  
Tel: 312.469.0239

**Endless Greens**
1013 Darrow Avenue, Evanston, IL 60202 (home business, consultant)  
Website: www.endlessgreens.com  
Contact: Gareth Proctor, gareth@endlessgreens.com  
Tel: 847.890.2885

*Mr. Proctor is interested in bringing commercial aquaponics establishments to the City of Evanston. He has been a wealth of knowledge on the technical aspects of the industry. He welcomes any questions or concerns.*
1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

2. ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT  12PLND-0036
   Consideration of the proposed text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to discuss
   the regulation of aquaponics.

   Melissa Klotz, Zoning Planner, provided a staff report concerning the proposed text
   amendment to the Zoning Ordinance addressing regulations for aquaponics.

   Commissioner Freeman motioned to amend the proposed definition to read:
   “Aquaponics: The symbiotic propagation of plans and fish in an indoor or outdoor
   recirculating environment that may intends result in the harvest of said plants and
   or fish.”

   Commissioner Putta seconded the motion.

   A voice vote was taken, the amendment was approved.

   Commissioner Freeman motioned to approve a favorable recommendation to the City
   Council for the proposed zoning text amendment to provide regulations for Aquaponics

   Commissioner Steele seconded the motion.

   A voice vote was taken, the motion passed unanimously.

3. ADJOURNMENT

   Commissioner Ledesma motioned for adjournment
Commissioner Freeman seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 10:32 P.M.

The next regular Plan Commission meeting is scheduled for **WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 08, 2012** at **7:00PM** in **COUNCIL CHAMBERS** of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.

Respectfully Submitted,
Craig Sklenar, AICP
General Planner, Community and Economic Development Department

The next regular Plan Commission meeting is scheduled for **WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 08, 2012** at **7pm** in **COUNCIL CHAMBERS** of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.
MEETING MINUTES
ZONING COMMITTEE OF THE PLAN COMMISSION
Wednesday, May 16, 2012
7:00 P.M.
Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Council Chambers

Members Present: Dave Galloway, Stuart Opdycke (Assoc.), Patricia Ledesma Liebana, Scott Peters, Richard Shure (Chair), Seth Freeman

Members Absent: Jim Ford

Staff Present: Melissa Klotz, Dennis Marino, Ken Cox

Presiding Member: Richard Shure, Chairman

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

A.) 12PLND-0036 TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCE
   Consideration of the proposed zoning text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance
to discuss the regulation of aquaponics and other similar establishments.

Melissa Klotz explained the proposed ordinance. Committee members agreed that the
proposed zoning districts for the use are fine.

The Committee suggested a separate definition and use regulations for Community
Gardens so that they can be allowed in residential districts.

Commissioner Opdycke suggested placing a special use requirement on aquaponics in
all zoning districts until the City is more comfortable with the use and fully understands
the implications of the use.

Commissioner Ledesma Liebana agreed, and asked whether fish meal would be used,
because fish meal is odoriferous.

Commissioner Ledesma Liebana motioned to refer aquaponics regulations to the Plan
Commission as special uses in all proposed districts. The motion was seconded by
Commissioner Freeman.

Commissioners agreed that the Urban Farm idea is relatively abstract, and more
information must be brought to the Zoning Committee in order to create proper zoning
regulations.

Commissioner Peters motioned to continue the discussion on Community Gardens and
Urban Farms to the July 18, 2012 Zoning Committee meeting. The motion was
seconded by Commissioner Galloway. The motion passed unanimously.
2. **ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Peters motioned to adjourn. Commissioner Galloway seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 9:15 PM.

The next meeting of the Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission will be **Wednesday, July 18, 2012** at 7:00 P.M., in Council Chambers of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue.

Respectfully Submitted,
Melissa Klotz
Zoning Planner, Community and Economic Development Department
MEETING MINUTES
ZONING COMMITTEE OF THE PLAN COMMISSION
Monday, April 30, 2012
7:00 P.M.
Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, 2404

Members Present: Scott Peters, Richard Shure (Chair), Jim Ford, Dave Galloway, Stuart Opdycke (Assoc.)

Members Absent: none

Staff Present: Melissa Klotz, Dennis Marino, Ken Cox

Presiding Member: Rich Shure, Chairman

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

A.) 12PLND-0036 TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCE
   Consideration of the proposed zoning text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to discuss the regulation of aquaponics and other similar establishments.

Melissa Klotz, Zoning Planner, provided an explanation of aquaponics and the various types, locations, and sizes aquaponics may take on, as outlined in the packet memo provided to the Committee. Ms. Klotz then asked the Committee for direction on what type of zoning regulation proposal should be brought forward.

The Committee recommended further research be done as to how other communities regulate aquaponics, as well as hydroponics and fish farming. The Illinois and Wisconsin Departments of Natural Resources may have useful information for creating aquaponics regulations.

The Committee suggested zoning regulations that prohibit aquaponics as a primary use in residential districts, allow such use in industrial districts, and require special use approval in the downtown area would be appropriate for further discussion.

Commissioner Peters motioned to continue the consideration of aquaponics zoning regulations to the May 16, 2012 Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission so that more research could be done, and specific zoning district regulations could be brought forth. Commissioner Ford seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

2. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Peters motioned to adjourn. Commissioner Ford seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 8:18 PM.
The next meeting of the Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission will be Wednesday, May 16, 2012 at 7:00 P.M., in Council Chambers of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue.

Respectfully Submitted,
Melissa Klotz
Zoning Planner, Community and Economic Development Department
Main Street Station
Transit Oriented Development Study

14PLND-0021
To: Chair and Members of the Plan Commission
From: Mark Muenzer, Director of Community Development
       Damir Latinovic, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Subject: Main Street Station Transit Oriented Development Study
          14PLND-0025
Date: April 4, 2014

Summary
Staff recommends approval of the Main Street Station Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Study. City partnered with Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) to conduct a planning study focusing on the Main Street Metra and CTA station area enhancements and increase the connectivity between the CTA and Metra stations, Main Street Business District and surrounding neighborhoods. The Study identifies short term and long term improvements to the Metra and CTA stations as well as general improvements to the area around the stations. If adopted, the Main Street Station TOD Study could become an element of the Comprehensive General Plan of the City.

Background
The Main Street CTA/Metra station is one of only three stops in the Chicago area where CTA and Metra stops are in close proximity to each other with ridership transfer opportunity. (Davis Street station in downtown Evanston and downtown Oak Park (Metra)/Harlem Ave (CTA-Green Line) stations are the other two). The current Main Street station ridership numbers are compared to the Davis Street station and the downtown Oak Park stations in the tables below. To put the numbers in perspective, ridership numbers for two of the busiest stations in the system (Fullerton Street CTA station in Chicago and Rt. 59 Metra station in Naperville) are also provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTA Ridership</th>
<th>2012 ridership (average weekday)</th>
<th>2013 ridership (average weekday)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street Station</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>1,201 (+2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Street Station</td>
<td>3,819</td>
<td>3,873 (+1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlem Ave/Green Line</td>
<td>3,708</td>
<td>3,856 (+4.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton Street Station in Chicago</td>
<td>13,190</td>
<td>13,609 (+3.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Metra Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>2002 total average weekday boardings</th>
<th>2006 total average weekday boardings</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Street Station</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>869 (+13%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Street Station</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>1,854 (+28%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Park</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>1,025 (+7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt. 59 (Naperville)</td>
<td>5,001</td>
<td>5,793 (+15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the increased transit ridership numbers and in anticipation of the CTA’s Red and Purple Line Modernization Plan, in February 23, 2013 the City of Evanston entered into an agreement with the RTA and hired Parsons Brinckerhoff, a nationally recognized consulting firm specializing in development of TOD Plans to complete the Main Street Station TOD planning study. The purpose of the study was to identify a unified vision for future transit improvements and make the transit investment an economic development opportunity for the Main Street and Chicago Avenue Business Corridors. Through its Community Program, the RTA provided $100,000 for the study with the City contributing $25,000.

The following are some of the objectives identified at the beginning of the Study:

- Plan for the future redesign/improvement of the CTA Purple Line Main Street Station.
- Identify redevelopment opportunities that can capitalize on the anticipated transit investments in the Main Street Station area.
- Strengthen the Metra/CTA customer transfer opportunity.
- Enhance the multi-modal connectivity of the Main Street Station area; including bicycle, pedestrian, and bus service to the rail stations.
- Identify public open space opportunities in the study area to further enhance the desirability and livability of the neighborhood.
- Study the feasibility of providing for an elevated multi-purpose bicycle and pedestrian path between the Metra and CTA corridors.

### Study Area

The Main Street corridor near the Main Street CTA and Metra stations is well recognized as a local activity center with shopping, service and entertainment destinations. Early in the process, it was identified that the study area should not include properties and areas which are in closer proximity to the Dempster Street and South Boulevard CTA stations. The boundaries needed to encompass the Main Street and Chicago Avenue commercial corridors and surrounding residential areas within a 0.5 mile walking distance to the station. As such, the boundaries of the study area were set as Greenleaf Street to the north, Keeney Street to the south, Michigan Avenue to the east and Ridge Avenue to the west to avoid overlap with 0.5 mile walking radius from the Dempster Street and South Boulevard Stations.

### Public Involvement

The project stakeholders identified include Regional Transportation Authority (RTA), Chicago Transit Authority (CTA), Metropolitan Rail Corporation (METRA) and Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR). Along with City staff, representatives from the agencies comprised a Project Advisory Group and Technical Advisory Group both of which met...
several times through the duration of the project, provided constant feedback and reviewed technical reports and findings.

The project also provided opportunities for general public to get involved and provide feedback throughout the duration of the study. The consultant created a project website (http://www.evanstonmainstreettod.org) to provide information about the project with periodic updates including technical reports, preliminary reports and public meeting announcements. Three public meetings were organized, one at the beginning of the project, one during and one towards the end of the project study.

**Study Recommendations:**

Based on the analysis of the existing conditions, the consultant developed three different concepts for station improvements. Each concept was evaluated by the Technical Advisory Committee and Project Advisory Group and in accordance with CTA and Metra design standards. Additionally, all three concepts were presented to the public for its feedback.

Based on the review comments and public feedback a preferred concept design was selected and evaluated in further detail in the final report. The proposed improvements in the preferred concept design can be categorized into short term and long term projects and could be divided amongst CTA, Metra and the City of Evanston or be implemented through a long term combined effort by all three agencies. While most of the large scale projects identified are direct improvements to the CTA and Metra stations and as such are under CTA and Metra’s jurisdiction, the Study does identify several short term and long term projects the City can implement.

The following are some of the Study recommendations that could be implemented by the City of Evanston:

**Short term projects:**

- Install new unified way-finding signage through the station area and street intersections to direct the public and to clarify the location of station entrances, bicycle parking, bus stops, short-term (kiss-and-ride) parking and Metra parking.
- Install curb bump-outs for bus stops in front of the CTA station on Chicago Avenue.
- Add crosswalks to Chicago Avenue at the intersection with Washington Street with “yield to pedestrians” signage.
- Relocate the northbound bus stop at Chicago Avenue and Main Street from north of the intersection (far side) to the south side of the intersection (near side).
- Increase pedestrian signal timing from five to seven seconds at the intersection of Chicago Avenue and Main Street.
- Install 15 to 22 new bike racks near the station entrances.
- Install east crosswalk at the intersection of Main Street and Custer Avenue and add stop signs to Main Street at the intersection with Custer Avenue.
- Implement TOD parking requirements within study area.
- Implement zoning regulations to encourage retail uses on ground floors within the study area.
Long term projects:
- Install unified streetscape improvements (landscaping, street lighting, banners on light poles) to create a unique identity for the area.
- Construct St. Paul Park Improvements
- Construct the sidewalk along east side of Custer Avenue between Main Street and Chicago Avenue. (This improvement would have to be coordinated with Metra’s reconstruction of the retaining wall embankment on the east side of Custer Street)
- Construct a new landscape plaza with bicycle parking on the north side of the service drive between the CTA and Metra Stations (this improvement would have to be coordinated with both CTA and Metra)
- Implement a parking management plan in the area through public/private partnership

Most of the large scale projects identified are direct improvements needed to the CTA and Metra stations and as such are under CTA and Metra’s jurisdiction. The consultant evaluated the Metra Station to be in fair condition, while the CTA station was identified to be in fair to poor condition. Most of the projects recommended were identified to be in-line with the future federal grant process for the Red and Purple Line Modernization Program by the CTA.

The following are some of the improvement recommendations that could be completed to the CTA and Metra stations and platforms:
- Construct a new stairway at the southeast corner of Main Street and Custer Avenue
- Construct new, tiered seating and new staircase at the northeast corner of Custer Avenue and Washington Street
- Construct a new CTA/Metra walkway connection underneath the CTA embankment.
- Construct the new ADA accessible CTA station entrance building on Chicago Avenue.
- Expand the CTA platform to accommodate eight train cars.
- Reconstruct retaining wall at the northeast corner of Main Street and Custer Avenue

Implementation
The goal of the Main Street Transit Oriented Development Study was to complete an inventory of the existing conditions and engage the City, CTA, Metra, UPPR and RTA in defining a unified vision for future improvements to the stations and the area. While most of the large scale improvements will have to include federal funding grants to be administered by the CTA, RTA or Metra, local initiatives by the City of Evanston will also play an important role. Additionally, collaboration and project prioritization by the agencies will be needed to implement all identified improvements.

The City of Evanston has already started working on implementing some of the recommendations identified in the Study. The Chicago Avenue and Main Street TIF district has been established and is being used to, among other things, potentially fund critical TOD developments such as the construction of the mixed use planned
development at the southeast corner of Chicago Avenue and Main Street. As part of the same project, staff negotiated the developer provide a contribution ($50,000) towards St. Paul Park improvements identified in the Study. Additionally, staff is in the process of proposing a zoning ordinance text amendment that would encourage establishment of retail uses on the ground floors within commercial corridors along Chicago Avenue and Main Street.

The City is also in the process of adopting a new Comprehensive General Plan. Staff anticipates one of the components of the new Plan will be a requirement to make all neighborhood specific plans and area studies (such as the Main Street Station TOD Study) if adopted by the City Council, a part of the Comprehensive Plan. As such, standards for approval of projects within the study area, such as the proposed planned development at the southeast corner of Chicago Avenue and Main Street will include a requirement that they are consistent with the recommendations outlined in the Study. In addition, future Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments relative to bike parking requirements and reduced parking requirements for TOD developments, are also being discussed.

**Recommendation**
Staff recommends Plan Commission make a positive recommendation to the City Council to adopt the proposed Main Street Station Transit Oriented Development Study. The study is consistent with the City’s goal for the Plan Commission to review and adopt neighborhood area plans and studies. The Study will serve as a unified vision for future improvements to the CTA and Metra Stations, and the City’s rights-of-way surrounding the stations. If adopted, the Study could become an element of the Comprehensive General Plan which guides development in all parts of the city and serves to identify capital improvements in the study area.

**Attachments**
Main Street TOD Final Report Link: [http://www.evanstonmainstreettod.org/info_center/default.aspx](http://www.evanstonmainstreettod.org/info_center/default.aspx)
Project Website Link: [http://evanstonmainstreettod.org/](http://evanstonmainstreettod.org/)