Planning & Development Committee Meeting
Minutes of October 22, 2012
City Council Chambers – 7:15 p.m.
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT: J. Fiske, D. Holmes, A. Rainey, D. Wilson, M. Wynne
STAFF PRESENT: G. Chen, K. Cox, S. Griffin, M. Klotz, D. Marino, B. Newman,

PRESIDING OFFICIAL: Ald. Fiske

I. DECLARATION OF QUORUM
A quorum being present, Chair Fiske called the meeting to order at 7:17 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 8, 2012 MEETING MINUTES

Ald. Wynne moved approval of the minutes, seconded by Ald. Holmes.

The minutes of the October 8, 2012 meeting were approved unanimously 5-0.

III. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

(P1) Ordinance 69-O-12 Amending the Zoning Ordinance to Remove the Prohibition on Drive-Through as a Special Use on the Property Located at 2628 Gross Point Road (Chase Bank)

Evanston Plan Commission and staff recommend that the City Council approve Ordinance 69-O-12 to amend the Zoning Ordinance of the Central Street Overlay District (oCSC) Subarea 6, to allow consideration of a Chase Bank drive-through as a special use only on the parcel at 2628 Gross Point Road.

For Introduction

Ald. Rainey moved approval, seconded by Ald. Holmes

Chair Fiske called Dennis Marino, Manager of the Planning & Zoning Division, to the podium.

Mr. Marino explained that Ordinance 69-O-12 amends the original ordinance to address issues of the Central St. overlay and removes the prohibition of a drive through only on one parcel at 2628 Gross Point Road. He explained further that in July, 3 parcels had been proposed and the current proposal only includes the parcel at 2628 Gross Point Road. Passing of this Ordinance will enable the applicant to proceed with an application for a special use on the site. He added that rezoning to R2 to the west of the parcel is not part of this Ordinance and is no longer under consideration. He presented a site plan of the proposed development which has been revised. He said the proposed Ordinance 69-O-12 only removes the prohibition of a drive-through. If approved, a notice of a public hearing before the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) would follow, after which the ZBA would send its recommendation of the revised proposed development to City Council.
The last time this ordinance was before the Committee, there was a companion ordinance for introduction which was to rezone the R2 parcel to the west and that is not part of this. Instead what is being proposed for a development is a different concept that was described in the meeting materials and is shown on the screen. Ordinance 69-O-12 only refers to the removal of a prohibition of a drive-through on the site and will allow the special use process to begin. He concluded that ultimately any special use application will come back to the Planning & Development Committee with a recommendation for or against from the ZBA and would be considered in final form by the City Council. He introduced Richard Sapkin, the developer and property owner.

Ald. Rainey commented for clarification that this Ordinance only pertains to removing the restriction of a drive-through on this parcel and that if the bank moves away, there could be a drive through for another business on this parcel.

Chair Fiske asked the public who wished to speak to the podium.

Josh Huppert of 2630 Crawford, and across the street from 2628 Gross Point Road and 2635 Crawford, said the developer has the same plan that was discussed in July and the Committee appeared clear at that time that they want the development to stay within the business district, which is the lot at 2628 Gross Point and it not use the alley or any of the residential district. In the proposed plan, the bank uses the alley for part of the bank and part of the residential district as a parking lot. They are calling it a municipal parking lot, leased to a bank but it would be a bank parking lot in a residential area. He said if the plan is not up for consideration then there is no reason to make a text amendment. He noted that prohibition on drive-throughs was part of the Central Street Master Plan, which is just a few years old and a great deal of work that went into it. If there was a prohibition of drive-throughs, there must have been a good reason, and no good reason has been presented to change it and the lot could be used without a text amendment. He said it seems dishonest and sneaky to pretend it is not a bank parking lot when it is a bank parking lot and to pretend that they’re leaving the alley, when they’re actually taking it over. He said 40 years ago there was a proposal to tear his house down and build a parking lot that would have been an accessory use to the business across the alley and City Council said no because it was in a residential district, and that is exactly what this bank is trying to do. He concluded, if this plan is approved, when he looks out his front window the entire width of everything across the street from him would be a drive-way for a bank. Chair Fiske thanked him.

Megan Lutz of 2637 Crawford, next door to the residential property that is proposed to be used for the bank parking lot, said spoke against rezoning of that property for business use at the July P&D and despite this Committee’s strong recommendation that the developers return with a plan that does not cross the alley to use a residential lot, the current proposal still involves putting a parking lot on that residential property. She said because the proposed Ordinance to lift the drive-through prohibition will allow the bank to propose a plan that encroaches on the adjacent residential property, she urged the Committee to recommend denial of the request until they have an acceptable plan. She reminded the Committee that a petition with 157 signatures was submitted from neighbors who were against the original plan that had a parking lot and drive-through on the residential lot. She noted that the difference in the new plan is a technical one. It still
involves using the residential property for the parking lot but by moving the drive-through to the business district and donating the parcel to the City, it means re-zoning is not required, which also voids the neighbors’ petition for re-zoning that required super-majority to approve. She said if the original plan which all of these people opposed were placed beside the new plan, you could not possibly come to the conclusion that the new plan satisfies the concerns of these neighbors. She said she has heard that the Alderman has said that the new plan has the support of the neighborhood, however most of the neighborhood just found out about this proposed Ordinance on Friday and a month ago, the Alderman met with a few adjacent neighbors to show them the plan and they all had concerns about it. At that time, he asked her not to share the plans with anyone until he had the opportunity to talk to some other people, so she requested that he inform the Hillside area neighborhood if this were to proceed. There was no information sent until Friday, when he had a brief mention of this hearing in the ward newsletter. She noted that his failure to engage with residents or to provide information on this issue stands in stark contrast to the McDonald’s proposal in their neighborhood. Ald. Tendam made an appeal via the Hillside Neighbors’ online forum, encouraging residents to write him with their opposition to the McDonald’s project and has been providing updates on meetings and information on a regular basis for that issue. Since Friday there have been several emails on their neighborhood’s forum from people who feel blind sighted and are upset that Ald. Tendam is not responding to their emails or answering their questions about the Chase project. Several neighbors stated that they could not be there on such short notice but oppose the current proposal and she reminded the Committee that last time there was a large number of neighbors in attendance. She concluded that new Chase proposal is no different for those who signed the petition and no different in principal from the one the Committee dismissed in July, so they asked that the Committee to support their neighborhood by recommending that the City Council deny this request until there is an appropriate plan. Chair Fiske thanked her.

Sigrid Pilgrim of 2750 Bernard Place just north of the Hillside Church, since 1983, asked for clarification of the drawings of the new plan, one which shows entry on Crawford and exit on Gross Point; the other showing the opposite entry and exit. She distributed copies of her emails to the Committee and to Ald. Tendam and said he has not replied. She said she is opposed to the plan and read an email sent by Elizabeth Hubbard, who has 2 children 12 and 9 years old, addressing the exit onto Gross Point. The email stated that she is concerned about the plan because her children walk across the street at this intersection and it is dangerous for pedestrians. Ms. Hubbard said she appreciates the need for tax revenue, but a bank with drive-through lanes would make the traffic worse and even more unsafe. She suggested recruiting another gas station there which she could use, instead of a bank, of which there are many.

Christine Sammel of 3614 Hillside since 1992, said she was there for the 4th time speaking against the unwise and unwanted excess development of the corner of Gross Point Rd. and Crawford. She reiterated that she and her neighbors were informed on Friday of the meeting, giving them little time to organize their opposition and that there had also been no public meetings on the new plan. She said the agenda does not mention that under the plan, a residential lot will be used for commercial purposes; it only refers to lifting restrictions on drive-throughs. She explained that in the current plan,
Edgemark proposes to deed the residential lot to the City and use it for bank parking and asked whether that removes discussion of the residential lot from debate. She said she is opposition to the plan. She reminded the Committee that the developer and bank were told by the P&D Committee on July 23rd that the plan they presented was too large, required the unnecessary vacation of an alley, the use of a residential lot and generally went far beyond the outlines of the Central Street Master Plan. Now, she said, in a legal slight of hand, the same plan is being presented but the components are shuffled around. The old plan had the bank and the parking lot on the Citgo lot and drive-through on the adjacent residential lot. The new plan has the bank and drive-throughs on the Citgo lot and parking on the adjacent residential lot. Either way, the alley gets jumped and residential lot is not residential any more, no matter how it is labeled by Edgemark and Chase. It doesn’t matter who holds the title. She said she is astounded that this plan was even presented and that the Central St. Master Plan shows the alley as a buffer between commercial and residential and no encroachment on 2 residential lots. She urged the Committee to not approve the zoning change and to tell Edgemark that we do not appreciate legal manipulation in an attempt to get their way. Chair Fiske thanked her.

Courtenay Wood of 3306 Hartzell, 3 houses away from the site since 1987, said she found out about the proposal from this morning’s email alert from EvanstonNow and she was shocked that there was no notice to the neighbors and she also did not know that some of the neighbors had been briefed. Since she lives within 500’, she has always gotten noticed. She reminded the Committee that on July 23rd, the conclusion was that in Evanston an alley is a buffer between residential and commercial properties and that the proposal to put the alley, a parking lot and a drive-through is a farce. She said the other conclusion of the July 23rd meeting was that this neighborhood overwhelmingly is residential and focused on preserving its residential nature and increased traffic is an issue for it and asked why there is a bank drive-through being proposed in the internet banking era and by taking the R2 lot and putting it to commercial use is rewarding the bad behavior of the owner who tore down the house to sell it to a developer for commercial purposes.

Carl Bova of 1322 Rosalie St. said this is a thinly veiled conversion of R2 for commercial use. The clear message on July 23rd was that the Committee requested a considerably different plan evolve that stays within the confines of the Citgo site and this does not. He said he doesn’t know how staff agreed to go forward with this plan which does not follow with the dictum of the Committee and he is ashamed of it. He asked for clarification on which ingress and egress direction is in the current plan, since there were 2 included in the materials. He noted that only half at most is needed of the 35’ driveway for a one-way drive going out and suggested using the space for green space including the area that is paralleling Sarkis’ side wall. He said he sees no need for the 3-4 drive-through stalls and that 2 might be sufficient, leaving extra space in which angled parking could easily fit. He suggested, considering that many developments on Central St. have underground parking, this could also easily be done because the grade drops down towards the rear of the lot. It would involve more work but would follow the direction made by the Committee in July. Chair Fiske thanked him.
Jean Lindwall of 625 Library Place said the Central St. Plan which cost the City a great deal of money and many meetings, consultant time, resident time and was a very thoughtful process, came up with this prohibition in order to make this neighborhood more walkable and safer for pedestrians and asked why throw out a plan that the City spent a lot of time and money creating and adopting. She said she believes it is an affront to the people that were involved in that planning process and whether the citizens can rely on the plans that have been developed for any part of town and that the Committee should think long and hard before changing it. She said she does not believe the developer has demonstrated a need for this change and hopes the Committee will not approve it. Chair Fiske thanked her.

Mr. Marino clarified that the current proposal would have the drive-through traffic exit at Gross Point Rd. and that the other site plan in the packet was from the previous proposal.

Ald. Wilson said he appreciates all the correspondence they have received and in reviewing it he was struck by the fact that some people would rather have a gas station at the site because he would not want a gas station there instead of a bank. He appealed to the public that in trying to balance what could go there and what is proposed, it is not perfect but it is a bit of a compromise and added that underground parking may be too costly. He said he is inclined to make this change and see what comes of the process and as Ald. Rainey pointed out, this is the first step.

Ald. Holmes said she also appreciates the input from the community. She said she is relying on the fact that it would be a special use which means there would be a hearing and all the input from the residents would be considered and she is comfortable with that.

Chair Fiske said that as she had said in the July meeting, she considers alleys to be almost sacred especially in Evanston, where there are many commercial districts abutting residential districts. She said in areas closer to her ward, for example, on Chicago Avenue, she wondered if the City would jump over the alley if Trader Joe’s or Whole Foods needed more parking and someone on the west side of Hinman decided to sell their house and make it available for a parking lot. She said there was an issue like that in the 1st ward and that she argued against it before she was an alderman. She said she sees Evanston as an urban community where zoning districts come together in very meaningful ways and many residents stay here for many years, reliant on a zoning code that assures that they live in a residential area, and that the Central Street Plan gives them additional security that their area would remain a little bit more residential that it had in the past. From a neighborhood point of view, she feels that alleys, no matter how wide or narrow, still provide a level of security to the residents in an area and she is very much in support of them. She also thinks that changing the zoning ordinance in a text amendment for one specific parcel of property is a bad precedent.

Ald. Wynne said she has some reservations as well for the same reasons as Ald. Fiske’s, the newness of the plan and making a text amendment. She said her ward has lots of residential property that is buffered by an alley and she appreciates the value of the alley. She said she would vote to introduce it but she is not certain she can support it
ultimately. There must be much more discussion to convince her that this is an appropriate thing to do after the Central Street Plan, which was carefully studied and involved many public meetings. She is concerned that the City would so rapidly make a change for a drive-through.

Ald. Rainey clarified to the public about the timing, that the Committee does not see the information that is going to be on their agendas, especially introductions, until late on Thursday or if they are at meetings, not even until Saturday or Sunday. She said she sides with Ald. Wynne because they will have two weeks to examine it and she was concerned also about one location being singled out. She does not want to support spot zoning either but she could be convinced that there is a reason for it in this one case, so she is going to vote to introduce it and she is going to talk to Ald. Tendam. She said she has read the residents’ emails.

The Committee voted by majority 4-1 with Chair Fiske opposed to recommend introducing Ordinance 69-O-12 as amended.

Chair Fiske said hopefully there will be a meeting with the residents and Alderman Tendam before the next time it is before the Committee and they will have the information they need to make a decision.

(P2) Ordinance 119-O-12 Amending the approved Planned Development at 635 Chicago Avenue (Walgreens)

City staff recommends the adoption of Ordinance 119-O-12, amending the Planned Development as granted in Ordinance 36-O-12 adopted May 14, 2012 by the Evanston City Council for the development of a new Walgreens at 635 Chicago Avenue.

For Introduction


Ald. Rainey said she is envious of Ald. Wynne for having this in her ward and that it is the most amazing alteration to the original proposal.

Ald. Wynne thanked Ald. Rainey and said she would like to say it was through her own enormous persuasive powers but it was really from the good grace of Walgreens. She asked that Walgreens’ representatives speak and she said at the meeting at which she learned of the changes, one of Walgreens’ engineers commented that they had insisted that it be in Evanston. When Walgreens spoke before the Environment Board she asked them to elaborate on that and they said it just had to be in Evanston because of Evanston’s reputation. She added that it really is for everyone in Evanston.

Mr. Marino showed slides of the new Walgreens site plan showing the location of the wind turbines and the solar collectors on the roof and the increase in the amount of glass. He introduced Dan Garneaux, Project Manager from Walgreens. Mr. Garneaux said, as Ald. Wynne was kind enough to mention, they had their choice of many locations across the country for this type of project and they did specifically choose to bring it to Evanston because they needed a community that was cooperative with this
type of progressive, cutting edge architecture and design. He explained that they are going to try to do some things that have never been done before, specifically generating their own energy and reducing the amount of energy they use. He thanked the Committee for having them and said they are very excited about the project.

Chair Fiske clarified that the wind turbines are cylindrical and they generate approximately 6,000 to 8,000 kilowatt hours per turbine or 12,000 to 14,000 kilowatt hours.

Ald. Rainey mentioned that at the Dodge and Main Walgreens she discovered electric vehicle charging stations in the Walgreens parking lot. Mr. Garneaux said they will be in many more Walgreens parking lots and there will be some at the new Walgreens on Chicago. Ald. Rainey said people should be notified of this because it is so innovative.

Ald. Wynne said, to Ald. Rainey’s point, when she met with the developer of Walgreens, that the City would publicize the charging stations. They are anticipating that this store will be a stopover place for people from all over the country and they will be giving tours. All the employees will be trained to explain how the energy is being generated and used and the features of the store. Catherine Hurley and City staff have discussed how they can participate in letting people know.

The Committee voted unanimously 5-0 to introduce Ordinance 119-O-12.

(P3) Ordinance 120-O-12, Granting a Special Use for Northwestern University Scoreboards at 2250 Sheridan Road
Zoning Board of Appeals, Sign Review and Appeals Board, and City staff recommend the adoption of Ordinance 120-O-12 granting a special use permit for scoreboards at 2250 Sheridan Road. The applicant has complied with all zoning requirements and meets all of the standards of a Special Use for the T2 District.

For Introduction

Ald. Rainey moved approval, seconded by Ald. Holmes

Chair Fiske said the scoreboards are in her ward and they have worked with Northwestern and have come up with a compromise that is satisfactory to the neighbors and the university and she is happy to say she is in support of it and she thanked the University for understanding the concerns of neighbors. She explained that it is a special use for 7 scoreboards at the University tennis courts. 6 of them will be below the 12’ high fence and one will be approximately 19’ high. The University’s landscapers have devised a way of screening the back of the scoreboard from the residential area with an evergreen type of ivy and the neighbors are very pleased. She encouraged the Committee to support it.

Ald. Rainey said it was an extremely sensitive proposal and wondered how anyone could be opposed to it and then she realized there must have been a great deal of discussion to come up with it and that it is a perfect proposal. She said she was glad to hear that Ald. Fiske was involved and she had thought so.
The Committee voted unanimously 5-0 to recommend introduction to Ordinance 120-O-12.

(P4) Ordinance 121-O-12, Granting a Special Use for a Type 2 Restaurant at 843 Dodge Avenue (The Famous Burrito)
Zoning Board of Appeals and City staff recommend the adoption of Ordinance 121-O-12 granting a special use permit for the operation of a Type 2 Restaurant at 843 Dodge Avenue. The applicant has complied with all zoning requirements and meets all of the standards of a Special Use for the C1 District. The applicant plans to open The Famous Burrito, an owner-operated eat-in and takeout restaurant on the southeast corner of Dodge Avenue and Main Street.

**For Introduction**

Ald. Holmes moved to introduce Ordinance 121-O-12, seconded by Ald. Rainey.

The Committee voted unanimously 5-0 to recommend introduction of Ordinance 121-O-12.

Ald. Rainey asked about the amendment to the language change in Ordinance 72-O-12 to clarify that existing structures are grandfathered in and included in structures that can be rebuilt if they are destroyed by natural causes without a letter from the Zoning Administrator. Mr. Griffin said the language was changed and the item is on the City Council agenda for action. Mr. Griffin said he would bring the language to Ald. Rainey at discussion.

**IV. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**
- There were no items for discussion.

**V. COMMUNICATIONS**
- There were no communications.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**
- The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Bobbie Newman