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Transcribed Report of Proceedings of a Plan Commissioner Meeting, held October 14, 2009, at the Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Council Chambers, Evanston, Illinois, at 7:00 p.m. and presided over by Mr. Opdycke, Chair.
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D. GALLOWAY
J. NYDEN
C. STALEY
S. FREEMAN

STAFF:
C. SKLENAR, Planner
D. ARGUMEDO, Zoning Administrator
CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. The meeting is called to order. We do in fact have a quorum. I was expecting to introduce Lenny --

MR. SKLENAR: He had a previous speaking engagement before he got assigned night -- so he'll be here November --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: What does he do that he had a speaking engagement?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: He's an attorney. He has Zoning -- Smith, Matthews.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: The second item on the agenda is approval of the September 9th meeting minutes. Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I have an issue with the --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Staley.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Yes, thank you. Under Item 3 here. This may be what I said, but it's not what I intended, as someone once said. But I said obviously something here. It says, Mr. Staley stated that while changing it just for the purpose of the pending case, and then, that this use should be removed. I think what I said was something to the effect, might be questionable, changing it just for the purpose of the
pending case might be wrong or might be questionable. I must have said something, because it makes no sense, to go on with just that this use. I can't remember.

MR. SKLENAR: I was paraphrasing from transcripts.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Well, but there has to be something in there, because this doesn't, and this particular thing will probably be looked at by the courts at some point, this year. So, maybe they'll go back to the transcripts, but I want something in there indicating that I think what I meant was that, because I had some question about just removing this for the purposes of litigation. But in my own feeling was that when I reviewed it, I didn't think it fit in there, and so I was perfectly happy for ruling to go along with it. So, what I would suggest is inserting after pending case, might be questionable, the words might be questionable.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Did I say, I got to go back and look, but I read it already once. I don't think I did say just to make this case better. I think I was concerned that by doing this, it could be implied that way.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Craig, let me suggest you
do this, that you go back, review the transcript and
amend this so it accurately reflects what in fact was
said.

MR. SKLENAR: I will, verbatim.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All right. That will be
what we suspect what Mr. Staley said --

Any other questions on the minutes? Any
comments? Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I move we accept the
many amendments in the way that they're going to be
amended.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Can we continue the
minutes?

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I move to continue the
approval of the minutes from September 9th to our
November meeting.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: With the amendments that
we've already talked about.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: With the amendments.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Second.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Those in favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)
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1 CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Opposed?
2 (No response.)
3 CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Motion carries. Thank you.
4 Mr. Court Reporter, is my microphone on?
5 THE COURT REPORTER: No, sir.
6 CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: How about now? Okay.
7 The third item on the agenda is Group D Zoning Update Recommendations.
8 MR. ARGUMEDO: Good evening, members of the Commission. Dominick Argumedo, Zoning Planner filling in for Bill Dunkley, Zoning Administrator, speaking on Group D Zoning Update Recommendations and I believe everybody here is also a member of the Zoning Committee.
9 As you recall, the last item from the group of two items for Item D, one was forwarded from the Zoning Committee to the Plan Commission for recommendation to the plan, for the City Council, and that was to specify standards for authorization of a restoration of a non-complying structure in the case of major damage or destruction, a rebuild letter. Let me just pass out something where we have the correction from the Zoning Committee's recommendations, and I'll just go over those very briefly.
10 COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: What zoning meeting was
this from, if there was one.

MR. ARGUMEDO: Yes, there was, I believe because I just read the transcript.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: There was one last month, but I don't believe --

MR. ARGUMEDO: I believe it was earlier in October, maybe.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I don't think I was at that one.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: No, it was in September.

MR. ARGUMEDO: Okay. I'll go over this one.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: What's the difference between this that you just handed us and the one that we received via the internet?

MR. ARGUMEDO: Probably nothing, but Bill just gave it to me as he left.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: It's a nicer format, it looks like.

MR. SKLENAR I'm sorry, there is a larger description of the proposal and, that you guys wanted, but the rest seems to be --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Say that again, Craig.

MR. SKLENAR: There's an expanded description under the proposal section at the top, as well as under
CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay, all right.

MR. ARGUMEDO: Just to briefly recap what this issue is and why we're bringing this forward, we're receiving lots of calls right now in the present economic situation for people trying to do refinancing and a lot of times they'll need refinancing for buildings that are non-complying structures in certain environments. To get that financing or to receive that financing, they'll need rebuild letters to say that if this property is destroyed, they are able to rebuild it. For example, in an R3 District, which only allows two residential units, they may have had a long standing, three unit structure that we've certified as being allowed there for, because it's been established there for a long time.

Currently, the Zoning Code at its top says that once something non-complying has been destroyed, you must build it to the present code. The rebuild letter allows the Zoning Administrator's determination to say that yes, if this has been destroyed, you can rebuild to the present state of nonconformity, and it's something that can be allowed. The problem we have though is we have no standards for
issuing that rebuild letter by the Zoning Administrator. The zoning, and Bill Dunkley likes to joke around, sure it could be at the whim of it, but in terms of a legal challenge, we just don't have any letters establishing the standards that we would adhere to. Our corporation counsel recommended if we close this chink in our armor to establish standards such that we have for variances, such that we have for special uses, to establish some kind of guideline for issuing a rebuild letter that they could rebuild this non-complying structure, which you'll see at the bottom of this page, are the three standards we pulled and were discussed at the Zoning Committee. They're based largely on other standards we have for variances.

The one change in the discussion from Zoning Committee to here is the third statement at the bottom where it says, the restoration of the structure would not have a significant adverse effect upon the values or enjoyment of adjoining properties. When we originally brought this to you it said, it just said, adverse effect upon the values of adjoining properties. One of the members, I forget who it was, wisely stated that we should add enjoyment into it, which made sense. We have done that. So, we're looking to establish
this --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I think that was Mr. Freeman. I think that was your suggestion.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: No, I don't think so. But, I don't think I was at this meeting actually, so, but I do have a question here. Isn't that kind of subjective?

MR. ARGUMEDO: It is still subjective, but it provides some type of guidelines. When we look at our major variance guidelines, that's one of the standards we have, is that it does not have an adverse effect or impact on the neighbor's enjoyment of their property. So, in terms of subjectiveness, at least we're being consistent in the subjectiveness of a standard across all ways that committees in Evanston would review it.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: But does enjoyment, is enjoyment anywhere else or was this just added here? Value you can determine, but enjoyment is kind of a, people enjoy their property in different ways.

MR. ARGUMEDO: One of the ways we looked at it, the variance, I'll go look at my Zoning Ordinance right now and then we'll just read off the major variance to see if it's there. But an example in terms of enjoyment of a property may be, we talked about, when
we first talked about air conditioners and we wanted to allow air conditioners to be within ten feet of the rear property line, and I believe through discussion of that committee, someone said well, what if the neighbor puts their patio in their rear yard and then they're close to that air conditioning unit. That's impacting their enjoyment of that property right there, to have a nice summer night out on the patio. So, that's one way we would subjectively, as much as we can, objectively look at the issue.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Do we actually say enjoyment --

MR. ARGUMEDO: Let me go check right now. I know exactly where it is.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I just think that that's, and I just think that's too subjective. You know, you build something and then all of a sudden some light's blocked on your property and, is that impacting the enjoyment of your property.

MR. ARGUMEDO: Reading from the second standard for minor variations, it says, the requested variation will not have a substantial adverse impact on the use, enjoyment or property values of adjoining.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Okay.
MR. ARGUMEDO: Adjoining properties.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Any other questions? That being the case, I would move to approve the text amendments, concerning the standards for authorization of restoration of non-complying structures in the case of major damage or destruction.

MR. ARGUMEDO: Should we say the standards that it's going to City Council.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yeah, I'll pick up that later.

MR. ARGUMEDO: Okay.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: But first, okay, there's a second. All those in favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Motion carries. Next, it is my finding that the proposed text amendments are consistent with the goals, and objectives and policies of the comprehensive general plan, and that the proposed text amendments as well will have no adverse impact on the value of adjacent properties. So, I find that those standards have been met. Does anyone disagree with that?
That being the case, I would move that the Plan Commission acknowledge that the standards, as far as the proposed text amendment is concerned, have been met. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Second.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Those in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Motion carries.
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CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Next item is the Downtown Zoning Implementation Update. Dominick?

MR. ARGUMEDO: Thank you very much again, members. I have just five quick points I want to go over as we move forward with this very large project, exciting, but large project and explain some of the things. I want to pass out a revised schedule, interim schedule we are using as we go forward.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: This one that we got last time is no good anymore, is that it? I like the colors.

MR. ARGUMEDO: We've been informed you're kind of looking for a color printing --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Is it possible to get electronic copies?

MR. ARGUMEDO: Yes. As you know, most of these members, all the members here on this Board know, we've revised this schedule to move the Zoning Committee meeting from October to the 11/4, sometimes called November 4th, where we'll talk about the administration and district-wide regulations. We've just noticed that in the Evanston Review, and we, and that's what we'll talk about, an ongoing discussion. The Administration District-wide materials is substantial. It is not intended that we complete it in one Zoning Committee
meeting. Rather expect that it will be continued throughout the length of the effort, as we move toward a favorable recommendation at the end, along with everything else.

It's important that we get it out there, and these are Dunkley's words, at the start of the process so that we have a framework into which everything else will fit. We're talking about the administration and the public benefits part that will cover all the approved districts in the adopted downtown plan, such as the public benefits that come by administration, how things will be reviewed and approval, the decision making criteria, submittal requirements and the design standards and guidelines. Again, the design standards and guidelines won't just apply to an RT District or DT District or DC District, but across all guidelines. So, that's one way we're looking to get out in front of everything.

We plan to use the website for status updates, distribution, schedule and more. We're looking at using zoning information list serve. I plan, when I send out notices, to heavily emphasize that we are implementing an adopted downtown plan that has been vetted many times so that people, we don't want to give
the impression that people can come and reshape the
adopted downtown plan, but it's an implementation of
that downtown plan, as much as we can, as we move
forward.

Right now we're also in the process, City
staff is in the process of reviewing the strategy,
determining allowed uses in these new districts, the DC
Districts, DT Districts, and RT Districts. The adopted
downtown plan just has gaps and says City staff and Plan
Commission will do these new adopted uses, which is a
nice chunk of work to leave for us, challenging work.
Right now City staff is going out and walking these
districts and we're using maps to, our first cut or
guideline is an RT District, kind of covers, for
example, an RT District covers DT, downtown, R6,
residential and like a D1 District. It kind of makes it
it's own little Yugoslavia, throwing all these different
uses that are allowed in there.

Example, a DT District allows media
stations, an R6 District doesn't. So, we're kind of
trying to figure out, well, what is the proper uses for
these districts right now. If a use goes across all of
them, for example, like retail services, that probably
makes our first cut. And then as we go out and walk
about it, we'll say, yeah, we can see a retail service going in here. For example, an example, since we're not discussing it, I'm just giving an overview of something, if a power utility is allowed, and it's mainly a residential district, you may decide that goes better for a little downtown area. Not that we're including power districts there, but just giving an overview what we're doing. We're using a base of the uses that are there in trying to figure out how do they mesh together properly, to go with the adopted downtown plan.

The Preservation Subcommittee has been working on figuring out the public benefit for facade improvements. Again, they adopted a downtown plan, it gives ten benefits, ten public benefits, anything from parking to plazas, certified buildings and they provide a formula. It's a pretty easy formula to come up with parking. So many parking spaces underground equals so many square footage of FAR. For facade improvements, it's a little bit harder to come up with a formula that says, this facade is ten times prettier than what exists there. So, the Preservation Commission has headed two subcommittees to meet to come up with standards and guidelines, then to come up with a formula. That will be, get sent to the Zoning Committee for your perusal,
and then discussion of that benefit.

So, we have been making some progress as we go forward on those aspects. One thing we'd like to bring forward in an effort to alleviate the members' time and make it much better use of it, as you see on the, we want to see what your thinking is on this. As you see on the schedule that was just handed out, and this is a work in progress, we have in November --

pardon me, my wife has bronchitis, I may be catching it -- in November, November 4th we have a Zoning Committee Meeting and November 11th, the Planning Commission, and then November 18th, schedule the Zoning Committee. We were thinking of moving that Zoning Committee to the first Wednesday in December, which would eliminate, and moving the 16th December to the first week of January, or second week. That would alleviate the holiday season more and that would not force Commissioners to come three straight weeks in November to the Zoning Committee and Plan Commission, Zoning Committee, if that would be approved. That would not set us back --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: There's an Economic Development Committee too, which sometimes meets on the same day.

MR. ARGUMEDO: Okay. So, that's something to
CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Go ahead. Yes, please comment.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Thank you. I would say, and first of all, I don't know how people feel about the 11th, if that's going to present problems, because that is Veteran's Day. I don't know, I know I won't be able to attend, but I don't know if that means other people -- that is when the regular Plan Commission meeting is on Veteran's Day, it falls on Veteran's Day. So, is the City even open?

MR. SKLENAR: The City is open.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: It's not a problem for me. I'm a Veteran. I will be here.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Sorry, I did not serve, I still feel guilty.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Is that a problem for anybody, the 11th of November for a Plan Commission Meeting? Apparently not, so that stays. What about the other dates that Craig mentioned.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: So you want to move the 18th meeting to the first week of December?

MR. ARGUMEDO: We're proposing it. I mean, I
definitely will be here on the 18th, if that time
schedule works better for everybody else. That will be
fine.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: What's wrong with the dates
that we have on there right now?

MR. ARGUMEDO: Nothing's wrong with it. We
were just suggesting as we were, you had been generous
with your time to move the 21st to the November 4th, and
that just set up a kind of a three week -- well, we're
very comfortable with that schedule. Just wanted to --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I actually prefer it,
I have more in November than December.

MR. ARGUMEDO: All right.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yeah, I'm okay with that
too.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I'm happy with it.

MR. ARGUMEDO: So far, I'm very happy.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Staley? Mr. Freeman?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I'm easy.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Whatever.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay, it looks like the
schedule is going to stand. Any other questions from
Commission Members?
I do have a question. I notice on the November 4 Zoning Committee Meeting, Public Benefits is discussed. When does that subject then come before the Plan Commission? I mean, I assume everything that's in Committee eventually finds its way to the Plan Commission.

MR. ARGUMEDO: That is correct.

MR. SKLENAR: That would be on the 11th.

MR. ARGUMEDO: That will be, we would look to move that to the 11th, with a good, as long as it's kind of had doubt, this could be a long topic that could be held in Committee for a while. That's not going to hold up the rest of the process, if we continue to talk about it, so I don't want, I'd rather have it, we'd rather have it that it very well in Committee before it comes to Plan Commission. As I recall, we're going to bundle everything to send to City Council, rather than send the Public Benefits part.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Right, sure.

MR. ARGUMEDO: That may have been left off because we're envisioning quite a bit of discussion and just tabling it, moving it to the next meeting, talking about it and moving it as we go.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: At some point it's going to
go to the Plan Commission.

MR. ARGUMENDO: Without question.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: How much time do you think should be devoted to, let's say for example, November 11th, to these issues?

MR. ARGUMENDO: At the November 11th for the Map Amendment?

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes, how much time were we going to spend, I just want to get a sense of the, scheduling the agenda items and so on. How much time do you expect that we'll spend at the Plan Commission level, let's say on the 11th of November, and going forward?

MR. ARGUMENDO: We're hoping not to spend much time in the Plan Commission because we're hoping to have all the, not all the discussion, but the gist of the discussion and answering those questions, and figuring out what the next level of things we may have missed or we need to fill in or need to provide more information will be at the Zoning Committee, much like we've done with our Zoning Plan Update. As we've gone through, we passed out those issues in discussion at Zoning Committee, so that when we come here, there are a few questions for members that haven't been on Zoning
Committee, but at Zoning Committee we've talked about all the issues that have been raised and wording and discussion and the potential side effects or benefits. So, getting back to your question, how much at Plan Commission, this is a new process for me, implementing such a large downtown plan, but I'm expecting that our heavy lifting to be done at Zoning Committee.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: So you were thinking the Plan Commission is going to be kind of rubber stamp, once it comes out of Committee.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I don't think it will.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Because I don't think that's going to be the case.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: For those that are not, I see us going through, repeating deliberations and history, is in a guide that we will be repeating a lot of those deliberations or just going over deliberations here at the Plan Commission.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Johanna?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I think while we've been over this a few times, this is confusing. I think it's going to be incredibly confusing to the public, if they decide to come. So, I think there needs to be, I mean,
I understand what's going on here, the Zoning Committee, I think we all understand what the idea here is, the Zoning Committee to Plan Commission. But this order isn't necessarily completely intuitive and I think it's going to be very, very confusing to anybody who comes to some part of the process, and then is upset if they've missed out on something that they thought that they were coming to comment on, because this is not how we did it when we went through the downtown plan.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: So, I think, I mean, I'm more than happy to proceed with this, but I'd like to see something that's public friendly and also that there is something on the web site and also that the various media outlets are apprized of this so there can be maybe even stories about this.

MR. SKLENAR: If I could interject, I am working on a public friendly flow chart as far as how this is all going to work out and Bill and I had some discussions today as far as how that should be divulged. But I'm basically taking some of this text and placing more emphasis on public hearing and votes, rather than the full detail of everything and dates. So, hopefully I'll have that information.
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Because I think, I mean, I don't know how, I imagine if this was like Central Street when people came and sort of sat, I mean, we were doing, this is different than West 7th and it's different than Central Street, I mean, they're all unique and I think each one of those implementation of the zoning was very different. So, just so people can understand what there, how they fit in, and I think that there will be less opportunity then for people to say oh, let's rewrite this, let's redo this.

MR. SKLENAR: Do you think we should develop some maps that show just, if we're doing downtown?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes.

MR. SKLENAR: Highlight just the downtown zones that are going to be interested.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes, and put a date on them.

MR. SKLENAR: And put a date of when the next --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: And the body that will be reviewing it.

MR. SKLENAR: Yes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: So, maybe even a flow chart that says Zoning Committee, Plan Commission, City
Council, one, two, three.

MR. SKLENAR: That's it.

CHAIRMAN ODPYCKE: David.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yeah, I was going to suggest exactly what you mentioned. If on the website, you could make it as color coded or something, but yeah, if the topic is RD Residential Downtown, there would be a corresponding map that has those districts shaded. And then there may be references to the body of text that pertains to that. We don't want anybody with an excuse for not knowing what goes together and nobody wastes any time on text in areas that are not going to be discussed.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: You guys have like a plotter, right? Do you have a plotter? I mean, print off the map, so there's a map hanging somewhere that people, and an exhibit that people can look at when they come here so they know.

MR. SKLENAR: Including, I think we should even print off the diagrams --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Absolutely.

MR. SKLENAR: Spacial suggestions and bonus and all that.

MR. ARGUMEDO: And we can definitely include
those maps and ideas in our notices that we'll be
mailing out and the signs we'll be putting up in the
various neighborhoods. We definitely appreciate that
input, and we've been, Zoning and Planning have been
working together for, with the previous contact list
that was used throughout the downtown process, we
understand that was awhile ago, but it gives us the
basis as to be reaching out to the community. But all
of those suggestions in terms of making a visual on the
website and making it much more community friendly to
interpret, we'll definitely appreciate it and we'll work
on that.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Ben, I understand why you
think this might not generate a lot of interest, but I
can assure you the downtown, the downtown plan was in
Committee for two years, Committee. And then when it
got to the Plan Commission, if memory serves, we were
six, eight months, a year, whatever it was and there was
a lot of citizen input. So, I would expect this will
occupy a good, that's my guess, it will occupy a lot of
the agenda time on given evenings.

MR. ARGUMEDO: Completely understand, and
we're trying to figure out the best way to notice it in
terms of using the words adopted.
CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I mean, some of this isn't controversial, but when you start talking about core text and certain things and bonuses --

MR. ARGUMEDO: I definitely, definitely can imagine the discussion that will occur when we talk about the uses that will be allowed.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Uses, of course.

MR. ARGUMEDO: And special uses and everything like that. Definitely see quite a discussion.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Why are we talking -- I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Go ahead, Johanna.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I think Dave --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Oh, Dave, sorry.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Along that line, I think it would be beneficial if before any of these meetings commence, that someone, whether it be you, Stu or somebody from the Planning Department or Zoning Department, discusses what the purpose of the meeting is, what the parameters of the discussion will be, i.e., we are talking about revisiting the concepts or the general intentions of the plan, but here's what the intention of the meeting is and here are the types of items that are open for discussion.
CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Thank you, Dave. I would expect to do that at the beginning of, that's a very good --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Of every meeting.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Of every meeting.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I think you should do it in the announcements, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Seth?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I think you should do that in the announcements of the meetings, if that's what you're saying, not just the beginning of a meeting, I mean, the announcement of a meeting.

MR. ARGUMEDO: You mean the notice.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: The notice for the meeting.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: What do you mean by that? You mean --

MR. ARGUMEDO: You mean in a publication when we announce the meeting for the Evanston review and in the mailings we'll do to people in that --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Surely, but also at the meetings.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Oh, of course, at the meeting, but yeah -- you want to set expectations as to
why somebody is coming to the meeting.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Not find out when they get to the meeting, oh, you mean, this isn't, we're not opening the -- again for this conversation.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right.

MR. ARGUMEDO: Right, a prime example would be --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Which is why I think is the whole point of articulating the purpose of the meeting, right?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.

MR. ARGUMEDO: For example, heights are identified in the plan. That's how heights have been approved by the City Council. So, if anyone comes with a decision to talk about heights, something that we can point to it and say no, that's part of the approval. But those are all there.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Johanna.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Should we adopt new rules, some of these rules, committee rules before we do this, because I think that there's some things here that would make this smoother and give us more, just make a smoother process, particularly, I mean, we know there
will be certain people who will line up here at 6:45 to
get on the sign-up sheet to speak and they will speak at
every meeting. So, I mean, for 15 minutes too, so.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, Committee Reports is
Item No. 6 on the agenda, and I'm not on the Rules
Committee, but I did read a number of these suggestions
and implementations, and so on. Perhaps we can take
that up in a few minutes. Before we leave Item No. 4
though, I did bring up the question with Bill about
television coverage when we get into some of these
anticipated controversial aspects of the downtown plan.
He said he was going to survey the Council members or
the City Manager, whomever, but I know this will be of
some civic interest. That's the reason I mention it.
And also, we were going to get hard
copies of the final version of this downtown plan. We
don't have those copies.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: There's one right here.
They were sitting there when you sat down.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I didn't realize what
it was either, until now.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Oh, okay.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: They were waiting for
us.
CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Oh, all right. February 9th, oh, okay. So, we have that then.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: That was easily resolved.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: That takes care of that.

Thank you, so much. I'd love to know what the changes are that are reflected in here from the last version that we have. Is there a log of those changes, by chance, or are they highlighted in this?

MR. SKLENAR: I would have to research, but from my casual viewing, a lot of it was quick edits, cleaning up some language as far as making it flow properly, more grammar oriented.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: If there are some substantive changes, can you furnish those to us, so we don't have to compare page by page by page.

MR. SKLENAR: I'm trying to figure that out myself.

MR. ARGUMEDO: When is the last copy you would have had would have been --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: November 10th, 2008.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Manage to compare --

MR. SKLENAR: We actually don't have the master documents, because they were done in a format
that we don't have software for. But, we are working on that.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All right. Any further comments on Item No. 4, Downtown Zoning Implementation Update?

MR. ARGUMEDO: I guess we'll say, I think one of the substantive updates is the, where the districts are, I don't know if it's on Page 89 or what, I'm not sure about that page, but I was working off a, previously on the November page and there was one area of the downtown on the eastern portion that said, to be determined or we'll figure out at a later part. I know on the February 9th aspect, that has been filled in with either RD2 or RD1, so I know that's one substantive.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Send us a memo then, will you include that, you know, just so we have an idea of what the substantive changes have been.

MR. ARGUMEDO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Good, thank you. All right.
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CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Craig, you're next.

MR. SKLENAR: Since we're already talking about rules, could we switch the two agenda items really quick.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I have no problem with that. Anybody else have a problem with switching an agenda item?

MR. SKLENAR: You received in your packet a memo from Sue Guderley, describing some of the changes that have been implemented by the Committee, and items of recommendation for change. And then items for further discussion. The first thing I would like to propose is establishing a time for the Rules Committee to actually meet and seek more than one member of the Plan Commission to be on the Rules Committee.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I think Mr. Staley, you're --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I think Seth is on the committee too.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I was on the committee.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: You were?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yeah, I'm on the total of three, so if I've got to get on Rules, go back to Rules, that makes four.
COMMISSIONER STALEY: All right. Well, then I guess I have the Rules.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Well, maybe once we get --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I should ask Mr. --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Let's just tell Lenny he has to be on Rules, the new Plan Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I thought that --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: He's going to enjoy that when he reads the minutes.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: That leaves you, Mr. Staley, because Robin, who was on the Rules Committee is no longer with us.

MR. SKLENAR: Mr. Peters is --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Peters would be possible because he has the zoning background and all that sort of thing.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I think the new attorney would be a good one.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Well, both have, both I think have comparable experience, I think, but Mr. Peters served on ZBA and was previously a chair there. So, he might --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Well, I can tell you, I
looked this over and I commend Susan, because I looked
back and I had notes that were pretty much consistent
with this, but she found more and planned this, she had
to go through and parse many, you know, this wasn't just
sitting out there, otherwise I would have brought it in.
And I do remember, some of these I don't remember, but
most of them I do. But my thought would be that, and I
don't know if maybe we want to discuss it, but Item 2
here, most of these shouldn't be very divisive or
confrontational. They're mostly to try to make it more
transparent, make it easier for people so they're not
lined up. Just basically not annoy the public is what a
lot of this first group is.

And some of it, a lot of this is from
Jessica Feldman's memo, which was very thorough and
covered many, many things, this beaucoup, in other
words, going out of our way to give notice for people,
you know, that we might not be thinking about, but would
actually see it, would come. And so I would think, you
know, I think maybe we should look at this and then I
could just prepare a motion for, you know, the Item 2
issues, and maybe bring that to the next Plan Commission
Meeting. And then at that point, obviously it can be
amended to delete or if somebody else has got something,
1 but we could do a lot of work. Colleen particularly,
2 did a lot of work and so did Robin, and I was at the
3 meeting when this was done.
4 So, as I went back through them, I think
5 these things that are under Item 2, are all things that
6 really could be set forth in a motion, and if there is
7 somebody who objects to it, then we can talk about it
8 and delete that. I don't know if you want to discuss,
9 spend any time tonight. I know, Stu, you have some
10 feelings about limiting people, or at least my
11 recollection is that you said that you had. And so,
12 maybe, I don't know if you want to discuss that.
13 Probably just makes more sense to discuss it at that
14 time, at the next meeting, I suppose, or unless we want
15 to discuss it now.
16 This is limiting, well, the people on the
17 Rules Committee have a basic agreement there should be
18 some time limits, I mean, there wasn't anyone, even
19 Robin, who feels that everyone should be able to be
20 heard. She was the one who was the most resistant to
21 that, but my recollection is at the end, even she agreed
22 that it was better to have some. It should be generous,
23 but that there ought to be some sort of a limitation.
24 We shouldn't have people up there just going on and on
and on, and people should know the rules when they come. Then there was the issue of, what about groups, should they be, how much time should they be given. Should they go first, should they not go first. And we really couldn't, we couldn't really hash all that out. But we all felt that there ought to be some time limits.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: David?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Is there any reason why we can't discuss and, itemize the number 3 tonight?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: No, well I don't know, excuse me, I don't want to be vague --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: There aren't that many and they predominately relate to exactly what we're talking about right now, which is time.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay, let's take up Item No. 3. Any comments from anybody? Johanna.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I would say, I would be in favor of limiting minutes, but I think that there's, but under the guise of prepare something that you can deliver in five minutes, and then if that person is saying something that we would like to hear more of, it's at the discretion of the chair to allow them to continue. But I don't think it should be, it shouldn't
be implied that you can prepare ten minutes worth of a speech and then at five minutes, request it, five more minutes. That you should be understood that it's five minutes.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I would agree with that, but I think you should be able to request in advance, I would like ten minutes instead of five minutes. So if you know you're going to want to talk ten minutes, I just, I think five minutes can be limiting, especially after the experience on the downtown plan and some of the presentations that were made, that were by citizens that were very, very good, very detailed and well thought out, and quite frankly wish that some of the consultants had presented stuff as well analyzed. So, I think five minutes is limiting, but in most cases it's probably okay. You just have to have a way to extend that and I don't think it should be up to us to say well, no, you can't present more than five minutes.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I have a question, or some clarification then. What is the difference between five minutes for individual citizen comments and 20 minutes for citizen presentations? Because I think maybe what you're discussing is some individual citizens
had an actual presentation, with AV materials and so forth. And others just simply had a text from which they were reading. Am I correct in understanding that is the --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: It doesn't say it here, but my recollection was more the presentation was reserved for a group. I mean, that's, I don't remember any discussion where we thought that an individual would somehow have a different handle on your thinking. But, we did definitely think, if there's someone there and they're, it's part of the Central Street neighbors, or something, if you've got, you know, Mr. Smith up there, you know, putting that on, then I think we agreed that that should have a longer period. I don't recall anything about someone who is making a presentation. I mean, they're all making a presentation.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: One does say here, 20 minutes for a citizen presentation. So, is that for a group or again, is that an individual?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: It was still, it was a group when we discussed it, I'm sure.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I.E., a citizen that represents a group, is that correct?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Yes, when they're
speaking for it.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Well, I mean, what I this is, I'm sorry. All right, I think if somebody talks, here's what I see. I see, let's say we have a hedge issue with 20 people who have signed up to speak. If we say, well, you know, some people can talk for five, some people can talk for ten, there's going to be some people who cannot speak, will not come again in 30 days.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Good point.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: And I think if somebody needs to go on for another ten minutes or five minutes, they can get at the end of the line. It's sort of like kids and water fountains, after gym class. It's like if there is a bunch of kids that all need water, they each have to take their turn.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I kind of think that's, what's the word I want to use, I don't agree with that, it goes against the line. I do agree if there's, you know, enough people to fill up the evening, then you should try to limit it to five minutes. But if there's five people here and we have, you know, an hour scheduled, there's no reason why that person should go to the end of the line after five minutes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: No, I think that's why
the chair, it's at the chair's discretion to extend that time.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: But, I mean, I'm fine with that.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, along those lines then, perhaps the last sentence of this brief paragraph might say that all these interpretations are subject to the chair's judgment, or words to that effect, that allows the chair to make those kinds of decisions. Like you said, if there are 40 people, well then, five minutes is your max. But if there's, you know what I'm saying, --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I think we're in alignment, violence agreements, correct?

MR. SKLENAR: The one thing I might propose is we define the difference between your presentation and citizen comments and provide that in our rules.

MR. GALLOWAY: That's important, because I could see citizens arriving with a great deal of misunderstanding on that.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: What's noticing requirement? 48 hours or 24 hours?

MR. SKLENAR: For this meeting?
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: For any meeting.

MR. SKLENAR: Forty-eight for this, for a special hearing, I believe it's two weeks.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Okay. So what if people want to apply to be special presentation for a group, they have to notify within 72 hours of the start of the meeting. So that gives you 24 hours to make a decision, and 48 hours to notice them that they will be on.

MR. SKLENAR: If they want to be on the agenda?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Right.

MR. SKLENAR: Yes, that would be --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I'm fine with that. I think that's a good point.

MR. SKLENAR: And you're talking about the 30 minute for special presentation?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: So, right, if Central Street Neighbors wants to come and give a presentation about something, they should --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: If they want 30 minutes, they shouldn't just show up and sign up for 30 minutes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Right.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: They need to notify us
in advance that they want 30 minutes to make a presentation.

MR. SKLENAR: That's in pursuant to our agenda writing anyway. We try to get that out by Friday, so if they want to be on the agenda, they have to, the week prior.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: In terms of the point here for effective neighbors, noticed area speak first, shouldn't it just be first come first served.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I kind of think so too. I don't know how you're going to, I mean, talking about who's --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: First come, first served, and you know, if you sign up, you get on the, and I think the 30 minute presentation should be separate from the time allotted for individual comments. So that's part of the agenda, and the people who come and sign up, it's a different portion of the agenda.

MR. SKLENAR: Again, I think it's more organizational in how we present this and I think I agree that we separate instead of having one -- for the entire round of speaking. We divide it out and that way there is a format to that.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Okay. And I have two
comments or suggestions. One is, intuitively, it seems to me that group presentations are larger time, large time presentations might be better to go first because therein you more than likely have someone who spent a great deal of time and is sort of a quasi-expert on these issues and for them to go first, might assuage or answer a lot of questions that people, of the masses that are going to spend five minutes.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So that's the, in advance, they get on the agenda and that is an agenda item before public comment, even though it's part of public comment.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yeah, and then another thing that occurred to me as I was reading this, it really is very important for the chair to know, as soon as possible, how much time is going to be accrued with citizen comment, citizen presentations, so that the agenda can be adjusted as early as possible, so as not to inconvenience someone who has worked for three months and is looking forward to making their presentation that evening. Do you follow?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Another reason for some of the --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So, the earlier, I
think obviously then, the 72 hour requirement for large group is very important because obviously if you have three groups at 20 minutes and you've only got, only budgeted an hour for the whole thing, and you have another item on the agenda, then you're going to, then at least three days in advance, notify the other item on the agenda that I'm sorry, it doesn't look like we're going to be able to accommodate you.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: But I don't think that we should, I think it should be 30 minutes is the limit, for a group presentation.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yeah, sure.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Okay. Just want to make sure. And then what are we, when we say group presentation, you know, what about, I mean, Central Street Neighbors versus the Evanston Chamber of Commerce, those are two very different entities, and then are we treating them, every, every membership organization the same way?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Well, I think it depends on the circumstances of what's being presented. So, if the Chamber of Commerce is coming to make a presentation, like they do at the Economic Development Committee, on their budget and stuff, that's different
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I mean, the other thing that I worry about is what if some of these, some membership, I could just see this happening, I could see this happening in the past with this rule. What if several organizations decided to put themselves together to do a filibuster or something. You know, like if four people sign --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: You still have to, but you still have a set amount of time for public comment, so, you know, so are they going to, so you're saying they're going to filibuster for an hour and a half when we only have an hour of public comment.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: No, but I'm saying like what if the two, and when we still have ten people who want to sign up and talk. So, if we have two membership organizations that want to make a presentation, and we grant that to them, and then we have ten people who also want to speak.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So then perhaps what you should, we should limit the number of 30 minute, of presentations per public comment meeting, for meeting.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: This highlights a problem. There are so many scenarios that one can envision.
That’s why I want to retain and share as much discretion as possible. So, I would propose these as guidelines only, subject to change without notice by the chair. So, I can live with all of this stuff as long as I have the authority to be able to change. But given the agenda, given the number of people out here, there's all these variables that I have to take into account, the number of people, the issues.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So you can say at the blanket at the start, we have so many people that we're going to limit conversation to two minutes. But you wouldn't do it in the middle of it and say, okay --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, exactly, exactly.

MR. SKLENAR: One key point to the presentation, if there is any item that has to go on the agenda, they have to give me materials to go into the packet, and then that way presents to us exactly what they are presenting. And I think that should be written into the guidelines that a, materials must be provided at time of notice. So that helps us with part of that, but I agree there should be a provision for, at chair's discretion.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Listening to this, I'd kind of like to go back to the 30 minutes. I think it
might be better if we limit it to 20 minutes, except in extraordinary situations, because you know, 20 minutes, a group ought to be able, I mean considering what we're, ought to be able to get their --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Agree.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: You know, 30 minutes is a long time, unless they really are, 30 minutes, they're kind of redoing it for us and pointing out, you know, why we're off in left field, which we might be, but, if it's, well, anyway, I --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Absolutely. I would much rather have the chair be in the position of granting someone an extension of time rather than everybody, including other citizens, sitting through a regurgitation of stuff, simply because people think well, I've got 30 minutes then we're going to fill 30 minutes.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I think we're all in agreement, finally. I have an issue here. I had a what the heck moment here on the, an hourglass? Would you give me, how about a stop watch or something. But you know, an hourglass, all this was pretty funny. Place it on the podium so the speaker can turn it over. You're on your own.
CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Forget the hourglass. If I'm the chair, I'm the hourglass.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: That's right, you're the timekeeper. That's a clock right there.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Yellow sheet, red sheet --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Okay. I wasn't the only one who had a what the heck moment on that one, huh?

MR. SKLENAR: These are just recommendations. We still need to draft it into a motion.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. This last point, workshops throughout the City. Does anybody want to pursue that one? Mr. Staley?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I think we can delete that.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Any objection to that?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Is there anyone in the audience? Let the record show that no one opposed this. No one citizen.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Is there anything else we want to talk about with respect to some of these -- rules.
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Well, I do think the one, the last point there, about the physical layout and other constraints, we all have voiced that concern. So, I don't know how we address that.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: It doesn't have to be a rule, does it? Can't we just suggest to staff, if they see a better way to sort of situate this.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: How were you thinking? Was it going to be that last row over there, kind of in line, like that? Was that what you were thinking about?

MR. SKLENAR: These were all written before I --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I might have written them myself.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: No, but this is, this really is a problem, and if the presentation is not oriented so that both Commissioners and the attending public are afforded the same opportunity to view and understand it. We're setting us up for a lot of justifiable animosity, and this room does not, period, in its present layout, afford that opportunity. So, we're not going to move the dias. We might be able to orient say that wall for the presentation and then have the chairs loose or oriented so at least people are at
somewhat of an angle, or at least oriented toward the presentation, so that we're at least saying to them, we are not what you're supposed to be looking at. You're supposed to be looking at the content of what we're all trying to understand.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: It's a great idea. You must be an architect. If we could actually move those chairs, I mean, it could be, the focal point could be over there.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: It's worth the assessment of that.

MR. SKLENAR: I don't know if that's a rule, per se, but definitely keep an eye on what's being presented and then, that's sharing that there's enough time for me to come in here and help set up properly.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: The biggest affront was a couple of presentations where the developers came in and they put the boards all across here, oriented towards us, and all the audience is looking at the back of the boards, I mean, what kind of message is that.

MR. SKLENAR: I guess maybe submittal requirements should state that printed copies for Commissioners as well as any presentation boards be submitted ahead of time. That way you have what's being
presented and if they do bring boards along with them, that you have something in front of you as well as something for the audience to view.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yeah, but we still have to address the physical layout of this room and like I said, I think the only way that we could really improve on that is how the chairs are arranged. I mean, at least let's experiment, you know, these aren't nailed to the floor.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: So, how are we going to do this? Am I going to put together a motion or is staff going to put together a motion and we're going to look at it or what --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, there's a lot to talk about here, and some of these suggestions, I don't know if we want to talk about them tonight, what is your --

MR. SKLENAR: Where are you at, Stu?

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, we just finished Item 3, and now I'm looking at Item 2, which are I guess recommended changes. And then there's Item 1 that have, I guess, already been implemented. I didn't know all this had been done. I'm looking at Item 1. There's a web page, a Plan Commission FAQ web page.

MR. SKLENAR: Yes.
CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I mean, is that this, this one-page thing that we can get off line, on line, rather, is that their web page? I mean, it doesn't have any reference to frequently asked questions, but I don't know.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: What do you have there?

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, this is all the, the website and it describes the Plan Commission, the composition, the terms --

MR. SKLENAR: Does that say plan, or committees? Is that a committee's page?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: That's different than what's in here.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: It's appoint boards, commissions and committees.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Is that what it is?

MR. SKLENAR: There's an actual Plan Commission page on the planning web sites.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay.

MR. SKLENAR: That does have FAQ, it talks about the downtown planning, those things.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay.

MR. SKLENAR: But I do know there is an FAQ, I don't know how up to date it is, and maybe that's
something that we need to address.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: There's reference to a flow chart. Do we have that already? Apparently, we do. We talked about that earlier tonight with respect to the downtown plan discussion. I'm looking at item, Paragraph No. 1, right in the middle where it says create a flow chart diagram showing plan development, public hearing status, that is printed on legal size paper and place on the table nearest the door of the meeting room. Is that done?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: A thought that I, I don't know, maybe this is for different things, but this was either Colleen or Robin, and it was a pretty good idea, it was sort of like, you know, you are here pointing with an arrow. When people come in to see what's going on, there would be the line out of this flow chart the various steps to get all the way through the City Council, and be kind of an arrow that this is, you know, this is what's going on now. And that would change, obviously, depending on which project that you were talking about. That's what I think you were talking about.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: But we have that now in place?
COMMISSIONER STALEY: That I don't know. I mean, I didn't know we had anything in place.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well it says items that recently have been implemented.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I don't know who prepared this, so I guess it must have been. I could ask her, I guess.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay, okay.

MR. SKLENAR: We haven't had a PD submittal come up since this has been --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: That's right. The arrow was there or it was way over to the left, wherever it is, the left-hand column.

MR. SKLENAR: I can research through Tracy's folders and see if she's created anything, prior to my arrival.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, you know, I guess we're not of a mind to go into all these things tonight. You want to do a memo, Chuck, and give us your recommendation as to which of the items, No. 2, on Paragraph No. 2, that you would recommend for implementation?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I'll do that or else I'll give a footnote indicating for what the discussion
was. Most of this, I think most of this is kind of non-controversial. Yeah, there are a couple things that are maybe about the relative, there was some discussion about what to do with, you know, the letters that are written in and them becoming a part of the record, the same as anything else, and available to everybody and I don't know the logistics or whether that all makes sense, and whether it should be, that's about, I don't know if that's in here. That must be in here.

MR. SKLENAR: Yes, revise the rules to note that written comments will be forwarded to the Plan Commission members, become part of the record, and made available for public viewing.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: If it's electronic, that's pretty easy to do.

MR. SKLENAR: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, how much of this ends up, say we approve all of this, how much of this actually ends up as text in the rules, in the Plan Commission rules. I mean a lot of these are just sort of suggestions.

MR. SKLENAR: Right. I would imagine those, like the item that I just said, would have to have actual text that would go into the rules. But beyond
that, I can't imagine it being more than just
recommendations for staff members.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay, not then to be
incorporated as an official rule.

MR. SKLENAR: Right. The largest item that I
think that would be a rule is Item 3, detailing a public
comment process.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay, all right. Okay.

Thank you. Any further discussion on -- oh, Dave?

MR. SKLENAR: If you want to work with me in
the next couple weeks on drafting that --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: David?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I have a question for,
I guess for Chuck. Under Item 2, it would be the, one,
two, three, four, fourth paragraph from the end.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Starts with there?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yeah. What does that
mean?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: That was --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I think that's -- a good
point.

MR. SKLENAR: I think that's spacing

between --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Things coming up from
the Zoning Committee.

MR. SKLENAR: Right.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: In other words, at the Zoning Committee, we ought to be thinking about the Plan Commission. I mean, we can't send them six things knowing that, you know, we need to kind of work our agenda in a reasonable, logical fashion so that it moves smoothly and we don't get everything logged up. That's what I think it was.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: It isn't smooth now, of course. But it won't be again, because life is cyclical. They'll be back. They'll be back.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: So the only thing I've seen that really qualifies as a rule change is found in Paragraph No. 3 where we talk about limitations. Everything else is sort of a suggestion to staff or procedure. Okay.

MR. SKLENAR: A big digital clock.

Transcribed Report of Proceedings of a Plan Commissioner Meeting, held October 14, 2009, at the Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Council Chambers, Evanston, Illinois, at 7:00 p.m. and presided over by Mr. Opdycke, Chair.

PRESENT:

S. ODPYCKE, Chair
D. GALLOWAY
J. NYDEN
C. STALEY
S. FREEMAN

STAFF:

C. SKLENAR, Planner
D. ARGUMEDO, Zoning Administrator
CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All right. Let's move on to the next agenda item. Craig.

MR. SKLENAR: The Subcommittee Meeting will meet after this if there's enough members for the Comprehensive Plan. And the one item I did have is I have submitted to the Urban Land Institute for $25,000 to help with our public participation as it pertains to printed materials and our additional websites that we want to create, just for the Comprehensive Plan itself.

There is a letter of recommendation from one of the Trustees who is an Evanston resident, Greg Hummel, and I have received a final letter of recommendation from the ULI Chicago Director, who has submitted that for this grant.

Beginning words I've been hearing is it's a very positive response from ULI, and we should know by the next meeting.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: This is -- if you were to hire outside resources in to help you?

MR. SKLENAR: Correct, correct. Yeah, help develop an actual web page that would be direct, funneled through the City, then its website will have its own distinct characteristics.
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: -- is still managed by you and all that.

MR. SKLENAR: Correct.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: You'll be hiring some consultant, I'm assuming.

MR. SKLENAR: Correct.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Getting --

MR. SKLENAR: Yes, yes. We talked about that in the last meeting.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: We didn't have that here -- available.

MR. SKLENAR: Oh, yeah, and --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Maybe we should go on to something else.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All right. Is there a motion to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Motion to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Second.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Those in favor.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Motion carries. We are now
adjourned.

(Whereupon, the above meeting was concluded at 8:11 p.m.)
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