CITY OF EVANSTON

PLAN COMMISSION

RE: CONTINUATION - DRAFT DOWNTOWN PLAN AND ZONING

RECOMMENDATIONS. Consideration of additional comments and questions from the public and Plan Commission and discussion by the Plan Commission.

Transcribed Report of Proceedings of a public hearing on the above captioned matter, held January 16, 2008 at the Evanston Civil Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, 2nd Floor, Council Chambers, Evanston, Illinois, at 7:04 p.m. and presided over by J. Woods, Chair.

PRESENT:

J. WOODS, Chair
C. BURRUS
R. SCHULDENFREI
L. WIDMAYER
J. NYDEN
D. GALLOWAY
S. OPDYCKE

STAFF:

D. MARINO
C. RUIZ
T. NORFLEET
CHAIRMAN WOODS: I'd like to call to order the Evanston Plan Commission Special Meeting of Wednesday, January 16, 2008. And we have a quorum, six of nine.

The first thing that we're going to do, actually, is change the order of the agenda, I think, so that we do other business first and so that we can handle some issues of sorting out. And Dennis, I talked to Dennis late this afternoon. He said we can't officially vote tonight. But we can sort it out so that we can officially vote at the next meeting. Because it's not an official agenda item. Therefore, we can't vote, so.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Why isn't it an official agenda item?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I don't know. I don't know.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Will the vote be binding next one? Sorted out?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: We can do a straw poll?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: We can do a straw poll, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: We can have it all organized so that we're ready to go.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Or there's no surprise it's next time.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: God forbid. Okay, so Sharon is actually the most senior. But she is not here. So, I am the next most senior member.

And what we have sort of decided amongst ourselves is we're going to go around and decide, say what, what it is, role that we would like to fill. And I would like to continue as Chair. I don't have any particular desire to be the Chairman of the Zoning Committee. I would just like to continue as Chair. And in terms of Committee membership, I'd like to be a Committee member of Zoning and, I guess, Downtown for as long as Downtown needs to exist.

The next most senior member is --

COMMISSIONER: Stu.


COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: You want to know what I'd like to do?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: I'd like to serve again.
on the Zoning Committee. I've been on it two years. And zoning is very close to the core of what we do. And I've learned a lot. I knew nothing about zoning when I became a member of the Plan Commission. I thought I should learn something about it. And I have learned a tremendous amount. I think anyone, frankly, that serves as Chair should put in a couple of years in the Zoning Committee. Because that's where I really learned the business of the Plan Commission. You learn so much from Dennis. And you learn so much from Arlova and the Zoning Administrator, Bill Dunkley. So I would like, again, to be on the Zoning Committee. I think I can make a contribution to it this time around.

And I'm very happy that Jim has expressed a willingness to remain as Chair.

I signed up for the Rules Committee when I became a member because I'm a lawyer and I have some experience with rules and so on. So I would like, again, to be on that Committee. Whether I'm Chair or not doesn't really make any difference. I enjoyed my role as Vice-Chair only because I got to run a couple of meetings. But apart from that, I have no grand design to be Vice-Chair or one day even to be Chair. But
that's where I am on the subject.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay, so that would mean that Coleen is next.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, I'm next. I would either like to be Vice-Chair or the Chairperson of the Rules Committee. And I'd also like to stay on the Community Development Committee.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Community Liaison to --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, Community Development Liaison.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Let's see. That would be David, is next.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I would like to stay on the Downtown Committee as long as it continues. I would like to take on the Zoning Committee and would not mind chairing the Zoning Committee. I'll also continue on Parking unless someone else wants to take that. It's a pretty, --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, it's a hotbed!

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: -- it's a pretty, well, yes, but it's a lot easier than many others.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Next is, is it Johanna?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Six months and now I'm
like the fifth in seniority.

Well, I would like to continue to be the Economic Development Committee Liaison. And I'd like to stay on the Zoning Committee. I've been learning a lot. I would volunteer to be the Chair of that if there's nobody else who would like to do that.

And I see that I've been put down in the Neighborhoods Committee. And I think that was because of a brief conversation I had with Al. I would like to know more about what would be involved in that before I commit myself to something like that, so.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Let me get Economic Development. What was this next one?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: And then Zoning. And I would be the Chair if nobody else --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: -- is up to that.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Is that you, Robin? Is that --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I don't know, I would like to continue as a member of the Zoning Committee. And if Coleen is voted Vice-Chair rather than Rules Chair, then I would be happy to be the Rules
Chair. And I'll carry on in the Downtown Plan Committee as a member.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: And I think I forgot to mention, I too would like to continue as a member of the Downtown Committee. That's a sub-committee of Zoning, right?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's actually a Special Committee of the Planning Commission.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Okay. I'd like, as well, to be on that. I've been on that Committee for two years, the Downtown. And I'd like to remain on that until the downtown is settled.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER: Settled?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, could we have a motion to vote this evening? I see nothing in the rules that indicates. The rules simply state, 2-8-5-2, Procedure and Organization, at its December meeting elect a Chairman to serve for the following calendar year with eligibility. And in point B, elect in December a Vice-Chairman to act whenever the Chairman is absent or unable to serve.
And then associate members, similarly in their
Plan Commission Administrative Rules and Procedures,
Article 5.

Officers, again Point A, the Officers of the
Commission shall consist of a Chair, Vice-Chair, and
Secretary. Point B, at its December meeting the
Commission shall elect a Chair and Vice-Chair from among
its members to serve for the following calendar year
with eligibility for re-election.

I think that we can make a motion to vote this
evening. And as long as it's seconded. No? It was
meant to be. We decided last week that it would be an
agenda item. And I see nothing here that it can go
under Other Business. It was supposed to happen in
December. And I think putting it off another month
doesn't particularly make sense.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I personally don't have any
objection to that.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay. Do you
want --

MR. MARINO: Jim, if I could, the Law
Department does in the sense that their indication to me
was that you really need to have as a separate agenda
item election of officers. And that needs to be on the agenda 48 hours in advance. I wish we could certainly go forward.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: But I asked --

MR. MARINO: But that's been their indication to me.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: So we could vote tonight and then confirm it at the next meeting.

MR. MARINO: I think Law Department's preference is that you continue the discussion, which obviously is an excellent discussion, to your next meeting, your regular meeting the second Wednesday in February. And again, it's related to a posting on the agenda of an action item 48 hours in advance.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, on Friday when I received our agenda, and this was not on the agenda, I specifically sent an e-mail to the Chair and to Dennis Marino and Tracy Norfleet asking that it be added to the agenda on Monday. And so I'm very surprised it wasn't added to the agenda since it was stated on the record on Wednesday that we would be discussing it this Wednesday.

And if it was a problem under Other Business,
which my understanding from Jim was that it would not be
a problem, then I think that should have been raised or
at least my e-mail should have been returned with a
statement from staff saying that it wasn't going to be
added to the agenda.

MR. MARINO: Yes, the Chair sets the agenda.
We consult with the Chair in that regard. Law
Department, my discussion with them was late this
afternoon, both with Herb Hill and also with Ken Cox. I
wish we could do otherwise, believe me.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Has the Law Department
said anything about the closed Executive Session meeting
in December and the posting of that meeting in the
elevator? I mean, was that really posted properly? I
would love to have a call on the Law Department on that,
those actions.

MR. MARINO: Yes. Their indication was that
it was posted properly.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Could we have both of
those things in writing? I mean, not that I'm
disagreeing with what you, what you're presenting to us,
but we get conflicting information regularly. And I
would like to see something in writing from the Law
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Department, either e-mail or, and as Robin said, you know, responses back too.

We, you know, we caught this early on, that it wasn't on the agenda. We notified you early on. And still no actions are taken. And it seems to me from looking at what our, when we look at the Planning Commission rules, that you're supposed to help us facilitate. And I see it as obstructionist at this point.

MR. MARINO: Yes, it's certainly not that.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, --

MR. MARINO: Staff works with the Chair to set the agenda. That's our process. And you as Committee members often work through the Chair. We would encourage that to occur all the time. We're certainly available to help you and work with you. But on an agenda, it's set by the Chair. But we certainly would make that request to the Law Department on those two issues.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, I mean, because --

MR. MARINO: No problem.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: -- it's a serious
issue that you're saying that there wasn't notice for this. But then there also wasn't notice for the Executive Committee. Except I think you said that it was posted in one of the elevators?

MR. MARINO: Yes, the requirement is that it be posted in the elevators and on the calendar, the City calendar. And that's the process we follow for that kind of meeting.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: So is it one elevator? And where else was it posted? I can't remember. You said --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Hey, Coleen, could I just interrupt for one second?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Of course.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Could we just maybe agree to meet same time, same place next week? You can do all your noticing and we can just vote then. And just, so February for a meeting, we're starting anew. Okay.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Let's set it now and then --

MR. MARINO: Sure. That's fine.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Let's set it now as an agenda item.
MR. MARINO: For which date?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Hold on.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: The 23rd. A week from today.

COMMISSIONER: Do we have anything scheduled for that?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No. We'll just meet, come vote, and go.

COMMISSIONER ODPYCKE: Do we have to, do we have to schedule a regular meeting for that purpose?

MR. MARINO: No, you do not. You may do it at a Special Meeting continued from this meeting.

COMMISSIONER ODPYCKE: But we must convene here?

MR. MARINO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ODPYCKE: When? On next Wednesday night?

MR. MARINO: Right. That's what's being proposed.

COMMISSIONER ODPYCKE: But why can't we just wait until the next regular meeting? What is so urgent about this? Why must we carve out an hour or so on a
Wednesday night just for the purpose of voting on this when we can do it at a regular scheduled meeting?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Why couldn't we have done it tonight? This is what --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Well, it's not on the agenda. We are told that it has to be on agenda.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: It was on the agenda, what, two weeks ago? We could have voted on it. We could have talked about it at our December meeting. The Executive, we were not told about the Executive Committee meeting. We could have voted on it in December as the rules state. We could have, you know, voted on it this month. And it's just, it's like pushing it off and pushing it off and pushing it off.

And we really do need to do this and move forward and have our associate members voted on, get our Committees set up, and go, go on. I mean, --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Is there any way we could get that on the agenda tonight? I mean, can we make something, can we take a vote tonight? Can we suspend the rules and get this over with tonight so we don't have to come back here next Wednesday night and --

MR. MARINO: I share your desire. But the
problem is they're not your rules. It's a broader issue in terms of the Law Department and public meetings. And action items on public meetings related to an action item needs to be on the agenda 48 hours in advance. I wish we could do otherwise, believe me.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Let me just ask a question. When the Planning and Development Committee changes Chairmen, is that an item on their agenda?

MR. MARINO: I don't know if it is or not. But certainly that's been set by the Rules Committee of City Council far in advance in terms of the rotation. I don't know all the details of that, Larry. But --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, it just seems to me that this is a, this is not a, this is an administrative action of the Commission not subject to any public input. And therefore I, it just seems a bit strange.

MR. MARINO: Yes, I'm only stating to you what's the Law Department's opinion.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Couldn't we vote?

And then if there's a --

MR. MARINO: I do not.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Well, could we call somebody from the Law Department? I'm sure they're on call. I mean, we don't have an e-mail, we don't have it in writing. I'm sure, though, we can pick up the phone. And to who, who is it exactly from the Law Department that we --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Coleen, Coleen.

Dennis has said that he's spoken to the Law Department.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I know. I'm asking who.

I'm just asking who.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: He just told you. He spoke to two people.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I know. But who?


COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Thanks.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Could we possibly vote this evening? And then if the Law Department decides that in fact it is not in a, Larry, could you repeat what that actually was? If we vote and we find out that it wasn't correct, --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Then we can re-vote.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: -- then we can
re-vote? But why don't we vote and finish tonight? And then if we then find out that it's not an administrative action, then we can just do a re-vote. There would be nothing wrong with that. It would just invalidate the vote tonight, correct?

MR. MARINO: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Then I make a motion to vote this evening and hope that it is in fact the way in which Commissioner, Associate Commissioner Widmayer, described it. And if we find that it isn't, then we'll get it on the agenda properly.

Do I have a second?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Can I make a motion?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, can I, can I --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Oh, sure. You can make a motion first.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, I don't want to make a motion.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Do whatever you want.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: I want to clarify a couple of things. You went through those positions, Vice-Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary. Or somebody did.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Oh, you're right. You're right. We can do --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And nobody --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: -- but the Chair and the Vice-Chair.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Nobody has volunteered for Secretary anyhow.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No. The Secretary is automatically done. It's Dennis Marino.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: But you know what? You make an, just to speak on the record, you make an excellent point. Because at the very least we can vote all of the other positions. It's Chair and Vice-Chair, perhaps, that are the only two items subject to these rules possibly.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Me also included. So, yes, whatever. So at the moment I have Jim, Stu, David, Johanna, Robin, and Chuck has also expressed interest in the Zoning Committee. Two people said that they would
be willing to serve as Chair, David and Johanna. Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Downtown, I got Jim, David, Robin, Stu, and Larry. And I would propose that Larry would continue as Chair of that Committee as long as it needs to exist.

Rules: Stu, Coleen, Robin, and Chuck. As I said, Chuck expressed interest in Rules. And Coleen and Robin have both said Chair. Robin's saying it if Coleen becomes Vice-Chair.

Neighborhood: I think Johanna's said she wants to know more about it. Al has expressed interest.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Assuming he becomes an associate member.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I'm sorry, Jim. What Committee was that?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Neighborhood Planning Committee.

Sara, obviously, is not here. And we'll need to find out what it is she wants to serve on.

Community Liaisons, Community Development:

And I think P&D in Place Names by whatever our Chair designates. I'll tell you honestly that in the four years that I've been on the Plan Commission, Place Names has met, to my knowledge, once.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: What Committee is that?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Place Names. They renamed a portion of a street for a school administrator who retired.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Can we vote from the Chair downwards so that --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Sure.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Can I make a motion --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: -- to nominate Jim Woods as Chair of the Planning Commission.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Second.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I'd like to nominate Coleen for Vice-Chair of the Plan Commission.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Second.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Stu? Do you want to be Chair or Vice-Chair?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Because I will acquiesce to you, Stu.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Oh, I would be pleased to be Vice-Chair.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Okay, that's fine. I'm going to muscle you out for something else.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: If someone nominates me for Vice-Chair, I will accept it. And if the rest of the, if there's a sufficient number of --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: In that case --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: -- members vote in favor, I will serve as Vice-Chair next --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I will nominate Stu as Vice-Chair.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Second.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I would like to nominate Coleen as Chair of the Rules Committee.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Second.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Johanna, you are actually the senior most member who doesn't have a position. So I'm going to nominate you for Chair of the Zoning Committee.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Second.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: We did --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Downtown.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Downtown. I will nominate Larry for Chair of that Committee.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Oh, I second.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Sorry, Larry. You're not getting away.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Larry can't even vote.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Exactly. All in favor?

Quickly.

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Neighborhood Committee. I guess I would nominate Al as Chair.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: All in favor?
COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And I guess for the Community Liaisons I would nominate for P&D Chair, designee.


COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Second.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And associate members, I would nominate Larry and Al.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Second.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. That takes care of that matter.

Now we are on to the continuation. Oh, boy. Hold on one second. Let me get the right piece of paper in front of me. Continuation of the Draft Downtown Plan and Zoning Recommendations, public comment. And similar to previous meetings, I would like a show of hands for those people who would like to speak this evening and ask that those people who wish to speak that you agree
to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the
truth. As much as you know, at least, considering this
is what it is.

And so with that, actually, we invited the
Preservation Committee to speak. And we'd like them to
go first. And you need to state your name and --

CHAIRMAN CRAMER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- address and all that kind
of stuff.

CHAIRMAN CRAMER: Good evening, everybody.

Jordan Cramer, 2607 Park Place. I am the Chair of the
Preservation Commission.

First off, thank you for inviting us here.
And thank you to the members who came to our meeting
last night to discuss this.

I'll first note and thank all of you for all
the time and effort you've put into this. As also a
volunteer Committee member, I know how much time and
effort it takes to do these things. So your work is
appreciated.

We had a lengthy discussion last night about
this. It was kind of a continuation of work that we
started last year where we went around and we identified
certain structures in the downtown area that we thought might be significant, worthy of landmarking, further discussion for preservation. And there's a couple associate members here tonight who want to speak as well.

I'd like to address three points in particular that I think would be beneficial from a preservation aspect to the plan. The plan, I think, is certainly, as far as preservation goes, it's, it mentions it somewhat, but I don't think it mentions it quite enough, not at least as much as, I think, the Commission, Preservation Commission would like to see.

The first thing is, and Carlos Ruiz is handing out the report that we did, would be to identify all of those landmarks that already exist in the downtown area. I think that that would be a crucial thing to visually look at. There's a number of maps of the various zones you've identified to, as my fellow Commissioner pointed out to me earlier, you know, to have that visual to see where they're clustered, where they're at, I think is important, as you move forward and take a look at blocks and take a look at more development. Where are those landmarks and where do they fit in?
Along those same lines we went through and we identified what we believed were the most significant structures that haven't been landmarked yet. We had a process of rating them on a scale of one to 10. And we deemed that anything that was seven or above would be worthy of either landmarking or some other special designation that gives significant character, I think, to the downtown area. And there were, I believe, 10 of those properties. And those are also in the report that Carlos is handing out. I think it's important to note those buildings as well. There's been criticism of the preservation efforts in the past that people wait to preserve or landmark buildings, you know, right as they're being asked to be torn down. So I think we've gone through and we've tried to identify some of those structures already that we think are worthy. But that process hasn't taken place yet.

The third one is a much more, I think, broad, conceptual point. The plan, as it was described to us last night by Dennis and the consultants, has a number of bonuses built in for developers if they want to exceed the form-based zoning requirements where they could give money, perhaps, or make concessions somehow.
related to preservation. And I think that's at least a starting point.

But one thing we identified is, what about the existing owners in the downtown area? There are a number of buildings in the downtown, as we've identified, that are worthy of landmarking. There are others that might not be worthy of landmarking, but they are still significant. And perhaps the owners of those buildings would like to preserve them. But what incentives will this plan offer them?

And what we'd like to suggest is that there is something in the plan, if we established, perhaps, a fund or a pool of funds that could come out of this bonus system, perhaps, or some other source that would maybe establish like a matching program for owners who would like to, you know, restore their buildings, but simply don't have the funds to do it. And that process, I think, would necessarily involve the Preservation Commission taking a look and seeing which buildings are worthy of this and perhaps how to apportion some of the funds that might be available.

We also talked about the fact that Evanston has had a facade retention program that, as I understood
from Dennis when he explained it, it's not really available to buildings in the downtown. But perhaps that should be extended to buildings in the downtown. If we've got that program, let's revive it as part of this Downtown Plan and make those funds available.

There's also a number of other programs. There's state programs, federal programs that I think are worth mentioning. One of our goals, at least personally one of the goals I'd like to see for the Preservation Commission going forward, is being more proactive. We wait for a lot of applications to come to us. But, you know, adding something along these lines where we can actually go into the community and tell an owner, you know, we think that your property is worth restoring, here is what we can do to help you, here's the plan of Evanston that supports your restoring this property.

So those are kind of broad brush strokes. We don't have a lot of specifics yet. But I think we'd like to see the plan incorporate that. And I think that's, those were the three last night points that I think we were able to reach a consensus on, as well as the associate members, I think, have some other points.
that they'd like to raise.

So again, we appreciate your efforts. We appreciate the collaboration. I think it's important for all of downtown. And we're happy to come back or to take the laboring war on some other aspect of this if you'd like us to.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: David?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Jordan, I have a quick question for you. The downtown Evanston building survey, which is the second page of the thick handout, that is identical to the survey you performed at the Downtown Committee's request approximately a year ago?

CHAIRMAN CRAMER: Right. It was some time ago. Right. That's what we presented to you when we came to your sub-committee and said, here, these 10 that are seven and above are ones that we think are worthy of landmarking or some other type of designation.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Any other --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: What is the asterisk?

It says more discussion needed. Line one.

CHAIRMAN CRAMER: Right. There were a couple properties on there that it was thought they didn't
reach the seven mark, but perhaps we should talk about them further. And I think as we went through the process and -- them down, those still didn't make the list for, it could be a variety of reasons.

I mean, for example, I know from personally some of the ones that I looked at the integrity of the building was maybe so far gone that we just didn't think it was at that point where it would be appropriate to designate it as a landmark.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Robin.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Can I talk to Opdycke for a minute? I'm just writing a couple --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Sure. Stu?

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Directing your attention again to the survey, was a vote taken of the members? It that how you arrived at the various assignments?

COMMISSIONER CRAMER: What we did is, we all ranked it. Right. We all ranked them and then collectively we put the numbers together.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I had a couple of questions.
COMMISSIONER CRAMER: Sure.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I don't know if I should hold them until the end. I entirely agree with the facade retention program being extended to downtown. And what's wonderful looking at the 1989 plan and other plans in Evanston is that once the language gets into the plan, it's much easier to keep Commissions going on these tasks and City staff and ultimately if it has to go to P&D and City Council.

So I guess I would say to my fellow Commissioners that I think that these points that Commissioner Cramer has brought up are really important in getting in the language of the plan, especially reading through the meeting minutes of the Downtown Plan sub-committee prior to my joining it. There's a lot of language about historic districts and landmarks. But I think at times people get starry eyed or one might get starry eyed with the landmark designation. I think you're absolutely right. They particularly get starry eyed when the building's going to be torn down.

But I think the 1989 plan has a lot of wonderful language about character-giving buildings, historic fabric, historic contacts. And I think these
things are important too. I think, then, extending the Facade Retention Program downtown is absolutely crucial to getting in the final plan somehow in a very instrumental way, in a way that will actually make it happen the next couple years.

I wanted to know about facade retention in terms of redevelopment of sites in the Charrette by the consultants. There was a map which I extended, a JPG in your e-mail, to the Preservation Commissioners. And I was just wondering if you spoke at all about retaining facades.

Now that's a controversial program, as many people know. But people who don't, this is when a building, you keep the actual facade up to a certain number of feet or inches and then build higher behind it.

There's a lot of problems with it. One is that you lose the integrity of the interior space and the exterior space matching perfectly. Often, especially if there's a parking lot behind it, you lose that sense of the building. On the other hand, you don't lose the streetscape altogether.

So I was just wondering if you talked about
that or whether, if Preservation Commissioners, if you could comment on that this evening one way or another. It was proposed. It didn't make it into the final plan. But this is obviously just a draft. So I guess facade, retaining a facade, it's often called a facadectomy.

The second question is one regarding historic districts and whether you did feel like you did need to go forward on that or not. Again, you didn't, wouldn't need to decide this evening. I'd just be interested or would welcome your comments on historic districts. Again, once the language is in the plan, there's a greater chance of that actually happening.

And then there's also a number of buildings that either scored very low or were not on your list at all. I think one of the buildings that I've continued to be concerned about actually got a 6.8. That's 518 to 526 Davis. It's a very low, two or barely three-story building on Davis between Chicago and Hinman. And it is a beautiful building. It's on the south side of the street. It has a very worn out facade. It has a lot of vacancies right now. And it was under pressure with the 1515 Chicago development that did not get approved.
This is an example of a building that's two stories, but slated to be in the zone of six to 10 stories. I'm just wondering should we as Plan Commissioners be concerned about a two-story building in a zone that can be up to 10 stories or not? What kind of opinion the Preservation officers had about that?

CHAIRMAN CRAMER: Okay, well, there's a bunch of questions in there. I'll try and answer those as best I can. And there are some of these points, I believe Mary McWilliams, who's an associate member who also, I think, is an original member of the Preservation Commission, can speak to as well.

As far as the facade retention, we talked about it briefly. The question was asked of Dennis Marino if we still had that program in Evanston. And I believe the answer is we do, but it's not really being used. And I don't think people really even know about it. And to extend it into the downtown, I think would be an excellent way to incorporate preservation into this plan. We didn't really get down into specifics on how it works, how it would be done.

So as far as a historic district, we have talked about that. We talked about different ways of
preservation of the downtown. There's landmarking.
There's also establishing a historic district, which, you know, can be tricky depending on where you put it and what you incorporate into it and what you don't.
I think Mary McWilliams also sent around an e-mail today that had an interesting point that I'll let her speak to about establishing a conservation district overlay, which I think is a really interesting, intriguing idea. So I'll let her present that.

Your last question, remind me again.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, I still wanted to hear about facadectomies. Thumbs up, thumbs down, neutral.

CHAIRMAN CRAMER: Personally, I can only tell you personally my view on it. Because we really didn't come to a consensus on it with the Commission. So as owner of 2607 Park Place, I'll tell you it's, I think it's an interesting idea. I see it happening in downtown Chicago when I'm down by my office. I think there's some value in it.

You know, if it's a choice between, you know, losing the building altogether and preserving some semblance of it, I think it's nice to preserve some
semblance of it if it makes sense, if it's going to look
good. If you're going to use that in place of saying,
we should limit, you know, the height, you know, it's
okay to take the facade and then we're going to put 10
stories on top of it, I think that's kind of a different
thing than I would envision.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: And my sort of
third general category of question was regarding
buildings that aren't landmarked, aren't perhaps even
landmarkable, but are part of the sort of historic
fabric of downtown and how many stories you think starts
to put pressure on a building to be torn down.

If it's a beautiful, two-story building, but
again, for many reasons, perhaps the owner is averse to
landmarking it, at what point does zoning cease to
protect a building? Is 10 stories sort of too much to
protect our two-story buildings or do you think that
it's okay?

Again, with part of the traditional zone,
we've got a lot of one-story buildings that can be built
to five. And I can foresee a time where if you can get
five stories, if you can go from CVS to Marshall Fields,
you might want to tear down the one-story building.
CHAIRMAN CRAMER: Um-hum. Well, again, I, you know, I'm mostly speaking for myself here. I mean, there are, I think, varying opinions on this. As we went through and identified in our report, one thing that became clear is there are certain streets that have patterns. And this, I think, is where the form-based zoning comes in. But perhaps it doesn't go far enough.

For example, on Sherman Avenue as you go north from Church Street, Davis Street going west from the tracks, there's a certain height and look that gives context to that block. And I think to have that context disappear because you have, you know, a 10-story building in the middle of it, would certainly take away from the character overall of a block like that.

And those are, you know, those are things that we have discussed as a Commission. I don't think we have necessarily a consensus on it. You might ask all 11 of us and get 11 different opinions, which, you know, which I'm sure never happens with any of your meetings either.

But I, you know, and again, I think that's part of the reason, I think, the idea of either a historic district or as Mary will explain, a
conservation district overlay, is a good idea. Because it might be able to help retain some of that. And I think also, just to kind of circle this back in on itself, the idea of giving incentives to existing owners to fix up their buildings and not just new developers to come into the community, I think is important. Because there might be some owners out there who, they're just simply, they don't have from an economic standpoint, based on who they have as tenants and how long they've held the building, they just don't have the resources to fix it up. But if there were a program in place, they could. And I think that that would be a wonderful way to find a balance between new developments and old developments.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Larry?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: All right, I was just going to say that I wanted to thank the Preservation Commission for their work. Because when we started with this Downtown Plan we asked for some help. And anybody who hasn't gone through this, they really should. It's very well done. And certainly what we got back was the basis for establishing traditional districts, the
appreciation that where some were landmark, there were a
lot that were character-giving and that keeping at least
the form and context of that that gives character was
very crucial in those areas. And a lot of that comes
directly from the work that you did.

You know, I think also looking at the facade
calendar, of finding some way to help with the facade
program, I believe that was one of the motions that Jim
made when we were talking about the Fountain Square
block and looking at the block as a whole in the
Fountain Square building, which in itself is not a bad
building, but could use some help on the outside. And
if we can find a way to do that that fits in to the
total program for downtown, that that then does become
important. So I just want to thank you guys for that,
for the efforts you've put in. Because it's been very
helpful in the work that we did.

CHAIRMAN CRAMER: Well, we're glad to do it.

Any other questions?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Other Preservation
Commissioners or associate Commissioners who wanted to
speak?

MS. EARL: I am Ann O. Earl, 1508 Hinman
1 Avenue.
2 I am concerned about the east and west
3 expansion of downtown Evanston boundaries to include
4 areas where solely residential apartment houses stand on
5 land currently zoned R6.
6 The Draft Plan states of downtown transitional
7 areas, 'Mixed-use developments with residential and
8 ground-floor retail or office space is recommended for
9 this zone in buildings of six to 10 stories.'
10 Three condo or co-op solely residential
11 apartment houses stand on Hinman Avenue between the 500
12 Davis office building and Raymond Park. Another condo
13 apartment house stands around the corner on Grove and
14 faces Raymond Park. To replace these multi-family
15 residences with mixed-use buildings would change the
16 existing residential character of the neighborhood.
17 While I recognize that many Evanstonians
18 choose to live in mixed-use buildings, the condo and
19 co-op owners chose to live in a residential neighborhood
20 near, but not within, downtown Evanston. Perhaps the
21 impetus for splitting the apartment houses on the west
22 side of Hinman Avenue from their neighbors across the
23 street is a desire to include a reorganized Raymond Park
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in the Downtown Plan. Incidentally, if I read the proposal correctly, a 35-foot building could be built within Raymond Park. But that is not reason to ignore the existing residential character of both sides of Hinman Avenue.

A boundary that runs down the alley between Chicago and Hinman Avenues south of the 500 Davis office building would preserve the existing residential character of Hinman Avenue. The east side of Chicago Avenue would become the eastern edge downtown transition zone, a buffer between the center part of downtown Evanston and the residential property to the east.

On Ridge Avenue, the proposed western edge of downtown Evanston, stand four large three-story apartment houses that are local landmarks and are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The four multi-family residential apartment houses form a handsome one and-a-half block ensemble from north of Church Street to Davis Street and around the corner on Davis. South of Davis Street on Ridge Avenue stand two owner-occupied apartment houses. Yet the proposed Downtown Plan would change land use from purely residential to include business and commercial use of
all those Ridge Avenue properties.

Construction of buildings shown on the proposed Downtown Plan on the two existing surface parking lots on Church and on Grove at Ridge, which are now zoned R6, should not jeopardize the solely residential character of Ridge Avenue. Drawing the western boundary of downtown Evanston at the alley that divides the post office from Ridge Avenue apartment houses and extending that boundary north and south to exclude the existing multi-family residences and the two parking lots would preserve the residential character of Ridge Avenue.

I hope you will change the eastern edge and the western edge downtown Evanston boundaries to reflect the fact that while these buildings are near downtown Evanston, they are not in fact a part of downtown Evanston. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Ann, I have a question. Oh, do you have copies of that for everyone?

MS. EARL: I have a, I'm sorry, I have only one copy.

COMMISSIONER WOODS: Okay. Because you covered a lot of ground there. And just as one member...
of the Commission, I'd like to ponder it and take a
close look at what you've said. So perhaps our Chair
will --

MS. EARL: Jim said he'd make copies.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Thank you.

MS. MCWILLIAMS: I'm Mary McWilliams. I live
at 1606 Wesley Avenue.

I'm currently an associate Commissioner, as is
Ann Earl. And like Ann Earl, we both sat as associates
and then ultimately full Commissioners from 1976 onward.
We sat on the Evaluation Committee which looked at all
the City of Evanston from the time that the survey
started. Well, it didn't start in '76. It started, I
think, more formally a couple of years later. But we
worked on it for the entire time that the first survey,
and so far only survey, of Evanston was done. So we
have looked at buildings, a lot of them.

And I have a couple of things. I have, I
think the idea of offering bonuses for facade or
restoration is, it has, it's a mixed benefit. For one
thing, on the good side, it helps to preserve the
smaller, older buildings and preserve the more
affordable retail and office, and in some cases, housing
that those buildings, spaces, those buildings provide.
And that's one thing I'm also, I'm very, very pleased
with it. And in full disclosure, I am also property
manager for one of the historic buildings in the area
that could possibly benefit. So on that score I have
to, that's the Willard House, the WC-2 property.
I worry, though, that the idea, the bonuses
would be given in exchange for allowing greater height
and greater bulk, which destroys the context of those
buildings, of the historic buildings or character-giving
buildings, which I think is a very good term. And I'm
concerned about that. So I would like you to think
about how this could be worded so that it can at least,
at least in the document it is mindful that this is an
issue, that this is a concern.
The other issue is designation of historic
buildings in that area. From a purist standpoint, I'd
designate them all in a minute. I, some of them are not
as good as others. But in order to protect them, from a
purely idealistic standpoint, yes, by all means
designate them. From a realistic standpoint, I know
that that isn't going to happen as we'd like it.
COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Why not?

MS. MCWILLIAMS: Because it takes convincing.

I think it can take place. But I think it takes time.

And I think one of the issues that I see happening in the downtown is the speed with which the character of the downtown has changed and gone from being a city of mid-sized buildings to tall buildings. And a lot of tall buildings. And a lot of very large buildings.

And I think there are ways of protecting the buildings for the time being and then working on the process of landmarking. I think that's, it is not a simple process, the landmark. It takes time.

I was, Jordan alluded to a suggestion that I had for conservation districts. Conservation districts we tried in the 5th Ward a few years ago, to get a conservation district in that area where the buildings, the majority of the buildings are, don't have the architectural and historic qualities that one would associate with designation. But there is a strong character to the area. And what a conservation district would do would be to help to preserve a sense of place and a sense of the character. It's a simple way, well,
it's not simple, but it's, you identify the critical
features of an area and say, these features are
important to retain if we're going to retain the
character of that area.

The example in the 5th Ward I will give you is
the fact that that is an area of single-family houses
surrounded by lots. But they aren't single-family
houses anymore. Most of them are not. Most of them
are, have been turned into two-flats or apartments.
That's realistic. That should stay. I mean, that
should stay. But by keeping, by saying that the, you
want to keep the single-family, the discrete building
surrounded by a yard, is a character, is a thing you can
preserve, but you don't have to, you aren't restricting
the use of the building in that sense. The same could
be done, for instance, for Davis Street west of the
track between Maple and Ridge.

We were talking last night at the Commission
meeting that there are not very many buildings that
would qualify for designation either as a, for the
National Register or for local designation. But there
is a very strong sense of place there, a very strong,
distinctive characteristic to that place which is
distinctly different from the area immediately east of the railroad tracks.

You could do that by identifying the characteristics: low-rise buildings, different facades, that sort of thing. Large, they all seem to have, or many of them have large fixed-pane windows. That sort of thing. You can, you can designate those characteristics that would then come up for review probably by the Preservation Commission. But it would not have the same rigorous review for, the Commission puts on a local landmark. That's, that would be the issue. They can be as rigorous or as flexible as the municipality, the governing body, wishes it to be.

That's the beauty of the conservation district.

You could do one in the central core of the City to talk about this. That might be a little stickier because that's where the development is very likely to take place. But it would help to preserve the character of a block, for instance.

Another block that might be good for this would be the 1500, the east, the west side of the 1500 block of Hinman which are buildings that probably will not make it to the landmark's rise to designation as a
local landmark. Those are co-ops. But they do give a
distinctive character to that area and help to preserve
the residential character of that street. Those are the
areas.

The next, that would be what I would put into
the Downtown Plan first, as a first step. Because if
you get that into the plan, then you have something that
is there immediate for everybody to use as a guide for
future development. It doesn't preclude development.

In fact local district designation does not preclude
development either. But it helps to give guidance, very
concrete guidance to the developer.

The next step I would do would be to propose
listing buildings, working with the owners of the
buildings to list them in the National Register of
Historic Places, certain buildings. Some of them are
eligible. Some of them might not be. But for history,
for architecture, I think you could do it.

The benefits of that, there are definite
financial benefits to doing that. There are federal and
state programs. I think there's one in Cook County.
Programs, financial incentives to do that. And for that
reason, so there are pluses.
The other, and the other thing, there is no, there is no Preservation Commission review of their projects for the National Register. That's, it's just for local designation that there is review.

And finally, I would try to get local designation for certain buildings. Because that is where the real teeth comes in, where the real protection comes in. But I think it's a three-step process to do that. And that is what I would propose. Somehow, if some language to that effect could get into the plan, I think it would be helpful.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: David, actually.

MS. MCWILLIAMS: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Mary, would you reiterate your first step.

MS. MCWILLIAMS: First step would be to create conservation districts --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Okay. That's what I thought.

MS. MCWILLIAMS: -- of certain blocks.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Okay. And I have a comment. Or in a question, then, for our consultants after --
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COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes. My question is, the way you described the conservation district seems to me to be almost identical to what we were trying to do with the form-based code.

MS. MCWILLIAMS: It's very, I think there's a lot of similarity. And it may be able to, you may be able to use the form-based code in that way. And certainly these areas, Dennis Marino was talking last night about how they want to preserve the character of, --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes.

MS. MCWILLIAMS: -- of Davis Street. That may be that the form-based code takes the place of that. But I think this might, the conservation district, overlay district might go just a small step farther.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, maybe that's, is there something in that small step that you can think of that we could include in the form-based code?

I guess one of the things we're trying, I think we're trying to do two things here together.

MS. MCWILLIAMS: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You know, one is to preserve the character that you're talking about.
MS. MCWILLIAMS: Right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Especially, very pointedly in the traditional areas. But the other is at the same time to sort of reduce the amount of bureaucratic City burden overhead.

MS. MCWILLIAMS: I think you do --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That goes, you know, that the process goes through for a building owner. But at the same time, not losing anything at all that you're talking about. Because that's exactly what we're trying to keep.

MS. MCWILLIAMS: Okay. I think, then, you get very specific about naming the characteristics that you're trying to save. That would be the thing I think you'd do.

And I do think form-based code is helpful, would be very helpful to this process. And if that's the way you can do it, that's fine. But I'm trying to offer, as opposed to historic district, there's, personally from a preservation, as a preservation purist, I'd love to see them. But as a privatist as well, I know that some time, it would take a while to do one of those.
And I think what you're trying to do, and what I agree with and trying to encourage you to do, is to provide an immediate, clear plan for this protection. That's, and I must say, I'm impressed with your work. I apologize. I wasn't able to participate this summer. But I am pleased, very pleased that you are doing this plan and taking the time to look at it so carefully.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I have a question for --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Excuse me. I wanted to follow up after Larry.

MS. MCWILLIAMS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Thank you very much, Mary, for your comments. I just wanted to say that speaking for myself, and I think I speak for the other members of the Downtown Committee, one of the areas that we were most thrilled about in formulating our plan was the establishment of these traditional districts. And that in my mind was a real breakthrough for all of us. And amazingly we were all on the same page from the get go on that.

Now, as I'm looking at some of these
traditional districts, the way they are zoned presently with the form-based code is an underlying maximum of three and an absolute maximum of five given, you know, the possibility of getting all the bonuses to get to that maximum height.

I've indicated all the heights of all the buildings in the downtown on my Downtown Master Plan. And it's very evident to me that, for example, in the Davis Street area the south side of Davis west of the tracks, which is our West Traditional District, there are a whole slew of two-story buildings.

MS. MCWILLIAMS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So I ask myself, you know, I would like to see those two-story buildings retained and restored. Okay, so I ask myself, well, we've got a maximum of three to five. If any development was going to occur there, and I will mention this, the consultants have not indicated that they don't believe that there's any probability that those areas would be developed. But nevertheless, let's just take the most, perhaps, pessimistic approach. What is the possibility that someone could acquire four or five of those buildings? Because it seems to me that that would
be the only way that it would be viable to alter a
two-story building and make it, make it financially
feasible.

So I ask myself, what's the viability, the
probability of that happening? Well, I don't know. I
think it's probably low. But nevertheless, a part of me
says I don't want there to be that risk.

MS. MCWILLIAMS: Well --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So as I, let me
finish, so as I look at this, at this traditional
district, there are two lots on the north portion of
that district which the consultants have said are
potential development sites. Why couldn't we, one
possible solution would be to make your conservation
district and have it address the buildings only on the
north and the south side of Davis. And those two lots
that are further north would simply be out of the
conservation district and still capable of being
developed to, you know, three to five stories.

MS. MCWILLIAMS: I don't think that's a
problem. I think, I worry, though, that for instance
the problem that's at the corner of Church and, oh,
well, where the tracks, immediately west, the tall
building that was just, the new tall building that's --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Church Street Station?

MS. MCWILLIAMS: Church Street Station, that building. And the Winthrop, which is going up. Those are both tall. I mean, that, that's, I agree with you, Dave, I think the probability and one of the reasons that will be, is less likely to be developed is because there are so many owners. That's been a problem for a long time. But I don't think that precludes development. And I think if you wanted to say that one little parcel would be a three to five-story building, that could also be a transition between Church Street Station and, and the north side of Davis, buildings on the north side of Davis. So yeah, I think that would work.

But I think the thing is, I think what's critical is to identify the characteristics that you're trying to preserve and have them in the document so that when it comes time to address this with form-based code, you have very specific things in the document. And I think it makes it easier for people not to forget that these things are there if they're in the document, which is what I would urge so that you've got the language
there so that people can't forget. Oh, I didn't know that was there. It's there to read.
And then it becomes easier, it becomes less bureaucratic if the language is there and it's something that everybody says, okay, we're going to follow it. Like a building code violation. You know you can't have more than three people living in a single-family, you know, three unrelated people living in a building, in a house or an apartment. That's very clear. And that's what I'm, that's the kind of thing I'm talking about. I think this is where I'm leading.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: My only addition would be to ask the consultants to respond to that scenario that we've just talked about.

MR. BISHOP: Yeah, you know I think that the notion, whether we call them conservation-style districts or supplemental, architectural, and character-giving standards, jibes very well with the preliminary strategies for zoning as proposed in the plan document. You'll remember that one of the recommendations in the plan with regard to zoning is to bring some of the existing planned unit development architectural guidelines forward and actually codify
those. I think, and that too was intended as just an initial starting point.

Maybe West Davis, for example, is an area that through an overlay that supplements the urban designs, the fundamental urban design standards of the form-based code or through a conservation district, could receive an extra level of protection to preserve and enhance the character-giving elements of those areas.

MR. LAMOTTE: And I would just add, the strategy as we've been discussing along with the Commission is that the zoning isn't working like it should. We need to change it. That's really what you're approving in the plan with a model or a prototype of what a form-based code would look like. Then when we're done, as we've talked about, then you would drill down in all those specifics with your sub-committees and the whole Commission. So if the standards in here, you don't feel at that time are strong enough to do some of the preservation things, then as Kirk said, we can either beef them up or we can do some other overlay things in there.

But the whole reason for these form-based codes is to get into those things. Because even if,
let's say a building burned down, it goes back to the context question. You want something that's going to fit the tooth in there the right way and not look like an odd duck. Forgetting heights and depths yet, just so that there's character to that missing tooth going back in.

As far as the susceptibility, I mean, we were very careful going parcel by parcel to see what we professionally saw something that could be susceptible to change within five years. We used either development opportunity or susceptible to change. We looked at all those buildings. They're small, they're narrow, they're not efficient. So there's nothing vacant there. There was nothing from the windshield survey that looked like it was falling down. I mean, there could be problems inside. So we didn't think that stretch, which is good news, was susceptible to some heavy change by tomorrow.

A parking lot, obviously, or a little building on a big site.

So A, we don't think it's susceptible to change. B, I think we can cover a lot of the preservation things globally or for that block in the form-based code.
And then I think, maybe not tonight because I think we're going to get back to your discussion sooner or later, is what is the appropriate height? Because if it's a two-story character and somebody has to come out of there, it's the tooth. Because it fell apart or is obsolete or it's falling down. And we put a new one in as two-story building viable economically to go back in.

And what we often find is if we have to do underground parking, retail at the first floor, you got to give some economic meat, so to speak, to make that thing buildable. Otherwise it might sit there as a vacant lot or a burned out building.

So, you know, I think the preservation thing is, we got to make sure we get, especially in design, we really got to get that right. And then make sure that your landmarks are in there. And we've gone through this earlier. And we appreciate the update. And then get to the height as we get to the final votes, okay?

MS. MCWILLIAMS: Yeah, I think the idea, I think, I know what I'm trying to suggest is that if the language is in the document from the beginning, then it is possible to follow, find a way, creative way to correct or address the problem. And --
MR. LAMOTTE: And to preserve, right?

MS. MCWILLIAMS: And to preserve, yes, and to preserve. You're preserving more than just little buildings. You're preserving affordable office space and affordable retail space and affordable housing in some of those buildings. And there are a couple of buildings with, it's the whole menu. That's why those buildings aren't empty. Because they're affordable. So, you know. And we don't have enough of that anymore.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Thank you.

MS. MCWILLIAMS: Yeah, thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Thank you so much. And we can definitely use your help going forward. Hopefully we can call upon the Preservation Commission to help us identify these specifics.

MS. MCWILLIAMS: Well, I can't speak for the Commission. But I would be, I would think that they're, they're definitely, Jordan's not a yes, indeed. And I too, as an individual who's concerned and interested, would be happy to do what I can.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Okay, we'll let you know. We'll let you know when all the zoning meetings are.
COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Jordan, are some of the things that Mary mentioned, are those going to show up on your agenda at some point?

CHAIRMAN CRAMER: Well, we just started discussing that. And I think, you know, we've rolled around these ideas for a while. We go with the historic district.

Really, we don't want to work at odds with what you're doing. So I think the more, you know, we can have a working session, even, to talk about some of the specifics, might be helpful. We have been talking about these things for a while.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CRAMER: So there are a number of ideas floating around. And I'm not sure we have consensus yet. But I think Mary described it well in terms of wanting to, you know, have some characteristics of what those buildings should look like a little bit further than what the form-based zoning has.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: I would think that you would take the lead on this and come to us with some recommendations and some proposals. Is that possible?

CHAIRMAN CRAMER: Absolutely. I mean, that's,
when we were invited in the first place to do the survey and participate, we jumped at the chance. And certainly when we found out that you were going to be soliciting our comments, --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Johanna, can you pass that mic back to --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: So we can make sure we're --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: That we're on record.

CHAIRMAN CRAMER: Sure. Just to repeat, so you can say you have done, certainly when we were asked to prepare the survey, we jumped on it and thought that that was an exciting opportunity for Preservation to get involved in this process and again, assembling our thoughts, although it was kind of quickly given that the holidays, to come here.

And I think the more coordination we have between ourselves, the better. So like I said, you know, to even set dates to say we'll have a working session. Let's come with specifics so we can, you know, get language. I'm happy to volunteer my services and to, you know, gather the collective thoughts of the whole Commission. Because you've got a nice make up of
different people with different professions and views that come into it.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: I want to thank you for the cooperation of the Preservation Commission throughout all the Committee meetings. We had 29 meetings, I counted them, from February of 2006. And Preservation was on the agenda. And someone from your Commission appeared, I think it was, a dozen times. And so I really appreciate your input along the way. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CRAMER: I hope it doesn't take another 29. But if it does, we'll be here.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Just to second that, I really like the idea of the conservation districts. But I like the idea of the historic districts. I would even more strongly support that moving forward. So just in terms of agenda items and ongoing discussions, I think that there's a strong interest from the Plan Commission, at least on my part.

CHAIRMAN CRAMER: Well, we'll certainly see if we can set up some working meetings. I think that would --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Thank you so much.
COMMISSIONER CRAMER: -- be great.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Larry?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I would just like to

go back to what, Ann's comment earlier, now that we have

a copy of them. And I appreciate that.

And one of the questions that I have, I know

when I look at the transition district, you know, it

says it's intended to accommodate residential and

mixed-use. So we're not trying to put everything in

mixed-use. But one of the, we talked at one point about

separating these out. And the discussion, as I recall,

got to these are probably condominium buildings. So I

guess one of my questions is, did we do a survey and

know how many of these are single-owner buildings?

MS. EARL: Three buildings south.

COMMISSIONER: Ann, let's get you the mic.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes. And the reason I

asked this, Ann, is it was fairly unanimously assumed

and it was an assumption that if you have 15 or 20

owners, that most declarations require a very large

percentage of those owners to agree to sell a property.

And the chances are that would never happen.

MS. EARL: The three buildings south of 500
Davis, between 500 Davis and Raymond Park, there's one condo, two co-ops around the corner at --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So those are all really multi-family owned?

MS. EARL: At 525 Grove is a condo. On Ridge Avenue I think all four landmark buildings are rental. I know three of them are. But the three between Davis, between Church and Davis, are rental. I believe the one north of it is also rental. But I'm not certain. Then on the, across the street on the south side of Davis on Ridge is a co-op. And south of that is a condo. But as --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So there's, there does appear to be that one area.

MS. EARL: So it's true that the ones with multiple ownership are partially protected. On the other hand, what if there's a, the question you brought up tonight, what if there's a fire?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That's true. But then you still have to have the agreement. I mean, I lived at Church and Hinman. And there were 18 of us. And we'd never get 80 percent of those 18 to agree to it. I don't care how hard you tried or how much money you laid
on the table. That just wasn't going to happen back
when we were there.

And even, and we had a condominium burn down,
I think on Hinman. It was eight or nine years ago now.

MS. EARL: The -- Museum burned down.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, that's
different. That was, no, that was the house. But we
had one. I don't know. Does anybody remember?

COMMISSIONER: I think that was Kedzie, right?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, yes. It was
started by, I guess a plumber, heating a pipe. And it
went up the walls. But even in that case, as I recall,
it required, you know, every owner had their share. And
to do anything except rebuild that required agreement.

So that's why I was curious. But if there, it appears
that there are some areas where we do have apartment
buildings and --

MS. EARL: But then you're, but you're not
addressing the fundamental issue that I'm objecting to.

And that is that those are residences. Those are not
mixed-use. They are not, they are near downtown, yes.

But they are not a part of downtown.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: No, but I think --
MS. EARL: And the proposed boundaries expand to include purely residential buildings. This is purely residential housing. Yes, it's multi-family. But it is purely residential housing. And that's not part of the character of downtown.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, that's been part of, described as downtown for at least 20 years.

MS. EARL: It's not --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: As a matter of fact, we reduced it. We reduced the area that was known as downtown. It was formally the downtown area.

MS. EARL: It's been R6 ever since --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, there has been R6 zoning in the downtown area. But it was still part of what was defined as the downtown area. So I think the question that we had, and that's why I was asking, at one time we talked about whether the RD area should be, that we should separate those parts of it that are purely residential from those parts that are mixed-use or whether we felt just by putting it in, the fact that they were multi-tenant or multi-owner buildings would, you know, keep them residential just by the nature of the thing. But you're saying that there are three or
four that are apartment buildings.

MS. EARL: But you're relying, then, solely on ownership. Yes, what's more, the three,

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes.

MS. EARL: -- three of the four landmarked buildings on Ridge have the same owner. That's an entire half block with one owner. Fortunately, he is a very strong preservationist and known as a preservationist throughout the Chicago area.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Those are landmarked already.

MS. EARL: And they area landmarked.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So they're protected?

MS. EARL: No. You can tear down landmarks. I can give you a list of landmarks that were torn down willy-nilly.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: We never tore any, did we tear any down on Central Street? I don't remember that. Thank you. But that was my question. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Johanna.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I was just going to say, I think that we could keep the downtown boundary as it is, but consider that the land use on some of these
transitional zones not necessarily be mixed-use just
because I think it is important. And I think other
people have mentioned this when they've come to speak,
that there's concern that if you have on the east side
of the street or the west side of the street residential
and then there's the potential for a business or an
office or something located on the ground floor of a
mixed-use building. So I would suggest that we think
about the use on that, those transitional zones.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: David?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I'm frankly wondering
why anybody would think there'd be a great economic
incentive to include ground-floor retail in some of
those locations anyway. But nevertheless, yes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No further retail would be
tough. There'd be no parking in front for sure, at
least on Ridge.

MS. BRUGLIERA: My turn?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely.

MS. BRUGLIERA: Mary Brugliera, 1304 Wesley.

And I'm an associate member of the
Preservation Commission, having just retired from my six
year adventure. I always like it when all of these
smart people speak ahead of me and say everything I was thinking of saying. Because that makes my task much easier.

I have an interesting announcement to make that's very related to what we're discussing tonight. And that is that the Chicago Architecture Foundation, in its infinite wisdom, has put a new walking tour on its schedule, which will be in all of its materials this March to start in May. And that is a downtown Evanston two-hour walking tour. You will all be informed and invited. And I am studying to give the tour right now. So kind of interesting. And I, we've been joking. One of the members of the Preservation Commission is the author of that tour. And he's been saying, I hope we have a lot of the downtown left to tour.

The only other things I would like to add are a couple. One, that's a personal opinion of mine. And that is that in the central core, which is a very odd little triangle of property, that the maximum height with benefits be changed to 32 stories. And that in the G zone, the core zone, that the maximum height be changed to 20 stories.

I think the comment about standing out like an
odd duck applies to both of these height allowances. And I think the varying heights of the condo buildings that have gone up in the last 10 years mixed with our lower traditional districts makes for a very nice varied skyline. But in my opinion we have reached our maximum height. And I would like to see it kept below 32 or 20 stories in those two zones.

I also want to urge that there be some language, perhaps, added to the Downtown Plan that the landmark bonus segment be administered by the Preservation and Plan Commission jointly after those Commissions have sat down and hammered out some kind of parameters and guidelines for how that would be handled. We had a very interesting discussion with this gentleman from the consultants last night at the Preservation Commission about the various ways other communities have handled this. And some allow landmarks outside the downtown to be included in this landmark bonus. And there are many ways to skin the cat.

But I think that in order to make it happen the way we all want it to, it needs to be kind of set down. We can't take every single instance into account certainly. But I think to hammer out some kind of
guidelines for how that would happen would make sure that it would happen.

MS. DIENNER: I'm Ann Dienner, 1034 Sheridan Road, Commissioner on the Preservation Commission.

I thoroughly agree with all that has preceded the discussion. I agree with my Commissioners who have spoken this evening. I have just a couple of comments to make.

I feel that the West Davis Street area is, should be preserved in a low-scale effort. It is sort of a relief from the excitement on the east side of the tracks. It's a low key, it's a tempering area. And it's also somewhat of an introduction to your Ridge Avenue historic district area.

And I was thinking, we were talking about, just a few seconds ago, about the Ridge Avenue apartment buildings. Why not move that boundary from Ridge to Oak? Because on Oak you do have a very, very mixed up area. And I can't see where moving that line from Ridge to Oak would be all that difficult or unreasonable.

Also, let me check my checklist here, yes, let's be logical and consistent with our form-based zoning. It's a good guideline. And it will sort of
protect us from having spikes occurring in places where it will be more of a shock content than a visually pleasing area.

Keep the one-way streets. We have to keep Orrington one-way at this point. I can't see any other way out. Because you have a dead end there at Clark Street. And there's nothing you can do about changing Orrington and Clark and what's north. That is there for eternity, as far as we're concerned, as this generation is concerned. So keep the one-way streets.

You want to keep as much parking, curb parking, as you can. Therefore, that's one reason why keeping the one-way streets like Sherman and Orrington. Because people do not like to have to go far to park and go in and shop.

Now, our parking structures, our parking, off-street parking opportunities, should take care of the all-day people, people who come here to work, and get their cars off the streets. And we know there's a problem of having the owners of businesses telling their subordinates to go out and keep putting quarters in the machines.

Now of course we've said, oh no, no more than
two hours. All right. But you want to encourage
all-day people to go into the public parking or even if
some of the private parking has opened up. And you want
to give your shoppers, your doctor's appointment people,
the convenience of curb parking. And I think this is
very important.

And therefore, keep the parking along Sherman
and Orrington available. I don't know how many of you
have driven south on Sherman when it's a very busy time,
but it's a madhouse. And so is Benson Avenue. But
that's two-way. That's a different topic.

But otherwise I think we're starting to really
get somewhere. And I'm delighted that the Plan
Commission and the Preservation Commission are beginning
to work together. And let's keep it going. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Stuart?

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: I have a question for
you. You're recommending that the west third of the
tradition area on Davis Street be placed in the RD-2
district, is that right?

MS. DIENNER: Well, I want to keep it low-key,
yes.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Because right now it's
in the Oak Avenue portion, is in the three-story tradition. And if it were moved into the RD-2, it would move into the six-story range.

MS. DIENNER: Well, --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: 6/10-story, yes.

MS. DIENNER: Well, I'd want to keep it as low as possible. I don't want to go up. I don't think 10 stories is --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: But then wouldn't you want to keep it in the traditional zone as it is presently reflected in this plan?

MS. DIENNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Oh, okay. I guess I just misunderstood you.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Hey, Jeff.

MR. SMITH: Evening. Jeff Smith, 2724 Harrison.

Thank you for giving the time tonight for additional public comment. I agree with the previous speakers. I wouldn't classify myself as a preservationist, per se. I don't care so much about buildings from the emotional sense of the buildings. But I think it's important that buildings have a context.
which affects people positively and that people feel
that they're in a community where the buildings
represent what that community is about. I believe
that's exactly what the preservationists are trying to
accomplish with their input into this plan. And I
applaud it and echo it.

I for myself want to speak briefly about beer
industry buildings and process and relate that to
downtown. With beer, specifically I wanted to talk
about Chinese beer, the reason being that right now the
Chinese consume less than a third of what the average
American consumes in beer per capita. It's been
estimated that if each person in China increased their
consumption of beer by three bottles a year, it would
consume the equivalent of the entire grain production of
Norway. Obviously if they add another six pack, you're
getting close to the entire grain production of
Scandinavia, but you're still a long ways from what the
American drinks. Because you'd have to add another 40
six packs per Chinese drinker to achieve what the
average American drinks. I don't know exactly what that
would translate into, but I think you're starting to
approach the corn production of Nebraska at that point.
Of course the corn production of Nebraska by that point will all be going into bio-fuels.

Why does this relate to development? In the 1950s Mao Tse Tung, as part of the great leap forward, tried to get all the Chinese out of the country and into the cities, tried to get them to stop farming and to make steel. And now we have in China what National Geographic, after a visit there, referred to as ecological suicide ongoing.

The developing world wants to consume and have the quality of life that Americans enjoy. But we all know that it can't happen. There isn't room for another five or six or seven or 10 Americas on this planet. Yet growth is going to occur in the developing world. Therefore I think we have a moral obligation as Americans to exhibit some leadership in containing our growth.

With regard to industry, Evanston doesn't have any steel mills, per se, anymore. There's really no farms. There's one small community agriculture project. There's really no furniture manufacturers. We don't make the microphones and the tinker toys and the, we don't even bottle the Orange Crush that we used to here.
in Evanston. Once upon a time there was a port in Evanston. No longer. Once upon a time coal used to be unloaded here. No longer.

If you look south of the public storage facility on Green Bay Road from an aerial view or if you go up and walk around, you'll see that some of the strange shapes in the grounds weren't put there by aliens. They're the remains of what used to be a railroad depot where railroads would terminate. No longer does that happen in Evanston. The disappearance of the railroad lines is in fact what's created the development opportunities that are driving the west side plan. Because it's along that long diagonal where manufacturing used to exist that we now have space for putting in developments.

But the problem with this as relates to regional growth is that every single thing that's consumed in Evanston by and large has to come from somewhere else. We talk about putting growth near transit lines as if it's automatically good. But that's looking primarily at the transportation aspect of growth and consumption. When the fact is, if you're out in Rockford, you're a lot closer to where steel's being
made or to where corn is being grown.

Every pound of coffee that's drunk by a new
couple that's bought a condo that's built on, in Sherman
Plaza has to come in probably from O'Hare or Elmhurst.
It has to get driven all the way through Skokie and
Morton Grove to get here.

Glass, cement, steel, and aluminum are all
what the Department of Energy calls energy-intensive
manufacturing sectors. And that's predominantly what
we're seeing going into new buildings.

When I was here in late November I tried to
give some mathematical explanations of the concept of
embedded energy. And I've ratcheted down my numbers to
be even more conservative. But there's no way around
it, I think, that if you look at a $500,000 condo unit
being built, the energy that goes into that unit is the
equivalent of every driver in Evanston, every person
with a driver's license, getting into their car and
driving down to the Loop and back. If a husband and a
wife or a couple of partners buy that condo, the energy
that goes into building that condo is the same as them
each driving down to the Loop and back for a hundred
years.
Now since 1990, we've had a building boom in the, along the lakefront. And the condo-ization and the growth that we've seen in Chicago probably has been no more pronounced except maybe south of the Loop than on the lakefront and Evanston. Yet the current census figures, the interim census figures are showing that no, out of 435 congressional districts in the country, the 9th Congressional District in which we sit is number three in terms of population lost. And Rob Emmanuel's district is number, is number eight.

So we've had all this building going on, yet people are leaving. The inexorable conclusion is that we're building more and bigger units for fewer people. And the overall point I want to drive home as it affects the Downtown Plan is that stacking people is not necessarily Green. If it were, Hong Kong would be the cleanest place on the planet. But it's not.

I don't have any grandkids yet, but it's not impossible that some time in the next decade I will. And by the time I'm old enough to talk to them, by the time they're old enough to ask me at this critical point in our history, you know, Grandpa Jeff, what were you doing and what was your city doing about the rate of
consumption and about the energy problems that we as a
society faced at that time, I want to have a better
answer for them than saying, well, my town was engaged
in an orgy of building towers of luxury condos.

With regard to process, we recently went
through the Central Street Master Plan, which is this
close, I hope, to being concluded. But there was a
little protest over one aspect of it at the last meeting
of the Planning and Development Committee and the City
Council where some neighbors adjacent to one area
objected to the re-zoning to include a dormitory as a
special use in an O1 district where it had never been
included.

I think ultimately when they sit down with
National Louis College the neighbors will be able to
find some accommodation. And their objection is not so
much to the program itself that's planned to be put in
there as to the procedural aspects in feeling that it
was slipped in without due notice and without the
procedures that you would expect and that in particular,
a zoning change was being made to accommodate a
particular transaction or a particular property owner or
seller's need, i.e. that it was transaction driven
rather than planning, which they felt the Master Plan is
supposed to embody.

And talking with these neighbors, only a
couple of which are members of the organization I lead,
I couldn't say that they were wrong. I had, I felt that
they had a point even though I strongly want this plan
to go forward.

And in, I haven't spoken, I don't think, to
this Commission since November. And in the interim
there was the votes on the 708 Church Street building
which had been segregated from this downtown discussion,
but I think can't really be segregated. And there were
some comments made by some of the Commissioners, all of
whom I respect, to the effect that most people in
Evanston aren't really concerned about this or don't
mind the growth that's going on.

I just want to say that I think the
Commissioners may be grossly understating or
underestimating the degree to which the people who do
take the time out of their busy lives to come down and
speak at these meetings do in fact represent a lot of
people who don't take the time to come out. All I know
is that I'm approached weekly by people who say, oh, I
watch this on TV and thank you for, you know, saying
what you said.

The same types of remarks as to lack of
representation, that people don't, the speakers don't
really represent the general population, was said about
the Civic Center. And then when a referendum was held
on the Civic Center it came down 85 to 15. And I think
that was a pretty strong declaration that in fact the
people who were making the fuss did have the pulse on
the general Evanston population.

And I think, the neighbors that talk to me
about this plot at 1620 Central use the word outrage.
And again, it's a good program going into a building
where the footprint isn't supposed to be changed. But
they were outraged with the fact that it was being
transaction driven.

And I don't think that's too strong a term to
describe that what's at least a lurking or
just-below-the-surface sentiment in Evanston about a
number of the planning decisions that are being made in
this City. It would be a terrible mistake to let the
Downtown Plan be driven by 'development opportunities'
that are key to the particular desires of particular
individuals.

Barack Obama right now is riding a wave throughout this country by talking about the disproportionate influence of lobbyists and what he calls top down politics. He doesn't speak for everybody in Evanston. But Evanston might be the epicenter of Barack Obama's support in the State of Illinois. And I think that people in Evanston certainly share the desire that our decisions be grassroots up, bottom up, designed for the general population to the greatest extent and forward looking.

My conclusion from all of these things are a couple of points that I've made before, but I want to re-emphasize because so much time has passed. First that any building built in downtown should be a Green building. That should be a baseline. That shouldn't be an incentivized bonus. It should just be required throughout Evanston.

Second, there should be a much stronger emphasis in the plan on adaptive reuse. Because it's far more energy efficient to convert and reuse existing, in place resources than to bulldoze, ship out materials, bring in new materials, and build up.
Third, that the base heights throughout all the districts should be lower. And I would say there's a lot of sentiment that would be in favor of capping at 20 stories or 275 feet.

Fourth, that the caps, if there are to be caps allowed through bonuses, should themselves be lower and that the bonuses be strict and meaningful. I do applaud the elimination of site development allowances that's recommended in the Downtown Plan. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Thanks, Jeff. Anybody else? Yes. Go ahead. Yes, it's opened.

MS. BLANOS: Hi. My name is Stamata Blanos. I'm at 1720 Maple.

It's just a simple question. Tonight, you know, I've been looking at the Master Plan for the downtown. And the one thing I've noticed is that the plan is actually creating a wall, a 360 wall of eight to 10 stories around the downtown. It's actually putting it in a box. Do we really want to have our downtown boxed off? Is it really, you know, when people come in, and assuming that they do go 10 stories, I mean, are big walls like that really what Evanston and our downtown is
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about?

So one of the things I'm suggesting is maybe should vary those heights around the periphery and not box it off. Because it's not really that attractive in my opinion. That's all.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Thank you. David, you had a question?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: No. I have a comment. I'm getting very fatigued about hearing about walls of eight to 10-story buildings that are going to be conspired to be built around the City. If you look at this plan, it will be perfectly clear to you that the proposed sites for development that the consultants have designated on there are indeed probably the only sites that will be developed in those districts. And if there are many buildings, six to eight to nine stories in height that exist at present, some of them even landmarks, in those areas. So I don't want to hear any more comments about ringing the City with 10-story buildings. It won't happen.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Next.

MR. WEIS: Good evening. My name is Jack Weis.
If I had a Humvee I would run it right over procedural and legal issues. Because that consumed a tremendous amount of time tonight. And I'm glad that a lot of you stuck around for the rest of this.

I'm a resident of 813 Forest. Been a resident of Evanston for 40 years.

I'm one of the founders of Design Evanston and currently Vice-President and Treasurer, past President and Fellow of the STA of Chicago, graphic design, a professional graphic design organization, and currently Chairman of the City Sign Review and Appeals Board. And I have a MFA from Yale School of Art and Architecture.

During the time I've lived in Evanston I've seen the City blossom from a sleepy residential community to a vital urban center. And I love this town.

I want to make two points. First, about height and density. I encourage you to approve the features of the proposed Downtown Plan that addresses, that address height and density. City staff agrees that our infrastructure can handle increased height and density. And that's a fact.

What I want to speak to is the perception that
few Evanston residents are in support of the proposed Downtown Plan, especially issues of height and density. A few years ago, as Chairman of the Oakton Historic District Committee, I too developed a plan, a plan to create Evanston's newest historic district in South Evanston to recognize the unique historic and architectural features of that community. And that plan became a reality with the help and support of friends. The Oakton Historic District is now listed on the National Register of Historic Places. But we achieved our victory over the objections of a load and vocal minority, objections that were often irrational, distorted, emotional, and misinformed. But we achieved our objective because we focused on providing factual evidence in support of the district and communicating it to all of the effected homeowners in a systematic and targeted educational process.

We took that approach because we learned that we couldn't rely on the vocal support of the majority of homeowners. It seems that people who fully support some causes are reluctant to step forward, take the time, and speak their minds.
And my second point is about speaking their minds. I encourage you to add additional citizens to the project review process by expanding the Site Plan and Appearance Review Committee to include experienced professionals. Evanston is Evanston because it is so participatory. This Commission can improve the proposed Downtown Plan by expanding the citizen review process with a broader SPARK Committee composed of additional professional members from the community who have expert professional knowledge about design issues. No project in Evanston should go ahead without a citizen review.

So my advice to you, Commissioners, is this: One, approve the proposed Downtown Plan. Don't assume that there is no strong support for the plan. There is very likely a majority of Evanstonians who do support it. They're just quietly confident that you will do what's best for the City.

Two, approve the proposed Downtown Plan. Include additional citizen overview by expanding the SPARK Committee. And incorporate more professional members and adjust the hours so that they can, they and City staff can fully participate. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Coleen?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I think you actually contradicted yourself. You went from citizens shouldn't be heard, ignore them, to we need more citizen input. So it doesn't really, you're actually not making much sense with that, firstly.

And then secondly, your comment about most likely citizens want this height and density. And your data, in your speech here, you said facts and data are what you're about. That's what you believe in, right? And do you think that's the way, it's to drive it home?

MR. WEIS: Right.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But most likely, that's not data. Where are you getting your facts? Do you have citizens that have come out? Have you, from Design Evanston, where are they? Where are your petitions that these citizens are for height and density? So if you're talking about data, please bring it.

MR. WEIS: We will. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Thanks. Next.

MS. SAVIANO: Commissioners, hello. My name is Laura Saviano. I'm a resident of 540 Hinman Avenue. And I applaud your efforts to revision the
Downtown Plan. It's a great effort. And it's a great start.

I would encourage you also to take a revisioning of the Chicago Avenue. I don't know if there is a plan. I know that it was re-zoned a number of years ago. But some of the things that are happening on Chicago Avenue in my mind are disturbing. But that's for another discussion. I think some of the ideas in the Downtown Plan could very much apply to a Chicago Avenue revisioning.

Not only am I for historic preservation, which has been talked about a lot here tonight, I am also for creating and preserving open and green space in our City. And I think that is something that I don't think many of us have really thought about. I know it alludes to it a little bit in the plan. And I thank you for that. I think it's critical.

But I am also for more placement of public art in our open places and spaces and plazas. And I know that's mentioned in the plan. And thank you for that. That's something I've long advocated for. And needs to happen, more of it.

But I'm also for height and density in our
downtown core. I think that when I moved to this City about 15 years ago our downtown was somewhat dead. Nobody wanted to come to downtown because there was nothing here to do. Lots of parking lots.

And the City at that point and time went on a campaign to attract development and did with huge success create a brand new downtown. In fact, we've created this minitropolis, as I like to call it. And we are a model city nationwide. People look to us to get ideas about how do, how do they do this? It's been reported on over time. And it's something we should all be proud of.

We revitalized our core with high-rise development situated near our transit hubs.

Transit-oriented development really does work. We've attracted retail establishments that people actually want to patronize. We've attracted additional restaurants that, you know, attract people not only from the north and west, but our neighbors to the south.

Evanston needs to continue to seek this development in the downtown. We want to continue to attract the creative class of people that want to live and work and play here. We want to attract businesses.
and corporations that want to headquarter here. We want
to continue to look for opportunities to create open
plazas and spaces. We want to attract more
opportunities and venues for cultural, cultural
performing arts venues, for example, or music venues. I
know we have some. And we have been very successful
with some of those. But those kinds of things will
continue to draw people here and keep our citizens
happy.

But I encourage the Plan Commission and the
City aldermen to attract this development and continue.
Not, you know, everyone is painting this picture that
we've overdeveloped. We have missed some opportunities
in my mind, especially when it comes to public art,
plazas, open spaces. But I think that as a whole our
City is a model. And I encourage the Plan Commission
and the City of Evanston aldermen and women to continue
to look for appropriate development. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Coleen?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I have a response. So
when you talk about the creative class, --

MS. SAVIANO: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: -- could you describe
that? And do you consider that the creative class
actually has places here that are affordable, really,
particularly with the condo development that obviously
you're encouraging even though we're saturated at the
moment? And --

MS. SAVIANO: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: -- you obviously know
that data. But that creative class, can they really
afford $500,000 condos?

MS. SAVIANO: Right. It's a good point. The
creative classes, I don't know if you know the book,
Richard Florida, the, --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right, I --

MS. SAVIANO: Right.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: My point is, I want you
to call that out and tell me that you think that the
creative class can really afford $500,000 condos. I
want you on record.

MS. SAVIANO: I think, okay, good point. I
think that by attracting people that want to perhaps
patronize those, I don't know, businesses or galleries
or artists that are the creative class is a healthy
thing to do. And I know that, I forget the development
that's on the west side, help me someone, with the Live Work studios that are being developed.

COMMISSIONER: Dreamwood?

MS. SAVIANO: The west side, the west side stuff that's going on.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right, but that's not downtown.

MS. SAVIANO: No, no, no. That's not downtown. But I think we should encourage those kinds of developments downtown, as well as high-rise.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Okay, right, fine. But if you're encouraging more development and developers aren't allowing local businesses or developments that are affordable for artists, how are you, like, reconciling those two things?

MS. SAVIANO: Well, it could be, who knows, along your lines of the bonus things that are mentioned in the plan. You have bonus points for creating open places for public art, for example. I mean, I think there are bonuses in the plan for creating more affordable units of housing in these high-rise developments.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, no, no. That's
not --

MS. SAVIANO: That's not in there?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: -- true. That we have not, we have asked the developers to put affordable housing in the high-rises.

MS. SAVIANO: Right.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: They've over and over again said no.

MS. SAVIANO: No.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And they will only contribute to the affordable housing fund. So the creative class that you're talking about will never be in these buildings. And the developers of these buildings have said they will mostly only rent to national tenants because the rents, yes, it's on record.

MS. SAVIANO: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: It's saying that. So this creative class and the artists that you're talking about can't afford to be downtown with the current development going on. And that's part of the reason why we need to keep the buildings we have, particularly Class B office space --

MS. SAVIANO: Right.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: -- so we're not throwing out people. Particularly going into a possible recession, we're talking about throwing people out of their livelihood. But you're talking about, you know, redevelopment. What about keeping the people we have and keeping the creative class and allowing them to afford being here in Evanston?

MS. SAVIANO: I think it should be a part of the plan. I think it should be written in there. I definitely agree with you.

I think that not only having high-rise development and attracting people that want to spend a million and-a-half dollars on a condo, fine, let them go right ahead and do that. But, you know, there's got to be some sort of provision or opportunities created for people like that, the creative class, that make a community vibrant and make people want to come here and patronize our businesses and buy their art and go to our movies and spend money in our restaurants.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I wholeheartedly agree we need to keep the creative class. But we can't do that by continuing the expensive developments, is my point.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Let me just help you out with a little definition here.

MS. SAVIANO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: When we're referring to the creative class downtown, the downtown areas and the people we're looking for whom are looking for Class B office space, what we're typically talking about are such industries as advertising, graphic arts, architecture, web design, market research, this type of activity. They are people who don't need fancy buildings, office space. They're not going to pay for it.

But by the same token, many of them are making a lot of money. It's not just the starving artists. You know, we have some of those also. And we have some places where they work very well. But a lot of the commerce that we're talking about is in the advertising, communications, computer web design, market research, that type of industry. And that's a lot of what we refer to when we've been referring here as the creative class.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: David?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I'd just like to say
that we don't need a tall high-rise condominium that the
creative class can't afford in order to attract the
creative class to Evanston. The tall condominium that
people probably more well-heeled than us will reside in
will increase the tax base, will increase the market for
upscale retail. It'll increase the market and the
available, you know, customers for all the small,
independent shops that locate, you know, in more in the
traditional districts.

And as testified by one of the creative class
individuals that came before us quite a number of months
ago who was enthusiastic about this spire in Evanston,
he thought, this is so exciting, I want to live here. I
not only want to work here, I want to live here.
Because that means that that's, that this town is on a
roll. It want to have an active downtown. I can shop
here. And I can entertain here.

And the wealthy folks that may move into this
high-rise are certainly, based on our statistics, are
not going to have the standard quota of children. So
they're going to be able.

My point is that while the high-rise building
that we've been talking about may not be occupiable by
some of us, I certainly welcome anyone who wants to live there to live there. Because I believe the benefits of that trickle down to every other portion of the community. And the creative class people that have testified to us have said that.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Johanna.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I'm getting visions of 708 Church all of a sudden.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Because it shadows everything in Evanston.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I just sort of want to say I think affordability in Evanston's a very important thing to consider. But I don't think we need to put our wealthiest people right in the middle of it.

When my parents moved to Evanston 30 years ago before I was born it was a place where professors could live, grad students could live, and buy a home. And I think finding a way to keep that group of people coming to Evanston and being able to live in Evanston and raise a family in Evanston is very important.

And I think also bringing the high-income individuals, part of the creative class that Larry just mentioned, is also very important. But I just don't
Want to sort of get into this where we're talking about let's only pick one group of people in an economic group to move here. I think we need to make decisions where everyone can be part of downtown Evanston or any other neighborhood in Evanston.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Can we take a break now?

MS. SAVIANO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Is that okay?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: We'll be back.

Ten minutes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: We want to take a 10-minute break. In that case, we'll let him speak. Yes, absolutely. No.

MR. VIDARGAS: I want to ask the Committee, oh, good evening. My name is Federico Vidargas. I'm a resident of Evanston. I live at 800 Elgin Road, Apartment 921, Optima Horizons. The horizontal building, it should have been vertical.

I want to make a request. My colleague, James Torvik, had to leave. And I have comments. But I, he asked if I could pass his along, if you don't mind. Could I?

COMMISSIONER: Yes, of course.
MR. VIDARGAS: I'll read his first. His name is James Torvik, -- 212 Dempster Street, Evanston 60202. Ladies and gentlemen, I am here to speak in favor of the proposed Downtown Plan. I met with the consultants last fall and have reviewed the plan. It is not a perfect plan. But the City needs the plan to establish a vision for the future of downtown Evanston. I have had several direct experiences with the current system of obtaining planning and design approvals both as an architect and a developer. The system is dysfunctional and needs to be modified. I hope you approve the plan and work with the City Council to make it official.

I am in favor of increased density in downtown Evanston. The proposed heights are appropriate. Tall buildings are a good thing in the center of town. And we are blessed with the transit, City services, and infrastructure to support the proposed plan.

The plan provides a framework for future development. Great building come from a strong development team, a great location, and an excellent architect. We need to encourage the best design and development teams to come to downtown Evanston.
The zoning envelopes and definitions should be clear and represent the City's vision without imposing a final design.

At the last meeting Jean Lindwall suggested that the Plan Commission and Council's Planning and Development Committee, sorry, carefully review the proposed nuts and bolts of the plan, including the form-based elements of the plan in a round table discussion. That type of review by the two may be a good idea as long as the basic tenets of the plan remain in place.

But we need a framework that is reliable and consistent. The City Council should not be redesigning the proposed projects during the final stages of plan approval. I am also in favor of substantially increasing the threshold for the planned unit development process. Small projects should not be subjected to onerous reviews.

During this planning process there has been discussion about preserving the historic fabric of downtown Evanston. I am in favor, and I'm speaking for Jim Torvik here, of preserving the best structures. The historic structures, historic structures should be protected. But new development is not a trigger for
designating another old building a landmark.

The City's character develops over time. And we cannot stand still. We should strive to build the best new buildings we can. And this plan provides a framework for that development.

My friend and architectural colleague, John -- could not be here tonight. I agree with his observations completely. Other aspects of the plan have been discussed in many forums. It is time to act. Please expeditiously approve the plan. Respectfully submitted, James Torvik.

I'm sorry I cannot answer any questions regarding that. But I would like to add, you know, that I am also here to speak in favor of the downtown Evanston plan. And that although some of the kinks still need to be worked out, particularly regarding a form-based code approach, increased density in the downtown in my opinion is desirable.

I am also a board member of Design Evanston. And I also chair the American Studio of Architects, Chicago Chapter, Regional and Urban Design Committee in Chicago.

I live in downtown. And I benefit from all
the advantages that come from, with buying into an idea that makes sense such as living in the rail-oriented community par excellence in the United States.

It is important to define the direction for the downtown. It is also important to make sure the appropriate review mechanisms are put in place to encourage, enhance, and track the forward development of downtown Evanston. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Break.

(Off the record.)

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I've enjoyed Jeff Smith's testimony and his humor and saw his creative metaphors. But he made some statements tonight that are just simply not correct.

I don't care whether you want with Al Gore, whether you want to talk with any of the prominent planners that are busy trying to create Evanstons in other communities. But the most environmentally sound development that you can create is higher density in existing downtown corridors that utilize the existing infrastructure. And in the event that they are located, fortunately, like ours, adjacent to a multitude of mass transit, they also discourage automobile use and
encourage foot traffic. They encourage cultural and retail development in their vicinity, and as such, create the least burden upon the land and upon our resources.

Now, in neither are we going to solve the world's environmental and ecological problems by cutting our nose off to spite our face and say we are not going to build a high-rise in downtown Evanston because it uses too many resources. In my opinion we'd be cutting off the portion of our face behind our nose if we were to make that statement as some kind of ineffectual and inaccurate attempt to address the world's energy and ecological dilemma that we are in.

If there is a great demand for housing in this entire region and we have seen green space so beloved and so stated as a desirable characteristic by many of our Commissioners and many citizens, we have seen it depleted throughout this region extensively. I have lived in this area since 1950. And I am incredibly disheartened to see all the urban sprawl around us.

If, while nevertheless there's still a phenomenal demand for people to live in this region. And I would far better put them in high-rise buildings.
in the center of towns and cities like ourselves than have them go out and move into Kane County, Lake County, move to Des Plaines or any of the suburbs now that ring our City and use far more resources, create far more waste, and consume far more green space. So I don't believe that his argument had any merit in that regard.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Robin?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I just want to comment not on the content of your comment, but on the timing. After Jeff Smith spoke, then four Design Evanston people spoke. And now Jeff Smith has left and can't either rebut your comments. And I don't think it's a place here for us now to debate these issues. Because I think our next agenda item is going to be about the process and how we're going to decide to move forward with the Downtown Plan.

But I would respectfully disagree with the timing of this comment, given that Jeff Smith has left and a number of people have gone in between and we're not offering him an opportunity to respond. And I just think public perception of the Plan Commission continue to be important. And I want us to take seriously people's comments with the utmost of respect both in
terms of process and comments. We can disagree with them. I have no problem disagreeing with them. But I do disagree with the order in which it's gone forward.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, I would have preferred that Jeff was still here. And I was hopeful that he was. But, given the alternative that he is not here, I do not, I could not sit here in all good conscience and let those remarks go unrebutted.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right. I just think that you should have asked him to stand there. Or should have rebutted them before five other people spoke and then we had the break.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Your objection is noted. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay, do we have anybody else who wished to speak? And, yes?

PARTICIPANT: I have a question.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely.

PARTICIPANT: And that is whether the text, I was here on Monday night hoping to talk about the lakefront. And I know on that agenda, as I say, on Monday evening I was here with concern especially for the Lake Street or for the lakefront plan. And I'll be
back on the 22nd. The --

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Speak into the microphone, if you would, please.

PARTICIPANT: I beg your pardon. I'm not used to this sort of thing here.

I know in that case you were doing, moving to adopt the text of the plan as revised and the mapping as revised. I have some particular concerns about the text of this plan and the use of the word, the descriptive part and the prescriptive part. The use of the word should, it seems to me, is not consistently applied throughout the document. And I'm interested to know whether what we have had available to us up to this time is the full text of what's going to be adopted.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, I feel certain in saying that the text as currently presented is not the text that will be adopted by the Plan Commission, that there will be edits and suggestions and other concepts put forward before we finally adopt the Downtown Plan.

PARTICIPANT: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I know that there have been other people, Jean, who have put forward edits to various things not only from a kind of, I guess, design
sense, but also from a grammar and structure and all those kinds of things as well.

PARTICIPANT: We apologize.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, no, no. I mean, --

PARTICIPANT: That thoroughness has been noted.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely.

PARTICIPANT: When one has time to do it, I might contribute.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Understood. Okay, with that, we're going to close public comment. And we're going to go to Plan Commission deliberation.

And I think our first subject is really to talk about format, structure for going forward with our review. Obviously we've had a lot of public input and that kind of stuff.

That's right. I forgot one thing. Kirk, would you like to summarize? Sorry.

MR. BISHOP: Mr. Chairman, Plan Commission members, I just didn't want you to forget us. It's been a long -- I have a feeling you'll be talking to us in short order. But since it's been a while since we kind of explained our overall approach and rationale, if you
could just indulge me for a few minutes. I by no means am going to do another presentation. But I thought I'd just kind of summarize for those in attendance who maybe haven't heard just a few basic points about the approach we took to this project, the rationale for some of our recommendations, the role and really how we've attempted to address public input and involvement to date. And I thought just at the end of my comments I might kind of revisit some of the height recommendations and maybe for the first time make clear how we arrived at those recommendations. And I'll try and do that as succinctly as possible.

As you know, our planning team was selected mid-year 2007, consisted of professional planners, architects, urban designers, landscape architects, real estate market professionals, transportation planners, and traffic engineers, all qualified, experienced professionals. We truly approached this project as we would any project of this nature. We began by conducting field surveys, walking tours of downtown, research on existing planning policies and data that exists, really attempting to understand the downtown planning context and existing physical conditions in
downtown, a fairly straightforward first step.

We talked, as you know, as we made clear throughout, with really hundreds of individuals in various forums and venues throughout the process. We talked with and listened to. And they've included dozens of kind of stakeholder and interest groups, as well as individuals. And we've attempted to be responsive. And I'll get into that in a little later.

We've brought to bear, really, a wealth of experience. This isn't, or you may not at times believe it. It's not the first time we've done this. We've worked in cities throughout the United States, big, small, and in between, a sampling and names that we've heard as part of the public testimony.

I began my professional career in Austin, Texas where I spent 10 years working on downtown planning issues. We've performed planning and zoning studies, I personally, and Duncan as a firm, in Seattle, Portland, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Kansas City, Palm Beach to sort of go to another range of the scale, Savannah and Charleston, places that really, you know, the last examples, places obviously with historic character and the sorts of form-giving elements.
Locally, particularly with Lakota's experience, work in Milwaukee, Oak Park, Lake Forest, Glenview, Skokie, just to name a few, dealing with the precise issues that we're dealing with here.

We've sought throughout this process to bring a balanced, unbiased, professional perspective to our recommendations. We truly have. There was no agenda from the outset. We weren't given marching orders by anyone. These are our professional recommendations.

And most, most importantly, we look forward to continuing to work with you and ultimately with the Council, with the governing body of the City of Evanston, to bring this project to a successful conclusion.

We've learned a lot from both, from our early talks with folks and from listening to the testimony and comments, often times very constructive comments. And we look forward to listening to you and responding to your comments as well.

In terms of the rationale for our recommendations, as I said, they're really based on our best professional judgment for better or worse. They were formed by many factors: planning policies, economic
development needs as established in existing City
documents and as established through conversations with
City staff, appointed officials, and elected officials.

Infrastructure capacity, of course was taken into
account. Real estate market conditions, as we've heard.

Best practice research in the types of places that I
mentioned previously and in other places that we know of
that we haven't worked in, but that have dealt with
similar issues in trying to sort of strike a balance
between preserving quality of life and these
form-giving. I too like the form or character-giving
element and yet continuing to stoke the fires of growth
and not standing still in today's world. And yes, too,
public input was considered. And truly, it was highly
valued. But it was one of several considerations and
factors that we attempted to balance throughout this
project.

We've heard a few times during the preceding
testimony an occasional suggestion that we weren't
listening, that we weren't listening on the fourth floor
in the library in the studio on Orrington Avenue. And I
really don't think that's true.

The public involvement process that we used
throughout this process, it is fair to say, was not
structured as a plebiscite, nor was it advertised as
such. In other words, the recommendations in the plan
were not formulated by tallying the opinions of those
who favored five-story buildings versus 10-story
buildings versus 20 versus 50. In fact, if you go over
the lengthy, voluminous comments that we received,
particularly from the early workshops, you'll find very
few references to actual building heights favored by one
group or another.

It's true that we heard many people say, we're
cconcerned about the way Evanston is growing. There were
others, in all fairness, who said, we like the vitality,
we want to continue to do that. We want to preserve,
again, quality of life. But we want to do that.

So we weren't really challenged to strike a
balance. And we're not aware of any communities that
simply get people together in a room and with a show of
hands decide how to establish a physical growth
framework for downtown. It is an important
consideration, but it is one of many.

So having said all that, I must respectfully
disagree with those who've said, and, or with the
general perception that we didn't listen. For those who
gave their time to participate, we than you for doing
it. Indeed, I believe that the draft plan document is
replete with examples of our attempts to respond to the
comments that we heard.

Case in point, during the June and July
workshops, again, one of the most prevalent themes, and
I've said this before, was a near universal plea from
nearly everyone for certainty and predictability about
downtown development patterns and downtown development
intensity.

The plan tackles this subject head on. Like
it or not, the plan makes specific recommendations for
an objective, predictable, and certain development
framework. It includes base or as-of-right building
intensities or heights and at least a strategy for
addressing additional public benefit bonuses that might
be available using objective, clear criteria, not a
highly discretionary process.

Now, I know that many have been critical of
the recommendations for allowed intensity. And we truly
respect those views. But let me make something
perfectly clear. The exception provisions in the
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existing Zoning Ordinance effectively mean that there are no absolute building heights downtown today. So, in evaluating the proposed height recommendations in this plan remember they could be fairly compared with infinity. The recommendations, whether it's for 26 stories or 42 or 10, could be compared with the existing Ordinance, which has no limits at all. Now that's an extreme example. But it's fair.

So in addition to the predictable development patterns based on the defined character areas that were initially formulated by the Downtown Plan Committee and were continued to be revised in the Charrette process and through the plan preparation process, there are other examples of themes from public workshops that, public workshops and the public input sessions that find their way into the plan. Let's not forget those. Open space, park-type enhancements, pedestrian enhancement, seven very specific and I think pretty exciting ideas for new spaces and enhancement to existing spaces within downtown. Obviously they'll need refinement as we move forward to implementation. But for the first time we've got something to really chew on with regard to some new ideas.
Green buildings and sustainable design, I remember well workshops in which the content of the buttons was different. Everyone calling for sustainability and Green development. And those themes find their way into the plan, at least in measurable ways through the density bonus system.

Efforts to further enhance the City's efforts to encourage affordable housing, again, perhaps those could be better perfected. Perhaps greater certainty could be added to them. But they are in the plan. You'll remember that between the first and second drafts of the plan we added bonuses to attempt to accommodate, better accommodate local serving businesses and small office space. Incorporation of what were formerly design guidelines or the recommendation to incorporate what were formerly architectural design guidelines into the actual zoning regulations of the City, I think moves the City forward in many ways into, again, an area of predictability and better public realm.

Support for arts and culture find their way in to the proposed zoning strategy through bonus system. Continued emphasis on preservation of resources and conservation of traditional areas is really a key part
of the plan. Yes, I think it could be clearer that many of the themes and narratives from the 1989 plan continue to be relevant and more than happy to respond to those sorts of comments as we move forward.

I want to focus for a second on the traditional areas. We've heard more tonight about the traditional areas than we have in past meetings. And so I'm happy that it's beginning to be mentioned more. It's extremely important to remember in my opinion that this plan recommends greater protections than currently exist for these pedestrian-oriented, traditional development patterns that exist along Sherman and Davis. Hats off to the Plan Committee and the citizens of Evanston for getting that core principal in place even before this project was handed off to us. We think our recommendations enhance those initial core principles and could, again, as you move forward into implementation, be enhanced even further or refined to include gradations or differences between, say, West Davis and East and other parts in between.

The traditional areas, again, first identified by the Downtown Planning Committee, are a fundamental component of our attempts to strike a balance. I rather
like Ms. Dienner's terms about offering relief from the sort of urban excitement level of the core area or that the traditional areas provide a sort of tempering effect. That was really something that excited us about the initial recommendation that were handed to us and that we thought made all the sense in the world. And that is really one of the key ways in which this plan attempts to strike a balance in terms of a physical development framework.

So, well then, I'm going to conclude by talking just a little bit about building height and for revisiting our initial recommendations and a little bit more on the planning rationale. Bear with me just a second while I, I'm going to use just a couple of slides for this explanation.

I want to, again, kind of remind us. I've already drawn contrasts between the recommendations in the plan and the sort of very unpredictable nature of the exception process. But even, by and large, when you compare the recommendations in the plan with existing base zoning and the allowance system you'll find that in many cases our recommendations are not to increase in any significant way allowable building intensities in
large areas of downtown at least or at least to keep it
about the same.

Here we're looking at the RD-2, the
residential, the residential transition or edge area,
the dash 2 version of that district. The zoning that's
in place in the areas that the plan suggests might be
appropriate for the RD-2 or the edge classification are
predominant zoning areas, is of the D4 nature. And
these slides make clear what you can do now under the D4
through the use of the base and allowance system and the
existing Ordinance versus what would be allowed under
the proposed zoning strategy in place.

And as you see here, using the same sort of
assumptions about floor to floor heights, the D4
district now allows through the parking component of a
building, the parking, I'll use the word allowance,
although it's really not -- that, and the allowance
portion allows buildings of 13 to 16 or 15 to 18 stories
depending on whether it's a non-residential or
residential building.

Our recommendation for an equivalent
form-based version of that district has a base of six
stories with an absolute max of 10. So it's in fact a
little less intensive.

R6 is also a pretty prevalent zoning classification for the edge or residential mixed-use downtown transition district. And again, looking at the R6, we have an eight-story maximum that compares with a six base in RD-1, up to eight through bonuses, six base in RD-2, which I just mentioned, up to 10 with bonuses. A little bit higher, but in keeping with approved buildings in the area, improved projects in those areas.

And then the RD-3 on the north side, the north edge district, in fact a little bit greater intensity is suggested for consideration in that area, again, in recognition of the types of projects that have received recent approval in those areas.

Let's look at the downtown transition area, this sort of balancing or relief from the higher intensity areas in downtown. Existing zoning in those areas is that D4 classification again, which I mentioned before. These are zoning classifications that allow 13 to 18-story buildings by and large if one exploits the full measure of the allowance system and the parking. That compares with, as we heard tonight, three to five maximum under the proposed zoning strategies. Three
stories as a base as-of-right allowance up to five
through the use of a bonus system. We're recommending
for the first time sort of predictable upper-story
building setbacks for those districts.

D2 also exists in those areas, but again, at
10 to 12 stories through the use of allowances and the
extra floors available to accommodate parking. Still,
well in excess of the protections that would be offered
under the downtown traditional, downtown traditional
district proposed in the zoning strategies.

As we get to the downtown core, we can compare
that with existing D3 zoning. D3 zoning varies somewhat
in terms of what's allowed based on the size of the lot.
But by and large we're talking about, again, through
the use of the parking floor provision and the allowance
system in the Ordinance, buildings in the range of 17 to
25 stories. That compares with the DC-1 with a base of
15 as of right up to 18 stories.

When you compare D3 to D2, you for the first
time see that under the existing zoning strategies
buildings through the use of the bonus system at least
could be slightly larger than approved now: 25 as the
max here in D3 versus a base of 15 as of right up to 30
through the bonus system. So four or five extra floors.

And then as we get to the central core, we do indeed recommend a zoning strategy that will allow for a sizable increase in the allowable intensity over D3 for obviously a very confined, small geography.

The recommendations for the height limits as proposed in the zoning strategy and the traditional areas are, as we've said before, based on either existing buildings, approved projects, or a rough equivalency to existing zoning. That's by and large the rationale for the edge areas, the traditional areas, and the basic core areas.

When it comes to the central core we have, again, recommended some significant increases. And our recommendations as we sat as a group and we talked about this at length through the Charrette process, there were many people who said, there needs to be some area where we continue to allow the sky's the limit. Prove it up. But because of the insistence, --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Could you repeat that, what you just said?

MR. BISHOP: As we sat in the Charrette process and tried to devise the maximum allowable height
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in the central core area, there were an equal number of
the architects and urban designers who said, there is no
objective, empirical basis for establishing an absolute
maximum height in this area.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Okay. I didn't see that
in any of the transcripts.

MR. BISHOP: No, well, it didn't make its way
into a recommendation. It was a minority of the
planners in attendance as we sat to make the
recommendations.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: In the Charrette a
minority of the urban designers and architects suggested
this extraordinary height? So a minority --

MR. BISHOP: No, no, no, no, no, no, no, no.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: It never made it into
the transcripts, is what you're saying?

MR. BISHOP: No, no, no. A majority, --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: You said minority.

MR. BISHOP: A minority of the folks in
attendance said, there's no reason to establish any
maximum height in this area. So, sky's the limit.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: The majority of people
in the Charrette said, the sky's the limit?
CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, no, no, no.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Say it again. I'm sorry.

MR. BISHOP: Okay. We sat as a group. And I'm talking about the Charrette team here, not outside architects --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Oh.

MR. BISHOP: -- and urban designers.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Okay.

MR. BISHOP: This was the Charrette team.

MR. LAMOTTE: Brainstorm.

MR. BISHOP: The brainstorming session that led us to the recommendations that we presented on Saturday morning at the end of the Charrette with regard to building height where you'll remember we recommended a 50-story maximum height through the allowance system in the central core area, since revised to 42. At the time we were making that recommendation there were those among the professional team that said, we shouldn't have any height. And we said, no, we've got to have a height.

One of our founding, one of our essential principles here is that we need to have a predictable
and certain system. People need to know what can happen. And so on that basis we considered several factors.

One is that one doesn't have to spend too long in Evanston to know that there aren't endless opportunities for growth and development. There isn't a lot of re-zoning of single-family neighborhoods in Evanston to accommodate higher intensity development. And thank goodness for it. There isn't a lot of vacant, underutilized property in Evanston.

Downtown is the City's key opportunity for growth. The core area, because of its sort of insulation from lower intensity, lower density, single-family, often historic areas, is a very appropriate location for growth because it's furthest away from those residential areas that might be impacted by the type of intensities proposed.

From an urban form standpoint, call us traditionalists, we think height is appropriate in the urban core area. If you're trying to decide where you're going to allow significant building intensities and significant building heights, it is not a far stretch to say that should be in the central core area.
The unique geometry of the central core area's triangular block lends itself to a different consideration.

I think it was expressed a couple of times in the Charrette that two things sort of pop out as very neat, sort of organizing, urban form ideas for the central core. One is a sort of Central Park. The other is a significant, massive building, a building of some significance in terms of height.

The base height allowed in the central core, 26, is essentially the existing D3 district with allowances. So there's a rationale. It's a sort of one for one. D3 is the base as of right, was the basis for the as-of-right height in the central core. The bonus, in our opinion, was based on a sort of logical, proportionate height transition from the core, an increase of about 50 percent, where the maximum, the tallest building in the core today is 28 stories in height. So increase that by 50 percent, you get to the 42 that we proposed.

And I just want to close by reminding us again that, though I don't think we've talked about it much, the recommendations in the zoning strategy also
recommend at least that the City sort of beef up and
codify some of the things that are now handled as PD
guidelines and include them within the form-based zoning
code for downtown.

So with that, I'll, I've spoken longer than I
thought. But I did want to kind of remind us where our
jumping off point was and appreciate the time that
you've given us obviously. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Johanna?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: This is a question for
the consultants and the architects on the Commission
here. Is it important to put in floor to ceiling height
for some of these stories?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's personally my belief
that we should not have just height in terms of stories,
but height in terms of feet --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Totally?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- as part of, yes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: We can allow floor heights to
vary, floor to floor height.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Absolutely, yes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: But, so that we can have
office buildings and/or residential. But we should maximize a height in feet as well as in stories. Because there's a big difference between a 42-story office building and a 42-story residential building. Or there could be, anyhow.

MR. BISHOP: And that really was part of the reasoning for our recommendation, frankly, is the different program for office versus residential. A couple of ways to handle it. One is to sort of, the belt and suspenders approach that says no more than 42 stories or X feet in height, whichever is more.

I've also seen approaches that say floor to floor heights in excess of X feet shall be counted as 1.5, two floors for the purposes of calculating building height, which might be a slightly more flexible approach.

But any number of ways to do that. I think we've grown convinced that the recommendations that's based on floor is not -- for this world as, you know, as, in terms of the testimony that we've heard thus far.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. So I think now we'll move on to the Commission's discussion about process. Moving forward here and just in terms of, it seems
evident to me that there probably are things that we will easily reach consensus on. And there will be things that will be difficult to reach consensus on. But in any case, we need a process to kind of go through this document.

We have from staff a memorandum that presents kind of an outlines for going through this, which really deals with sections, or chapters I guess, six through eight, of the booklet. And it seems to me we also need to do one through five. But --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Do you want to start with a suggestion?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, no. You.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Oh, me? Well, beyond this meeting, first of all, my suggestion would be that we go back to a format where the group of us are sitting around a table so that we can actually work together as opposed to doing this setup, which is very difficult to discuss, see, any of us to see what somebody else might be pointing out on a plan drawing or anything else in a document. So, to go to a meeting room beyond this meeting for further meetings.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Do you envision the Preservation being part of that? Or is that a separate point? I'm throwing it out. I don't have an opinion.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Personally, I would like to see anybody, you know, participate with us who would like to. But I think that, you know, the deliberation is ultimately amongst ourselves. But we ought to seek the input from particularly those people who clearly are very knowledgeable about certain subject matters.

Larry, you want to --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: No. I was just going to say, yes, exactly there. We can get very specific in discussion at this point in your format and then take the result and bring it back to the Commission for final deliberation. But by having other people sitting with us, there were a number of times when I know when we were doing the Central Street plan where it was a great mixture of the Commission and the public together at least, you know, talking through finally and getting as honed as you could and then the Commission did their work.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And obviously there's sort of a limit to a manageable size --
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, the manageable size.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- to have a discussion.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And the number of sessions you're going to have.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. But, anyway.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Are you suggesting that we go back to Committee? I mean, is that what you're suggesting? And then we --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, it could be operating as a Committee of the whole.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. Yes, the whole Planning Commission. It's got to be the whole Planning Commission.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: I really like your idea, Jim, of gathering in the round so we can discuss all of these things in much greater detail.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You may also, when it gets to certain points, break up into two or three groups each taking a section. And then come back together.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. And in fact, one of the things I was --
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You get a period of time and then coming back together.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Particularly relative to sections one through five, which really deal with a lot of background stuff and process stuff and things like that that people ought to sort of take that as homework to kind of go through that and bring that back to the group.

I mean, I think the things that staff has outlined, obviously, are the core of the Master Plan that in fact deal with Section 6, which is titled Master Plan, Section 7, which is the Zoning Critique and Recommendations, and Section 8, which is Form-Based Zoning in Downtown. So they represent the central sections of the document that represent the Master Plan.

David?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I'd like to say that the outline, I think prepared by staff, was certainly very effective for me in my working through the document again. I think there's a good deal of rationale with starting out with, you know, discussing the vision statement, objectives, and strategies and then moving, in other words, this whole process moves from the
And I think that's an appropriate way for us to approach this so that we can reach as much consensus as we can on concepts and procedures and so forth and then move into the specifics. I think that will save us a lot of time. And I think it'll be much more enjoyable. Because I have a feeling, you know, that we share a lot more in common as regards the goals of this plan than may be represented, you know, in some of our processes. And I think this could be a great way of building consensus and understanding.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I think it would be a really interesting exercise too to involve the public. And each maybe sit at like a table at one point during our deliberations or discussions and let people, like each lead a table and have people from the public sitting there, having their hands on the plan, we're listening to them, and then we come back together as a group. And maybe even have some of, like, this outline on, like a PowerPoint or some kind of projected something and each, and go through and have the tables report. And in some kind of organized manner so we're asking the right questions, we're getting answers that
we can then use and make a really strong recommendation. And then also just having the public there and having them be able to provide feedback, I think would only strengthen any decision and any recommendation that we're making. Because we definitely, and this is not a, necessarily the best forum to let the public give us their feedback. Because you're only getting the people who want to go and stand at a podium in front of a microphone.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I guess what I'd like to see is that we as a group kind of go through this the first time to try and figure out, you know, sure, where we can build consensus. And yes, solicit input from people as we go through that process so that we can make sure that we're sort of on track with what people are thinking.

But when we get to the issues where we are having difficulty getting consensus, that, I think seems like those are the things that we really ought to get additional input on to try and figure out how we either can build consensus or can't build consensus or whatever we need to do at that point.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, I absolutely agree with that. I was going to say that. So --
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: -- you beat me to it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Sorry.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: You took the words literally right out of my mouth. But just attendant to that, I liked Johanna's idea of having the plan on a projector so that we can all see what we're doing. And possibly with the Microsoft Word document, just going through and actually making the copy as we go instead of marking up our copies, literally being on the same page, and then making a running list of issues further on that we want to bring back to the public. I think that that would be speedier.

And it's also, we haven't had a chance to talk about the plan ourselves at all. I mean, we've been at it since July. So I really welcome first a Planning Commission process where we hammer out these details and literally make changes to the draft so then we've got a Plan Commission draft with a running sidebar of Plan Commission outstanding issues for the public. And then, following Jean Lindwall's excellent idea, and I think we need to really give her credit so everyone knows, of
then bringing it back to the public. I think that was a breakthrough and just a perfect example of how a citizen can cut through the fog of Plan Commission in a single idea in that way. So I'm hoping that we could do something like that.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Yes, Andrew, why don't you grab a microphone?

PARTICIPANT: What I was going to suggest was, you might want to look at the Microsoft Word process that put the, put, yeah, and then you can actually put all of the changes in a parallel page right there. You can see it. Everybody can cue into it. You can put it on line. Everything's there. And you're not losing anything at the time that you're doing it. And that'll give you a lot of time.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Are you going to be our tech support?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: He'll be there.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I don't know. I guess that'll be a question, Dennis, to staff and to consultants as whether we have the technical capability.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, we will, yes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay?
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: A $300,000 plant, $200,000 plan, we can get a PowerPoint projector.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, I'm not worried about the PowerPoint projector. I was just wondering about the software.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Microsoft Word, track changes?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, we're -- I got it.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, I don't know what this was created in and --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I'd like to make an Old World suggestion to some resources that might be available to us as we deliberate. And that would be to have some large blow-up maps or documents of some of these pages that we can clip to the chalkboard and then be also replete with rolls of, yes, trace paper, so that we can sketch upon them, you know, any alterations or possible options of how the districts might be rearranged.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Figure 6A and Figure 6B certainly seem to be --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right, right.
That way we can all gather around the same document. And it'll also afford us an opportunity to stand up for a change, which I think might be good for our circulation.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, our health. Robin, anything else?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: All excellent suggestions. I guess as the person who's looked into the contract with the consultants, I don't want City Council to have to allocate this process, more money to the process. Because I think we've spent a lot of money. And we can do a lot of this work ourselves.

So I just want to address that, that I think we can take this into Plan Commission and we can do the tracing and the blowing up. We've got staff capabilities to help us do that. And we can just run a laptop, there's two up here right now, through a PowerPoint projector and do it ourselves. So I don't want to, with these suggestions in any way, incur any more expense on the part of the Downtown Plan. I think we can do the work ourselves, although they're welcome to come and sit in for free if they'd like.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I can envision a
process where we get to a, we may get to a certain point
on a certain district or a certain topic wherein we
might want their feedback. Because it might raise some
questions as to their intent or their knowledge and
experience. And in that instance, you know, as with any
situation like that, you put, you know, you make a list
of all those questions and we invite you guys in to
address them. And you know, and using the most
efficient time, you know, rule as a procedure.

MR. MARINO: Just a comment about the
consultants' role. Their obligation is to stay in the
process until we're through the work with the Planning
and Development Committee. Obviously we're trying to be
very prudent about what expenses we incur. But that's
part of their obligation. And also professionally they
would want to do that.

Obviously City staff will work with the
Finance Department and the appropriate Committee of City
Council if we need to request more funding. But
certainly I appreciate the offer of the Commission
members who want to get more directly involved. You've
been very directly involved. So we'll, yet we should be
able to collaborate just fine.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, I guess the question I would have is, can we go forward with starting some discussion about particularly items one and two of the staff's kind of outline for these things? As I said, I think we all need to look at chapters one through five and sort of do that as a take-home homework assignment kind of thing.

It seems to me that in terms of future vision and ultimately the objectives and strategies, something that was in fact missed from these overall objectives and strategies is this whole notion of preservation and adaptive reuse.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Could we take notes right now?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, it's in fact being recorded.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, I know, but.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, I know.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Can we just receive a fresh copy? Or, I'm sorry, I should make this statement on the record.

My question is, if we start to go forward right now, instead of having a large transcript and then
someone having to pull these comments back out of the transcript, I'm just wondering what the best way to go forward, if anyone has a clean copy. Maybe Dennis.

MR. MARINO: Right. Certainly staff will be recording your comments, in addition to the transcript. Tracy devotes a considerable amount of her time to this. So we'll assign staff resources to work with you on that. I'll be involved as well. So I think we can handle that. We'll both have the transcript and also a more detailed inventory of the particular comments that you make, particularly like the one you just made, which is a pretty significant one. And we addressed that last night in front of the Preservation Commission as well.

Objective two, improve the quality of the physical environment, encourage the rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of older structures and historic properties, as listed as a strategy among those 10 or 12 strategies. But one might contend that that should be a separate objective in and of itself with its own set of strategies.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. So I think it's, I think --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Page 38, bullet
points at the top of the page.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, the bullet points at the top of the page. You know, they fall under, based on this goal, downtown Evanston in 10 years will be. We need a statement. And quite frankly at the moment, I don't have the words. But we need a statement that says --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: What about pulling something from the old Downtown Plan? They had a lot of good language.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Is that a suggestion?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes, yes, yes. Hold on.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Unfortunately when I picked up my package of stuff this evening I picked up the wrong package.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: It happens to the best of us.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I got too many bags with too much paper.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: There's a couple, if anyone has their downtown, their '89 Downtown Plan, page 78 has quite a few nice sentences. The first one is:

While redevelopment has been the most visible type of
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physical change, other techniques have broadened our range of responses for achieving a healthier downtown. Adaptive reuse of major buildings which have lost their principal tenant has been a popular and successful approach.

Another sentence later on in the section says:
As much as redevelopment has made the difference at critical times in the history of downtown, which could have gone under, it is now time to recognize that less drastic surgery is also a practical option.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Rehabilitation, this is on page 79 of the 1989 plan: Rehabilitation is another technique for increasing the economic vitality of the downtown and strengthening the tax base. While not as dramatic as redevelopment where new buildings rise from the rubble of vacant sites and parking lots, nor as exciting as the sudden transformation of an old gas station into a trendy grocery store, rehabilitation is the glue that binds the old to the new and adds stability to the fabric of the downtown.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Might I just suggest the following language, given the preface which is based on this goal?
Downtown Evanston in 10 years will be a recognized example of the preservation of and adaptive reuse of historical structures.

Just to throw that out there.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That sounds good to me, at least as a first pass.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Can we go home now?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Soon.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: We got a lot of reading to do.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. And it seems like the same idea needs to be one of the objectives.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Same idea.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Same --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Oh, add in the objectives.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, in terms of --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Add a whole new objective or enhance?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Add a whole new objective.

COMMISSIONER: A whole new objective, I love it. Objective one. -- optimize economic funds?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay, well,
objective.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, objective. It certainly should be before predictable and sensible development, controls. And certainly I think before enhance cultural --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Can't it just be after economic development?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, it could be.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I move that it goes after objective one, optimize economic development. So that would become the new objective. Two would be --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Actually, you know what?

Maybe it ought to be after objective two. Objective two is sort of --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Improve the quality. Okay. Well, it's the new objective three.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Or the new objective three. And move everybody else down.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Objective three, adaptive reuse and rehabilitation as a new --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And this is particularly where we could use Preservation Commission and other folk's help in developing the specific strategies
related to that objective. You know, we've heard some
great ideas tonight in terms of either conservation
districts or, you know, a highly refined version of
form-based code or extending the Facade Improvement
Program into downtown. But you know, those are
obviously some first blush kinds of things. And maybe
there's other things that we need to add to that too.
But we need some words and some thoughts about that.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Jean, you'll get us a
memo on that, won't you?

PARTICIPANT: Well, actually, I was just going
to -- No, I just thought for preservation purposes it
would be useful for you to have the Class L and send a
packet from Cook County. And I don't want it.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Could I suggest that
this might say, the objective being, to protect and
rehabilitate historical/vintage buildings of high
integrity?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Maybe not vintage,
but character-giving. Because there may be some
important modern buildings.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Jordan Cramer
actually mentioned the sort of egg, what he called the egg of the bank building. The rotunda, that's the word. The rotunda, sorry. He probably didn't call it the egg.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Vegan plant.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, so I like the use of character-giving buildings. I like architectural context. I like architectural fabric, as well, as terms to all three.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: How about historical, vintage and character-giving buildings of -- integrity?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Of medium integrity.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: We don't want to protect buildings that have a low integrity because --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right. Well, that opens the question of --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: It's a poor use of our resources.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, I know.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: And the Preservation Commission is already, you know, given us the foundation for that through their initial survey, which they probably want to go back and look at it again and maybe...
do some -- investigation -- historical resource -- of
those buildings. But --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. No, just to
go back on the issue of, yes, I'll let them speak.
Well, the question of high integrity and landmarking, --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: The -- integrity.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. Well, just
to articulate what I'm thinking for a second, I think
through it and I think as part of these deliberations we
should be able to throw ideas out there and then they
can be rejected. So let me just say that caveat. But I
think, okay, you go first.

MS. MCWILLIAMS: I was going to ask, comment
on the integrity issue. If you're only going to focus
on high integrity, then there's not much point in
rehabilitation or restoration. Because the problem is
in those areas that the integrity has been compromised
by --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right.

MS. MCWILLIAMS: -- inappropriate rehab. So I
think the issue, if you're going to stick with high
integrity, then you've missed the point.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right, okay, yes.
That's --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: What if we said worthy buildings?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, that's kind of --

MS. MCWILLIAMS: That's very subjective. And I think, I think the point is trying to -- this a bit more. I mean, that's one of the things I'm concerned about, is being too, too subjective in how it feels.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, to go back to that point, I think this downtown survey that was done by the Preservation Commission under great pressure incredibly expediently and well, looked for landmark structures. And that was the goal of what needed to be landmarked or not. And I want to move away from the landmark discussion a little bit in our deliberations and again talk about historical context, architectural context, architectural fabric, and buildings of perhaps low integrity, but high level of detail, buildings that perhaps need to be cleaned, buildings without their original windows, buildings with hideous air conditioners sticking out, buildings, American Mattress is my favorite example of this.
American Mattress is one of the most beautiful buildings downtown with a store and signage that probably hasn't caught up to our regulations. And so I encourage everyone to look at the American Mattress store on Davis and see it with fresh eyes. Because I think it brings up this issue of, just because a building has had a bad landlord, doesn't mean we exclude it from our historic fabric, architectural fabric, especially when the building is made of nice stone.

MS. MCWILLIAMS: I would also say, want you to, suggest that you consider the word historic. Because some of those buildings are very simple buildings, but they have, when you look into the history of those buildings, have a significant history. And that should be, unfortunately history is often times discounted in the process of determining which buildings are important to save.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I would agree with both of those comments. And Robin strikes a good point. There are some buildings and quite frankly a lot of them fall into that same vintage as the mattress building that simply have not been, their original design has not been and character has not been respected.
But I mean to correct you, though. When we asked the Preservation Commission to look at buildings in the downtown our instructions were strictly on the basis of, give us your idea of what you believe the integrity of these buildings are. Because I mean, we said in addition, if you see anything that you think, you know, that warrants, you know, immediate attention for landmark status, say so. But our primary instruction was, give us some idea of what you believe the integrity of these buildings are, you know, by walking by them and so forth.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: When you're talking about encouraging restoration or adaptive reuse, what's your idea about, as a mechanism for encouraging?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Cash.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Cash is good.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, that would be one of the strategies that we haven't thought of yet and that the Preservation Commission I think can very adequately provide us with, I think.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You know, and the only reason I asked this is we get too deep into some of this. There are some cases where it takes restoration
of the facade. Clean up, fix up, that kind of thing.
And that's certainly do-able.

There are other cases where, you know, the
building is in very, very bad shape and the amount of
money to preserve it or restore it becomes excessive.
And I think one of the, what was your term, integrity?
Well, you know, integrity may mean that it, the original
design was compromised. Or it may just be that
structurally, the building --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Is falling apart.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: -- is falling apart.
And the cost to put it back together, you know, exceeds
what's reasonable.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Just a quick
question to that. I know that Johanna's next.
How many buildings downtown are in that state?
I mean, you obviously get into a lot more of the
buildings through working in real estate. What, can you
just give me a kind of, what building might fall into
that category?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, I really don't
want to mention the building.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Oh. No, but are
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You know, there are some that are going to take more money than others to, you know, sustain over the next 20 years, let's say.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay, so there's some structural --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: There are some that, well, there are some that there's been a lot of deferred maintenance on. And it's still being deferred. And, you know, as you look at each of these you're going to have to somehow in this process of defining integrity, and I think that's where we're kind of hung up a little bit, --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I would move that we farm this one out to the Preservation Committee.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I think that's a great idea.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Ann?

MS. DIENNER: I think what you need is a glossary in this study. Because --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Ann, you got to talk in the mic or else we won't remember what all you said.

COMMISSIONER: Will the consultants please
pass the mic?

    MS. DIENNER: I think when you come up against words like integrity what you should have is a basic glossary so that you can, you know, you say well, this is what we mean. Of course there could still be an argument over, over, depending upon the circumstances. But I think a glossary would be helpful, at least to the public. Because you do use special terms. And special terms will be --

    COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I think that would be useful for everything, just if, to make it a useful document for anyone, Joe Schmo, who wants to read this.

    COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Or even the Commission as they try to focus in on what we're saying when we use the word integrity.

    COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I'll add that to the Table of Contents page. That's how we do this.

    COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So could we be a little more clear, maybe give a summary as to what we're requesting specifically from the Preservation Commission? Are we asking them to write the objective and the strategies?

    COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, maybe 10
bullets or something?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: To help us define this.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. It would mirror --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: We're already comfortable with the bullet point that precedes the objectives and strategies, then?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I don't know if we've gone over that one yet. I think we were just doing adds, add-ins right now.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, I got favorable response to the language, a recognized example of the preservation of and adaptive reuse of historical structures as being a bullet point prior to the objectives and strategies.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Under the downtown rules, under the statement -- based on this --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, right.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Robin?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: New topic: Is there a place, and again I ask this with hesitancy, that will not necessarily be conveyed on the transcript, is
there a place in the bullet points for independent
retailers/local retailers? And I ask this because it
does seem to be that in the summer Excel sheet that the
loss of independent retailers was an issue for the
public. I don't know if it's a bullet point here,
but --

COMMISSIONER: Is that something that maybe
you can put under, optimize the technology --

COMMISSIONER: Yes.
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I would actually, I
would, I mean, one way to, instead of just saying
independent retailers, I would say, encourage affordable
retail space instead of just saying, independent
retailers. Because it's such a vague term that can be
applied in many situations. I think affordable, I think
while, at least at the table I was at during the summer
public meetings, there was one woman who had had a
retail business and wanted an affordable retail space in
downtown Evanston and not necessarily, you know, didn't
have a problem with national or regional chains, but
wanted an affordable space.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. No,
absolutely, that's a much better, more refined comment.
Because the issue isn't that they're independent. It's that there's a need in the plan for having a diversity of spaces.

And, well, the question is, would Banana Republic jump to get in that space, though? Right? Should, yes, no, I guess it's a question in my mind.

MR. MARINO: I hear two issues that might be two separate bullets under, optimize economic development. One is the affordable retail space that Johanna was mentioning. The other is a separate bullet encouraging regionally-owned independent retailers to locate here.

It might be the same thing. It might be different. There might be a boutique retailer based in Hinsdale that we'd like to see here, in Oak Park that we'd like to see here, that could afford, you know, the market rate or come close to it. But I think you, there are really two different objectives. And I've heard both of those from people, and more certainly.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, I recall it's a boutique in National --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, but I think that's a good point, Dennis, to add in the regional part of it.
Because I think a lot of our, you know, like Hecky's, you wouldn't necessarily consider it regionally.

MR. MARINO: Right, sure.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And there are several that are, you know, Argo Tea, that kind of thing.

MR. MARINO: Exactly.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Much more --

MR. MARINO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: -- broad.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I mean, there are any number of other areas in this document that reference the goal of achieving a balance of regional retailers and local retailers or language to that effect. And I would hope that maybe the consultants might be able to revise that --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, we've been, we went through that a couple of times trying to get a definition.

COMMISSIONER: Right.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Good.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And I think one was, you know, those that are managed nationally or are stock companies in a, you know, that kind of a thing. And
ones that are more local in operation and, or ownership. And that might be a franchise or it might be an independent. You know, the, the issue is the market forces.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: That's right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And so too, I think one of the things we understand, one of the issues that may hit that the best, is to try to encourage or lower cost of retail space as well as new retail space. Because it's, it costs less on Dempster west of Chicago, or the rest of the tracks, because the buildings are older, the cost of ownership is less, and the spaces aren't as large. And that's encouraging.

When you build new buildings the cost of construction is so high that even though we'd like to see more local or regional people in there, the cost per square foot is the challenge. So you're going to get maybe some very successful ones, but not the quaint little shops.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I have a question.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But I think the document addresses this to some extent, you know. And it's an emphasis on, you know, retaining the quality and
character of the transitional districts which, you know, for the most part, contain smaller, more independent operations.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: You mean traditional?
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Traditional, yes. Did I say transitional? I'm afraid I do that too much. I'm sorry.

And identifying alleyways that might be developed to attract and accommodate retailers that would be at a lower price point.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: In any case, can we add it as a bullet point so that it's really up front and center in the plan? I mean, it is buried elsewhere. But I think it'd be great if we could. Good.

So something just like, with the strategies under objective one, optimize economic development, encourage affordable retail space and --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Encourage a mix, a good, solid mixture of affordable or of retail space affordable to more local or localized --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, footnote,

the --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: -- operators or --
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: -- market study has a good definition.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Okay. Let's go back to that.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay. Does anyone know what page that's on? I thought it was good.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Somewhere we came up with one. Or there was one that was going on it one time.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: You know, Diane Williams might have some valuable language to include in here as well.

MR. MARINO: We'll certainly work with your suggestions. I think they're good suggestions and certainly consistent with what we've heard in a number of circles about people's interest. We can certainly draft something up and contact Diane as part of that.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, because I think we're struggling, and I think heartily, with the descriptive language. And I don't want to --

MR. MARINO: Your intent is clear.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: -- preclude or miss, miss, -- something that is not accurate within the
MR. MARINO: Right.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: -- you know, and that as a consequence precludes somebody from not having the opportunity --

MR. MARINO: Sure.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: -- or give them the wrong impression.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, I just wanted independent retailers in the bullet point of objective strategies. Because again, as you said earlier, it's a good idea to sort of get that on that table.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: And then we can drill down later.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, but I'd just like to, I think if we gave that charge to Diane Williams and maybe, that she might be able to come forth with the appropriate language, given that that's sort of her bailiwick.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, in the market assessment they refer to it as a mix of local merchants and national retail tenants. That's on page five.
So it doesn't say independent. It doesn't say one location. It just, you know, there's a term, local, which could mean one store or it could be regional, but as opposed to national retail tenants.

MR. MARINO: Do we have consensus on the other strategies listed under objective one?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I'd actually would like everyone to consider possibly adding something that says under, we're still under objective one, optimize economic development, something that says, attract a wide, under, if you look on the top of page 39, the second bullet says, continue to attract a wide range of ages to downtown with housing, rental, and --

I would love to see a bullet under there that said, attract a wide range of income levels and provide affordable housing or just a diversity of and not let it be the one bedroom, two bedroom, three bedroom diversity that some people talk about, but the, you know, different income levels.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Also, I guess two bullet points down from that is, assessing the costs and benefits of changing downtown streets from one-way to two-way system. I think most of us when we discussed
this, we didn't really want to go to the two-way, that
we thought that the one-way would be better to maintain.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I'm not ready to
discuss that. I still am back with what Robin had just
mentioned. And I would, I'm asking the consultants
right now in regards, in that, what is a viable, both
economically, socially, and a viable statement that has
a high degree of probability of being achieved that
addresses the intent of what Robin said?

MR. MARINO: Robin or Johanna? The affordable
housing issue?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Affordable housing or
low, or different incomes or --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Wait, are we talking
about me or her?

MR. MARINO: Wasn't that yours?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Independent
retailers.

MR. MARINO: Yes, right, but nevertheless,
yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: This one.

MR. MARINO: This one.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: This one.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Far away.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Now you're forgetting names.

MR. MARINO: I think as a goal statement it's a good idea.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.

MR. MARINO: In terms of implementing it, it's difficult economically and requires subsidy to achieve that. But there are places in the City where every month we're able to achieve that. So it's a laudable goal. It's something that's very consistent with the Evanston ethos. And it's in our Comprehensive Plan and many other places. But how to get more specific in terms of implementing that, --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I would definitely, I mean, I can't emphasize enough, I would, I really would like to see different income levels living in downtown Evanston. It has the Metra, it has the CTA. We want people who work in some of these jobs in downtown that don't require a college degree and aren't paying, you know, seventy or eighty thousand dollars a year to be living in downtown. Because these are the jobs that those people won't do. And I think it's very important
that these people can walk to work, they can take the
train to work.

And it increases the vitality of the downtown if, I mean, especially if you have, and you know, I'm
not talking necessarily like building a new condo
building and saying 25 percent of that has to be
affordable. I'd love to see some percentage to be
affordable.

But this doesn't necessarily have to be a new
development. It could mean that we're preserving
existing affordable housing. Maybe some of those, I
don't know to what extent, some of the downtown spaces
have apartments above them.

MR. MARINO: On Sherman certainly.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Right. And so preserving
some of those units and making sure they remain
affordable.

MR. LAMOTTE: Could I just add? I think for
the sake of getting through this whole document and
getting it through, I mean, now we're starting to hear
direction from you as far as a goal statement.

MR. MARINO: Absolutely.

MR. LAMOTTE: And then a lot of the specific
things like how do we do that may come in here in the form of a bonus or something or it may need to be a program or project later. So if we as a Commission recommend to the Council XYZ as our goal, sharpened, cleaned up, expanded, then there's a lot of work here for staff and Commissioners to implement this plan. But those kind of things, that we get the wording right, that we get the intent right, that we get the shade of the wording right, then we can wordsmith this and bring you back.

And what we typically do is, you know, from Central Street and others, the sheet of the changes. You know, you asked us to change the goal here. We wrote it, it's in italics. You could read that. Otherwise I just, we're just talking, otherwise you guys writing every sentences, look, this is going to take forever.

MR. MARINO: I think Johanna's intent is very clear to us, and again, very consistent with all of the planning documents in terms of creating that kind of diversity.

MR. LAMOTTE: And one last thing there. As you go through the goals, and we've got a lot of them
listed here and you're sharpening or adding, you, we've
said this many times, you have one of the few downtowns
that is accomplishing a lot of this right now. But how
do we keep that going so it doesn't swing to one end or
the other?

All, you know, affordable doesn't work. All
luxury doesn't work. But you truly can say to anybody
outside the City that we have a lot of these ingredients
already. Let's keep this thing going, okay?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You know, I just want
to say that the point that you made when we look at
these and we talk about practicalities, when you say
affordable it may mean pushing to retain second-floor
apartments that are there and not adding to the new
development. It becomes kind of a key thing to making
an objective work. And I was looking at it, and not
always in terms of new development, but as in the
broader base and what the downtown is. That's a good
point.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: The other thing I would sort
of wonder about is that, a member of the audience
brought up, was the idea of are there sites that because
they are either City property currently or could be a
property that some sort of development could occur on, that would be affordable as opposed to an obviously privately-owned site? Which, you can never structure that deal other than through some sort of bonus system which would allow somebody to maybe include affordable units within an overall development. But is there, are there sites within downtown that something could happen on?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It's, you know, in a development standpoint it's probably easier to do a rental than an ownership.

MR. LAMOTTE: I agree.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And we keep thinking condo, condo, condo. But some people just pay rent.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, and --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And with rent you can make it affordable. Condos, you got the issues of condominium law and assessments and all these complications which you don't have with rentals.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. And my point is more about, are there sites that because they're either City owned or some other situation that can be, that are affordable as sites that will allow you to develop
something that is affordable?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: In the Parking Committee when I was a member of that we looked at six or seven. A couple of them down, but at least one, maybe two downtown --

MR. MARINO: One or two, yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: -- that are, were City owned sites. You know, we did some deals with a couple other places where we gave them sites and got return. But that's a possibility.

There's one on Oak across from the post office, for example, that maybe something like that could occur on.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Let's just, because obviously if you, obviously in sort of the current climate of things from a private development site, that site isn't going to sell at a price that --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That's right, yes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- he could easily just build an affordable development on. You would have to have some sort of incentive system to get some units included.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So that type of thing
is a possibility. That's not one you've changed to a park, is it?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, probably.

MR. MARINO: Which one is that?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: On Oak across from the post office.

MR. MARINO: Not, yes, but there are competing visions for that site. And you'll hear about this later in your deliberation. The Parks Department very much would like to see more open space. And they've certainly identified that space that Larry just mentioned and others where they think that's a possibility.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Okay, so it's the race to affordable housing.

MR. MARINO: The parking system would like to keep it as parking. But we'll talk about those tradeoffs later.

MR. LAMOTTE: Mr. Chairman, if I could just add, because again, there's like a whole tree or matrix of things --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Sure.

MR. LAMOTTE: -- underneath each objective or
goal. Like we discussed the affordable office
situation, it's either preserve and adaptive reuse of
buildings we have because then that'll be the more
affordable stuff, or a bonus for affordable office
within a building on the second or third floor or the
front skin on a parking deck.

That's one of the things, as you just raised,
we can look at for affordable retail. We have talked to
developers in other towns that said, we know the
community wants to keep a lot of the local independents.
There's some really good strong ones. They may not be
able to afford new construction now. We can ramp them
up over time. But maybe if you give me an incentive for
putting 10 percent or a thousand square feet of a small
guise or something. But that's something that could be
worked on, and with -- and staff to kind of start to
implement that goal. Some of it might come in as a
recommendation for a bonus and some maybe a hard program
like two dollars a foot, this or that for certain
programs.

One thing we just look up, I think your
minimum threshold is 3,000-square feet for no parking,
that you don't have to provide parking. I think we
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recommended increasing to 4,000. That sounds little,
but some businesses that helps.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: Because they're not burdened
having to go find --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: -- parking with somebody. So
there's about five or six little currents that we can
keep going. Either acknowledge them here or let's
follow up with one of your Committees, you know, your
Economic Development Committee.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That's -- what we're
talking about.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Now as we start
looking.

MR. LAMOTTE: Sharpening this, right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Beyond just what's
going to happen if we try to build something?

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: If that's what your --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Wait. Hold on. We, I
can't help but say this. But we just had this, like,
great idea over here. And we have consensus. We would love to see a building maybe on that site that you currently have as a pocket park next to the Y. I don't know. The little, right. I mean, that would be a, right. It would be, I think it'd be a great, if the City owns that, --

MR. MARINO: It's a great idea for a site. The City doesn't own that site. We lease it from the Y. But I wouldn't stop there.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Right. Well, so anyway, you have daycare next door. You have a landmark next door. You have possible affordable housing. So anyway, I just thought I would share that. That has nothing to do with the objectives right now, but.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, the idea was to build the building above the parking. So the parking, a certain semblance of the parking would still be retained underneath the building.

MR. MARINO: Which is what occurred on Chicago Avenue with a CitiBank and parking lot just south of Dempster --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right.

MR. MARINO: -- several years ago.
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And maybe we'll trade the Parks Department that site for, and parking and all.

MR. MARINO: It should be an interesting discussion.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Is rent control legal in Illinois? Well, I mean, if we're talking about affordable housing in the rental market, I'm just wondering if there's any --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Stuart, you're the attorney.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: I've never, I've never thought about the question before. I think it's pretty much a New York concept.

MR. MARINO: Yes. And there've been studies of the New York situation. Certainly a lot of tenants benefit from that. But there's also an issue of disinvestments as part of that.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Well, yes.

MR. MARINO: But there are places in California that they rent control and do it well. But in Illinois that's not been an issue. I think that would make people, a lot of people concerned here.

I think there are other ways to address
affordable housing, which we're doing, we'd like to do more of. And I think there's some innovative ideas being suggested tonight.

ANDREW: Mr. Chairman, I have one comment.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

ANDREW: You were talking about the allowances for parking and the size of the square footage. There is a proposal before the City Council, I think, right now for a Green building which actually states that 5,000-square feet is the minimum number that a Green building would start coming into effect for any development.

So what I would urge is that anything that you do here regarding parking and affordable retail or whatever, actually dovetails with other legislation that's being considered. So that when a developer or somebody that comes in and looks at it, there is actually uniformity across the City in terms of square footages so that the individual isn't penalized in one direction while we're trying to benefit in another direction.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's a good point. It wouldn't certainly make a whole lot of sense to allow
creation of a nice small affordable retail space and then suddenly say, oh, you have to be LEED gold.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Is silver okay?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Pre-certified silver.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, yes.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: PVB. Any more comments under one? How about objective two if there aren't any more under one?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Can we go back to the --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Sure.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: -- one-way street?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Sure, absolutely. Oh, yes, the one-way street, two-way street thing?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: Mr. Chairman, if I could just ask, though, if you are following a progression, are we okay on the next objective? If we just keep going down and you guys chip away at each one unless we're already over to the transportation.

MR. MARINO: I think we're still on objective one with this downtown street issue.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, the one-way, two-way streets and stuff.
COMMISSIONER: And I think that that's the fourth bullet.

MR. MARINO: And it's a debate everywhere we go certainly.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, I mean, personally I'm kind of fine with the statement of assessing the costs and benefits. We've got this Commission, we've, the City's commissioned the transportation study and all that kind of stuff. So I think the statement is a fair statement.

MR. MARINO: It is. It's not a statement of commitment.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think we all should weigh in on, you know, before we get to that study --

COMMISSIONER: That's fine.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- as individuals or as whatever, although that it comes before us. Yes.

PARTICIPANT: That was one of the inconsistencies I thought -- But every time I'm about to leave, those streets come up. Commissioner Burrus had raised the question just after I put my coat on. There are inconsistencies. In some cases it uses the word should. Other places it may say will.
But someplace it's talking about these dog-

gone streets. It says feasibility. And I've sketched

in here feasibility, desirability. You've got costs and

benefits. There are some places that a two-sided

shopping street is looked on as desirable. Elsewhere, I

don't know if it's in the text or if it was some of

these meetings -- two-way street slows down the traffic.

Well, if it slows it down, but you want them to go and

park in a structure anyway, it's just another one of

those inconsistencies.

Now, I think as you all know, I am fine with

the way the streets are. And I had asked John LaMotte

earlier this evening, what were the evidences or the

documented difficulties that some people have with these

one-way streets?

Well, he said, you know, that's hard to

document it. I don't think so in the world of

transportation, engineering, and traffic reporting, and

accident or what are now called crashes rather than

accidents. In that world that the traffic engineers

will be venturing into as they pursue this study there

are some things that can be quantified. The

distractions, the turns across traffic, which are
happening spontaneously and with regularity along Benson, a two-way street.

At this point with that traffic, the whole transportation plan having been referenced again, I'd say one of the thing if you don't want to make this too academic, but I think there should be some hyperlinks, some footnotes, or even in the scientific. You don't have to put them at the bottom of the page, but you could reference it to the back of the book if you've got your glossary.

These other studies that are mentioned, the bicycle plan, the transportation plan, even the ones that are referenced in the past, the 2004 evaluation of the adequacy of intersections and then its update in 2007, those things can add to the credibility and the tightness of this. And you as the founding fathers may be looked to by the strict constructionists and the kind of, the subjective reading of it. And I think it can only be helped by some specificity and certainly internal consistency.

I'm going to get in my car and go home. Because I got to make a living.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: That sounds like a great
idea. For all of us, actually.

MR. LAMOTTE: Just quickly to clarify, so, what I said and didn't say. Our recommendation as a professional team is that this two-way system be looked at carefully, very carefully, for two reasons. One is to keep the folks in front of the stores, being able to see to the stores, being able to get to the stores and get into the parking. Because in other communities we've worked in the two-way system has been put in because it's moving traffic. But people get aggravated because they get kicked around three, four, five blocks. They have to make u-turns, loop turns on angle streets and what not. So in that core it's, what do we do to really help that retail grow onto Orrington and do better and sustain itself?

The second part is, what we've heard in the workshops and sidebar conversations, what we've personally experienced of people cutting us off as they're going to the left to get to the parking lane across four lanes at a high speed, was that that's not such a great movement for being downtown when you're looking at shops.

So we're saying at this stage, professionally,
including KLOA, Tim Doran, that there may be some merit there. But what staff's going to do with the study is make sure that that doesn't break down the traffic, it doesn't break down the intersection.

The good news is you have a wide enough street to do two-way where in other towns we wish we had enough width. So --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: John, let her go home.

MR. LAMOTTE: All I'm saying is that we are recommending that as an objective. Amen. End of the debate.

PARTICIPANT: The adequacy of those streets needs to be looked at again when we talk about the necessity to close for construction of any large, unnamed projects that may need access from the two major north-south, the north and the south running streets in the existing downtown. God bless it.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay. Okay, so that's really the basic. And your new study will address this cost benefit?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Correct. Robin?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Oh, I'm sorry. I just wanted an update. I was just wondering, the
multi-modal transportation study, do we have a timeline from that, Dennis?

MR. MARINO: We do. I don't remember what it is right now. But we can certainly get that for you.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Because I doubt we'd be moving as fast as they are anyway. So maybe by the time --

MR. MARINO: Yes, that stretches out quite a length of time. Carl? One, total of one year. Again, it's a very expansive study. But they are addressing a number of issues within the downtown and we'll make sure these two things connect.

Yes, so it sounds like we've gone through objective one and made a number of additions. We've also --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: We made a new objective.

MR. MARINO: We did make a new objective and referred it to the Preservation Commission. But we had some content in it first. And we did, objective two, we did touch on. Can we spend maybe a little more time on objective two or are we done for the night?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Not tonight.

MR. MARINO: All right. We're on a roll.
Sorry.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: What I would like to do is ask staff right now, what is on the agenda for the February 13th meeting?

MR. MARINO: Tracy Norfleet will address that.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Nothing?

COMMISSIONER: No way.

MS. NORFLEET: No.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Then I would propose that we continue this meeting to February 13th.

MR. MARINO: What I'd suggest, the Planning and Development Committee room, if you've, I think you've all been in that. It's a larger room and I think would accommodate the kind of thing Jim's trying to achieve. Yes, absolutely. All right.

And Carlos wants to add something here.

MR. RUIZ: Okay, I'd just like to get some direction as far as the time frame you would like to get the strategy that was added in here. I just want to alert to the Commission --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Can you have that tomorrow morning at eight o'clock, Carlos?

MR. RUIZ: Okay. Noted. We meet once a
month. But obviously we, while the Commission, I will alert them the fact that you're awaiting your recommendation for a new strategy or objective. But can you just give me an idea, when would you like to see this back to you at least as a draft form?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, as soon as possible. I mean, when is your next meeting, Carlos?

MR. RUIZ: It's the third Tuesday in February. I don't have my calendar. I think it's the 15th.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. So my guess is that it'll be, if you could try and have a draft of something following that meeting, that would be, I think, great.

MR. RUIZ: I'll, probably could be done.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: We're going to obviously continue to refine.

MR. RUIZ: Okay.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Or staff will continue to refine it. But --

MR. RUIZ: Okay. Well, I'll let them know and hopefully be able to get back to you as soon as possible.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right, I know, you've already got agenda items and all that kind of stuff too.
MR. RUIZ: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER: And we do appreciate you --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Motion to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Second?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Second.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: All in favor?

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

(Whereupon, the hearing in the above-titled cause was concluded at 11:02 p.m.)