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CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: I'd like to welcome you all to the joint meeting of the Planning and Development Committee and the Plan Commission and the Economic Development Committee. I'm sorry we're not all home watching the Cubs in the World Series, but since we're not doing that, I'm glad that you're all here.

First, I would like to declare a quorum. I think you all are here. And second, to introduce the consulting team, Kirk Bishop of Duncan Associates. And Chris, do you want to come up? You're going to get to take this over shortly. John Lamont of the Dakota Group, Kevin Sumkinberg of Design Studio, Linda Goodman of Goodman and Williams, and Tim Doran of KRLA.

And Kirk, would you like to take over the presentation of the draft of downtown planning?

MR. BISHOP: Yes, I would. Thank you, alderman. And welcome to everyone: Council members, Commissioners, friends, citizens, consulting team.

Let me also point out the other members of our consulting team with us tonight: Christine Williams from -- Group and Kevin Clark from the Dakota Group, and my colleague, Tom Smith, from Duncan Associates.

You know, this if of course, kind of an
exciting moment as we get to sort of see the culmination of a lot of hard work, not only from members of our consulting team, but city staff and you all, who I know have participated with us at many opportunities throughout the process. And we're thankful that you're here tonight. And we look forward to continuing the conversation we want to begin tonight with rollout of the draft plan.

The presentation tonight really follows in sequence the organization of the plan and the supporting report and background work. The way it helps provide the foundation for the plan follows basically eight chapters, that you'll find in the report, pretty faithfully with a, as you might imagine, with a real strong emphasis on the sort of middle part, the master plan, in its draft form and some ideas for implementation of the planning concepts by way of some changes in the way zoning is conducted in downtown Evanston.

As we begin tonight's discussion and as we sort of internally thought about the task before us, we found it sort of helpful to sort of reflect on why we're, what our charge is, what the challenge is before
us. And it really, I think, is a kind of two-headed
tale, a tale of two downtowns, if you will.

For many, many of those in this room, many
members of our consulting team, particularly those who
work in other environments who haven't seen the sorts of
successes, this is truly a really unrivaled success
story, in many respect at least. Significant growth and
development since the 1989 plan, remarkable sort of
convergence of market forces, national economic
conditions, and the important planning framework that
was provided by way of 1989 plan and planning effort
since that time really converged to create just a
success story that is the envy of communities throughout
the country.

For others it's a more cautionary tale: that
with that success comes some challenges. Many, many of
you who participated in early sessions pointed to the
loss of local independent retailers and professionals
within the downtown as something that we need to
continue to monitor and address, if possible, through
future planning and regulatory efforts.

For others, sustainability, the environment,
affordable housing, conditions as they relate to
pedestrian flows, bicycle amenities, and safety features in downtown, a whole litany of things that have come as things that we need to sort of continue to monitor.

Others have cited their perception that new development hasn't always made a substantial and direct positive contribution to the quality of life, that we need to always be mindful of the sort of balance that we're trying to obtain.

And then of course, a sort of overriding theme, it's nearly, I think nearly everyone shares, is a desire for a more predictable development framework in downtown. So in many respects our challenge is to sort of address those sort of polar opinions, to sort of continue the economic success story, to continue to have articles written about downtown Evanston in planning magazines and journals throughout the -- but yet to continue to monitor the effects of growth and development and continue as we have in the past to address any concerns that come about as a part of that development.

The plan really begins with an assessment of the existing context and conditions within downtown. By in large measure, the successes of downtown are the
result of a nearly ideal sort of size of downtown
geography. And the fact that it's centered around such
transit facilities such as the Metra lines, CTA, bus
network, is ideal to support a sort of transit-oriented,
pedestrian-oriented environment that has been really
critical in helping to provide for the successes.

As I say, the 1989 plan just couldn't have
been more right on in terms of its vision for a future
15 or 20 years out. The 1989 plan talked about the
desire for a 24/7 downtown that focused less exclusively
on office development and included places where people
could live, where they could work, where they could
shop, entertainment venues where they could spend their
leisure hours. And of course you add to the portent
that nearly all downtowns yearn for. And you bring a
remarkable sort of learning institution like
Northwestern into the mix and you have, again, what many
communities can only dream of.

All of those forces, as well as the downtown
plan, set the stage for a remarkable era of change that
was going on in the 1990s, as we all know. Another
important reason that we're here is green buildings on
the illustration here showing development that has
occurred in downtown Evanston since 1997. And it is truly remarkable.

Physical conditions, by and large, the downtown is in excellent shape. New buildings have contributed greatly and positively to the overall fabric. They're well maintained. The stock of vintage buildings along nearly every street in downtown adds significantly to the overall quality of life and character.

There are instances of where we need to continue to be ever vigilant in terms of maintenance of facilities, be it the occasional sidewalk in need of repair, open space, or transportation facility. That does make a contribution to downtown. And if we allow them to sort of decline, we need to be ever vigilant that they don't.

Of course existing zoning sets, is an important consideration and one that we evaluated extensively as part of our initial analysis work and continuing on to the plan and plan implementation phases that we find ourselves in now.

It's also important for us to take stock of the ongoing planning initiatives that have had a focus
on downtown since the 1989 plan, beginning in the early
1990s and really continuing to today. These planning
studies and documents provide a sort of critical jumping
off point and framework for the work that we're rolling
out this evening and in the coming days.

It's important, too, to sort of think back on
the opportunities and contributions that folks
throughout Evanston, not only downtown residents and
merchants and employers, but folks throughout Evanston
have made to the plan and their education of us with
regard to issues in need of attention.

We of course kicked this project off in early
June. Then in a series of three city-wide workshops
held at three different venues throughout the city,
about 350 people joined us to really engage in some real
interesting discussions of their perceptions of the
strengths and weaknesses and challenges that lay before
downtown, critically important for our understanding of
the issues before us.

Of course, the design should add a really
exciting period of this planning effort. Also greatly
informs the sorts of recommendations that we're
presenting tonight and were presented in the plan
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document held during the middle of July. And opportunities throughout -- we need to sort of build on the public involvement opportunities. I think we held seven focus group meetings. Our closing presentation on a Saturday morning included a crowd of over a hundred of you all, your friends and neighbors, to sort of engage in a discussion of what had happened during -- week and the sort of citing, physical design ideas that had come out of that design --

We are now entering another key phase of public involvement, public participation. As we rolled this plan document out last Thursday morning we made a presentation to the downtown Plan Committee of the Plan Commission. Tonight of course we're making an opening presentation. Tomorrow morning another meeting of the downtown Plan Commission. November 6 is currently scheduled as an opportunity to continue this discussion and to take additional input on the plan. So another sort of heavy involvement of the public during the upcoming hearing stage of the process.

Of course as we sort of think about the possibilities of downtown, both in terms of physical growth and development, it's important to have an
understanding of real estate market conditions. And that's where we were really fortunate to have the expertise of the Goodman and Williams Group, Linda and Christine. And they're going to now kind of ground us in some, a sense of reality of what's possible and what's been happening in downtown.

MS. GOODMAN: Good evening. I've asked Kirk for a little bit of light. There we go. It's a lot of light. Because my part of the presentation is not the pretty pictures. So it's less important that the slides look nice. But I do want to go over some numbers. Let me get my glasses and little bit of light.

What Christine and I did was really focus on the residential, retail, and office opportunities in downtown. And what we wanted to do was really inform the plan so that what we were, what the design team was really looking at really made sense in the context of the market.

But during a 10-year time frame the market for any one of those land uses will go through at least several cycles. So we weren't so focused on what's the condominium market today or the office market today, but really looking at the potential over 10 years. So
that's, in some ways that's a lot harder assignment for us than it is to say, could you, could the market support a hundred new units at the corner of walk and don't walk?

But within certain constraints the plan must be flexible to allow changes in the market. And at the same time there are certain realities that aren't going to change over the 10-year period. So I just wanted to go over a few of these.

This is really, the slide that you're looking at now really takes a look at the various land uses and tries to access the position, the competitive position of downtown Evanston looking at it from the perspective of a developer or a retailer who would say, do I want to be here? And what opportunities do I have and what constraints do I have? And I'll go through this briefly without reading it all to you.

But on the residential side, I think the explosive growth in the residential units in downtown Evanston is not surprising, given all the advantages: the excellent transit service, service to downtown, which of course we're all keeping our fingers crossed will continue; the proximity to the lakefront, to
Northwestern. And there really are no competitive disadvantages, although there will be market fluctuations and times during which the rental market may be stronger than the for sale market and vice versa.

But sort of as an overall strategy we recommend that the City embrace a variety of residential opportunities to keep the vibrant downtown. And that means different kinds of product and for different segments of the potential residential demand.

On the retail front the advantages are just that the expenditure potentials from the households in this market are fairly high. There's a growing base of downtown households that will support more retail services. And also the Northwestern students and faculty, even though that's more of a seasonal base, it certainly supports a lot of restaurants and retail.

But the thing that you have to remember, and the developers and the retailers are very cognizant of, is what retailers are in Old Orchard? Because that's three and-a-half miles away. And that really does in many ways define what kinds of retail can, will choose to locate in downtown Evanston. And so what we think is that downtown Evanston will continue to support a
variety of specialty retail that will be complementary and not competitive with Old Orchard.

On the restaurant and entertainment front, I'll go into this a little bit in more detail. But again, because of the access to transit, the demand from Evanston households and Northwestern students, there is a thriving restaurant and entertainment market: the movie theaters, the restaurants.

But the competitive disadvantage is, you can't have all kinds of entertainment. Because you're not on an easily-accessible commercial arterial where you can get a sea of parking. So there are kinds of restaurant and entertainment venues that wouldn't choose to locate in downtown Evanston. But again, we think that this is an important component of your downtown mix. And it should be encouraged.

I think, quickly, on the office side, this is one of the areas that I think was least understood in the context of what's going on in today's market. But the access to the knowledge-based work force is really an important advantage for downtown Evanston. And the connections to the university, whether they're directly serving the university or hiring graduate students or
teachers or whatever, but just the proximity really is important to a certain select group of office tenants. But on the disadvantage, and there are lots of disadvantages, which is why the Evanston office market has remained relatively small, is the poor access to O'Hare, the poor access to the Edens Expressway, and the high Cook County taxes. And we certainly heard a lot about that. And we'll talk some more about strategies for how we can encourage not only the retention of the inventory of office space, but even expansion going forward.

And finally, we didn't do an exhaustive look at hotel. But the three hotels in downtown Evanston are a very important component of the downtown and supported by the demand from Northwestern visitors and the needs of the Evanston households. But again, it is not competitive with airport-oriented locations and therefore will never be a major hotel market serving that segment of the demand.

We did complete detailed market assessments of the office and retail and residential markets. And that will be available shortly in a separate document. But for each we sort of looked at the demand and supply
factors and calculated what we thought would be a reasonable expectation of a, over 10 years, of how much additional development could be supported in the downtown.

And starting with the retail, you can see our conclusion up there is that we think that over a 10-year period the downtown could support an additional 100,000 to maybe 120,000 square feet of retail. And that's on a base of about 1.2 million square feet. So that's roughly a 10 percent increase.

And what we did the summer we updated our inventory of every single downtown storefront, and I think we've corrected the 25 number. We're now at 23 new businesses since 2004. And the breakout of those businesses is kind of interesting. Thirty-nine percent are service-oriented. Thirty-three percent we can categorize as retail. And 28 percent are restaurants. Which just shows you how important the restaurants and the service businesses are in terms of supporting the retail and also contributing the economic vitality of downtown Evanston.

The other thing that we wanted to talk about, and it will be available in more detail in our report,
is even though a lot of people are saying there's so
many national stores coming into Evanston, national
stores and restaurants, we calculated, counted up how
many of the storefronts are local and how many are
national. But before I give you the answer to that, it
gets very hard to categorize. And I use Argo Tea as an
example. That now has a number of establishments. Is
that a local or is that a chain? So the successful
local businesses often times do want to grow and roll
out. And so it's an ever-changing, evolving number.

But using the definition of Chicago-based ownership
and five or fewer establishments, fully
two-thirds of the businesses in downtown Evanston met
that criteria of local. So in the apparel, in some of
categories you can see growth of a lot of the national
chains. But there's still a predominance of locally
owned retailers, restaurants, and businesses.

We also present some data that shows that the
retail sales have increased. We have data from the
City's Finance Department that shows a 12 percent
increase in the retail sales tax between 2003 and 2006.
And a lot of that relates to Sherman Plaza and the
additions that that brought.
Looking forward as we look, where is that support for the 100,000 new additional net, additional square feet of retail going to come from? About a third of that is going to come from the new residence that we're projecting, will be moving to downtown. And the remainder will come from increased penetration of the secondary market. That's those households not living downtown, but living elsewhere in Evanston and in the North Shore and also the North Side of Chicago. And we've heard time and again that for many people living on the North Side of Chicago, Evanston is their downtown.

Okay, turning to the office inventory. There's actually been a lot of, the spotlight has been shining a little bit on the small, but vibrant office market in downtown Evanston. The vacancy rate in all three classes of space, and typically the classes of office space are divided by A, which is the highest -- most expensive space, B, and then C. And all three of those are showing limited options, that they can see right in each of those classes is around eight percent. And that means that for a firm looking to expand or to move, there may not
be that many choices. Demand is strongest among small firms that rely on the educated work force and like the downtown environment and don't want to be in an office park along the Edens. And even if the per square foot occupancy cost is less, there are those for whom that's not the choice they want to make.

So as we look to expand or at least maintain the office inventory, there are a few ways to do it. It's going to be unlikely. The opportunity scenario has a 100,000 square feet over the next 10 years. And that probably means the building of one exclusive single-use office building. To do that you have to find an anchor tenant who'd be able to take about half of the space. And there just aren't a lot of 50,000-square foot tenants in Evanston. So that's sort of long shot.

But there are ways of expanding the office inventory that don't involve building a whole new office building like 909 Davis, for example. And that might be to renovate some the existing commercial buildings. You have some beautiful examples of existing buildings where office space has been renovated and made appropriate for some of the, the firms that are looking for quality space. And also in some of the new developments and
some of the new mixed-use developments. Often times if there's commercial space on the second floor, it may be better suited for office than it would be for, for retail.

Turning to residential, and this is perhaps the most vibrant of the downtown markets. In the past 10 years there have been 1,753 new units added, which is about an annual average of 200 new units since 2002. So if you take a longer time horizon, it's a slightly smaller annual average. But recently it's been about 200 new units a year.

We also present some results from a newcomers survey, survey of who's been buying the new condos, who are your new downtown residents. And there's some interesting findings. Evanstonians represent about one-third of the new buyers. Twenty percent come from other North Shore communities. And clearly Evanston is competing with other locations and particularly competing effectively with some of the choices in downtown Chicago. Young professional households and empty nesters are the two major sources of demand.

And that's not surprising. And currently some of the rental demand is being satisfied by the
condominium units. And I think it's important. When we say that there's demand for 1,500 to 2,000 units over 10 years, that's a mixture of rental and condominiums. Because over time some of the rental units may be converted. And on the other hand, some of the condominium units may get rented out. So I don't think it's useful at this level to talk specifically about the rental versus the condo market.

Go to the next slide. This is an excise we put together really to show you what this could mean for downtown. And we're not projecting increase in tax revenue. But if we just take some simple calculations and say the retail space is at least $300 a square foot. And that's based on both the sale of the retail portion of Sherman Plaza and the sale of Church Street Plaza, were well in excess of $300 a square foot.

If you take office space, and say conservatively new office space would be $200 a square foot, and if you say the average price of a new condominium downtown was $400,000, you can see that in our best case scenario we're up to a total of $640,000,000. So that's just, again, to give you a sense of the order of magnitude of what this development
might bring in terms of its market potential.

So at this point I'm going to stop. I'd be glad to answer questions later. And as I said, there will be lots more market material that will be distributed as a separate document from the plan.

MR. BISHOP: Thank you, Linda. The next chapter in the report that I want to touch on is trying to take you through the basic infrastructure. So, because obviously, any sort of growth and planning framework needs to consider capacity of existing infrastructure and planned infrastructure into the future to accommodate whatever growth or development is planned.

Our review of existing plans, studies, our conversations with staff and agencies responsible for the basic infrastructures to support whatever growth is to occur downtown really indicates that there are no know significant constraints to growth as we know it today. There are a number of, and there will continue to be, ongoing studies. I think there's a multi-modal transportation planning study on the near horizon that will continue to look at things.

We know that improvements can be made in terms
of pedestrian and bicycle improvements I eluded to earlier on. We know we need to be ever vigilant and work with state legislatures to maintain funding for transit service and capital facilities. Those will be critical. So supporting whatever growth. There are intersection improvements underway. And those level of improvements will, while reasonable estimates continue into the future in support of growth.

So, but one thing that we looked at in particular was residential parking demand as sort of a component of overall infrastructure network. And here we were fortunate to have Tim Doran from KLOA Traffic Engineers perform some actual analysis of parking utilization within newer downtown residential mixed-use style buildings. And I'd like Tim to kind of report on his findings from that analysis since it's critically important that we kind of understand that demand as we look at things like offstreet parking ratios associated with zoning requirements into the future.

MR. DORAN: I'm losing my voice quickly so I'll make my report rather quick. My name is Tim Doran. I'm with KRLA. We have done a lot of work in Evanston so I'm very familiar with the sites. This is the
results of our studies.

And to make a long story short, we've looked at the six most recent larger developments since the year 2000 to identify, go in and tabulate the actual parking that was being used. And as many of you know, the City code requires two spaces per -- unit, for any unit with three or more bedrooms and a space in the -- for anything with two bedrooms or more and 1.25 spaces for anything less than two bedrooms, ostensibly a one bedroom or studio apartment.

Anecdotally, by talking to developers, owners, management companies at the locations, at these locations that we're showing now, we felt that there was too much parking being reported by -- When we say too much, a developer that builds those spaces out or builds those buildings wants enough parking for his people that live there. But also if less parking is required, and to get a long story short, that space could ostensibly be used for public spaces or other things that have enhanced the development, make it more attractive.

So we wanted actual data. And it isn't easy sometimes to go out and ask the people who are generally people like yourselves that are, just happen to be on
the Homeowner's Association and have to get up at four o'clock in the morning to meet our counter and walk him through the garage. Because that's the time we like to do it, between four and six in the morning before people go to work, so we can catch the garages that are full.

And these are the results of what we found. A couple of those are Optima buildings. And then Church Street Station is in there and 807 Davis and Sherman Plaza. So when we went in we counted the spaces occupied. Now, it was a one-day snapshot, although we went back and counted Sherman Plaza twice and got similar results. It was a one-day snapshot. But in addition to that we interviewed the property managers, the management firm, the developers, the owners of the building, and got feedback from them. They filled out a questionnaire.

Suffice to say, if you look at the far away column, that's the ratios of the occupied spaces per dwelling unit. Remember the code, the City code requires far in excess of that. And just to, I did some calculations just to give you some information as to what's required by code, what the development requires, what's actually there, and what would happen under our
new proposal.

I looked at Church Street, excuse me, I looked at 1720 Maple, which is a large development. It has 202, 204 units in it. The actual code requires 365 parking spaces. There are 237 supplied. So at some point during the planned development process a reduction was made in the required parking. Two hundred, a hundred and ninety-seven are occupied. So by the code there's 315 required. Only a hundred and ninety-seven are occupied.

Under the new code, which we would need, suggesting for consideration, there would be 253 spaces that would be required. But yet there's only 197 occupied. So even under our proposal for changing some of the parking requirements, the actual parked cars are less than what our requirements would be suggested.

So that, in summary that's what we found. And again, please keep in mind that it was two tugs of war here. One is requirements by zoning. And that is the City's obligation to require enough parking, residential parking for the developments. The developers also wanted to require enough parking and put enough parking in the building so that they can make their tenants and
their owners happy. But again, that space, that is not, what we've found out, from these large-scale developments that is not being used.

MR. BISHOP: Thank you, Tim. Tim pointed out that the individual buildings were counted on a single occasion. I think it's important to note, though, that not all of the counts where all the buildings were conducted on the same night. So any sort of seasonal or weekly anomalies really should be discounted by the fact that the counts for the multiple buildings, because of challenges of getting in some of these buildings, were conducted on --

PARTICIPANT: What are some of the dates --

MR. BISHOP: -- different nights. The dates --

MR. DORAN: July through September.

MR. BISHOP: July through September of this year. And I'm going to turn the microphone over to John Lamont who's led our efforts in the master plan portion.

MR. LAMONT: Good evening. What we're going to do now is really get into the future. We've been talking about some the existing conditions in the context. What we want to do is go from what we've
talked about publicly with everybody at the -- and the focus groups into where we are today and what we're recommending, then, for the Council and the Plan Commission to approve.

So first let's revisit the four thoughtful, thoughtfully carried out principles during the design -- Kevin Klingenberg's here. Kevin Clark is here. All of us were at the -- Many of you in the audience were. And we were looking at these as kind of driving the thinking and the planning to create more intimacy in downtown, that a lot of folks said, we like the growth, we like the bigger buildings, we like the activity. But down on the street we have to have it livable, walkable. And the intimacy of the streetscape and the public spaces is very important.

Then the public amenities, taking up the next step, is very important, that we have spaces. But are they really working for us? Is Fountain Square where we should be in this great bustling downtown? Are other little nooks and crannies of open space in the alleys going back to Bookman Alley, are those in good shape? Are those designed to the level that they could be? And then are there other public amenities, which you'll see
in a minute, that we can think about putting into the plan.

The third one was the thoughtful new construction. Kirk indicated earlier, we're going to hit it a little bit later, with the zoning strategy and discussion. But how can we make the new development more thoughtful, meaning how could it look better, how could it match the street better? How could we get better architecture, better site amenities, and kind of get our arms around some of the growth that's happening, make it easier on staff, easier on the Commissioners, and easier on the Council as far as getting what we want out of the process?

And last but not least, Kevin used the word, better rules for development. That's where we're going. We're not only doing a master plan, but the City has asked us to put a zoning strategy into this so that it's all worked together rather than hoping and waiting that zoning gets addressed down the road.

So quickly, and I'll go back one more slide here, on the right is the figured round, or the first illustrative sketch plan that we did at the -- that Kevin Klingenberg presented, that Saturday summary.
Look at that for a minute. And just take a close look at this. The blacked out sites are buildings that are there and they're going to be there for a long time.

I think there's some folks that think the whole downtown's going to churn over, the whole downtown's going to be multi-story, the whole downtown's going to change. But think about all the churches you have, the post office, the library, Sherman Plaza, the great buildings that are there. And when you really start to look at the lighter colors, that's really what we've been addressing. It's what we call either sites susceptible to change or opportunity sites. So there's really not a lot of development sites. And you'll here me talk a little bit more about these in a minute.

So you go to the next slide. And this is our overarching goal. This is a goal that was the driver for the 1989 plan, the driver that gave me much of the success for downtown. Those of you that participated in your strategic visioning sessions, in the 2004 visioning sessions, wanted to add a few things. And we've added one more thing. And let's go through it.

It's a mixed-use Central Business district that is attractive, convenient. We've added the word,
livable. Because that keeps coming up in the visioning session a couple years ago and in the same sessions now, make it more livable down at the street for visitors and residents and employees.

Sustainable, you want to take it to that next level of a green downtown, of a green city accessible to all and economically vibrant for not only residents, but businesses and visitors. Because we're all mixing in there keeping this economic engine going. And the great line is everyone's downtown.

And when Kirk mentioned earlier it's not only Evanston's downtown, the good news is there's a lot of folks on the North Shore that are coming down here to do entertainment and business and shopping. There's folks on the North Side of the city that are coming, of the City of Chicago, that are also helping fuel the economy.

The next thing is taking that goal and honing in. So these are goals and objectives that we started to sharpen, either new or that we revisited from the 1989 plan. They're in no particular order. But these are the things that are driving us through this master plan section. We want to make sure that the Commissioners, the DPC, and Council members think we're
on the right track.

One of those goals is to optimize economic development. If you think of downtown as our economic engine here in the City, it is. It's one of the few locations in the country that have all of these ingredients, which I'll talk about in a minute, that foster smart growth. So we have to be very careful that we allocate land in the right way.

When you look again at some of the maps coming up and the one I just mentioned, there's not a lot of land for developments. We have to be very careful to allocate development in the right location and kind of ride the tide of development, but in the right way.

You'll hear us use the word optimize, not maximize. Not develop every block to a super maximum, but develop in the right way and towards the character. So economic development is important.

Improve the quality of the physical environment. That came out strong in the 2004 visioning sessions for those of you that were there. It came out even stronger that we've got some great streetscape improvements that the City's put in. But we've got to connect the dots in some of these blocks. We've got to
make the whole downtown feel a little bit warmer and a little greener.

And then the viaducts and the public spaces, how do we improve their physical environment the next level? The good news is, most of the downtown, because we did the streetscape audit a few years back, is in good shape. We just need to take some of that European street feel to some of the other streets and get these spaces fixed up.

The next thing is sustainable green development. That is mainstream, thank God, trend now around the country, to make our buildings and sites and our lifestyles more green and more sustainable. That came out strong from you during this process. We put that in there as a main objective and strategy and some ideas for how to accomplish that and so that we don't hope it happens, we want to keep pushing to make it happen.

The next is the strong multi-mobile transportation system. Again, where are we going to find all these elements lining up and coming together? You not only have a train station, but you have two. You have bus routes, you've got walking lanes, you've
got three major parking structures that are shared with
over a 3,000-car capability, plenty of on-street
parking. So we want to make that stronger and continue
to build that up.

Enhanced arts and cultural opportunities.
This was discussed at length in 2004 and in 1989. The
idea here is we've got good things going program wise.
We want to revisit those and see what more we can do
downtown to bring people in, more to celebrate our
diversity, more to celebrate our culture, including the
possibility of physical changes with public art in the
open spaces.

And last but not least, which is where we're
going to end this presentation, is a very predictable,
sensible set of development controls, that we're not
kind of making it up as we go along, that we don't have
to have meeting until three in the morning on every
single project, that our Council, Plan Commission, DPC,
can work on a whole bunch of other things. But a very
predictable box that we need the developers to fit in
with guidelines, with standards, but with enough
allowance that there's creativity from the architects,
the planners, and the engineers.
So let's take a close look at what we call the illustrative plan, the earlier drawing that had the sketches and the blacked out blocks. We've had a chance to fine tune this. All our planner, architect, designer types are in here working on this. And basically the outer edge is the downtown boundary and the little dark roofs are the potential development sites. So just soak that up for a couple of minutes.

Most of the downtown is developed. Many of these things will be here for 50, 60, 80, 100 years, the churches and libraries and things. So we're really looking at from the north, some of the blocks along Ridge behind the new development that could some day develop. The owners could come in. What can we do to get ahead of that? The plan gives a direction and a zoning for that. We're showing the potential for residential buildings framing Ridge with parking tucked underneath and maybe some green roofs on top of the buildings or on the decks.

The next one inside the core here is the Northwestern University parking lot. Behind the hotel by the big parking deck, we think again surface parking lots probably don't make sense in the long run here for
this downtown, that that's too valuable a land. It
needs to be either green space or developed. This shows
the potential for an office research center on that site
that someday, if Northwestern wants to add more to their
space and bring more business to downtown.

Working our way, then, to the west, some
infill sites along Church and along Davis with some day,
if smaller little pieces we've found would develop, how
would they fit into the fabric? We show it
illustratively here. Developers would come to the
table, look at the character zones, look at the height,
look at the zoning, and fill in.

Now we're getting down on the south. We've
got the new development going in, the Winthrop Club.
The potential on the one-story building some day, if
those turn over, the gallery and the bank building at
one story, that what would happen if they fill in and
hold the street wall? The potential for the east side
of the pressed home site, which is the parking lot,
granted parking lot for the YMCA, that could be a new
development.

We're also recommending, because there's not a
lot of open space in this quadrant, for a new plaza on
the corner or somewhere within the site. It would be an open space that everybody could use, walk over, and have a cup of coffee and meet some neighbors. There's also a little teeny tiny site next to the YMCA that we think also could be a nice little urban plaza working over time with owners to get that greened up and cleaned up, a place for the residents that are there today and future residents and shoppers to sit and have a quiet space. We felt that that quadrant, then, would be served by that space.

Coming in from the south, Raymond Park, most people thought that this was a great space, but there probably could be some subtle changes there, maybe moving the -- lot and play equipment stuff around, maybe opening the lawn up a little bit more, you'll hear us talk about that in a minute, and just strengthening that park as an anchor on the southeast quad.

This is the Tommy Nevins block and the Best Western block, a little infill some day if one of those small buildings were to go. The parking lot that's there to the north, the Best Western site, I think many people saw the picture of that and said, we can do better than that big bunkerized parking deck there. It
does not fit our character.

It also is a one-sided shopping street.

You're going to hear us talk about that more. The west side of the street has the small restaurants and shops. The east side has got the big blank wall of the parking deck. We've got to encourage a new development there that will put retail on the east side and have a two-sided shopping experience to help keep those stores going and bring new stores into downtown.

Then further east up and down Church and, I'm sorry, Chicago and Orrington, there's sites in between here that we looked at. Some day a vacant site or an underdeveloped site may change. And we then fill that with buildings that frame the street, that come up to the street, and tuck the parking in behind.

Further to the northeast we felt there was a lack of open space in that quadrant. We looked at the potential future redevelopment of the parking lot by the library as a green space, another plaza, the northeast quadrant, kind of the Savanna, Georgia or the Charleston model of little quadrants and greens around to serve people there.

The parking lots could be green in the short
term with new trees and landscaping, but in the long
term is at a candidate for an open space, maybe even
some parking underneath if needed. But the idea is that
this is a walking downtown with a parking deck to the
east, a parking deck to the west. And could we then put
an open space in that site?

Then I'm working my way to the middle. Inside
the core there's not a lot of development sites
available. The north side of the Fountain Square block,
we think, is a development site, something that's being
looked at separately in the Plan Commission right now
for another new infill building that would frame the
street and bring retail back on those street edges, but
as importantly, help take the block and frame the east
side of block with retail over on the Chase Bank site.
That this is a two, one-sided shopping street now, we
need to get on the east side of Orrington more shops and
on the north side of Davis more shops as well.

There's been a planned unit development
approved for the corner by the bank. We show some more
infill there. We've got a two-sided shopping street
experience on Davis and up and down Orrington, keep
activating that core. And then the bookstore, the
former bookstore site, if it's rehabbed for a new use, that would be great. If not, we show another new development hugging the corner.

And last but not least, is the north, what we call the gateway to Northwestern and from Northwestern. Right now there's an awful lot of activity, a lot of people crossing that street. Anybody that's been through there on car or foot, the idea would be to possibly realign that intersection, take Oldberg Park and expand it and reorganize it and make it a bigger, grander space. And then develop the Burger King corner with a new gateway building that would bring more energy and a new look to that corner.

So this is an illustrative plan. This is basically saying those few sites that are susceptible to change, an owner wanting to change, a vacant lot needing to change, a parking lot needing to change, this is how they physically could develop.

What we then did is show you a little bit closer some of these. And I won't go into all the specifics. This is Ridge Road. We're up at the north end at Emerson. Just how these buildings would fit in?

You're hearing us talk about framing the street,
keeping the street walls open with glass. The zoning
will now have that in there as a requirement, not a
negotiation, Things that we need to do at the bases of
the buildings.

This is going further east. This is the
Oldberg Park area, the potential gateway building coming
off the main entrance off of Northwestern, the potential
bookstore fill/infill building, the potential north end
of the Fountain Square block, the little green space
over by the library.

The south, this space over here by the
Winthrop Club. And the southeast by Raymond Park and
some of the Best Western potential ideas.

Quickly let's just take a closer look at these
spaces. Kevin called them intimate spaces. We call
them intimate spaces, special places. You've got some,
but we've got to make them better. We need some more.

So this is a closer look.

This is Northwestern's office building and the
Optima residential building along north/south building
there. There's a green space in there today. It's kind
of overgrown and it's kind of hard to see what's going
on in there.
The idea, the recommendation here, is to make it more open and more usable, possibly with some other features inside that people would feel comfortable from north or south walking in and using the space, as a public space, not just for those two buildings.

This is the potential of greening up the parking lot for the library. Here's the library. Could we accommodate enough underground, under the library that's there today, and create a full green space, maybe a -- light, a central fountain, some benches, some places to sit and gather, and if need be, could we get underneath there and put some of the parking below grade?

This is the Oldberg Park idea. Look closely at this. The idea would be, could we reroute Orrington so it tees right into Elgin Road? We'd take that dog leg, kind of curve that comes around Burger King where all the people are crossing. Oh, we'd frame up the intersection, create a bigger space for people to cross, fountains and public art, a gateway building, and then take that leg of the street out and make Oldberg Park much bigger with much better landscaping, a kind of a port of entry, a great central plaza at the north end.
with better landscaping and views and outdoor cafes.

Here's a sketch that was done, real quick, about how that possibly could look. This is where the street was. We could possibly take that out and infill that with a promenade.

We also looked at the possibility of expanding the parking up further north on, parallel parking on Sherman and along Elgin, and then a small parking area behind a new building to serve those immediate shops along there.

The next one is the alley. That's a great little space, the intimate space, as we talked about. The kind of discovery space that we want to find and have fun looking for.

The idea here would be to pavement up that alley, put some banners, dress it up, maybe wrap some of the windows or some public art on the sides, and make it a nicer space to be in. People are going through there anyway to get through the block. They're in there anyway to get back to Bookman's. Could Bookman's be fixed up into a little outdoor café or space? That could be another special place in the downtown.

Then we get into the Fountain Square. We have
two concepts for Fountain Square that we want to discuss
with the Council and Plan Commission. The one on the
left is the Fountain Square space as its existing size.
And the Fountain Square building to the north is rehab.

There's been discussion about that still being
there, keeping 50,000-square feet of the small business
office space in the downtown, putting a new kind of
facade on it facing the park. But all of a sudden
Fountain Square is redesigned. And then the whole
intersection is brought together and redesigned
together. So the pavement, the benches, the lighting,
the landscaping is done well. We don't have the super
high planters that people are kind of intimidated going
through or behind.

The idea on the northeast corner on the Chase
site is to frame that plaza out to match the Chandler
Plaza across the street. And we're even looking at the
possibility of taking Orrington out as one leg right
here west of the Chandler building and expanding that
space to make that even bigger. So when you talk about
Fountain Square, the whole space would be Fountain
Square. You close it down for events. You could do
that more. And the whole space would feel like one
designed place, including adding much more open space here just west of the plaza.

The second concept says if the building to the north is taken out, you could double the size of Fountain Square and do more things in there, to do landscaping, plantings, water features, and what not. The rest of the intersection, the concept still would hold together. So I think the discussion needs to be which direction we need to go as an open space, as well as the development potential of that office building to the north.

This is a closer look at a concept for Raymond Park. What we did is open up the lawn area. We moved the active spaces to the east. We'd have more events and art shows and things here. By day it's just a bigger patch of space, but a little more clustered, a little more intimate space to the east. This is a concept in the plan that then future initiatives would be used to design it and get it ready for improvement.

This is the corner of Maple and Grove and the Presbyterian Homes parking lot that's being used right now by the YMCA. If this was to be developed with a building kind of framing it, we'd get another nice space
with possibly some retail or office space wrapping that
to activate it further.

This is the little space to the west of the
YMCA. Here's the YMCA on Grove. It's a little, tight
space, not a really great one to put a building in.
Again, this would be another good open space opportunity
that we could work on over the next couple years.

Here is an idea along Benson. One of the
thoughts during the -- was, can we at least dress up the
viaduct a little bit more, landscape it, maybe have
little outdoor kiosks for cafes or newspaper stands?
The idea is to be creative, to maybe use that little
linear space along the tracks to make it more active and
a little more attractive.

Now, let's get to the development framework.
What you saw was the illustrative plan, the concepts on
how these sites could possibly change. But this is then
the plan, the guide, the regulation that says, this is
where we're going with the downtown in the future.

So what we did was, these are the character
areas that were given by the downtown Planning
Commission, Committee. They said, we want to really
focus on those three character areas, the traditional,
the small Davises and the small parts of Sherman, and
really think about that scale differently, not to think
those are major redevelopment sites.

We then want to look at the transition, the
drives that are going from our outer neighborhoods into
downtown to the core. And then we want to talk about
the core. So we took that baton from the Committee, as
Larry and Jim handed it to us and said, get out there
and look at everything closer. We did that many, many
months, including, then, the week of the --

And what we've done here is we've adjusted it
in different places, but pretty much kept the character.
On the outer edge would be your western transition
district, the western edge. This would be the bridge, then,
from the existing neighborhoods outside and to the south
and west into the core.

We then had the core in this tan color here,
near the tracks, near the train station. Taller
buildings have been approved in there. Taller buildings
have been developed in there. And they're buffered,
then, by the outside transition.

And then we've got our little traditional
areas, along Davis, along Sherman to the north, along
Davis and down Chicago to the south where the smaller character is there. And then what we've come up with, then, is an east core/west core, the main core.

And we really think the Fountain Square block has something a little special going there. It's small, very visible. It can be seen by many different locations. It's got retail on the one side and needs retail on the other side. And we think that could be the central core and could handle a much taller building.

Now what we're looking at here is, what is the direction of density and height? When we really stop and think again, like I said earlier is, your downtown is one of the few in the country that have the ingredients. Transit, transit where almost the whole downtown is a quarter mile from that. Very walkable downtown, wide sidewalks. You've got activity and density going now. You've already got three major shared parking structures. You've got major activity generators like the university, the library, and the post office. So you've got the ingredients.

So we want to now show you what we're recommending in each one of these character zones. So
just follow me. On the north is A, the north edge.
This is the transition from north of Emerson and Elgin Road down into the downtown. Two 15, 16-story buildings have been approved there. The future zoning of this would be eight to 15 stories. And what you're going to see is a two-legged column here. The left side of the column is the base height. And that base height would be allowable by zoning, obviously still with guidelines. But if the developer comes in and says, I want to go to the higher height, they'd have to work with bonuses to get there. It's not just negotiated and we hope it happens down the road. So think about the northern edge. Base height is eight. And the top height would be 15, negotiated with bonuses, which we'll get to in a minute.

Then you've got B, the west edge, and you've got the east edge, a lot of big, solid buildings, big courtyard buildings, a lot of the vintage building that Kirk mentioned. We're recommending six stories as the base and 10 as a cap. Not mass, but cap, that someone could work their way up to the cap using a very prescribed list of bonuses.

Then you get to D, the university link, the
northern edge here. We think that over time some of
those small, kind of Burger King-type sites could
redevelop. And we've recommended here six-story base
with an eight-story cap in that frontage along Emerson
and Clark facing university.

Then we get to the west core, this triangle
here and this rectangle here. The Winthrop Club is in,
approved now, under construction. We've got other
denser buildings around. The west core, we're
recommending a 15-story base and then up to 18 stories
as the cap, okay, right near the tracks near the train
station.

The east core, same thing. Lot of density.
You've got the library there. If anything does infill
in there, it would be 15 with an 18 cap.

Now we get into the big triangle, the big
wedge in the middle where all the action is: the
theater, the big parking decks, the taller buildings.
There's a 28-story building in there. And in that core
we're saying that the base is 15 and the cap is 30. So
that is the height that some developer could get to, but
there's a lot of public bonuses and things that are
needed to get to that.
And then you start looking at the central core. And we thought that that block, small, thin block, could start at 25 and go to 42 stories. Now people say, how do we get to the 42 stories? Again, as a team we saw that this is different than the overall core and that the biggest building in the core is 28 stories. And we recommended going 50 percent higher with bonuses to 42 stories.

And last but not least, are three traditionals: our west, our south, and our north. And we're recommending three stories as the base with five stories as the cap. Now this is very similar to what the downtown Planning Committee handed to us. There's a lot of little adjustments and things to make sure we got the right sites in here. But we polished that up and adjusted it. And now we're putting zoning and density and bulk requirements and caps on it.

Here is the public benefits list. People have been wondering about this. How did we get up to those caps? This, quickly, I'm going to run through. And then Kirk and Tom are going to talk about more.

To get to that cap, you start to look at doing some green buildings, the site, the building, in some
sort of sustainable way. You can work your way up the
venue of sustainability. If you reach the platinum, you
can get to certain percentage, which they'll talk about
in a minute.

Affordable housing. If you did affordable
housing beyond what the City asked for, that would be a
bonus.

Landmark preservation on, near, or somewhere
else in the downtown, a bonus.

Public plazas. If you built a public plaza on
your site, near your site following the downtown plan or
contributed to a pool for public plaza with money, then
you could be bonused up. Any public park or open space
elsewhere in downtown, you may stay with weight. We're
going to fill our block up, but we contribute over to
the bigger pool of open space.

Public art installation and support for the
public arts. If there's some great program or some
public art that goes into a space, that would be a
bonus.

Widening the sidewalk. You have many wide
sidewalks. But some of these blocks have narrow
sidewalks. If you set your building back and widen the
sidewalk, that would be a benefit.

A green roof by itself. You want to make sure that some green things could go in there. They don't necessarily have to go all the way to the plan, but at least get some of these elements in there.

Underground parking and loading. Hide more of that stuff underground. Conceal the parking. The more you conceal it, the better it could be.

Streetscape improvements. Contribute to some streetscape improvements. Alley improvements and even something like daycare. Contribute to a daycare center or bring it into your building.

Now this map, if you just study it again closely, is a combo map or an overlay map. The lines around it is the development framework I just mentioned, the west, the core, the Davis traditional. And underneath it are the little illustrative site plans that we put into the illustrative plan. So just look at that for a minute.

So if someone says, oh, they're talking about 30 stories potentially with a lot of public benefit in the core, there's really only one site. And that's Northwestern's parking lot.
If you look to the west, the west core, one site. South core, two sites. Davis, two back sites. Not a lot of potential right now. Somebody could come in tomorrow with a building. But right now those buildings are in good shape. And we don't see those moving. Again, you just go from area to area and there's not a lot of sites within there. So we wanted to show you this and how it would work as an overlay.

And last but not least, before we hand it off to zoning, the illustrative plan, if it was built out to the cap with the benefits, the bonuses, this is what it could look like. The blue buildings are all the buildings out there today. The yellow and, or the gold and the white would be following the illustrative plan. So this would be the Best Western site. This would be the Fountain Square site. This would be the bookstore site, the gateway building over by Northwestern, the two buildings by Winthrop Club, the potential on the east side of the, on the parking lot by YMCA, other infill buildings.

The goal is the cap, or the base. That's what you'd start with. And then the white would be the cap. You could work your way up to that cap with those
bonuses.

So that's the master plan. That's the guide.

That's what we're recommending as a future plan for downtown for the next 10 years. And then Kirk and Tom are going to talk about how do we put zoning to that so that there's a real framework around it. So, thank you.

MR. SMITH: The first part of our assignment from the City was to look at the existing zoning and then suggest some improvements or some changes to it. And I'll do this very briefly. But I think the critique of the existing zoning kind of lays some of the foundation for what we're going to suggest as a revised zoning for the downtown.

But in the first place, these are some of the observations or findings about the existing zoning. And there really is in the existing zoning no real direction about urban -- There really isn't in the existing zoning the idea that there's a center of downtown. There's really not the idea that there are edges to downtown the way that the heights and the densities are provided under the existing zoning.

So what John laid out in terms of a form, of having a center and having density at that center and
then descending away from that center, that's missing in
the current zoning regulations. In the current
regulations there's a lot of text devoted to the
research park and to a research park of zoning
classification or district. And that classification has
become irrelevant. Because the plan for the research
park is no longer relevant and not really being followed
by the City.

So the current zoning is confusing. Because
it talks about a research park, it talks about
development being consistent with research park, master
plan. It talks about the Planning Commission and City
Council evaluating projects based on that master plan.
And yet the master plan is not really relevant to the
development of that area.

The height and scale regulations that are in
the current zoning regulations are more characteristic
of maybe a small town at the edge of the metropolitan
area here rather than, you know, kind of a vibrant and
lively downtown close to the, to the City. Also with
the height regulations and the scale regulations, it's
confusing what they say. They talk about the base.
Then they talk about allowances. Then they say that if
you have parking, that you can ignore that as part of
the height.

So a person reading the regulations is going,
well, I see a 42-foot figure. But then they also get
four stories of parking. And then maybe they get some
more height with allowances. And it's very difficult to
figure out exactly what might occur, given that kind of
framework. And what we're suggesting is something, you
know, a lot clearer than that. -- to actually look at
the -- and understand immediately what the regulations
or what the permissions are.

I think what our consultant, our traffic
consultant has found, is that currently we're requiring
too much residential parking. This is a location, this
is one of few locations where you can live and walk to
shopping and walk to entertainment and walk to
restaurants and walk to school and walk to your jobs.
And I think, of course, the findings of the survey on
residential parking reflects that.

Also, in the current code, there really isn't
design and aesthetics in the architecture of new
buildings. And all the -- and all the meeting we had,
very important, people. Very big issue for people who
live in Evanston. And yet it's not really addressed in
the current regulations.

So what, I think that this critique kind of
forms the foundation for some of the things we're going
to suggest in the new code. These slides just kind of
reinforce what I said. Staff who works with the zoning
code a lot describes the current zoning as kind of a
fallen souffle. Because some of the tallest buildings
that are permitted are allowed along the perimeter of
downtown. And actually some of those in the center allow
the lowest buildings. So it's not the kind of urban
form that you would expect.

This is a little bit hard to read, but this
kind of shows the fallen souffle. Along the edges you
have allowances for much taller buildings than some of
the central locations in the downtown. And this map is
in the text of the plan we've done. So you can take a
closer look at that fallen souffle-type of arrangement.

And also, this is produced in the plan also.
And what it does is, it shows that confusion about
what's permitted and what's not permitted. This white
line here is what the current code calls the base. And
then there's also a level in the heights of these
buildings that's related to the garage. And the current code says that that garage part, you're not really supposed to consider as part of the height of the building. And then above the base and the garage level are the buildings that, or the heights of the buildings that haven't been allowed through the allowance system.

So it doesn't really lead, the current code does not lead to a real predictable system in terms of building heights. And it's not easy to figure out exactly what might be built, given the allowances for both the base height or garage height and for allowance height and then also exception heights. But then Kirk is going to outlines some our recommendations, more specific recommendations about the zoning.

MR. BISHOP: This planning study is unique in a lot of ways. One of the most concrete ways is the way it so directly moves into the types of pictures and visions and illustrative plans and concepts for creating greater intimacy in public open space opportunities directly into a recommended strategy for carrying out some of the key recommendations, particularly as related to the character areas.

And by and large we're suggesting a sort of, a
major shift in direction of downtown zoning, a shift away from a downtown zoning strategy that focuses sometimes in excruciating detail on the allowable land uses either on the ground floor of the building or on the upper floors of the building, excruciating detail in what one can't do downtown in terms of setbacks and all sorts of requirements, and rather moves to more of a proactive approach saying what we want to occur, what we require the new buildings do, and attention, a much greater amount of attention placed to exactly where buildings are placed on a development site.

The orientation and location of a building on a development site really helps to ensure that the street level is activated by virtue of active floor space that lines the sidewalks, provides entry ways to outdoor cafes and eating areas. The location of parking is such a critical element of, that gives form and character to downtown, and when it's not present right at the street level.

So not only does the framework that's proposed in the draft suggest these sorts of build-to zones, generally requiring that buildings be built at or very near the outer edge of the, or the inner edge of the
sidewalk, but places restrictions on parking, whether it's at grade parking, which we really hope, by and large doesn't, doesn't come to pass downtown, but even when it's on the upper floor of the buildings, that it be setback from the lot line so that, to allow for sort of active uses to line even the upper floors of parking garages by and large.

It places much greater attention on prescriptions for how to handle the ground floor spaces of buildings by requirements suggesting the appropriateness of requirements for minimum transparency, the amount of windows and doors that allow views into and out of buildings. It helps to sort of enliven and keep the pedestrian experience going, the location of entrances and the like.

When it comes to basic development intensity, the Ordinance relies, the framework, rather, that we're suggesting, relies on some fairly tried and true approaches. It suggests that the City continue to regulate on the basis of floor/area ratio, which is a ration of floor space to lot area. And as John describes, suggests a sort of two-tier or two-pronged approach to regulating building heights, establishes for
each zone a maximum allowable base building height.

In this case I'm showing a district we're proposing to call Residential Downtown Transition, RD, RD2, a base of six up to 10 if public, public benefit bonuses are provided in accordance with an objective, clear formula for how one achieves the bonus FAR which can then translate into additional floors up vertically on the building. And again, the menu that John went through is presented in the framework that accompanies our form-based zoning recommendations, establishes what the eligible public benefit features are, which districts are appropriate or eligible for use of those districts. We're suggesting, for example, that sidewalk widening isn't as critical a concern within the edge or transition areas on the outer boundaries of downtown. So we're not thinking that's a public benefit bonusable item, just as an example.

It also establishes the maximum floor area bonus that's achievable through the use of any single formula. So even the whole building's sustainability or the LEED-based bonus system would have a cap on the amount of bonuses available. And it really would be a two-pronged cap for lower levels of attainment. Say the
LEED gold certification, one might be eligible for a bonus. We're suggesting in the framework of about six percent of platinum or equivalent certification could get you up to 15 percent. And these would work cumulatively.

So people could choose to use the affordable housing bonus, which I should point out, is only available to projects that provide affordable housing either on site or in form of monetary contributions in excess of the City's minimum requirements as they exist today. You don't get a bonus for meeting any of the minimum requirements that the City has.

Here is a suggested sort of framework or a way to think about how the character map that, that John described for us could be translated into a zoning scheme. We're suggesting really that the character areas that John described could really be handled through a series of three basic zoning categories in the downtown.

Along the, along the outer perimeter, the edges, as he described before, we're suggesting it, a district that for convenience purposes we're calling a Residential Downtown Transition. Since by and large,
there are exceptions, by and large, these are areas
along the perimeter that transition to different scale
residential neighborhoods beyond the boundaries of
downtown. They tend to be the locations, if they exist
at all, in downtown where you'll find single-purpose
residential buildings that don't have the sort of mixed-
use elements that you see within the core. So there is
a sort of stronger emphasis or allowance for purely
residential buildings. And that could continue into the
future.

But that these, each of these categories, and
then we have a downtown core that corresponds to the
core areas, east, west, general core and central core
from the character area, and then of course the downtown
traditional areas focused around Davis and Sherman. But
several, a couple of these zoning categories, though we
use a single category, really come in two different, or
three different flavors as a way to reflect the existing
built in environmental character of the area. We're
suggesting a higher classification might be appropriate
in the northern edge corresponding to the higher
allowances and intensity contemplated under the
character of that.
Let me just walk through, as quickly as I can, how these, how these districts would work. I described the edge area as the appropriate location for something akin to a residential downtown, transition-style zoning district. It would be a district that would accommodate a fairly broad range of residential and mixed-use building heights.

The university link area consistent with the character map would allow a base of six up to eight stories with a maximum FAR of 2.75 as a base that could be increased to a maximum of four or a cap of four through the public bonus system.

And you can see here the RD2, which we're suggesting would be appropriate for application, a district like that would be appropriate for application in east, west, and southern edges, six as a base height, three FAR through the use of bonuses up to 10 stories in height with a five FAR.

Another recommendation of the form-based zoning strategy is that it may appropriate to consider or include in the form-based code some limits on the amount of building coverage that could occur in upper stories. So we're suggesting here in a couple of
examples that in the RD1, the lower intensity of the,
lowest intensity of the three RD classifications, that
as you go above the sixth story, that the footprint of
the upper floor shrinks in size as a way to sort of
preserve views, prevent excessive shading on other
structures, and sort of mitigate any impacts that might
come from a taller building in those locations.

So we've suggested in this framework
throughout a couple of different ways to address that.
I want to just kind of walk you through some examples of
buildings that are in the edge area where it would be
appropriate to apply the RD classification.

These buildings really helped inform the
recommendations that John described in terms of height
limits. Those height limits were really meant to
reflect either existing buildings or approved buildings
within the areas. And as you can see, there's quite a
bit of, quite a bit of variation.

Now let's compare the, the types of zoning
categories recommended for the edge in the framework, in
the form-based zoning framework, with the existing R6
zoning classification which is a fairly typical zoning
classification that exists today in the edge areas. The
existing R6 zoning classification, that as I say, can be
found in a lot of the edge areas of downtown, allows a
maximum building height of eight stories or 85 feet.

So you can compare that to the three flavors
of Residential Downtown Transition zoning suggested in
the framework draft. You'll see that it's really very
much in line. And our recommendations are sometimes
lower, given the existing character of those areas. And
sometimes, through the use of the public benefit bonus
system, in the northern area one would be able to
achieve eight as a base, compared to the eight today,
and up to 15 through the use of the public benefit bonus
system, which again, is generally reflective of a couple
of recent development proposals in those areas. So
really we're adding some, adding some predictability to
that, to that framework. And it is not drastically
different from today's zoning framework.

The downtown traditional areas, the same sort
of story. Here, because of the pedestrian-oriented sort
of lower scale character, a much greater emphasis on
lower scale buildings, ground floor-type uses, and
activation of the street level through sort of basic
urban design concepts at the base of the building.
Again, three stories as a base, five as a cap through the public benefit bonus system. Of course the incorporation of the revised parking ratios that follow from Tim's work on the parking study and pretty severe limits on where parking can be placed, given the pedestrian-oriented nature of these districts of the downtown traditional areas. And we all know, of course, the striking and widely-cherished character of those areas.

Let's compare the downtown traditional zoning proposed in the framework draft with the D2 zoning that's in place in those areas today. And here we get into that sort of slight of hand that the Zoning Ordinance does today, that it says, if you look at the zoning, your first impression is, oh, this is a district that allows buildings up to 42 feet in height. I'm good to go. I understand it completely.

Well, that's only part of the story. Through the use of allowances, through the planned development mechanism, the actual attainable building height, even in it's most predictable form of the existing D2 zoning, is 85 feet. So our suggestion is three stories as a base, up to five stories through the use of bonuses, and
requirements that upper floors, those above the third
floor, at least as proposed in the framework there, be
set back from the street in order that the building kind
of -- as you walk down the street as a three-story
building and the higher portions have stepped back from
the, from the street.

The downtown core, the most intensive
classification, again, comes in three flavors, seeing a
sort of pattern to the formula. Fifteen as a right in
the DC1. As a base height, up to 18. Again,
incorporation of those revised parking ratios. Again,
limits on building placement, building orientation,
activation of the street level, sort of pedestrian
character being important in the core just as they are
in the traditional areas.

Here again, we show in sort of picture form,
how the base and the bonus height system might work.
And this illustrates, too, recommendations in the
framework draft for limitations on upper floor building
coverage as the building goes up. The amount of, the
original or base floor plate that can be covered is
decreased, again, as a way to sort of preserve views,
ensure adequate separation between buildings, and
positively affect the way taller buildings sort of interact with the sort of intimate pedestrian-oriented character that we're trying to establish or ensure perpetuation of downtown. Of course we all know some of the newer buildings that have occurred in the downtown core.

And then, again, let's look at the existing zoning classifications relative to the proposed DC1, 2, and 3 classifications in the draft. D3 zoning comes in a couple of flavors: one for small sites, one for moderate size sites of about 195 to 100 feet of street frontage and beyond.

One gets to avail themselves of essentially these rules which say that the maximum building height is 220 feet, and oh, by the way, there are four floors here you can also have. But that doesn't exist. We're not really counting it. So in essence, it allows a building under the most predictable scenario, one using the known allowances of the BD and the base zoning, to achieve a maximum building height of 260 feet.

So you can compare that in some of the downtown core classifications. These really are at the same scale. You can see that in a couple of the
classifications, only through the use of the public benefit bonus system is one able to achieve anything close to the height limits allowed today through a much less predictable formula.

But then as we look at the sort of iconic block, the unique geometry, the unique location of the central core, we see that a building in excess of the 260 feet allowable under D3 today would be allowed. But again, with a base of 25 stories, we're essentially at the same building height allowed today under the allowance system. Efforts to go above that would require, under this proposal, that avail themselves of the public benefit bonus system, which is a predictable formulaic and objective way of determining how additional height can be allocated and what the absolute cap is.

Now the final piece of the puzzle is that, in reality, under today's Zoning Ordinance, it is impossible to define the top of this building under D3. Because I've defined to you the rules that exist under the base zoning classification, the allowances that are possible through the use of the PD system. But there's another provision in the Ordinance that says, oh yeah,
and by the way, if you're really going to provide some
great, something great for the City, then you get an
exception to all that. And we'll essentially negotiate
a plan on a case by case basis.

And a lot of cities do this. Evanston is not
alone among places that allow this, this ultimate
flexible vehicle. But, and you're certainly not alone
in being frustrated by the results of it and the lack of
predictability.

We think that this framework for form-based
zoning really holds great potential in terms of
addressing the objectives, the themes that came out of
the design -- and the vision work that preceded it.

Finally, Tom mentioned the lack of adequate
design controls downtown. We're suggesting in the
zoning recommendations part of the report that many of
the things that are now listed as guidelines through a
separate planned development guidelines manual be
brought into the code, that they be refined, that we
sort of continue to sort of refine those. But that's
another way in which we'll add some predictability to
this.

So again, I want to go back to the slide that
John showed earlier to show how, based on the sites we believe to be susceptible to change, the so-called opportunity sites, how we recommended implementing zoning might play out theoretically under the recommendations in the draft report. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Thank you very much. You've all done a great deal of work in a very short amount of time and worked very hard. And we thank you.

I'd like to invite the Plan Commission, the Economic Development Committee, and the City Council up for a discussion and questions, a short discussion.

All right, welcome everyone. Who has questions? Ann, are you waving or --

ALDERMAN RAINEY: I'm waving to my friend, Chris.

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Oh, well, that's not helpful. All right, until we have questions, let's go around and introduce ourselves. Larry, would you start?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I'm Larry Widmayer. I'm on the Planning Commission and Chairman of the --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I'm Colleen Burrus. And I'm on the Planning Commission.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Johanna Nyden. Also on
the Planning Commission.


COMMISSIONER WOODS: Jim Woods, Chair of the Plan Commission.


CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Elizabeth Tisdahl, 7th Ward, City Council.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Dave Galloway, Planning Commission.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Anne Rainey, 8th Ward, City Council.

COMMISSIONER JULIAR: Mark Juliar, Economic Development Committee.

COMMISSIONER NORKETT: Marty Norkett, Economic Development Committee.

COMMISSIONER CREAMER: Robert Creamer, Zoning Board of Appeals.

ALDERMAN MORAN: Ed Moran, City Council.

ALDERMAN WOLLIN: Cheryl Wollin, 1st Ward, City Council.
Council.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Melissa Wynne, 3rd Ward,

Alderman.

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: All right, who has questions? All right.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Oh, I'll start. Why not? I was wondering, where, during the design -- that the public came out in favor of a building height of 42 stories? I have been at the Planning Commission for the last three meetings and I'm pretty positive that the public would have not agreed to this. And I can't understand how we suddenly did a spot zoning on Fountain Square that's so much larger. So I just would like to hear from the consultants on where the public was in favor of that.

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Who'd like to answer that?

MR. LAMONT: Great question. Very good to start out. We are in a position as consultants, as professionals, of taking information from all kinds of people. So we heard people say, no growth. We heard people say, go go growth. We heard people say, only on certain blocks. So we had to sort all that through and digest it and give you professional direction as to what
we saw.

So some, let me finish. Some folks said, this
downtown could handle more development as long as -- and
the -- there. Some folks said, don't touch a thing
because I want to have it like the old days. So we had
to interpret that and shake through all that and get it
to a focal point.

We went differently than the downtown Planning
Committee and said, we think that there are certain
locations that could handle our -- that counts for
about, could handle a higher building. And the smallest
number was the focal point. So that was our
recommendation based on all the info we got from a lot
of people.

So you might have been in a situation where
someone said, I'm sitting -- 10 people. They all said,
no high rises. But then we were at focal groups where
people said --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No. That's not what I
said.

MR. LAMONT: But I just want to make sure.

Because we've been getting this from some folks who've
told me that, well, we all said this. Well, we heard
many different things.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Well, I would like documentation on that. Because that is not what we're hearing in the public hearings not with 10 people, but with many people, and getting input. So when we see this come up, it's shock, I mean, unbelievably shocking to me that somehow, in all the design -- and all the input we're getting, that suddenly this Fountain Square -- is the only one. I think, I'm not sure which one of these that is, made the comment that you alluded to, while because there is a development of this height, that this is why you went to DC3. And that's the only place in all of downtown.

MR. LAMONT: No, no, no. Let's be clear, Carole. It wasn't because there was --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Well, there was a comment --

MR. LAMONT: We --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: -- during that.

MR. LAMONT: -- saw this when we analyzed the physical conditions, the land use context. We got, many, many people gave us -- I think Kevin, Kirk counted up over 500 -- of people. Some folks said, we're fine
with it as long as it's -- it's better if we made it
good architecture if it's higher. Others said, no, we
want everything three or four stories.

So we're professionally recommending to your
City Council, your Planning Commission, and your
committees that that block, that little slim block, that
can hold a higher building. We don't think 49 or 50
stories makes sense. When you saw one of the sketches
from the -- we had 50 stories on there as an idea from
the --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And it's actually still
in the books.

MR. LAMONT: Yeah, it was a -- Just so --
ookay? Right. It came out of the design -- That's the
way we presented it that Saturday morning. And we've
been working on it with the Village ever since then. So
we think that your downtown --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I just haven't seen the
data on --

MR. LAMONT: Well, you've seen the data right
here.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No. I mean the, from
public comment at the design -- the public said, we want
1 a building that -- I just want to see the transcript.
2 That's all my questions. I'm sorry. I've now dominated it.
3
4 CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: That was just fine. Thank you. Anyone else have any comments, questions?
5
6 COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Yes, yes. I had a, I have three pages of the -- Is the game in that Frame --
7
8 CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: I'm sorry. We can't get a microphone to him now.
9
10 COMMISSIONER HUNTER: I was simply going to suggest a slightly different metaphor, can you hear,
11 whoa, a slightly different metaphor, which is a Parisian model, okay, so that we reorient the thinking of what a downtown might be. And I think one of the unique, attractive features that people have talked about that's been relegated to the notion of traditional here, is that this is the unique, one of the unique properties of downtown Evanston, why you are getting people from the North Shore, why you are getting people from -- that it is not -- that it is a different feel, okay? And that feel is the European feel, I would suggest to you.
12
13 And that that notion that, let's not get
trapped in the Wizard of Oz notion where, that somehow the center has to be the tallest point. And the idea that we were in a wedding cake, I've heard that metaphor. I believe a wedding cake model here, I think we have to be careful of the language here. Because language colors the evaluation that we make of the spaces that we're creating.

So I would like to offer the notion of the European model here. And the European model, which respects -- in Paris, a certain sense of continuity of the type. And I would see that in terms of the structures in the different buildings. And I would see it in terms of a periphery which frames a traditional downtown quarter.

I would further continue to add to the idea of the base type that you've been talking about. Where did four stories come from as opposed to three? I think we should set all of these frameworks where it's not traditional versus modern, but how do we integrate traditional and the structures that you're talking about here?

So I think we have to, all I'm saying is be careful of the language, be careful. Because that's
generating imagery here. And it's generating pictures, okay? And this is going to lead to real physical structures. And I'm very concerned that we are going to be destroying what is in fact being one of the attractive features of downtown in the process here. I'm not against height. I'm not against density. It's where you put it. And I'm suggesting, be very careful in that process. That's the major point. I have lots of little points to raise about these. And those I can go to what Colleen was saying: I haven't seen the data.

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Thank you. Who's next? I can't see you all down there. So you have to wave. Yes. Go right ahead. And would you go to the mic? Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENREI: The first question I had was actually for the alderman and the consultants in terms of process, and specifically, public process. I have in front of me the downtown plan schedule that was shown in the beginning of all of the workshops and presentations from the kickoff all the way to the -- and the presentation which shows the June 7th meeting. It was a joint meeting between the City Council and the
Plan Commission. At community meetings on June 21 and July 12th in two locations, a total of over 350 participants. Then there's the design -- of -- And then we have plan preparation in August. And then we plan ourselves in October, which is the City Council and Planning Commission.

But I'm just wondering about the community workshops that I've scheduled for the full month of September. I saw on the slide, I believe -- presented this evening, that there'll be a couple of dropped plan presentations in mid-October. So my first question is whether public presentations are going to be held.

And I also saw that there was upcoming workshops and hearings in -- the November 6th hearing. But I'd like to know what kind of workshops would be needed in that. And for the alderman, I guess the question is, is this the only presentation to the public or do you have, some are being planned or --

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Go ahead.

MR. BISHOP: Well, when we outlined the known public schedule. Again, we're here tonight. I would consider this a workshop-style setting. If I've chosen my words incorrectly, I use the term fairly generally.
We know about tonight of course. We know about the public meeting of the downtown Planning Committee that was held last Thursday. There will be another meeting of the downtown Planning Committee tomorrow morning.

And we know about the scheduled November 6th opportunity for public comment and input on the plan, as advertised on the yellow -- the, we call it internally the shish kabob chart. The shish kabob chart was prepared very early in the process. We thought we would, in a very aggressive sense, be at tonight in September. Not through the month of September, but we thought we would be rolling out the plan to the public in settings much like this in late September. We find ourselves in mid-October doing that. We also made it, and so the shish kabob chart was kind of a preliminary sense of where we'd be in what we thought would be late September. We're at that point in October now.

Well, I should also point out that the shish kabob chart was sort of redone very early in the process when we made our initial presentation to the City Council and the Plan Commission and talked about our plans to hold a public workshop. The Council said no. I think you'll hold at least three public workshops and
you'll hold them outside of downtown.

So what was really decided very early in the process is, we really needed to front load opportunities for public involvement and participation. And in doing that we sort of slipped from the late September point that we thought we would be at tonight and find ourselves here in October.

So I've described to you two additional opportunities that, two public meetings. Beyond that I'm sure we'll get direction from the Council and staff about what is, what's anticipated beyond that.

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Thank you. Does that answer --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENREI: No.

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: No?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENREI: So we've had a public presentation this evening in which you've gone through the -- And a member of the public could come in and understand in an hour and forty-five minutes what the new downtown plan, -- a major part of the downtown plan. Then it's up to them to go to the library and read the book. What other opportunity is tomorrow morning at 8 a.m.? And then on November 6th they'll be
able to comment.

My question is really, we have 350 people come out to help prepare the plan, my question is, and it kind of follows on Colleen, there's a lot of very contentious items in the plan. I think it's, we've been in three months, twelve hours of hearings on 708 Church alone. And that's 49 stories. I'm not sure that 42 stories is going to be a whole lot less contentious in the community. And I'm just wondering how many more of these specific kinds of presentations might you make?

And for the aldermen, if you think a 9 a.m. meeting tomorrow morning and -- on November 6th is sufficient for the public to have a chance to absorb this plan and understand it in its complexities and where the issues --

MR. MARINO: I think Kirk accurately described the schedule as it exists now. November 6th is a very important night for public comment and questions and discussion. Will there be additional meetings after that? There certainly may be. Certainly there will be the additional meeting of the Plan Commission and an additional meeting of the Planning and Development Committee at that point.
The plan has been online since last Friday, the 19th at five o'clock. It's available online. It's in all the public libraries. It's available in the Planning Division Clerk's Office. If anyone has difficulty accessing it, we'll certainly help them get access to it. It's also up for sale for a cost recovery price, a modest price. That's where we are at this point, very much focusing on November 6th.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Liz, --

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Alderman Wynne.

MR. MARINO: The question was whether or not we're doing anything in the newspaper. Bob Sodenberg and Bill Smith and Mary Gavin have covered the process for the last year and-a-half very well. In addition to that, there'll be a display ad in the newspaper as well.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Dennis, --

MR. MARINO: Yes.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: -- I've been very involved with the lakefront master plan -- you know, which has gone on over the last 10 months or so. And comparing this process to that one, and I've also put the -- that just recently what happened with the lakefront master plan was, we had a number of design meetings where ideas
were brought forth and then they, the consultant brought
back three possible ideas. And people were free to
comment on those three different -- of less intense --
more intense with various options attached to them. And
Hugo commented on those. And then they brought back two
more. I mean, they merged the comments, they brought
them back. It was so very much an open and fluid
process.

And they said, does this match with what you
all were discussing with us over the last few meetings?

And a few people said, no, where did you get that? Or
that's what most of us said. And so then, then they
merged that factor a little bit more. But there wasn't
ever anything that was, you know, written in a book at
that point yet. I mean, they were going back and
checking with the people who had been participating for
10 months in that lakefront master planning process.

So I guess what, you know, I'm thinking back,
you know, what Robin Schuldenrei was saying, is that,
you know, I know how many people participated in the --
over the summer. And the question I have is, when do we
have -- And then that lakefront master planning process
is working very well. I mean, people are definitely coming back, looking, saying, this is what we said, no, that's not what we said. So when is it, where is that opportunity for people who participated to say, you know, I'm, this isn't what we talked about earlier? Maybe you got it wrong, misinterpreted us. Or tell us what you heard us say and we'll maybe re-explain it to you. Where is that dialogue?

MR. MARINO: I think November 6 is a very important night. It's an opportunity for people to come and comment about what they like about the plan, what they don't like, new ideas that have emerged. I think as Kirk said, we decided to front load this process pretty intensively. Many cities really engage the public at this point. And we decided to really emphasize a great deal of public participation in all major -- in June and July.

But again, November 6 is the next date scheduled for pretty intensive opportunity, as long as it takes, as long as the Plan Commission's willing to stay operating that night for people to comment on the plans, make their suggestions, whatever direction they feel that it should be. But we also had a tremendous
amount of that kind of commentary and participation at the public workshops and certainly during the -- and the focus groups as well.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Well, I, you know, and I think that was terrific. But if you look at the lakefront master planning, that was front loaded as well. And my point is, though, I mean, you can get all those people to participate, but if they're, if what they see in the final product isn't what they were talking about, then it doesn't matter that you front loaded it.

So what I'd like to know, I think you need more than just a single nights meeting. Because obviously, not necessarily everybody can -- And clearly by this time of night people are getting worn out and tired. So I would suggest that a single public hearing is not sufficient to take in the comments that --

MR. MARINO: Yeah, that may be the case certainly. All I can say right now is, what we have scheduled is November 6 at this point. It doesn't mean that will be the only meeting. But that's what's scheduled at this point.

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Dennis.
ALDERMAN WYNNE: I'm --

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Sorry.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: -- I'm -- Chairman Tisdahl.

I'm already going to suggest we have to have more than a single public hearing.

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Well, I would certainly agree with you, Alderman Wynne. Because if you look at Central Street planning, --

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Right.

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: -- it outdoes lakefront planning by a long shot. It's still ongoing. But I think it's terribly important to have November 6th, but to also then come back if on November 6th, and this is Evanston, you will hear that you didn't get everything right. And so then to have an opportunity to come back and have people say, well, now you've got more of it right. You'll never get everyone's agreement, but I think you will definitely need more than just November 6th.

MR. MARINO: I think we expect that --

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Okay.

MR. MARINO: -- to happen.

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Mr. Staley.
COMMISSIONER STALEY: Well, the question, more on the economics. A couple of times you said that there were really a limited number of areas in which development would take place. And the implication, well, is that, you know, it wasn't really too big a deal because most of it was already there.

But really part of the economics behind that in comparison with what we, and I admit, I don't know as much as I should yet, but I will. So with respect to a particular tract that has a, you know, a fine building on it, it's been maintained on the borders where it should be. But will this new type of zoning make that property so much more valuable that someone will come along and of course it'll be sold and torn down and a new building will be built and there'll be many more sites than what we're looking at?

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: I believe that's an opportunity site since they were, they went straight --

MR. BISHOP: The opportunity site are based on some planning judgments and sort of typical in our experience about what can realistically be expected. I can say definitively, though, that I don't think our, our proposed form-based zoning framework provides any
more incentive to knock down existing buildings and
build anew than does the existing zoning. And in many
cases it provides even less of an incentive to do so
because it more accurately reflects existing conditions
and lower allowable building heights and floor area.
I, we're fairly confident that those opportunity or
sites susceptible to change are a realistic appraisal of
what is like to occur over a 10-year horizon.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Thank you.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Liz, I have another one.

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Alderman Wynne.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: I wanted to find out a little
bit more about the public benefit list. And in terms of
what the thoughts are, the weighing of that, does
someone just get to check off one and get a significant
bonus? What's the suggestion? Should they have, should
it be like a -- where you define, you know, or how much
are they --

This is a problem we've always had in terms of
weighing the public benefits that we get in a planned
unit development. And I think one of the, what we
really, what would help us is if there were some way to
quantify these better, say you must achieve this much of
these, of you know, this list of 10 in order for us to consider this to be truly a public benefit. Because otherwise we end up negotiating against ourselves. So I want to hear more about public benefits.

MR. BISHOP: Well, we believe that the public benefit system described in the report, in the form-based zoning chapter, does exactly that. It provides an objective, formula-based approach for individual benefits and establishes maximum allowable increases that are due to any single bonusable item. So there's a formula. Give us, give us a hundred square feet of new plaza at the base of the building. And that will yield you, under the formula, this much floor area.

ALDERMAN WYNNE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Could I follow up on that?

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: For any way in which any of those public benefits might be incorporated in as a requirement, --

MR. BISHOP: You're saying instead of incentivizing the provision of those public --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Make it --
MR. BISHOP: -- benefits, --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Right.

MR. BISHOP: Well, I suppose one could calibrate such a system. But I think you then would have to re-calibrate the allowable building envelope, or it would be the allowable building height and floor area, to take into account the added cost associated with mandating the attainment of the bonusable public amenities. Otherwise, what you would essentially do through such a system is shut off developing. Because it would be economically infeasible to develop a building, turn some semblance of a profit, and provide the public, the mandatory public benefits if held to the base allowances as described in the old --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Sir, there's none of those that could be mandatory, for this you --

MR. BISHOP: Well, you know, the truth of the matter is, when it comes to sustainable buildings, by and large people have a leg up on the sustainable -- The City does mandate some level of sustainability through its building and energy codes. And as we move forward that may become a mandate in the future. But it will become so commonplace that buildings attain the
equivalent of silver, platinum, or what, the next
diamond LEED, that we will be mandating it. But for now
we think this bonusable system is a workable approach
that provides both flexibility, reflects the economic
realities of the real estate marketplace, and adds that
measure of predictability that folks have told us they
eyarn so much for.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Can I follow up on that
one?

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Sure.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: The affordable housing
piece of it is something that comes up quite often when
we talk to developers about the City's affordable
housing on site. And usually we get a lot of push back
on that. Was that discussed at all, about having that
to get that percentage of that public benefit, that the
affordable housing had to be on site versus just buying
your way out?

I mean, most of these public benefits, the
developer can buy their way out of it. You know, they
can build a daycare -- They can put money forward -- a
landmark not at that site. So you can do a lot of
things to add money elsewhere, but not really focusing
on that -- for this --

MR. BISHOP: Well, we've tossed these ideas around at a theoretical level and have decided to propose the system we have where one could achieve the bonus either through the provision of on-site or through the payment of funds that'll be sort of collected together and used to fund affordable housing, workforce housing-style projects.

I think our decision not to go solely with the on-site bonusable item, if you will, was driven by our observations of other markets that use the affordable housing. If it is only attainable through the on-site provision, it simply, it'll be very rarely used, based on sort of historical patterns. And so we wanted to ensure that we're helping to move beyond the minimum allowances through the bonus system, through its more flexible application.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Is that something that continues during -- versus -- I mean, we already have a minimum level of giving to the -- If we're going to give it an extra bonus on top of it, they should probably try to encourage something more than continuing to segregate affordable versus unaffordable housing. That's all I'm
MR. BISHOP: And that's a fine one. And it may be that on-site provision should be due a higher level of bonus than payment of funds. Maybe that would be a way to encourage.

I don't think our recommendations encourage segregation. They do nothing, I'll grant you, to help address that issue.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: That's my point, though.

MR. BISHOP: And certainly re-calibration of the bonus to take into account the barriers towards on-site provision, maybe something we should look at in terms of a graduated bonus.

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Any other comments? Mr. Staley.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I have a follow-up on that, as to how this bonus system would really work. Because Stuart and I were talking about it as we drove down in the car the other day. And I don't think that was an open meeting. It was only the two of us. And it was clear by the time we got to the Loop that we did not, and we're both lawyers, but we did not quite understand it. And I, if you do, let's take affordable...
housing.

It says maximum bonus. So I'm assuming that this percentage over here would be the most, the most the City could possibly give. In other words, the City might, for affordable housing, give only a two percent bonus because they really didn't do that much more. Is that the way that would work? I mean, you don't, and wider sidewalks and all this. When it says maximum bonus, there's someone in the city that's going to negotiate. And it might be anywhere -- No?

COMMISSIONER WOOD: It's all formalized in the text for the following --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Oh, is it? All right, well, I'm sorry. I was out of town. I --

MR. BISHOP: You take, the bonus section of the zoning framework begins with a summary table that says, here's the list of bonusable amenities. Here's the districts in which one can use these bonuses. And here's the maximum allowable increase that is available for use of that single bonus. It then goes into pages of formulas and descriptions about how one determines how much public benefit has been provided and therefore how much public benefit floor area and building height
is allowable in that situation.
But the 15, 10 percent, 20 percent caps are
simply that, caps on the amount of -- bonus that can be
achieved through use of that single bonus.

MR. SMITH: But basically you're right, also.
You might only earn two percent, okay, of the bonus.
Because you're only making a certain amount of
contribution towards affordable housing over and above
what the minimum is. Okay, so you only get two percent.
But you can never get 16 percent or whatever. If the
maximum is 15, you can never go beyond that point.

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Stuart.

COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Is it contemplated that
the Plan Commission or some similar commission would be
the deciders as far as determining whether or not design
standards are met and whether the bonuses, whether the
bonuses would be applicable? In other words, who would
sit in judgment as to whether, whether the bonuses are
allowed and whether the design standards are in fact
met?

MR. BISHOP: There's only one thing certain
with our recommendation now. We don't recommend that
you use the existing planned development framework as a
way to evaluate building proposals that want to make use of the bonus or use that process as a way to evaluate compliance with the design standards.

We think that buildings, we recommend this, that buildings that are attempting to make use of the bonus system are due and should be subject to some level of additional scrutiny beyond a simple, you know, sign off with the building permit. But we've not made a recommendation on the form or the review and decision making framework for that decision.

We think that in many cases it could begin with a sort of, you know, Development Committee-type review and maybe in some circumstances work its way up. But we've made no specific recommendations at this point other than to say that a review process should be in place, but it should not be the existing planned development review process.

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Thank you. Anyone else? Colleen?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Nope.

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENREI: I have a question following that. If they're not asking for a bonus,
would it be then by right if you just build?

COMMISSIONER WOODS: You're still following
the guidelines --

MR. BISHOP: There'd be review of plans for
compliance at a site plan review-type committee level
often administered at an administrative level. But
there'd be no negotiation involved in that.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENREI: But would there be
Planning Commission hearings, for instance, on the 708
Church where you could build a -- 25 stories and it
would not come before the Planning Commission even when
you're not asking to do the -- stories which --

MR. BISHOP: Well, I don't know that 708
Church is in the 25-story base district. Oh, okay,
you're right. I always think of it in terms of the
north/south -- I'm sorry.

Yeah, the proposal that we've made is that the
base allowances are as of right.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENREI: That would concern
me if the Planning Commission, or even the new Planning
Commission member, I think, -- we've all experienced in
-- under -- or 20,000-square feet. And I don't believe
-- most successful. -- examples. And at 25 stories, I
can't even begin to -- what kinds of the -- could
possibly, it just seems an unusual -- where the
public -- process and the Planning Commission -- and go
up to 25 stories. Does that concern -- at all?

    MR. BISHOP: No, it doesn't. As a matter of
fact it reflects our best professional recommendation
and something that I think reflects best practice
nationally. I'm not saying, we're not, in saying that
we're recommending as of right allowances at that base
level, we're not saying against no standards. We're
saying bring in some of the things that are now used as
guidelines and negotiating techniques. Bring those
predictable elements into the as of right zoning system
so that you can have some certainties and some sense of
what can be achieved as a comfort level about what's
achievable under the base system through the use of
incorporation of additional design standards and the
sort of urban design controls that are, that are so
much, make up so much of the form-based approach.

    CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Mr. --

    MR. LAMONT: Let me just add really quick.
The as of right would have to follow the -- Because I
think that's got to be clear to everybody, is that
they're not just going to be, okay, you've got 10
stories, 20, 25, and then just go do it. They've got to
follow good architecture, good site planning, good
massing, good screening of their --

Because what we're finding here in other
cities is that when guidelines are prescribed for only
one zoning thing like your planned developments, the
regular stuff falls into the cracks. And you want all
of your stuff to look good whether it's a one-story
7-Eleven or it's 30 stories.

So the petitioner comes in. It's as of right.

But they've got to do things that we've all been
talking about on all the streets: the articulated
architecture, open glass store fronts, hide the loading,
hide the parking, -- to the street the right way, the
width of the sidewalks. So staff has a lot of tools
there to make them do that.

The question is if they're going to go beyond
into this bonus level. And as the Alderman asked,
there's going to be a lot more description there too.

So it's not just, well, let's roll up the sleeves and
start negotiating.

Here's your cap. You're not getting over that
cap, period. And if you're going to get there, you've
got to have very prescribed bonuses with percentages
that go with it.

And I think guidelines are a national trend.
And we're all getting -- in there, getting away from
where guidelines are becoming standards. Because
communities need them as standards.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: On that point, a
question. We have -- guideline. Did you look at those
and incorporate those into your recommendation?

MR. LAMONT: Yes. And just --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: How many have you --

MR. LAMONT: Because what we're doing, I think
it might be a point of clarification. Because our
mission is to show you a zoning analysis, whether it's
working or not, and a zoning strategy, which right now
is, we're leaning towards the form-based code.

What you as Commissions and Council would be
approving is the plan, not the zoning map. The zoning
would still be detailed out. So we're recommending a
very specific set of guidelines using a lot of the good
ones that you've already worked on. You've had a lot of
good ones.
But for everything, we don't have it all listed in that right now. When the actual zoning was worked on, all those guidelines we -- over and more will be added to that.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Like the -- and all of that.

MR. LAMONT: Right. Lighting, screening. We talk about wrapping with good architecture, as this will --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: These will now be mandatory.

MR. LAMONT: Well, these standards, not guidelines.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Standards. That's what I meant. Standards. They have to be -- if you --

MR. LAMONT: There's a lot of folks in town that either worked on or liked the guidelines that are in a -- guide list. They want to beef them up, you know, for everything.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: Thank you. The Council did not approve those as mandatory.

MR. LAMONT: Well, that's the next step.

That's the selling strategy.
CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Mr. Widmayer.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Let me, let me in relation to this, let me just go back a couple of years, for three years when we first started looking in our current zoning structure with design guidelines and filing of -- review and some of the things. This was before everything, about 22 units, was a planned development.

Counsel at that time, legal counsel at that time, gave us an opinion that there was a problem with a separate binding -- review in relation to our zoning. So we went through the Board's stringent planned development process to give us a method of controlling that through negotiation. We adopted the guidelines, as guidelines, just something to sort of relate to.

The idea behind moving to form-based code was to address the objective of taking guidelines as not as guidelines anymore. Now there's a -- review. Standards, which are now part of the zoning, so that if we put, what we put into the zoning we believe are the standards by which someone can take options of two or three to build something. And that's what we want to see.
Then we may not need to review as many things.
And part of that is the benefit to the Plan Commission
and the Council of not reviewing everything as long as
it falls within these much more stringent standards and
only have to review those things which are exceptions to
that and only have to review those things that are
asking for buying-in bonuses.
And even if that, the recommendation here is,
there are height limits. There are tops. You can't buy
beyond a certain point. You can't be, as a planned
development might allow, you can't super majority beyond
that certain point.
So it provides reliable standards to everyone
in the City. And the developing community understands.
And if we do, if the zoning, this type of zoning
provides enough of that to -- then we won't need the
process that was many, of reviewing everything.
And in part, that's because to a large degree,
it's because through the -- and everything we've got
that -- all right from a number of citizens relating to
what that should look like.
COMMISSIONER HUNTER: We're putting a lot of
trust --
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I'm sorry. You --
correct me.

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: We're putting a lot of
trust in written documents here without any review. In
other words, the --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, that's the
challenge involving this --

COMMISSIONER HUNTER: But that's what I'm
saying. It -- spend a lot of -- There's not much.

MR. LAMONT: If I could add something here.
Because we actually drew a lot of, we worked in this
situation quite a bit where working in downtown, that
that's sort of a passport to zoning and standards or
guidelines they've used and adopted over the course of
many years. And this is becoming a very common
practice.

Because I think that the experiences that
you've had have become sort of unpredictable. And site
by site, building by building decisions is something
that many, many cities are grappling with and now are on
the forefront of doing plans and codes that are like
this, that essentially take the downtown area and treats
it like a planned -- planned development much like you
would have a planned unit development in a suburban context.

This really treats the downtown like a planned development and builds those standards into the process of the review so that you can actually have more of the day-to-day decisions really built in at a typical review level. But you trade that off for a higher standard that you require of the Applicants. So it gives the Applicants and everybody a little more predictability and understanding of what is expected. But it does at the same time hold people to a higher standard and then also provides additional incentives and opportunities to go beyond that in a more focused way, as Kirk and others were describing, with really letting out the formulas for how you go beyond that.

So this is a very typical sort of application of this. And it's a new way of doing it that is a little uncomfortable at first, but we think provides tremendous benefit for the community and for everybody to understand the process of development.

It doesn't mean at the end of the day that when you adopt a zoning code, that you will never change it. And in fact you will probably review it in a year.
and make sure that it's working the way that you want it
to work and see if there are ways that you can tweak it.
And that's very similar to how you would handle many
planned developments.

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Any other questions? Want
to make a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER: I'll move.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: So moved.

CHAIRMAN TISDAHL: Okay.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at
9:52 p.m.)