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CHAIRMAN WOODS: Good evening. My name is Jim Woods. And I am the Chair of the Plan Commission. And it's my privilege this evening to introduce the evening's proceedings.

So, the Downtown Plan Committee, the Plan Commission, was formed and began meeting in Winter of 2006, we're not quite sure, we can't remember that far back, but we think it was January or February, for the express purposes of developing a new downtown plan which provides a vision for downtown for the next 10 to 20 years and moves us beyond, case by case, reactive considerations of individual planned developments.

I want to thank the consultants, Duncan Associates, the Lakota Group, 180 Degree Design Studio, Goodman, Williams & Calloway, for an impressive and comprehensive draft report which has energized the discussion of planning around the City.

A couple of observations. First of all, I think we all need to keep in mind that the economic sustainability of our downtown and our city are inextricably linked. Every year we wonder how the budget gap will be closed, whether by new or higher fees or increased taxes, not to mention how the problem of
the under funded pensions can be solved. How much more
can we afford as a community before we are no longer the
socially, culturally, and economically diverse community
that we all appreciate?

We are not a new community that gets new EAV, Estimated Assessed Valuation, for those of you who
aren't familiar with taxes. That's what it ultimately
is, gets based on. Through the build out of our
periphery we are a bounded, built-up community. The
only ability we have to capture new income for the City
is through expanding EAV through redevelopment.

Obviously we cannot and should not focus only on
critical economic development needs. Enhancing the
quality of life downtown is also essential. The need
for more amenities and improved pedestrian experience in
some areas is self-evident. Appropriately balanced
development and attractive redevelopment are also
important for the future social and economic success of
the downtown.

Tonight we've organized this evening in a
slightly different manner than some of you are used to.
We're going to hear brief presentations about each
component of the plan. And that presentation of that
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little component, which is, the presentation is
primarily for those people who may not have been able to
attend one of the previous presentations. After that
will be followed by an opportunity for citizen comment.

What we're going to do at the end of the
presentation is we're going to have a show of hands to
see who wants to speak on that particular component of
the plan. What we're trying to do here is make sure
that all components of the plan get addressed by
everybody.

And what we're going to ask you to do is to
get up, either in threes or in a line or something, so
that we can try and efficiently have people make
comments rather than have an individual make comments,
wait for the next person to get up there, and so on.
Because obviously there's a lot of people here. And I'm
sure a lot of people are going to want to have comments
on various aspects of the plan.

When you get up to speak you need to state
your name and your address. That's for the benefit of
the court reporter in the back. Because there is no
specific sign in sheet for speaking tonight. There will
be an attendance kind of sheet so that we know who
attended the meeting. But in terms of people deciding that they want to speak on individual areas, rather than have, you know, four or five sign up sheets out there, we wanted to be able to do it as people felt the need. And I'm going to ask everybody to keep their comments as succinct as possible and avoid repetition from previous speakers. If there's something that's been said, just simply say that you agreed with the previous speaker about such and such an issue.

And just to review, there's going to be an introduction. Then we're going to talk about parks, open space, and pedestrian environment, then circulation and parking, then development framework and implementation strategies. After we're completed with that, if we get there tonight, there will be a dedicated time for individual statements after the presentation and discussion format if we have time.

This meeting will go until 11 o'clock I expect. And that, therefore, we will likely have a continuance from the discussion tonight and opportunity for public comment. We're planning at the moment for the next meeting to be November 27th at seven o'clock. This evening's proceedings are being televised
live and will be rebroadcast at either six or seven
tomorrow night. They couldn't quite tell staff what
exact time it was going to be yet. But it will also be
on a five p.m. on Saturday for those of you who want to
watch the rerun.

We want to hear your opinions, your criticism,
and what elements of the plan you like. We ask that we
all remain civil and considerate of others as we engage
in thoughtful review and debate about the special
downtown we have now and could have in the future. And
with that, I'm going to turn it over, I believe, to Kirk
to start the introduction.

MR. BISHOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members
of the Commission, and members of the public. Again,
Kirk Bishop with Duncan Associates. I'll get us started
tonight. I'm joined by my usual suspects, friends, John
LaMotte, Kevin Clark, and Tom Smith. I'm sure you'll be
hearing from them at various points. Or I can assure
you, will.

I'd like to get us started with a brief
introduction. As you described, Mr. Chairman, we're
going to do it a little bit different tonight, sort of
break this presentation into manageable chunks for a
couple of real reasons. One is to ensure that we engage in a dialogue that's focused, at least in the beginning hours of this evening, on the particular elements of the plan that I think are the critical recommendations. And then as you say, either later this evening or at a future date, however tonight goes, allow for just a general discussion and comment.

As you know, our team really began a partnership with the Downtown Plan Committee, and indeed the entire City of Evanston, back in June of this year when we were retained to assist in the, sort of final push towards development of an update of the 1989 plan for downtown Evanston. That was a plan that, through a remarkable circumstances of events or sheer will, was, really has to be looked at as a highly successful effort.

It had really seven key themes at its core. And many of them are familiar themes that carry forward into this planning effort, as we'll describe tonight or remind ourselves tonight. Encouraging economic growth, providing an appropriate framework for new development, economic growth within the downtown, continued push towards an attractive, safe, pedestrian realm, physical
amenities that attract folks and provide the safety and comfort for those who live, work, play, shop downtown. Circulation system that works and that really, one of the really core values of the 1989 plan effort was to provide a framework for a downtown that doesn't close the shutters at five o'clock in the evening. And there really is a 24/7, 365 days-a-year downtown.

And by all measures you've made great progress, if not absolutely achieved, many of those goals. And part and parcel of the proof of that is shown on this diagram which shows by way of the green lime-colored buildings, new development, redevelopment activities that occurred since 1997. Having established that critical planning framework and a sort of consensus in shared vision for what needed to occur downtown by providing a zoning framework, new development since 1997 is just a truly remarkable story and one that I remarked on previous occasions, is really the envy of many communities like Evanston, not only in the Chicago metropolitan area, but throughout, throughout the United States.

Following on the heels of the beginning of that growth trend, that map that began to emerge in 1997
with the exciting new development proposals, there were
downtown planning initiatives that occurred. Many of those were an attempt to sort of refine the
vision from 1989. We're a decade into the plan. It's
time to begin to revisit some of the goals, to begin to
look at some of the successes, to continue to nurture
that success story, and to begin to manage the change
that occurred as a city-wide effort, of course, with the
start of the new millennium, a new comprehensive general
plan for the entire City of Evanston that had some
important recommendations about continuing economic
growth and development within downtown.

In the early 2000, following on the heels of the comprehensive general plan, a downtown visioning
effort led by our colleagues at Lakota, a downtown
traffic model was prepared to continue to monitor
traffic conditions within the downtown and begin to
project the need for improvements to the transportation
network and circulation system within downtown. A
downtown retail strategy and real estate market report,
prepared in part by our friends at the Goodman and
Williams group, who are of course a part of our team.

Planned development guidelines were prepared in the
2005 city-wide strategic plan, again a city-wide effort, but with some specific focus elements on downtown. And of course the work of the Downtown Plan Committee of the Plan Commission by way of the guiding principles, which was really about the time, as I say, mid-year 2007, that the baton was handed to us and that we joined the partnership in preparing a updated planning framework for downtown and at least a strategy and recommended approach to a more predictable development framework for downtown.

Since we've begun the process there have been a number of activities occurring. And I know that many of you have joined us at various junctures, if not throughout the process.

We began the process in early June in this room when we made a presentation to a joint panel of the City Council and Plan Commission. It was at that meeting that the City Council and Plan Commission instructed us to take our show to the entire community and not confine our efforts to meetings held in downtown buildings or at the Civic Center, but go out to the neighborhoods because of this idea that downtown Evanston is a cherished and valuable resource for people
no matter where they live. Downtown residents, of
course, but residents throughout Evanston and even those
who visit Evanston on a regular basis.

We held those three city-wide meetings. The
third week of June we began, and it continued on through
mid-July, engaged in a conversation at round table
discussions as discussing strengths, weaknesses,
opportunities, ideas that folks have, concerns that they
have, and talked to over 350 people at those, at those
sessions and took a variety of input and summarized all
that input received and then documented it by way of
detailed notes from those sessions.

A downtown design shurettes a pretty exciting
point in the process that occurred very early, held the
week of July 16\textsuperscript{th} through 21\textsuperscript{st}, when again, hundreds of
to help us divine some sort vision for physical
improvements and physical planning within downtown. A
number of focus groups held during that week, seven in
all. And again, hundreds of people in total in
attendance at those downtown resident workshops. The
design community, young professionals, and the like
participated in those focus group sessions.
Then we began, really internally, to prepare the draft plan report that is now available on the internet and that many of you have seen and read and scrutinized in detail. And that really occurred during the months of August, September, and into October of this year when we released our initial draft report in late October.

We're now in the phase of the project, of course, where we're presenting that plan and beginning to engage in a discussion of folks' reaction to it. That will, that certainly started in October. We're into November now. And of course you'll tell us when that process is done. And the hearing will be the sort of final stage of the process.

In terms of the shurettes, I just want to remind us of some of the principles that came out of the shurettes process that were presented both in drawings on the wall at the Design Studio downtown and presented at the closing Saturday morning design shurettes summary session. And there were really four key physical design and planning principles that came out of the design shurettes that also provided important building blocks for our recommended planning effort. And those were
really to continuing to nurture a sense of intimacy at
the street level, places that people enjoy, feel
comfortable and safe in within downtown, and enhanced
public amenities throughout downtown, so critical to
sort of the basic quality of life concerns that were so
prominent in our discussions early in the process.

And then in terms of the future, the principle
of encouraging, if not demanding, that new construction
within downtown be thoughtful and adhere to the planning
principles and the development framework that was then
emerging. And of course this idea, again, a very
prominent theme from our early discussions, about
predictable certain rules for new development within
downtown, moving away from the era of some uncertainty
that maybe evolved in sort of case by case review,
planned development-dominated review process, and a more
predictable framework for new development.

Those design shurettes principles have been
refined. The 1989 planning goals, objectives, and
vision statements have been refined. And we find
ourselves in this new plan with, as I say, some updated
objectives and strategies, including optimizing economic
development. That's not economic development at all
costs, but looking for opportunities for economic
development city-side with a focus of course on
downtown, improving the quality of the physical
environment and an increased emphasis on green or
sustainable development, a very important principle of
this plan, as well as any modern plan in today's world.
Continuing to promote multi-modal transportation
opportunities for people who choose to take a variety of
modes of transportation in their daily lives, a focus on
arts and cultural opportunities, and again, this notion
of sensible and predictable development controls.
That culminates in a refined, sort of overall
vision, overall goal statement, that again, plays
heavily on the 1989 plan, which is so important to this
update. And that goal and vision statement, for those
of you who can see or can't see it on the board, is a
mixed-use Central Business District that is attractive,
convenient, livable, sustainable, accessible, and
economically vibrant for residents, businesses, and
visitors. And the key notion being that it is
everyone's downtown.
So with that, we're going to begin to sort of
walk through the elements, take breaks after a very
brief presentation of the key recommendations from the plan, and allow you to engage in a conversation about those recommendations.

MR. LAMOTTE: Thank you, Kirk. The first category or cluster grouping that we're going to talk about is really parks, open spaces, and pedestrian environment, very strongly discussed throughout the process, very heavily emphasized in all the documents that we've seen to date. And we want to just quickly give you the overview there was, talked about in detail in the report. But let's just start walking through them.

We've circled the sites within the overall downtown. Some are existing sites that need work. And I think we know the key one in the middle. But there's also some new sites that have come up and that we think have good merit for making them more into open spaces that are usable for everybody downtown.

The first one is the space between the Northwestern office building and the Optima residential development. Again, we were looking at every speck of either existing open space or a potential new space. And this is one that's been developed as a space already
out there on Elgin Road. But we felt it was a little overgrown and a little bit intimidating about going back in there.

So the recommendation is to open it up a little more, maybe add some plant materials, make it a little more inviting, and have it so anybody can go in there and not just the residents of the building or the office workers. So that's pretty straightforward. That initiative, if so approved in the plan, would be followed up by the City departments in working with the owners to try and get that upgraded to the next level.

The next one is the library parking lot. There's been a lot of discussions about parking lots in downtowns, especially in this downtown where it's developed more, where there's three big strategic parking decks. The idea would be, is that the best use in the long run, is to have a parking lot there when we have parking underneath the library for folks who need to get right into the library? There's a parking deck to the east. There's one southwest of here.

And the conclusion was that we think in the short term that that parking lot should be upgraded with landscaping, get it greened up a little bit more.
in the long term, as the City's transportation plan gets
going in the Spring where they start to drill down on
specifics in parking, explore the possibility of not
having it anymore as a parking lot, but creating a plaza
there. The northeast quadrant of downtown really
doesn't have a lot of open spaces. The idea would be,
this could be a park with some name to it. It could be
another design process after the master plan, that you'd
have quite a good large, open space there that folks
could use in that northeast quadrant.

So short term, upgrade it with landscaping.

Long term, consider it as a public space, and possibly
with parking underneath if that's feasible, knowing that
you can still get underneath the library to do direct
parking for those that need to be there underneath.

The next one is Oldberg Park. I mean, next
time you're out there again take a close look at it.
The trees are growing down. The mound is high. It's
not a very open park. It's a crossroads between
Northwestern and the downtown. And it is a gateway. We
have the Clark Street angle coming through. We've got
Orrington bending around there. We've got the Burger
King on the corner. You'll hear more about the
development idea for the corner.

But the thought was, could we pull that one leg of the street out, convert that to a pedestrian promenade in front of the stores, expand the park, upgrade the park, open it up, maybe flatten it a little bit so it's more of a plaza, get some more greenery in there, and just take that to the next level from what it is today, add to it and enhance it, and make it a really, a port of entry going to the university as well as coming back into downtown? So that's on the list of ideas.

Here's a quick sketch. On the right are the shops that are there now. In the background way in the back would be a potential redevelopment of the Burger King site, which again, we'll talk about in a minute. And on the left is part of the existing park with a new pedestrian open space added in where the street used to be. And we'll talk more about that in a minute as well.

The next think is Fountain Square, the civic heart, the soul of the downtown. Folks said that's an identity, but it's an identity that we need to really fix up. The planters are too big. They're overgrown. People feel a little intimidated going in there. It's
not a real special place like it was originally intended. A lot of activities come and special events, but day to day, a place where you want to go to and have a coffee or meet a friend.

So what we've done is, we've got two concepts here that we're talking about. One is to embrace the whole intersection as Fountain Square so all the corners, all the streetscape, all the spaces work together and are designed together and thought through together. On the north is the existing Fountain Square site. On the south we've shown the potential expansion of the Chandler Plaza that's in front of the shops there. A lot of folks like that. It was flat, it had a lot of nice seating.

So the idea is, could we take a piece of Orrington out, take that leg out, expand it to the west, add a plaza to the northeast corner where the Chase Bank is, try and get that down to ground level so people feel comfortable walking right into it, and then upgrade Fountain Square and just add in all new design features, benches, landscaping, public art, water features, and really make it the spectacular centerpiece that we've talked about?
The second option for that would be if the Fountain Square building were to be purchased and demolished. To the north of Fountain Square you could double the size of it. So the question there is, do we need to do that? And you could do some really nice open space amenities there. The question is balancing taking the building out with the active office tenants that are there.

We think that if the traffic study shows that we can realign Orrington and take that one leg out there, that you're almost doubling the space of Fountain Square by just expanding the Chandler Plaza. So we want to get input from the Commissioners and the community on that.

The next one is Raymond Park. A great space, this park is a big park. It's not a little plaza. There was discussion during the summer and in the shurettes about, could we make it one step better, similar to Oldberg Park? Could we upgrade it? Could we get different landscaping? And could we maybe move the active, kind of playground area to the east and open up a great lawn for other things: sitting, resting, maybe some art shows, things that could happen in there? But
not necessarily radically change it, but just make some refinements and enhancement to it to make it even better.

The next is the northwest corner of Maple and Grove. Right now it's a parking lot, a gravel parking lot for the YMCA. It's owned by Presbyterian Homes. We took a look at that southwest quadrant of downtown. There's not a really lot of open space over there. You're a couple block to Fountain Square.

So we thought, again, another little urban plaza might work in there, working with the redevelopment of that site some day that in the plan you've got a space allocated. And then working with the developer or development or the owner to try and make that upgraded into an actual urban plaza, working out the parking around the YMCA. This would be a situation where the City and the owner would cooperate and follow the plan and work that into an overall redevelopment of that block.

The next is a smaller site just west of the YMCA. It's the rectangle box on the east side of the screen. The right side of the screen is the YMCA. Small site, not a very big site.
If that site was to turn over for potential development, we see that again, as another little open space, the flower garden, rose gardens to the south. But these two plazas at Grove and Oak Street would probably really be much more centered in that southwest quadrant and a better use for those sites.

Next is Bookman's Alley. You walk through the alley to get back to the, for the shops in that little space back there. Because you have a denser, more European feeling downtown, we thought, could we upgrade the actual space where the shops are, make that a little bit more plaza-like? And then actually put some pavers down and some banners and some murals or whatnot to upgrade that alley, allow people to pass through there a little more pedestrian friendly.

This is happening around the country where these little spaces are reclaimed. By day trucks could still use it for deliveries. But by night and on weekends you could walk through there and feel more comfortable. It's really upgrading the existing behavior of using the alley.

And then one kind of out-there idea was, could we do something along the tracks, maybe upgrade the
landscaping, do some murals, maybe little booths or
kiosks with newspapers or candies, something more
European as well, just to make that edge, that wall, a
little softer, a little nicer? It might be one booth.
It might be a public garden. It might be some vines or
things hanging over. But to take it the next step.
Because we've heard load and clear from
residents, from Commissioners, and from ourselves that
there's a lot of nooks and crannies in this downtown.
It's a big downtown. We want to have these special
places. And we want them upgraded for everybody to use.
Next we're going to talk about circulation and
parking. And Kirk's going to kick that off. And then,
or I'm kicking --
CHAIRMAN WOODS: We're going to break now.
We're doing --
MR. LAMOTTE: Oh, break. I'm sorry. Let's go
back to the open spaces. So that's our first break.
And that piece of the plan, then, we could open up for
discussion: open space, plazas, pedestrian character,
and streetscape.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay, could have a show of
hands of those people who would like to speak on plazas
or parks, open spaces, and pedestrian environment?

Okay, if we could, those who are going to speak, if you could just, like, find your way around and sort of get in line and --

MR. LAMOTTE: The microphone's right here.

It'd be easier than trying to crawl --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Oh, there's a microphone in the middle. Okay. And as I said, again, state your name, your address, and then you can start your remarks.

MR. WHITACRE: Dick Whitacre, 1400 Chicago Avenue. The removal of Orrington, that segment of Orrington Avenue, I don't understand is, why it is that important. If you take the Fountain Square building out you will have provided significant additional open space. And you could maintain the Orrington Avenue access. What are you going to do with Sherman? Are you going to make it a two-way street? And if you do that, aren't you compounding the traffic problems in the downtown?

MR. LAMOTTE: A great question. If we could hold the traffic questions until the next section. We're going to talk about circulation, parking and traffic. But you've got a good point. If the plaza was
expanded to the north and almost doubled, if not more, in size, do you need then to expand into Orrington on the west side of Chandler? But it's a good kind of option A, option B. But the traffic thing we're going to talk about in a minute, okay?

MR. CARABAR: I had a more specific -- I'm sorry. My name's Allen Carabar. I live at 2510 Calper. I had a more specific question about the public plaza standards for, if a developer, for the benefit of the extra floors.

I agree with the 2,500-square foot minimum.

My question comes when you say there's only going to be 20 percent of landscaping required. Why such a small amount? You know, it kind of lends itself to what we have at Fountain Square: a lot of concrete, not much landscaping.

MR. LAMOTTE: We're not clear. Are you saying under the bonuses, that there's a --

MR. CARABAR: Yeah. Under the bonus structure.

MR. LAMOTTE: The way we've got it set up is a two-fold thing, is that with identified public spaces in the plan, ideally developers would contribute to that.
They may not have it on their block, but they would contribute to actually fixing Fountain Square or putting in a new plaza, or in general, funding an overall pool for that.

We're trying not to have every site do an open space on a site. Because sometimes they're afterthoughts. You want them to be really meaningful, open spaces.

MR. CARABAR: Okay, so my question is in regards to the 20 percent landscaping.

MR. BISHOP: I think there may be a misunderstanding. And it's probably our fault. We probably presented it in a confusing way.

The 20 percent that you're referring to is not a limitation on landscaping. It's a limitation on the amount of floor area bonus that could be given for improvement of public parks, plazas, and the like. There is no recommended limitation on landscaping for the very reasons --

MR. CARABAR: For the actual plaza.

MR. BISHOP: -- that you're describing. Absolutely.

MR. CARABAR: Great. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN WOODS: At least 20 percent of the parks and plazas.

MR. BISHOP: At least 20 percent of the public plaza needs to be landscaped.

MR. LAMOTTE: In order to get the, in order to get the bonus.

MR. CARABAR: Okay, 20 percent is low, is my comment.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well I, just to clarify, I think Kirk's saying that you get a 20 percent bonus to go and -- if you contribute to the open space. The open space has to be designed with water features and landscaping and public gardens. We're not there yet. That comes in the second and third phases of the plan. So don't put 20 percent of landscaping into the site. That's just, your bonus goes up. Your --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: John, it's actually in the draft for the standards and guidelines for the bonus that at least 20 percent has to be landscaped.

But the thing that I would remind everybody at this point is that we're not talking about specific zoning requirements right now. We're talking about the master plan. Because the zoning requirements, once the
master plan is approved, they're going to be fleshed out. And there will be another public process that relates specifically to zoning requirements. So, we got a long way to go.

MR. ANGELL: Good evening. I'm Tim Angell. I'm at 1432 Wesley. I'm a member of the American Planning Association, the American Institute of Certified Planners, and the Urban Land Institute.

Just general comments about the open space and component. First of all, in my mind Fountain Square currently isn't the center of downtown. Because it's just underutilized. And I think this plan does a really great job of bringing Fountain Square back to its preeminence and prominence in downtown.

Second of all, I was really glad to see that the consultants and staff kept Bookman's Alley as a nice corridor between two of our commercial corridors in downtown. And I really like its upgrading.

I walk through downtown a lot, especially on the way to Northwestern. And I think what the plan captures really well is the importance of our pocket parks in downtown. I think they need a lot of help right now. And I think the plan gives good direction on
how to spruce them up. And I'd ask the City staff to
take particular, to pay particular attention to what the
plan says. That's everything on that component. Thank
you.

MS. DEINNER: I'm Ann Deinner. I live at 1034
Sheridan Road. Former Plan Commissioner back in the 70s
and now on the Preservation Commission.

I like the idea of little parks. The main
concern I have is, who is going to take care of these?
There's nothing worse than having nicely laid out parks
and then they turn into tatty, ratty, messy locations.
And particularly in the downtown, you might say, where
you have more traffic. I think this is very important.
Who is going to be responsible for these?

And I think if there are certain gardening
groups in the town that would volunteer to keep them up
or see to pay for the expenses, that would be fine. But
that's another job for you all to work on.

I'm curious about the triangular park east of
the Congregational Church. That's where Grove and Lake
come together. Now is that owned by the church property
or is that City property?

MR. LAMOTTE: That is a -- question or Jim?
1. Park east of the --
2. MS. DEINNER: It's the, behind the
3. Congregational Church, east of it. Where Lake and Grove
4. run into Judson. Is that City property or is it --
5. CHAIRMAN WOODS: I don't' believe that's City
6. property.
7. MS. DEINNER: Well, I was curious. Because
8. there have been things added to that area like some
9. benches and so on. Okay, that's all.
10. MS. SPELLMAN: My name's Cornelia Spellman.
11. 1633 Hinman, the corner of Hinman and Church.
12. We're so happy to live downtown now. We used
13. to live in a house, like, in another neighborhood in
14. Evanston. This means that we walk all the time.
15. And so I urge all of you, we really need to do
16. something about bikes on the sidewalks. I'm working
17. with our beat officer. I'm doing research on bike
18. accidents. I'm taking photographs of bikers on my daily
19. walks. Because I realized this was the best way to
20. document it.
21. And to my surprise, I walk probably three
22. times a day, I take three to five photographs every walk
23. of people on sidewalks. And it's really dangerous.
Because when you come out of a store somebody can go
whizzing by you.
I was coming around the corner from Sherman to
Church, the old Barnes and Noble building, and I stopped
like this luckily because somebody was coming along the
other side. You know, if we want a safe environment
downtown, this is really a critical issue.

MR. EVANS: I'm Leonard Evans. I live at 1580
Sherman, Optima Towers.

The original discussions included more
ambitious plans for alleys. I think it's fine to do
more with Bookman's Alley. But for example, at one
point you were considering creating an alley north of
the bank building from Orrington to Chicago. And that
seems to have disappeared.

Now, the reason I consider this important is
because, as you have development which eliminates retail
space for small retailers, you should have available
space waiting so that they can be moved easily. And so
I think you should reconsider doing more with the
alleys.

Now, I know you want to put off discussion of
parking until later. And I don't know how I feel about
Oldberg Park and the Fountain Square plan. But it, certainly the merchants, restaurants, which will have parking eliminated from right in front of their stores, will be very unhappy if you do that. It may be worth doing anyway, but you're going to get a lot of opposition to that.

And finally, my issue I always bring up, and in connection with Fountain Square, is when, if the development process continues to make the downtown windier, you may have a beautiful Fountain Square which no one ever uses. The example is the Bank One plaza, which in fact nobody ever uses. Because most of the time it's too windy.

MR. SAVOY: Good evening. I'm Colin Savoy. I, like Tim Angell, am a professional planner, 27 years experience in public and private practice. Also certified, American Planning Association. John, who I know well, travel in the same circles.

A couple of questions, for you John. And then a couple comments. Of the concerns, and this may come up and be addressed later, I notice near the YMCA there is a new building across the street. And then the idea of the park where the existing parking is, and there are
other locations where there seems to be areas where
there's parking, that it's going to become building or
parks. So, I don't know if you want to address that
later or now, but it's kind of related to the open space
issue.

The question is, how can we do more open
space, eliminate parking that as far as I see, and use
those facilities weekly, is going to be a real problem?
And I don't see in your plan any provision for
replacing that parking, at least nearby. So that's, I
guess, a question and a comment.

The other thing that's really not an open
space, but it takes an open space away from the
inventory, is where the farmer's market is. And I know
others have talked about that. So the plans for where
the future farmer's market home will be and that space
is also a question.

Another, probably more of a comment than a
question, is with regard to my really strong feeling
about the issue of the future of Fountain Square. And I
know in your plan you have a couple options proposed. I
would suggest that one of the important take-aways that
we get as a community out of this process is an expanded
Fountain Square as a focal point for this community.

I don't think that this plan, if it's going to be a visionary document to last into the future, should be thinking anything less than that. And of course that ties into the broader question of the developments that we're currently considering.

The other, just question I have, well, maybe question and comment again, Raymond Park, which I found interesting that there is some desire to want to redesign that. I guess I at least raise a question, knowing the individual, the woman who actually was, spearheaded the effort to -- the accessible playground in that park, and don't see that, at least in the schematic, how that would be accommodated in the future. I think that would be sorely missed. It's a great value, heavily-used facility. And I think used very well.

And that park has been used in the past for the flower sales. And so it seems to work well even with that facility as it is. So I'm just wondering what's kind of driving the redesign of the park or what the issues are or how those are going to be accommodated. Because I don't see it as much of a
problem. Maybe it could be embellished.

The other general comment with regard to the open space is, is that except for limited park areas, except for limited park areas, maybe pocket parks, small little plaza and seating areas, there's no really significant other new open space in the downtown area. Yet we're adding, I think, with the calculations I've come up with, about three to four thousand people at the potential maximum build out densities that we're talking about, yet no new open space.

And if I were to equate this, it would be wrong to do it, but just to give it some perspective if I were to equate this. What I would be reviewing for a subdivision that would be generating this kind of population in the suburbs, in the suburbs where you have your back yard and so forth where people down here don't, you'd be, you know, looking at somewhere approximately 10 acres per thousand population, has been the traditional national standard even though that has been changed. And I'm not suggesting that's even remotely appropriate downtown. But to give it some context, if you reduced it by half, that'd be 15 to 20 acres.
And the idea that we're really not seeing any new significant open space, I had a couple weeks ago attended a presentation of the Chicago Central Area Plan. And a big deal about the densifying and repopulating, if you will, of Chicago Central area, is they're looking at an entire city block as becoming a new public park in downtown Chicago. And it seems to me if Chicago can be that visionary and pull that off, then we need to be at least thinking about how we return some open space to support the population. That's it.

MS. RAKLEY: Hi. My name's Barbara Rakley, R-a-k-l-e-y. And I don't have a question. I've got a comment on the third item listed in point two on the agenda.

It seems like a lot of the consultants' remarks have been directed to parks and open space. And I don't know that we've heard much about pedestrian environment. And it seems to me that pedestrian environment would be amazingly significantly impacted by the very large area of downtown under which very tall, in which very tall buildings could be built. So I would like to see a less artificial division and an integration of the building height issues, which is I
think probably why most of us are here, with the term pedestrian environment. I don't think there's any way they can be considered separately. I think that's a very artificial separation. Thank you.

MR. MINEMEIR: Dan Minemeir. --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Just hold on one second.

Barb, you will have the opportunity, both under D and E, the development framework and implementation strategies and additional comments and questions, to integrate any aspects of these plans.

MR. MINEMEIR: Dan Minemeir, 2720 Central Street. Just a few comments and one question, mostly on the previous speakers.

I like the term pocket parks. I frequent at least half the parks in the City throughout the area either on bike or foot. And I really enjoy them. I think I've taken them for granted, now that you're bringing this up. And I think in my mind, they are a little scrappy.

And I'm wondering, if we begin to improve them, and I like where you're going with this, the maintenance and when you begin to add more complex landscaping, who's going to take care of it? I see the
Parks guys out there, a little bit of forestry. It's a lot of work.

Another speaker had mentioned some more community involvement. Evanston's a perfect place where communities immediately surrounding that park, I guarantee you could get that community involvement. So if you want to put some notes in there to develop the plan a little further, I can guarantee you, that with some more complex landscaping, the residents might be willing to take care of that. Because you can build these beautiful parks, but you know, the onerous is on the, you know, the City. And we only have so many resources for that.

My question is this: this plan I hope is fluid at least for, or I hope you've left some room for fluidity in the plan as it pertains to Fountain Square. As Fountain Square's being developed, obviously we have a developer who would like to put up the large building. For those of you who haven't been following part of that development process, was promises to build up Fountain Square. And I've heard a number of things: making it flat and having a fountain that comes out possibly, some different things. What I want to know
is, are you going to work, that may happen or may not happen. So that might affect what your parks are here. And then the other gentleman brought up the point about the road being changed, the little offshoot of Orrington. So what I need to know from you is, is that part flexible? Because it may have to work and could change at a later date, depending on the development approval for the Church Street potential tower there. Thank you.

MS. MILLER: My name is Lucia Miller. And I --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: One second.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Hi. I just wanted to make sure to clarify something that you said about the Fountain Square development, that there was potential for the developer to do, flatten the building park. That is not true. The developer has made very clear that they plan to spend no money to develop Fountain Square or to buy that building and do anything with the park. The only thing they've said is that the TIF money, the City could do it. So I just wanted to be very clear about that. The developer has no plans, has never stated that they would do a Fountain Square park.
Okay.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: To clarify that, then, they just had, that was part of their plan, a presentation of their ideas, but not that they were going to do it.

They just presented ideas.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: They just presented ideas that the City could possibly do, but they have no intention of doing that.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Larry, you had something you want to add?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: No, I just, I have one question. But let these people.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: and then I'll ask it.

MS. MILLER: Thank you. I'm Lucia Miller. And I live on the corner of Hinman and Church at 418 Church.

My husband and I walk around downtown a good deal. And I like a lot of the ideas I've been hearing here, particularly the Fountain Square idea. And just as a comment on that, if the area across the street by the bank come down, it would make a wonderful, big, expansive area along the corner of, what's it name,
building on the corner? Southeast. The --

PARTICIPANT: Chandler.

MS. MILLER: Chandler's, yes. Charter, is what I'm trying to say. Anyway, my points have to do with sidewalks. And I think they come under the category of open space. They don't, many of them.

I'm particularly offended by a walk that we walk on almost every time we walk. There's a walk along Church in front of another, a 500 building across from the parking lot. It has a fence. And it has plants. And two people our age can just barely toddle along side by side. Nobody can come past us. Nobody can walk around us. It is the most inauspicious area. I would love to see a general rule for sidewalks being at least three abreast, at least wide enough for three people.

And then when you get into really decent sidewalks that are, you know, wide as they are along the next block in Church, try to keep tables only occupying about half of the sidewalk. There's at least one restaurant that takes up two-thirds of the sidewalk. And I find that offensive.

The surface of the sidewalks need a lot of
attention. I would love to see buildings adjacent to sidewalks being no more than a couple of stories high so that it doesn't block the sun and allows nice circulation of air.

And this wind tunnel effect, which was just mentioned, I'm sure there's some scientific way of approaching that. It has something to do with the heights of buildings, where they're set in relation to sidewalks. And I'm thinking if buildings were set back a little bit from sidewalks, that could help. I hope, anyway.

Oh, Raymond Park, you know, there's the most fabulous short-cut. At my age I think a lot about short-cuts. I go diagonally from the corner of Grove to the corner of Lake and Chicago whenever I take a walk in that direction. And I'd hate to see, lose that path.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Thank you.

MR. MARLATTE: Travis Marlatte, The Things We Love, 614 Davis. Also a residence, 1122 Maple Avenue.

Just a couple of thoughts, specifically about what's been said here. In reference to the 1987 plan as successful, certainly overall, I think everyone does
agree with that. And the, into the 2007 guiding principles I'm seeing the same kind of statements. And my concern is about retail in the downtown. I don't think we were successful with the 1987 plan in terms of meeting its objectives for the mix of retail, the focus on independent retail. I think that was a missed point with the 1987 plan. And I see similar kind of, what I'll call, -- or perhaps just confusing wording in the 2007 guiding principles. And I also see it in the updated planned proposal. And that is the confused use of the word retail. Some places it's used to describe all kinds of store front businesses. Some places it's used to describe just restaurants and merchant businesses, separating out service businesses and non-profit and things like that.

So I'd like to see some clarification on that. If we're going to use retail, let's use it to describe all kinds of storefront businesses. And then make sure when we're talking about guiding principles for what kind of businesses, that we don't just use the word retail, but we describe what kind of businesses that we're talking about there.
And kind of related to that is the Bookman's Alley. I love the idea. I loved it when we saw it in the design shurettes. As long as we don't build up something like Bookman's Alley, and I think you referred to an opposing alley just a little bit north of there going in the other direction as well, as the place to stick the small, independent merchants.

I think it's desirable to have them intermixed around town. I think those alleys, in building them up in that way, does create a very unique kind of walkway, thoroughfare, pedestrian thoroughfare. And the small businesses are certainly the ones that could do well there. But let's not push them all into that, those two alleys. Let's let them intermingle.

And that kind of goes back to, as this as a guiding plan, an overall plan, to really put some thought into and create some, a little bit more statistical-based guidance for the mix of the kinds of businesses that we have in downtown.

And I'll refer back to, this was in the discussion. It was said in the summary that was presented and also in the plan of the growth of downtown retail shops by 25, by the count of 25 between the years
2004 and 2007. However, you compare that to, from 1990, we've seen only a growth of 14 businesses, businesses overall. But that growth is a loss of 11 apparel and accessory merchants and a loss of eight home decor merchants. And the net growth is made up by restaurants and service businesses.

So without those guiding principles of what kind of businesses do we want in downtown, you might be able to claim a growth. But it may not be the kind of growth that the residents of Evanston really want to see in downtown.

MS. HOLBERT: Jenny Holbert, 1800 Ridge. I think the plan looks very nice for what I've seen. One of the components, one of the goals, is to encourage arts and culture activities. And it seems like it would be a good opportunity to use at least one of the parks to do that. So it might be wise to incorporate some kind of an amphitheater, to think about what kind of performance spaces we could get in our public areas.

It's a goal that's given a lot of lip service. I haven't seen much that really does encourage the arts and culture. So I would encourage that when you're
actually planning the public spaces.

I think the idea of the kiosks along the railway was a great idea. It would be another way to encourage cultural activity. They could be somehow rented on a, you know, weekly, monthly, weekend basis to artisans, to public interest groups that want to do some kind of leafleting or something like that. I think it is sort of a dead zone. And it would be really great to activate that in a way that was imaginative. And I think that's one of the most interesting parts of the plan I've seen.

And then thirdly, the Bookman's Alley is a great idea. It is already used quite a lot as a street. It could be much more attractive and it could be much more incorporated into downtown.

I'm sure everyone is aware that there is a theater above the Design Within Reach. Or is it above the GAP? Right. And I mean, one of the problems with that is there is no way to access that space. But if there were an extensive redesign of Bookman's Alley, it could be kind of an amazing asset. It's actually completely empty right now. And as I understand it, the owner of the property does not really know what to do.
with it.

MS. DEINNER: I just have one comment. Fountain Square has war memorials. What do you intend to do with those? And how can they be memorialized? That's all.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, I had one question. The gentleman who brought up the other alleys got me thinking. Earlier, somewhere in the early part of the process where we were talking about, first talking about Bookman's Alley, we also talked about looking at the alley behind Sherman between, I think it's Grove and Davis.

There are a couple of small service-oriented, I think, businesses that come on that alley now. And it's a very deep, the lots are very deep between the alley and Sherman. Was there a reason that that didn't go any further? Or was it just something that not enough people expressed an interest in or --

MR. LAMOTTE: It did come up, especially from our designers for input. And we, I just got to go back. And the memory is why we didn't go in there.

But several alleys that are of good size that people are using, you could at least get the pavers in
there and brighten up the sidewalks and things to make
it a little more pleasurable going through there. Not
every alley. You want to just kind of encourage people
to --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: No, this one had --

MR. LAMOTTE: We'll look at, we'll look at

that.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, that we should --

again. Because the depth of lots between Sherman and

the alley are such that they're already secondary

buildings facing the alley. So there might be something

that would work.

MR. LAMOTTE: You could make that more

pedestrian friendly.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Just one question, John. Is

there any reason that the kind of market along Benson

couldn't be extended further north to encompass the two

blocks?

MR. LAMOTTE: Someone else brought that up.

It's interesting you brought that -- The outdoor market

idea?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yeah. We've got to look at
that.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And just think about Saturday morning and going to EAC and the parking. And you know, that'd be great if that whole area was activated and stuff going on.

MR. LAMOTTE: With unique things, whether it's a booth or kiosk or art or whatnot.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, and if the university ever builds a building where the market is now, maybe that's a location for the farmer's market.

MR. LAMOTTE: A couple things to clarify while we're on the subject. Then we can move into the other area.

The parking idea or question around Oldberg Park we'll address in the next section. Because we didn't want to forget that. The global parking questions I think Colin raised about at the YMCA, the City's transportation study's going to be looking at that.

We feel that this very kind of conceptual level on parking, that there's plenty of capacity downtown, especially with three huge decks strategically placed. We think at the south end, if the Best Western
site deck ever was changed, that the deck needed to go back in there with some public parking.

So as far as putting open space on the parking lot for the YMCA and on the site to the west, that would be thrown into the discussion of the overall transportation plan. Because they're going to start looking at parking more specifically in the downtown.

But we wouldn't have recommended it if we didn't think it could be handled. So it goes back to the question of what is being approved. The zoning is coming afterwards. Design of these spaces would come afterwards, after the plan is done. This would be where our open space is located in the plan. What is the general character? Do they make sense, as a Plan Commissioner recommended it to the City Council? So right now we think they'll be fine. The detailed parking study will come later.

The farmer's market, there was no intention to throw that out. Contrary to the idea was to get more events and fun things going on downtown. When you start to look at the global Fountain Square intersection, you're going to do more with events in there along the rail lines. There's other places we can do those
things. So there was no intention there.

One of the gentlemen, and I think Colin
brought it up too, was there are two options on the
table for Fountain Square. It has nothing to do with
the developer. That's in Plan Commission. It's either
upgrade the existing space and maybe add new space
around the intersection or expand it to the north if the
50,000-square foot office building to the north was
taken down. So that's a policy direction we need in the
plan as to where the Commissioners and Council want to
go with that.

And then a couple other quick things. As far
as the amount of space per thousand, most of times in
downtowns we don't apply subdivision, green fields site,
national park standards to it. People are looking for a
downtown experience where they can go to plazas rather
than giant parks.

For us to take a whole block out of commission
to make a whole new park we felt wasn't balanced with
the economic development needs. We think there's a lot
of good open spaces in downtown. We're trying to hit
these different quadrants so people can get to a
quadrant without walking all the way to the center. So
we think the balance is there.

If a developer did step forward, there's provisions in the bonuses, and they want to do something on their site that was creative, not in the back by the garbage cans, then that still is on the table for you and the staff to look at.

We also think that when you look at the round circle of a quarter mile, the downtown is very walkable. But the outer edge is walkable. You have other parks. And unlike Chicago when you're in the West Loop, it's not that easy to get over to Millennium Park and Grant Park and the lake front. Here you can get to your lake front pretty, pretty quick if you're living in a condo downtown. So that is where we balance the open space.

And I think that was it on just some of the broader -- The war memorial question has come up many times. The idea is not to throw it out or move it out. It's to enhance it. It either stays in Fountain Square or it maybe goes into a bigger plaza. But when that space gets redesigned, because we're not designing it now, this is a plan, then the war memorials, maybe even more memorials could be put in there. The public art question that keeps coming up could fit in there. And
so a lot more design after you approve it as a plan
would be needed. And I think we hit them all, I think.

MR. BISHOP: There's a couple I wanted to also
address, John. There's a question about what was
driving some of the concepts for Raymond Park
improvement. That really grew out of focus group
discussions with downtown employees and particularly the
young professionals group who indicated that that's a
prime location for their lunchtime activities and that
they saw some shortcomings in terms of the design of the
space.

We also looked at Raymond Park as a possible
site for more performing art-type venue. So it was
really those two concerns that were driving the concept
of Raymond Park improvements. It by no means was meant
to dismiss or you know, downplay the importance of the
accessible park improvements there. And any sort of
redesign would need to at least replace, if not enhance
that aspect.

There was also a question, John, about
something that we, I think, showed during the design
shurette. And that was the idea, I think we described
it at the time as kind of an arts walk, a kind of new
alley east of Orrington, from Orrington to the alley
north of the bank plaza.

And really there, we haven't more fully
developed that. Because there is a development plan for
the bank site as I recall. And it just seemed like, as
a concept, it's still a great idea. But the plans for
that are far enough along or maybe even approved such
that it didn't warrant sort of redesign, maybe nudging
the developer to sort of consider that idea.

And that really is a theme, in terms of the
Bookman Alley, I really view that as kind of a prototype
idea that could be expanded in any number of ways
downtown. We've already got traction with the existing
Bookman's Alley and the sort of neat space that that
creates. And we saw this as an opportunity to build on
that, learn from the successes, and then carry forward
to other opportunity sites throughout downtown.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay, any other open space,
park, recreation, kind of downtown pedestrian feel
questions at this stage? We can open up more for that
later. No?

Okay, there's some broad themes as far as
circulation and parking that we want to make sure that
people understand are part of the recommendations of the plan. These are some of the strategies: encourage more residents and visitors to use transit. Now, you have one of the highest transit uses that we've seen in a downtown of your scale. But anything we can do to make it better, I think there's some comments on the pedestrian experience. A lot of your downtown streetscapes are in great shape. We just need to expand it, especially east and west, so that it's in better shape to get people to transit. But anything we can do to make that experience getting to the stations better.

Maintain and enhance vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian circulation throughout the area. We're recommending right out of the box that the City's new bike plan get integrated right into this. Obviously any streetscape improvements and street improvements need to have that in mind.

The way finding is a big thing. I always say that's a fancy french word for finding your way around. And many, many people, in fact even in the focus group and visioning in 2004, said it is still hard to get around downtown and find the parking lots. And all of us are in cars or walking and are busy. And you don't
always see all the signs. So we think that's the number
one thing coming out of this, even if street scapes
aren't upgraded right now, but the way finding and the
signage getting right to a space, right to a place,
right to the parking.

The two things that are underlined, we're
going to talk about a little bit more specifically. The
potential realignment at Orrington and Clark and
Orrington and Davis intersections and then the
feasability of going to two-way streets, either overall
downtown or in separate streets, which I'll get to in a
minute.

I mentioned the new bike plan and bike travel.
We heard some folks saying, I come down on the bike,
but I don't have a lot of places to park my bike. And I
want them integrated more near, you know, either transit
or the parks.

And then the sidewalk conditions were needed.
We did the streetscape audit a couple of years ago.
There's a lot of good things in good shape here that
you've done. A lot of people do come. And we bring
other mayors and manager and planners to your town to
see your streetscape. But again, we just got to finish
the overall system.

And then last but not least, this is a big one for us, but really big for staff. Because staff in the City Council are fighting every day to keep transit going. We see the craziness going on down in Springfield. So we've got to continue to lobby through the plan, making statements to keep this transit going, especially in a town that's so dependent on the transit.

So here's the two things that we want to talk about. If you can see, it's a little hard to see on my screen. The existing situation at Clark, Elgin and Orrington is, you're coming up northbound. You've got to swoop to the left in a one-way system. And you kind of hook around to get onto Elgin. And you've got a lot of pedestrians crossing.

PARTICIPANT: You can't do that. You can only go right.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right. Oh, I'm sorry. The traffic coming this way. And then you only can go right. So what we've found in our own observations talking with traffic engineers and talking with people at the shurette and the workshops, very confusing for pedestrians, very confusing for motorists.
And the idea is that at the main pedestrian crossing point, either for going north or going south, we've got three or four lanes of traffic going here. So we thought conceptually, would it make sense to straighten this out, create a regular T intersection here, and then reclaim this piece of Clark Street for Oldberg Park and then bring parallel parking on the sides of the park and on the sides on Sherman?

So what we're saying is, this is a concept. Because again, the city, city-wide traffic plan will start to take a look at this. And this is the concept as we've shown it as the idea. Orrington would come straight. -- and Elgin, you can go east or west. You wouldn't be able to make that hook into Clark. You'd come around and go to the regular intersection and down. This would be a normal intersection with less crossing problems. You'd cross into a bigger plaza, possibly with artwork and a fountain, a new signature building, which we'll talk about later. And then this would be more of reclaimed park space.

So because the traffic study's coming and our traffic folks were just doing a broader brush, we think this has merit as a concept. It's recommended in the
plan to be taken into the Spring study of overall traffic for downtown as a potential realignment, needing the feasability study before it's hardlined.

The next one is now looking at Orrington coming north, Sherman coming south. And the potential, if we all think that the overall intersection could use some improvements, and the potential then for maybe taking that little leg of Orrington out.

And the idea there would be to expand the Chandler Plaza, tie it into that island that's kind of sitting our there by itself, creating a bigger open space. This could be contingent on Orrington staying one-way or possibly, in a minute we'll talk about the potential for two-way traffic.

So here it is today. The concept, then, shows the potential for taking that leg out, creating the bigger space, focal points in and out of the intersection, overall expanding the intersection. And then it would really be contingent on whether the two-way traffic would work, which I'll get to right now.

This is the idea that, at the minimum, we looked at could we go east-west and change the east-west pair of one-way streets into two-way streets? It might
be able to be done. But it's narrow underneath the
viaduct. So we're not thinking that one particularly
would work.

The north-south, Sherman and Orrington, being
one-way pairs, are very wide. We heard from some people
that they're concerned about the safety when people
would go down the street. They see a diagonal parking
space on one side of the street and they kind of shoot
at 90 degrees over to get the space. People are
crossing the street at the same time the cars are coming
across. So from a safety standpoint, just flying over
to get to the spaces or across. And the same thing with
the big gaps here on Orrington.

So we thought the wide streets, could we
possibly put these back to two-way and convert the
angled parking on either side so it goes with the flow
of the street? We think it would help slow down some of
those turns.

But also on the other side of the coin, we
think it might be a good economic development
initiative. Because instead of somebody looking for a
shop, and you're coming all the way down and getting
kicked around for a U-turn and coming all the way back
to find it, they'd be able to move two ways on Orrington
and Sherman.

We heard from residents that still, it's
confusing for them. We heard then from visitors and
folks saying, when I bring visitors in, they get
confused. And what you don't want to do is say, I want
to get into a shop, but I'm getting kicked down to two
or three blocks and having to come back.

So conceptually, the width of the streets, the
flow of the streets, the safety issue, we think this has
merit. But again, the hard feasibility would be done in
the Spring with the transportation plan. And when I
mention hard feasibility, they got to look at all the
street system, the capacities, the intersections, the
lighting, the signals, to see if it would work. We
think at least there's a concept there that it would
work.

And I think the next thing, then, is parking,
which Kirk's going to talk about. And then we can open
it up for discussion.

MR. BISHOP: Yeah, to round out our discussion
of circulation and -- Oh, I'm sorry, Jim.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I have a question for
John. If Sherman is to go two ways, is it wide enough
to accommodate a landscape median that could be used to
assist pedestrians in crossing and also decrease the
broad openness, which I think is not really respectful
of the scale of the buildings on either side?

MR. LAMOTTE: That's a great question. And
the street is certainly wide. And I think the bottom
line would be, can we make the two-way work? And then,
can we do diagonal parking on either side, or at least
diagonal continue on the one side? And if there's room
left over and still traffic could flow, we should look
at that.

But what we find is if it's two-way, people
start to respect traffic flow a little differently. And
as a pedestrian, you're out there and it's not everybody
coming at you like the calvary coming down six lanes.
So, first let's see if the two-way works. We think it
might. Two, what's the width left over if we do that?
And three, what about the parking on each side? How
would that work? But an idea of a central kind of
refuge for pedestrians would be looked at at that stage.
Great idea.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Johanna?
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: John, I think one thing you need to think about in terms of turning these streets into two-ways is to look at Benson by EAC. Because what you have now at peak times, you have people who will be headed northbound and see a parking space on the left side of the street and they'll whip around. And at peak times it gets really, really messy. So I'm just a little concerned about turning these streets into two ways. You may alleviate that problem of people zipping over across the street, but you're now creating another one that's just as potentially dangerous.

Also, on the median, I think on the previous one, we're going back to Oldberg Park, that plan would get rid of the existing median on Elgin?

MR. LAMOTTE: Correct.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Okay. I think also, if there's any way to keep a median there, I think that's also important. You have so many Northwestern students crossing right there. And it's a little bit of a refuge from that crossing. When they got rid of the median on Maple after doing the movie theater and Optima project, I think that street's become way too wide. I think there should be a median there, put back there, some
kind of refuge again. Because the streets just get too
wide.

MR. LAMOTTE: So you're talking about in front
of the movie theater, aren't you?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes. Like years ago when
that was just a parking lot and the movie center, there
was a really nice landscape median there.

MR. LAMOTTE: Just a side note on that. I
mean, as you know from some of the focus groups, folks
said that just the pedestrians conglomerating on the
front of the theater, especially kids waiting for
parents, the sidewalk isn't wide enough.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: It's way too narrow.

MR. LAMOTTE: So we're, you can't, we didn't
get in all the details. And we're recommending that
that be explored, adding a couple, three, four feet at
least there and softening that edge.

But if you look at this here, and again, not
to get into too much detail, the thought was, could we
narrow this and take this off so we can bump out the
corners and get these crossings close and then get that
kind of second and third island out of there? But it's
a great point. Because with all that flow going north
and south, we think we could do better here. But the
traffic experts at that time will drill down on that.
But it's kind of hard to see. We just didn't
pull the median out. We actually closed the street up a
little closer and then allowed ourselves to try to do
the bump outs at the crossings. But we were amazed even
in the summer, off peak, there was so many people going
back and forth. So, good point.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Larry?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes. Elgin, as you
have it there, actually doesn't, the street that the
students cross is no more there than it is today. Is
it, isn't that true?

MR. LAMOTTE: It's actually, we, it's less.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It's less.

MR. LAMOTTE: We narrowed it. Because we took
the median out and --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And the median is
actually between Elgin and then Clark today.

MR. LAMOTTE: There's two medians.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: There's two medians.

Okay.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, this curve line was moved
over conceptually. Just, we moved them closer. And
then we got the bumps in. And then the traffic flow
really has to be looked at as far as, can we move
traffic up and down Orrington like we've had? Can we do
regular turning movements? Can we get the crossings in
there?

But one of the things, just by, just thought
processes, you know, stepping it into the traffic,
crossing here, crossing here, --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: -- crossing here. Then getting
over here. We just thought that's not really a great
spot at the heaviest pedestrian load we found in the
whole downtown.

So the question for the Commissioners, are we
on the right track as a concept to send downstream for
the study? That's the question. Okay? Okay?

MR. BISHOP: At the outset of the project the
City charged us with doing an assessment of some recent
residential projects, projects built since, I think the
year 2000, to sort of gage parking demand within new
residential mixed-use buildings, some of the larger
buildings built in the last few years.
And our friends at KLOA led by Tim Doran assessed us over the past few months in conducting actual survey of parking usage within downtown residential buildings. And the way they do that is pretty straightforward. They go out in the middle of the night, usually three or four o'clock in the morning, and count the number of spaces actually in use typically during a weeknight.

And just as a frame of reference, I want to just draw your attention to the existing residential parking requirements within downtown. And the existing requirements are based on the number of bedrooms within a dwelling unit in a building. One or fewer bedrooms, a one-bedroom or studio-type apartment, requires a minimum of 1.25 parking spaces, one and a quarter parking spaces today required by zoning. For a two-bedroom unit, a space and-a-half per dwelling unit. And three or more bedrooms requires two spaces at a minimum per dwelling unit.

So the essence of the study was to gage how effective those were in really replicating or approximating the demand. The idea is we don't want to require considerably more parking than is demanded for
buildings. It's kind of an inefficient use of
resources. But certainly don't want to significantly
under-require parking in terms of actual demand.

So the results of KLOA's survey are displayed
here on the board for six projects that met our age
threshold, built since 2000, significant residential
projects in downtown. And it's the final column that
really is a comparison between the ratios, the minimum
requirements under the Ordinance, one and-a-quarter to
two spaces per unit, depending on the size of the unit,
as compared to the actual demand observed.

Each building was surveyed only once. But the
surveys were conducted on multiple nights. So if there
was an anomaly at a given day of the week, it wouldn't
have been caught on each building surveyed. And by and
large the demand for all of these buildings, or for four
of the six, was less than one space per dwelling unit.

There were two that were over: 1.18 for the 1572 Maple
building and slightly over one for 1580 Sherman.

Based on that survey work, the folks at KLOA
have given us some recommendations that we've included
in the plan that we'd like you to consider. And those
are to revise the residential parking requirements
slightly within the downtown.

Two parts to the recommendation: moving away from a bedroom-based requirement, which is somewhat difficult to administer. One person's bedroom is another person's study is another person's library, and so forth. So they sort of get into a, look you straight in the eye, hook you up to a lie detector test. We're moving away from that and coming up with a system that's empirical and objective. So many square feet approximates a one-bedroom or studio unit, so the theory goes.

So Tim has recommended some thresholds. Up to 800-square feet, which is our sort of proxy for a one-bedroom or studio unit. The new parking requirement, as proposed at least, would be one space per dwelling unit. Eight hundred square feet up to just under 1,500-square feet, again approximating the average size or median size of a two-bedroom unit, the requirement as recommended would be a space and a quarter. And for larger units, 1,500-square feet or more, the requirement recommended is 1.5.

And again, you can compare those with the observed demand in the buildings downtown. And you see
that what he didn't do in recommending ratios is simply
shrink wrap the precise demand of less than one space
per unit be built in, where the recommendations build in
some deviation recognizing that we're counting parking
spaces in the summer months, you know, and so forth. So
we want to build in a sort of standard deviation, kind
of set the standard at about 85 percent, 90 percent, and
therefore not under-require parking in the future.

So that concludes that segment, the
circulation and parking. And as always, I welcome your
comments.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Could I have a show of hands
for those people who want to comment on this section?
And could we have the light? That'd be a great idea.
Okay, so same drill as last time. If we could get
people to start coming up.

MR. WHITACRE: Hello?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And again, start with your
name, address.

MR. WHITACRE: Dick Whitacre, 1400 Chicago
Avenue.

Going back to the Orrington Avenue question
and the two-way street question. You've probably got
studies on the capacity of a two-way street versus a one-way street, correct? And you know that there's a little bit of difference in the number of cars per hour. What are you going to do when people are going both ways on say, Sherman, and somebody has stopped to wait for somebody to park, etcetera and then you've got the street clogged up because you have two-way traffic? I ride a bike in downtown Evanston often. And I also drive in downtown Evanston. I'm concerned about the capacity of those streets. When you reduce them from one-way and change them to two-way you'll be creating some traffic problems and some difficulties getting around in the city.

Also, what are you going to do with Orrington Avenue as a southbound street which will not continue past Davis? In other words, that Orrington Avenue doesn't seem, the only way you're going to get -- northbound is to be coming west on Davis, correct?

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

MR. WHITACRE: So what do you need it as a northbound street then? You're only going to be getting right-turn people off of Davis Street to go onto Davis. So I think it would be better to leave it the way it is.
and not take that Fountain Square building out, expand
the park that way. Expand the Fountain Square area by
taking some of the plaza next to the bank. But keep
that segment of Orrington Avenue.

MS. HEAD: Good evening. My name is Ann Head.
I live at 1107 Lake Street.
In regards to the two-way traffic, if we could
see the proposed plan?

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, this is just two-way
arrows. You mean some of the realignments?

MS. HEAD: The proposed, on the two-way.

Okay.

MR. LAMOTTE: This is -- Yes.

MS. HEAD: I mean, well, if you can go back
to --

MR. LAMOTTE: Oh, okay.

MS. HEAD: That, that --

MR. LAMOTTE: There you go.

MS. HEAD: Yeah. Because it shows two-way.

Anyway, the way that it's set up right now is that you
come off Davis Street onto Orrington. It's a narrow,
one-way, one car going onto Orrington. Then it expands
into two. If it's a two-way street, it seems with,
it two lanes? Oh, okay. Well, then, forget that.

But I tend to agree. Somebody on the Committee had mentioned that over at EAC where you made it, it's two lanes, and people swerve across the lane to get a parking space. Being downtown near all the restaurants and any other kind of business that may be going into there, you're going to get people in a two-way street swerving around to go into a parking space, which creates more havoc and a potential injury or damage to other peoples' cars or people walking.

You had mentioned earlier on your previous presentation as to open space as to the parking or the parking lots by the Y being converted into parks. And you had mentioned that you were going to talk about that. I thought you were going to talk about it in this section. There was no mention of it.

And I think that all you had mentioned is is that there's all these parking garages within blocks of the YMCA. I don't think you considered, and I ask you do consider, is this: the people who do go to the YMCA rely heavily on those parking lots. And the convenience of those parking lots is something that is very attractive to the members of the YMCA. And to take
those away and to have these people walk several blocks
to go to the Y, I think is very detrimental to that area
and to that community in that downtown area. I like the
idea of the parks. However, you're taking something
that is very valuable to that area away in doing that.
Thank you.

MR. LAMOTTE: I have a question for you. Is
there not enough parking to the south of the YMCA to
accommodate parking?

MS. HEAD: No. No, not at all. In fact the
one to the south is further away from the doors to get
into the Y. So --

PARTICIPANT: Some of it's permanent too.

You'd have to take away from a --

MS. HEAD: And it's, yeah. Some of it's
permanent.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ANGELL: Hi. I'm Tim Angell, 1432 Wesley.

What I do for a living is I'm a Deputy
Director of Community and Economic Development for the
City of Des Plaines. And I've worked for three
different Cook County municipalities in the last 10
years as an economic development and urban planner. And
one of the things I can tell you is, not only do you need more residential units in downtown to support the mom and pop local retailers, as this gentleman talked about earlier, but also to help the restaurants in town. But probably more importantly than the residential units, is you need parking spaces.

So what I, first of all, what I didn't find in the plan, and maybe this would be helpful, is both a map of current parking spaces, as well as what future parking spaces there would be in the plan area, given the recommendations that are contained in the plan.

Secondly, I think those maps would help City staff determine priorities for land acquisition, both for public parking lots, as well as if the City chose to build additional parking decks.

Gentlemen, could I ask a question? Did you do any sort of inventory for non-residential parking spaces?

MR. LAMOTTE: We didn't because the City had that. There's over 3,000 spaces in just the three garages alone, not counting the Best Western garage. And there's over a thousand on the street.

MR. ANGELL: Thank you. It would be
helpful --

MR. LAMOTTE: Oh, I'm sorry. Twenty-three hundred on the street. Sorry. So it's 5,000 plus.

MR. ANGELL: It would be helpful, I think, I didn't find it in the plan, that based upon, again, the various objectives that are set forth in the illustrative plan, I think it would be good to give an approximate number of future parking spaces, not only in a map, but also in the text.

Let's see. What else do I want to say? Oh, as far as circulation is concerned, first of all, I totally agree with the draft that way finding in downtown Evanston is confusing, not only to long-time Evanston residents like myself and other folks here, but also for our visitors. If you do the two-way circulation, I think that becomes critical to have way finding that's easily identifiable for drivers. Because we have a hard enough time right now, I believe. If I'm driving to, if I'm not from Evanston, I'm not familiar with downtown, where the public parking is. Thank you.

MS. DEINNER: Ann Deinner, 1034 Sheridan Road. Way finding signs are fine. But don't get clutter in the process.
PARTICIPANT: We hate clutter.

MS. DEINNER: We hate clutter. And it's confusing.

In regard to the sidewalks, from the very beginning that the City decided to do pavers in the downtown, I felt it was a very dangerous choice. Because it's very difficult to keep these things in a level of maintenance.

And there is a bit of a sinkhole in the paving. I think it's by the entrance on Davis by the entrance to the Giordano's studios, dance studios, or near the little restaurants there. You're walking along and all of a sudden there's a drop. I don't know why that occurred. But it should be leveled.

And I think it's, I have nothing against concrete sidewalks. You can in-size designs. You can color the concrete. And it stays level longer. And with this climate that we have and with the problems of clearing our sidewalks in snowy weather, the easier your surface is, the easier it is to clear. They do manage to clear the sidewalks downtown. But a lot of times they leave nice, snowy barriers, too, that you have to climb over.
In regard to the T-shaped intersection at Clark and Orrington and Elgin, you might say, the City in its wisdom years ago permitted Northwestern to close off Orrington Avenue. And Becky Crown administration building went in there. And that’s why you have that T-shaped intersection. And it has caused a great, it has caused confusion. I think the way it is now, they’ve done the best they can with it.

The students will, the students are crossing over the islands there from the north side of Clark. And there is a pedestrian crossing right at the Becky Crown building toward Orrington. But the students prefer to cross over in the middle of the street over the humps, you might say. And the City tries to keep the place looking decent. I don’t know how you can stop them from taking that shortcut even if you combine the streets. Students will take the shortcuts.

If you have driven along Sherman Avenue as it is now, it is very congested, very congested. And to make it two-way with parking on both sides is going to be very chaotic, particularly if you increase the density of structures downtown.

The, and if you do make Sherman or Orrington
into two-way streets, keep it parallel. Keep the parking parallel. I realize the diagonal gives you more parking space. But when you have two-way parking, backing into traffic from a diagonal, I think you're asking for trouble. So keep the, I know the parallel parking will reduce the take on the meters and so on and so forth, but I think it's nice, it's not nice, but it's okay the way it is. So keep the two, you know, Orrington north, Sherman south.

MS. KRETCHMER: My name is Valerie Kretchmer. I live at 2707 Walnut Avenue. I served on the Plan Commission for seven years during the 90s. And I was on the Plan Commission when the movie theater project was being considered. And some of you may remember all of the uproar that went in over the traffic that the movie theaters were going to create. And I can't, you know, tell you how many meetings we all sat at with that. And I think everybody realized now that that street, Maple, is wider than it needed to be. Because the traffic has not materialized the way a lot of people feared it would at that time. So I think I'm in agreement with the plan that calls for trying to narrow that street and widen the sidewalks.
over there.

John, if you could put on the slide that shows the Orrington/Clark/Sherman area. There's one section that just, well, that's fine, where on the west side of Sherman where Clark Street now intersects with Sherman, right there, right now that's a very confusing location.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

MS. KRETCHMER: And I think pretty much everybody has to turn right. But occasionally I've seen people actually turn left there. And so if this is a design that will clear up that intersection, which I think is very confusing and unnecessarily so, I think that makes a lot of sense for not having as many people loop around, as you say, because they only can go right on Sherman Avenue over there.

MR. LAMOTTE: Good point. Because it's not only to work and see if we can improve this, but this movement and even this movement.

MS. KRETCHMER: Right. I think that that would be very helpful. I was also interested in the statistics that you had on the parking ratios in the new buildings. And I think that I would recommend reducing those parking ratios. Because I hate to see parking
being a driver that dictates how big a building can be. I think we've all seen situations where developers have
come in for variances for a couple of parking spaces, when they may not, you know, in retrospect they may not
have even been necessary.

So I know going to some of the meetings there were people here that said, we want to reduce the parking even more. We want people to use more and more transit. And I'm a big, you know, I believe people should use transit, use bikes and everything else, but I think we do have to be cognizant that developers can't sell condominiums or can't rent apartment buildings unless they have a certain amount of parking.

MS. ROSINSKI: Hi. My name is Mary Rosinski. I live at 1729 Chancellor.

I had a question regarding the ratios. Did you do a, or is there some place for the commercial ratios? Because I notice that, like, 1580 Sherman, there's a lot of commercial there, which would make sense. And I think that one thing that we need to consider is that, as we're developing the downtown and trying to get more retail there, we do need to have places for the employees and for customers.
I'm not, residential ratios may be, may be not accurate. But one thing I've found at the 807 Davis, with the existing spaces that are available in the public garage on a daily basis, you're up to what, the 12th floor, 13th floor full. And the commercial's not completely rented out. And I know other places are saying that maybe they don't need to have the commercial spaces required by zoning because there's parking at 807 Davis. And I'm thinking that that's going to cause a lot more congestion with people looking for traffic.

The second place where I'm a little concerned is over by the Women's Club Library. Because I know the Women's Club is used, that's used a lot. And that parking lot tends to be fairly full. And the one across the street, the parking -- seems to be fully full, at least the times that I'm there. And I'm in my car about seven days a week doing stuff, unfortunately, because of my business. So I would just be wanting to have more information on that, those parking ratios, and ones that -- there.

Who brought up about the left turn lanes? Was that you, about turning left on Benson? You know, that happens in a lot of communities. And they do give
tickets. And they raise a lot of revenue. Glencoe has a very big problem with that. And they put that in the street. And the police will stop you. And I don't know if it's 25 or 50 dollars. But it's significant.

So I don't know about that circulation issue. But if that's a concern, I think there's another way. If changing that circulation is good, then giving tickets to people, because I think Evanston just as overall, I really wish, whether it's downtown or in the surrounding community, neighborhoods, that they would take a very strong position on pedestrian safety and that the police would ticket cars that drive through intersections.

I was in California over the summer. I was shocked. On a four-way street on new nice pavement, and I started to go into it. No one stopped. And I was like, you know, but they would. They'll give you a hundred dollar ticket in a second.

And Evanston is very, could just mandate. You know, we're a pedestrian-friendly community and we will ticket. We could start with a warning period for six months, let people know that you guys are serious. And then the police could start ticketing. And our kids
would be safe, our bikers would be safer, and our
pedestrians. That's all.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Robin, you had a --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, I just wanted
to quickly follow on that comment about pedestrian
safety. Because in other communities that I've lived in
and know well that are similar to Evanston, those being
Cambridge, Mass and Princeton, New Jersey, they are very
aggressive about ticketing cars who do not stop for
pedestrians. And I cannot tell you the difference to
that experience. Obviously we have a young and an old
population in Evanston. And I can't underscore the
importance of the point that the speaker just made.

MR. EVANS: Leonard Evans, again, at Optima
Towers.

Since you have that on the screen, let me
refer to that. I'm skeptical about the method you used,
or whoever did it, used to estimate the spaces occupied.
By the way, in answer to her question, I assume that
the person got access to the garage, which of course are
closed, and came in in the middle of the night at Optima
Towers, 1580 Sherman. There aren't any commercial
spaces inside the garage. So that's irrelevant. But
there are people who aren't there. They go away for
weeks at a time. They go to Florida, etcetera. There
are a lot of retired people who live in our building.
So that's a very, very unscientific way to measure it.
And I hope the Plan Commission and the City won't make
decisions based on that kind of study. They should do a
more thorough study.

Now, could you put the, showing the
intersection of Davis and Sherman, that one? Yes. That
was the right one. Now, first of all, I walk across
that intersection multiple ways every day. I'm very
familiar with it. And just looking at the way you've
planned it, you've got a bottle neck right there at
Sherman and Davis on both sides, the north and the
south. But more obvious on the south.

It seems to me, the only way to make that work
is to straighten out Sherman in front of Argo Tea there,
which I think would be a mistake. It would certainly
make it look worse and detract from that corner. So I
don't really understand how you can do that and have
two-way traffic on Sherman without widening Sherman at
that corner on both north and south side.

Finally, I'm glad you're recommending that
Evanston do what it can to lobby our representatives in Springfield. But I'm afraid it may come to doing more than that. Because, you know, if we base our development plans on having mass transit, we may just be very mistaken. We can't count on people living in DuPage County and -- caring about Evanston's development plans.

So Evanston may have to do more. It may have to, for example, tax either developers or residents who live in the downtown in order to support transit. And are we willing to do that?

MS. LINDWAHL: Hi. Thank you. I'm Jean Lindwahl, 625 Library Place. I've been a resident for all but two of the last 40 years. I arrived as a freshman at Northwestern when the Lord's department store was being torn down to make way for the, what's now the Chase Bank building. I also am a urban planner by training with more than 30 years experience and also a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners.

The first 15 years of my career were spent in Evanston working on a variety of things, beginning as Evanston's first preservation coordinator. I worked on
the transportation center development project which
brought us the new Davis Street CTA station with the
pass through to allow the connection to Metra. As part
of that effort, you know, one of the conscious decisions
was to create or reserve a development parcel that
McDougal Littel was built on. I was staff to the
Planning Commission when they prepared the 1985
Comprehensive Plan. I spent 10 years preparing our
long-range Capital Improvement Program. And the last
thing I did with Evanston was to work on staffing a
special library committee that resulted in our, our
library.

Along the way, however, one of the things I
did was, I was one of the authors of the 1989 plan for
Evanston, working very closely with the Evanston Plan
Commission that really, it was their hard work and their
efforts and their expertise that really created the
document that really was, formed the basis of the
downtown zoning recommendations in the 1993 update.

And just to give you a little bit of
background on that group, of the 13 people who were
involved in that process either as Commissioners or
Associate Commissioners, seven were trained planners,
including, you know, two former City of Evanston planning staff, three individuals who have written and administered zoning ordinances, and the former Chairman, long-time Chairman of the Northeastern Illinois Plan Commission. So there was a lot of expertise that went into creating that document. And that's one of the reasons I think it has served as such a good guide.

One of my tasks was to put together the, the count of the floor area, the you know, number of businesses. So the 1990 data that was in the draft plan was stuff that I had pulled together.

Since then I've been a planning consultant, doing much the same thing as John and Kirk and other members of the team, specializing in tax increment financing, fiscal impact analysis, and strategic community planning projects in a variety of scales.

And what I would like to say about parking, I think that one of the things that is really important and is right now a gap in the draft downtown plan is consideration of where we are with the commercial parking and how that can help us achieve our objectives of making downtown, or having it continue to be the economic engine which is going to support our tax base.
It's clear from the market chapter that there's a real strong demand, a need, to be able to accommodate new office development to provide the daytime population that our restaurants and retailers need to supplement the residents. You know, you look at the numbers, the residents that are proposed from the new 1,500 to 2,000 dwelling units, really aren't going to support all of the anticipated residential, or retail demand. We need other users as well.

I have not been at the last couple of hearings on the tower, but I caught, you know, part of the, Jonathan Perman's testimony where he was talking about how in the parking garages there really is a lot of vacant space that's not being filled and that that's an issue with respect to the health and viability of the, you know, the parking garages and the parking fund. I don't know if that's, you know, I don't know if that's true or not, but I think that that's something that the consulting team needs to work with the City staff. You need to have the answers to that. Because it's real clear that if you want to attract office development, given the impediments of office development, we're going to have to be really proactive.
And parking policy with respect to commercial
development, is I think one of the ways that you can, we
can start to do that.

MR. LAMOTTE: Jean, can you clarify for me?
I'm confused. Are you saying that there's vacant spaces
in the decks available for shoppers or office workers,
but you don't think there's enough in the plan?

MS. LINDWAHL: Well, no. What I don't think,
I don't think that it's been, that issue has been
addressed in the plan as of yet. I think you've talked,
and you know, I know the charge of the RFP was to focus
on residential parking, --

MR. LAMOTTE: And that's coming in the Spring
study then.

MS. LINDWAHL: -- but I think that the
decisions on the land use policy for this master plan
has to address how you can be proactive and what --

MR. LAMOTTE: And just so we can, because
we've got a lot of folks that, as we feel right now as a
team, professionally, that there is enough parking, that
is going to be looked at space by space by the team
that's coming out. But when we find vacant spaces in
there of 2,000 plus on the street, 3,000 plus on three
decks, plus Best Western, --

MS. LINDWAHL: Oh, I agree.

MR. LAMOTTE: -- so, --

MS. LINDWAHL: I'm agreeing that there's --

MR. LAMOTTE: So we're saying at this level, not at the master plan level, we think we're okay and they're going to go through and look at all the numbers from there. So I just want everybody to be clear that that's where --

MS. LINDWAHL: Well, and I'm agreeing. I mean, I think that 5,500 spaces in downtown ought to be enough to support the existing parking demand. And if you look at how parking was created, the reason that the decks were sized as they were is to be able to provide parking for the existing buildings and the existing uses and the existing office.

And as properties are redeveloped, and for example, the 708 Church building, which has, what, 40,000-square feet of retail and 40,000-square feet of office roughly, as you demolish that and put back less retail and you know, little if any office, then the parkers, the demand that, of those parkers that were parking in the parking garages, goes away, which creates
a potential, you know, additional capacity for office
development.

And you know, so what I'm trying to suggest in
a difficult, and I'm not being very clear and I
apologize for that, is that there's a balance between
the land use and the office and you know, the retail and
office demand that can be accommodated by our existing
parking supply and the, you know, the replacement.
Because condo buildings are putting their parking on
site. And so I can envision, you know, an extreme kind
of example, if you have lots of condo buildings all with
their own garages, you know, there's the potential of
having somewhat empty parking, city parking garages that
we're all paying to build.

But, be that as it may, what I wanted to
suggest is that there are several strategies for
encouraging new office developments that could be
included. One of them could be making office
development, adding, increasing office development could
be part of the bonus structure. So you might get an
incentive for adding parking, or adding office to a
development.

The second thing, which kind of gets into this
whole issue of parking capacity, is that particularly in
the downtown traditional districts where you want to
encourage pedestrian activity, you're looking at smaller
development sites. One of the other options might be to
not require any parking for commercial uses in the
traditional districts so that you would reduce the
developers' costs.

You could do a similar kind of thing if you
wanted to with, rather than the incentive for affordable
housing, with a bonus, the extra square footage, by
reducing the parking requirement for affordable units
since after all, we're you know, within walking distance
of you know, the transit.

Finally, I think the other comment I'd like
to, and then obviously for the third thing for office
development, at least on the Fountain Square block, is
that you could provide TIF incentives for actually, for
you know, building office space that could again, you
know, you're looking at office space as a way of
energizing the downtown during the day, meeting the
demand that is clearly there in a way that doesn't, you
know, doesn't adversely, I think, impact some of the
other development options.
And finally, just a closing comment on the YMCA parking lot. The problem and the importance of having parking in close proximity to the Y is that you're dealing with families with children who are, you know, that the Y is used for daycare and after school programs. And having used that many years ago when my kids were small, you know, the prospect of having to walk three blocks to a parking deck or even two blocks to wherever the available surface, you know, on-the-street space is, is not a real good idea. So nice as that park space is, I think that's probably not a very family-friendly place to put a park.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Larry?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I have a quick question. Jean, I think in there, if I understood you correctly, one of your questions is, why is there not a parking recommendation for office space that might be built as there is for residential? Is that true?

MS. LINDWAHL: Not, yeah, kind of. I mean --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Use the mic.

MS. LINDWAHL: I think that what we need to be doing is we need to understand how the parking decks are working, what the capacity really is. I mean, I've
heard it's, you know, it's totally full, there are no
spaces. I've heard City staff say, you know, there's,
on any given day there's a thousand spaces in any
parking deck.

You know, a thousand spaces accommodates or
serves a lot of office users. And I think that that's
something the, as you're moving forward with refinements
and strategies and determining what your policy is going
to be, you really need to be looking at getting, having
the answer to that.

Because if there's a way to build in to, some
incentives to build office space into either the, you
know, the zoning or you know, if there's a way to, you
know, craft your land use policy, you know, maybe some
of the designations of certain blocks as to whether
they're traditional and they've got some sort of a
parking bonus, whether there's sufficient capacity that
you could, you know, eliminate parking requirements for
any kind of office, that you know, probably wouldn't be
inclined to necessarily go there. But the traditional
downtown areas are small enough. And that sort of thing
might work.

So I'm not sure that, so yes, I guess the
short answer is yes. But I'm not sure. I don't have any specific recommendations.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Can I ask a question? Not specifically of you, Jean. The lot north of the YMCA, I believe is owned by Presbyterian Homes, --

MR. LAMOTTE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- half of which is used currently by the YMCA and half of which is currently used by the King Homes?

MR. LAMOTTE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: The lot to the west of the Y, who owns that property?

MR. LAMOTTE: The City.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: A City-owned property? Okay. Just --

MR. LAMOTTE: And to clarify, the idea of the plaza was that because of that quadrant didn't have the open space, that we were suggesting that there, obviously there's a private owner, Presbyterian Homes, they're doing the parking now in agreement with YMCA so that that corner, if it was developed before the traffic study, which we don't think it will, would have to look at all those issues. It's providing public parking for
the YMCA now. But in the future, where would that go?

The traffic, or the parking/traffic study would look at
it. But that has to be carefully looked at. They're
kind of helping the YMCA out right now. But in the
future it could be a building. We're saying it's a good
corner, could we get a little space there as well, and
then still figure the parking?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, and it seems like it,
whether, I don't know exactly whether this can happen
within the plan or whether this is something that really
is taken up by a conversation between the City and
Presbyterian Homes developing that property. But the
provision of some publicly accessible parking for users
of the Y would be a benefit, obviously, in that part of
the City and --

MR. LAMOTTE: To look at part of the open
plan.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. There may not be that
huge a demand in terms of parking, but it depends on
what the use is.

MS. BLANAS: Hi. My name is Stamata Blanas.
I live at 1720 Maple. I also work in downtown Evanston.
And while I'm actually two blocks away from where I
So one of the concerns, first of all, the thing we're seeing here, this is new. The shurette that's being proposed is a new urbanism shurette. Is that right, Mr. LaMotte?

MR. LAMOTTE: Shurette?

MS. BLANAS: Yeah. The shurette, the design, is new urbanism. Is that correct? I just want to have a clarification. Because I did look it up. I just want to make sure.

MR. LAMOTTE: New urbanism's a term that we planners and designers and real estate -- use --

MS. BLANAS: Right. I'm just curious.

MR. LAMOTTE: -- about more of a urban, walkable town with --

MS. BLANAS: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: -- transit. And you probably define the word, new urbanism, in this city.

MS. BLANAS: Right. So this is what we call new urbanism? That's what we're presenting here tonight?

MR. LAMOTTE: There are people around the country that when they talk about new urbanism they
think about you as one of the centers of that.

MS. BLANAS: Right. But I understand.

Because actually I looked it up. And I looked at Evanston. And it did show the shurette as new urbanism shurette. So I just wanted to get a clarification when you google it. I saw it on the internet.

MR. LAMOTTE: You can call it new urbanism, good planning, community planning.

MS. BLANAS: Oh, okay.

MR. LAMOTTE: But it's new urbanism, you know. Well, actually, well, there is a concept that they developed in the 1980s where they looked at developing towns that were, you know, more sprawl. And they looked to do downtown. So a lot of this, just to get a clarification so I could understand, a lot of the new urbanists are using words like livable, sustainable, smart growth. And those are all buzz words of new urbanism. So I'm just getting a real good clarification.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, yes, yes, yes.

MS. BLANAS: Okay, thank you. Now, the question I have with regards to, you know, transportation as you're saying, like I said, I use my
car all the time. You're assuming the people that live in the downtown are predominantly or potentially going downtown. But I go to Oak Lawn, I go to Old Orchard. We don't have taxis, we don't have buses. The feasibility of somebody living in the downtown, using public transportation for a lot of our needs, is not going to work.

So if you're selling me a condo in my building for six or eight hundred thousand dollars and I'm paying ten, fifteen thousand dollars with the taxes and then telling me I could only have one parking spot, and I have to go -- in Oak Brook, that doesn't make any sense. Because what's somebody who owns a house, let's say in the, in -- Evanston, get three parking spaces?

I understand what you're saying, but if I'm going to pay that kind of money and you're designing that in the downtown, I think you need to provide something more affordable.

MR. LAMOTTE: Let me just clarify that. Okay. Because there's the balance. We've had people on Central Street and downtown that said, just have no parking requirement. So everybody has to use transit. And that just doesn't work. But someone buying a
condominium is making a decision.

MS. BLANAS: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: And if they have one car, they'll have one car in the space in the deck. If you need two or three cars, you buy a condo or town house out in a suburban location with a lot of parking. It's your choice. It's a freedom of choice. But you're moving into this downtown because you can walk to the grocery store and do a lot of things and take transit. But there is not one developer that can sell a condo without one space. So that's where Kirk was. One space per unit and a little extra if you have bigger bedrooms with more people there. So we're more than covered. 1.5, 1 to 1.5 is very generous for parking for a downtown.

MS. BLANAS: So how do you get, if you have a three-bedroom, you're going to give 1.5. How do you get a .5? I mean, that doesn't make any sense.

MR. LAMOTTE: So the .5 is part of the overall parking.

MS. BLANAS: Right. I understand. But I mean, if I'm going in there and I'm going to get a three-bedroom and you're giving me 1.5, I mean, what am
I going to do, get a little, little half a car and try
to put it in there? I mean, it doesn't make any sense.
I mean, that's not very descriptive.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, well, you're being confused
with how this works. Is we calculate the number of
units and then you put the parking ratio to it. That's
what has to be provided on site. You may have two cars
and he has one or he has none. And it all balances out.

MS. BLANAS: So I mean, you don't get your own
parking spot? What you're saying, people can just go?
I mean, that --

MR. LAMOTTE: You get a parking spot.

MS. BLANAS: Uh-huh.

MR. LAMOTTE: And if you think you need two
cars in downtown Evanston, which probably you shouldn't
have in this great downtown, then you can work with the
developer to buy or lease one of the other spaces. But
the 1.5 makes sure that everybody's covered with parking
spaces.

MS. BLANAS: But still I don't understand, if
I have to go grocery shopping and I don't have a car, am
I supposed to carry one bag at a time? I don't have a
car to go to the grocery store and I go to Whole Foods.
I mean, that doesn't make any sense.

PARTICIPANT: Get a cart.

MS. BLANAS: Yeah. I mean, you're going to have to get a cart and I'm going to have to go all the way to, I don't --

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay.

MS. BLANAS: But that's kind of where I'm going with it. It doesn't make sense --

MR. LAMOTTE: It does make sense.

MS. BLANAS: -- to restrict that kind of parking.

MR. LAMOTTE: I'll tell you, the quickest way, so we could move on because there's a lot of folks, is you go to the ITE, the International Traffic Engineer's manual, and they've got all the ratios there. They've been tried and true.

We're doing this so we're tightening up so you don't have so much parking at the base of these residential buildings. It's done by planners, engineers, economists, people that are in the business. Afterwards I'd gladly explain it to you.

But you would have a car, you would have a space. You could drive if you need be, okay?
MS. BLANAS: No, I'm just saying in the long-term feasibility, Evanston is not an easily accessible city. And if you want to leave, you can't just take a taxi. You got to get your car to go to Old Orchard.

Yeah, I --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: You made your point about --

MS. BLANAS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- you need more parking.

MS. BLANAS: Oh, okay. Your turn.

PARTICIPANT: I would never fit my suburban in half a spot. That just won't work.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Half a suburban?

MR. MARLATTE: My name is still Travis Marlatte. I still own The Things We Love at 614 Davis. Still reside at 1122 Maple Avenue.

Parking is my passion because of the small business that I have in downtown. So I do have quite a few comments. I'll try to get through them quickly.

One idea that kind of came to me while you guys were talking about the, rearranging Fountain Square, and that was Evanston collectively seems to have this real hangup about street closures. I mean, there was a big deal when they closed the streets for the bike
race that we had this year. We've seen a lot of
hesitation to close off a block for any kind of an event
in downtown. So perhaps as part of the plan and
certainly the discussions next year when we're talking
about parking and circulation, maybe we can take that
into account and design ways of closing the streets.

So for example, rearranging Fountain Square,
maybe there is some open avenues there. But there's a
design for traffic flow when we close that piece down
for special events. And that's really a part of the
overall thinking of how we would close the streets down
and which streets we would close down easily to sponsor
those kind of events.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And if I could piggyback on
that, I would certainly charge City staff, in terms of
working with the long-range transportation plan for the
City of Evanston, to look at those issues. Because
clearly, anybody who went downtown during the bike race,
what a great event.

MR. MARLATTE: And that was my reaction. I've
heard so much hesitation to closing the streets. And
everybody loved the event. There didn't seem to be any
real issues around it. And so it seemed like kind of
non-issue to close the streets down. But certainly if there's a plan for how do we close down this section and what does that do to traffic flow, I think it would help that.

The other comment is regarding the open spaces. Sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt. You're talking about it'd be nice if we had some open space here. Because there really isn't anything else in that quadrant. And I think the same way about parking.

Yeah, there's some confusion as to whether there is adequate parking in downtown. But I think it's adequate, convenient parking that is the issue.

So the City people certainly say that there's empty spaces, and I believe them, in the garages. The problem is that the visitors to downtown, and certainly my customers, are not willing to drive up to the 12th floor of Sherman Plaza. And that's just a fact. They're not going to do it. And so it's not that there isn't parking. It's that there's no, there isn't enough convenient parking. And I don't know really what to do about that.

And in fact the Parking Committee just voted to increase the meter rates. Maybe that will drive some
people into the garages. Maybe it will drive some
people out of town. I don't know.

We also have some overall policies that could
be put into place. So for example, being very strict
with the downtown employees who are feeding meters and
moving around downtown. Being very strict with the
business owners in downtown that are parking out in the
street. Ticket them. Raise the ticket price. I don't
care. Get them off of the street. Leave room for my
customers and be very lenient with them.

And the PEOs certainly know who's who. They
know who they can really lock down on and ticket heavily
and who's just a visitor in town. And I think we need
to get some of those judgments in our policies for the
City.

One of the other things that came to mind as
we were talking about parking and circulation, for a lot
of people that really, those two words go hand in hand.
Because they're driving around and around and around
and circulating looking for a parking spot.

Medians for pedestrian crossing, I think
that's funny, kind of an acknowledgment that pedestrians
have an inalienable right to cross anywhere the heck
they want to. So we're going to put medians there so they have a safe haven in the middle of a busy street. How about putting a fence up so that they cross at the crosswalk instead? It takes up less space than a median.

The earlier comment about the parking, absolutely true. The survey, I would love to see better data on that. Certainly the building owners, I would assume, have registration cards for the cars that are going into their spots. And that might at least provide some backup for the counting at four o'clock in the morning on an odd day.

The one thing I haven't heard is, what was the occupancy rates of those buildings? So not only were they out of town, but was there even anybody in the units? So we need some better parking surveys before we start adjusting the residential demands.

It has been said publicly recently that the Sherman and Maple garages were sized, not for current expectations, but for planned office expectations that never happened. So those parking garages, by that admission, are oversized. And we're paying the penalty. We're paying the penalty in not creating anymore
parking because we've got adequate parking. In the meantime, my customers are leaving town. And I'm not sure that I really understand the residential limit anyway. Would a developer ever shortchange their residents? Nobody's going to build a building with too few parking spots in it for their residents. But I don't really understand it. I'm more worried about the commercial parking and the visitor parking than I am residential parking.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: One comment on that.

MR. MARLATTE: Sure.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: If that was totally true, then why would every planned development, they'd be looking at a reduction in parking just about in all cases.

MR. MARLATTE: Well, probably because they know that the, what you're basically claiming is true, that they don't need the two and-a-half spots per unit or whatever. They know that it can be fewer than that. And I acknowledge, you're not going to set a zero requirement and let them do what they want to. We certainly need a policy there.

But this is key. Because in part you're
deciding whether Evanston is going to drive itself into a mass transit community or continue to support a mixed community. And as the woman said, you can't get out of town anyway but driving. So this is going to continue to be a vehicle-based community for the most part.

I like the gentleman's earlier comment, what we need in Evanston is a lot more residential units to support the mom and pop shops. Well, as a business owner, yeah, I'd like to build up 160 stories with residences because those people are going to come into my shop.

As a resident of Evanston, I don't want to see that. We need to have a balance. And we need to work collectively toward that end. But, and it's a balance. It's a balance of the office workers that we've driven out of town.

My business went down 25 percent when the hospital staff, I forget what the hospital was there, I think they were in the Bank One building or something, there's about three floors of them that left town, and I lost quite a bit of business from that. So the office, I would love to see residential units that convert to office spaces during the day. That would work out.
great. Pack them in. And like, make sure that we have parking for them all.

Way finding very important. I don't know if this is really a suggestion. I think I lost the train of thought from the earlier woman. But supplement our affordable housing deal that we have with developers and create an affordable parking fund. And let them contribute to affordable parking to reduce the parking rates and so forth.

And the other idea for meter parking and when we're talking about street flow and one-way, two-way, and that kind of stuff, some termed parking. There's no parking on this street during the rush hour times. But then during the low lull times, maybe we do open up some of that parking. So we have some parking that switches back and forth.

So for example, this summer during the sidewalk sale weekend, the biggest sale event that we have in downtown Evanston, I walked around and took pictures. And I got to tell you, I had absolutely no trouble crossing the street, standing out in the middle of the street taking pictures anywhere and everywhere.

So traffic on a weekend is theoretically a
fairly busy weekend for us, was not an issue. I assume
during rush hour during the work week it probably is.
So maybe we need some flexibility in either traffic flow
directions or parking or -- of the streets or whatever
to accommodate those changes during the week.

The other lady's comment, not only do we have
people of some age taking shortcuts through the park,
but we also have students who love shortcuts. So
apparently pedestrians just love shortcuts.

Moving violations versus parking. Absolutely.
I mentioned earlier trying to be more lenient with the
visitors who are parking at our meters and so forth.
Lock down on moving violations. That is absolutely an
issue in downtown and elsewhere. Rolling through stop
signs, that's just crazy.

I wanted to clarify that, the lady's earlier
comment about office spaces. I don't think that there
is a need, I don't think there is a demand to build more
offices. I mean, I think the plan kind of referred to
this. There is some demand for offices. And what
Evanston needs to work on is how to attract more demand
for the offices so that we can encourage the developers
to build more offices.
We've chased some of the larger office businesses out of town. And I think we need to find a way to attract that. Because that does create a vibrant work day environment in downtown Evanston. Thank you.

MR. WITTENBERGER: My name is Wayne Wittenberger. I live at 1501 Oak.

I have two points, one addressed to the Orrington-Sherman streets and the other on the parking. I think it was Sunday night I had a reason to park just on Orrington just south of Church. And fortunately I had no problem getting in a stall.

But on a one-way streets, I would say more or less de facto, people tend to use the right lane as an express lane. And if they want to park where they're kind of inching down the left and get a place, when you back out it's much safer. You back up a foot. Somebody moseying along sees your brake lights come on. You back another foot. And you pretty well, if they're interested in parking, you can -- tell when they come to stop and put their left blinker on.

So I think that we'd be going backwards by reverting to two-way. They're not as safe. And you can end up backing cars up for three, four, five, depending
on the traffic.

And the other point is the parking. If I understood the plan correctly, that you're going to beautify the parking spaces behind the library, eliminating some spaces next to the, I believe it's the Women's Club. We're trying to get our kids educated and make it, promote the use of the library. And if we're cutting down parking spaces there, parents say, hey, that's too much of a problem going over there. The heck with it. We'll just keep dumbing them up.

The other place of parking is across from the Y. And that's a property owned by Presbyterian Homes. And I understand that they're looking at making that, or beautifying it and eliminating the parking stalls. Living in the area, that place is loaded with cars morning and all times. All we're trying to do is make it tougher to slim down instead of trying to promote.

And also one other question. I brought it up before. And it has nothing to do with. On Grove Street just west of Sherman at the viaducts there have been, the tracks have been propped up for years and years and years. And I brought it up before that during July and August we get water under there.
And some of us are trying to live a year or
two longer. But every time we walk on the road in July
and August we just might get one of those mosquitos that
bite us and take us out of here quick. Well, that ought
to be fixed.

Now I understand it's a CTA problem. And I
know they don't have any money. But if they would use
their money instead of telling me there's a train coming
from the north and it'll take you to the Loop, I can
read yet. So there's a sign up there, says the next
train's leaving at so forth. So take some, talk to
them. Have them take some money and clean that out so I
can live a little longer. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay, at this point we're
going to take a break, 10 minutes. 9:30 we'll restart.

(Off the record.)

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I wanted to comment real
quickly on some of the traffic and circulation stuff
before we move on. First, is just a sort of, I guess
editorial thing. On page seven of the plan there's
mention of 1990 data on people taking public
transportation. And I'm thinking we need to use 2000,
particularly because the number of people taking public
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transportation has actually gone down since 1990 between
'98 and 2000.

And also some of the other suburbs around
here, you use public transportation more than we do. I
mean, I think Winnetka's like 26.7 percent of people
commuting. And also if there's anyway to make it read
so it doesn't sound like all 75,000 Evanstonians, 18
percent of us take public transportation, but just imply
that it is. This is -- the census Data Point that it is
people who are eligible to be part of the workforce.

Because it's not. I mean, when the census takes that
data it's measuring people 16 or older.

MR. LAMOTTE: We've got to check whether it's
census or it's CTA and Metra data. But we'll --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Okay. Perfect. Okay,
and then the other thing, and I don't know necessarily
how to deal with this, but, and when you're talking
about circulation I think it's really important to pay
notice to some of the other streets that feed into
downtown like Dempster, Central, Sheridan Road. I cross
Sheridan Road every day on my way to the train. And it
is, it's, sometimes I have to wait five minutes before I
can cross as a pedestrian. So I think looking at how, I
mean, Dempster, the Edens, and if people are coming to the downtown there needs to be some kind of acknowledgment that downtown in the context of all these other larger regional roads and how that plays in.

MR. LAMOTTE: And just quickly, as we were looking at it coming in as far as access points within the comprehensive transportation plan, we were looking at the whole city.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes. And just, I mean, how Evanston sits in the region. I mean, we're not next to an expressway. And we don't have a four-lane arterial. I mean, Ridge really isn't a McCormick, you know. It's not, and then the same with Sheridan Road. I mean, that's just the busiest street during rush hour, so.

MR. BISHOP: I too will just take a second to respond to that couple if I could, Mr. Chairman, just to clarify for the record.

The discussion about somehow limiting the amount of parking within residential buildings or one's ability to park multiple vehicles if that's their choice, I just wanted to clarify that the recommended ratios are minimum requirements. A prospective
developer, or more likely the prospective buyers within buildings, can have great influence over the actual number of parking requirements by demanding with their pocketbook how many parking spaces they buy. So there's no recommendation in the plan or under consideration that we know that would limit the maximum amount of parking that might be required. So I just wanted to clarify that.

I also kind of felt like it was my duty to rally to the defense of Evanston residents everywhere. There was a suggestion that our parking methodology may be amiss because people spend months in Florida. I know that no one leaves Evanston in summer months to spend a month in Florida.

But in all seriousness, there can be, at least anecdotally, a discussion about whether or not the months that we were forced, because of the timing of the timing, were good months to study parking. I suspect that any month is going to have periods. January may be a terrible time to count parking spaces. The holiday season may be a terrible time. And the methodology in general, by serving action parking demand, is a time honored and professionally-recognized way to measure
parking.

So we can debate whether or not the results are skewed by a particular day of the week or month. But we're confident that our methodology is professionally sound on that point. So I just wanted to address those two issues before we move on. And with that, my human shield, John, will --

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay, we're going to go on to the third part of the discussion and open it up for discussion on character and density and height. So as you can remember, the handoff of the baton that the Downtown Planning Committee gave us, the charge to update the plan and also to look at these character areas that you had conceptually defined, when you look at this map up on the screen, this is how we reshape and adjusted those.

Some are almost in the same location that you'd given us. Others were adjusted based on streets, half streets that are shopping, half that aren't. And so I'm not going to go into a real lot of detail. But the idea would be that the traditional areas, whereas you define in the more traditional walking, shopping, small store front, glass store front-type buildings,
some with some historic character buildings, some with just plain Jane buildings, but more smaller scale.

So, as if you can remember, I'm going to turn those traditional areas, were Davis and then down through to the south end of downtown, Davis to the west, and then the north part of Sherman near the old or former bookstore, as well as the small shops and restaurants to the west. So that was an area that we felt like you had given us good direction. We shaped and adjusted a little bit.

I think one of the questions we wanted to make sure was, we picked up the north end of Davis Street. Because we think the two-sided shopping is important there. You heard me talk about half a street. We also think, then, that the redevelopment of the Best Western would help create that second kind of shopping street experience. So we're pretty confident there. We're going to go over the density and heights in a minute. But it was really kind of matching the character of the area.

The next thing, then, was the edge or transition areas, which are in kind of the mint green, the north being along Emerson facing the, really the
gateway into downtown. Fifteen, 16-story buildings were approved there. The town houses are set. There's not a lot of development potential in the far western block. But the idea was that we were kind of following the existing pattern and the future pattern that is just recently been approved.

On the western edge is where you've got a lot of the older courtyard and full kind of apartment and condominium buildings. We felt that was a good approach. We call it an edge. I think others are calling it transition. But a lot of the similar character. You can see that square block that's being developed right now. It's going to have similar framing of the streets with the density of the buildings that are there.

The same thing on the east edge. The east edge is something we think also starts to introduce the character of the mixed use with the retail below. There's a lot more restaurants and retail there. So we think that was good. And we adjusted it to pick up the Best Western, came around and got up near Clark Street.

The northern edge was saw as a little bit different in scale because of the relationship to
Northwestern. They've got bigger side buildings. They may some day bring the buildings up to the frontage a little bit closer to kind of make a street wall there. So we've got a little bit different approach than the traditional areas to the south, as kind of the university link, we call it, rather than necessarily an edge.

Then we got into the core. We've got the east and the west core right up on the tracks right near the denser buildings to the east, things that are already dense there now, things that are already in place. There's not a lot of development opportunities. The larger core where most of the action and activity is taking place, as Kirk said throughout the development process. And then we've actually defined the Fountain Square block as the central core. We think there's some special things that can go on there. And we'll talk about that in a minute.

The next thing, then, is a little bit hard to see. But if you look closer, the little dark roof buildings, those are what we call the development opportunity site. I think there's been some confusion that if you look at the height envelope, the density
envelope for the whole downtown, that this could be one
giant development zone. That's farthest from the real,
or what would happen.

The core, for example, has a lot of blocks
that are fully developed. You've got things in there
that aren't going to change over in many many years.
And the only development site we actually found was
Northwestern's parking lot where the farmer's market is.
Some day that could be developed. We saw it as a site
susceptible to change.

You might not like the word development
opportunity. In other areas we've used sites
susceptible to change. Somebody some day is going to
knock on the door at City Hall and go to the Planning
Commission and say, we want to do something.

So it's one site within this core. It's the
northern site of the central core on the Fountain Square
block. The potential, if the old bookstore site
changes, either rehab or for new development. The
Burger King site to the north, a few other little infill
sites, because there are one-story buildings or older
buildings there.

You start getting to the west, there's very
few little infill sites. This is the east half of the
Pres Homes. This is the one-story gallery and bank
building. And then this is the Best Western, which I
think almost everybody in the room said, make sure we
address that.

So the idea here is that we're looking at the
whole overall development framework with these character
zones. But there's really very few sites susceptible to
change. Just picture downtown. The churches aren't
going to change. The post office, the YMCA, the
library, things like that are set. So those blocks
aren't going to really fill up with new development.
The sites that have new, like Sherman Plaza
and others and the Optima buildings, that's set. So
just really look closer at these development opportunity
sites and realize that that's really probably the only
thing that's going to be susceptible to change in the
coming years.

This is the developing framework again.
Transition and edges on the outside, the traditionals in
the little bit darker green, and the core. We're going
to first take a look at the edge and traditional as far
as density and scale.
Within these traditional, we're looking at a couple of different, or one approach. Three to five stories would be the zoning range. The minimum would be three. That would be as of right, so to speak, but with controls, as Kirk talked about at our last meeting. And five would be the cap. So this area here, three to five. The West Davis, three to five. The little park here by the old bookstore at Sherman would be three to five.

Then looking at the edges, north would be eight to 15 stories. These two buildings have been approved at the 15-story height. We feel it's a gateway. We've got big Emerson Street there. We've got the entry point coming to all the action down here. There's several very large, dense buildings in here. So we think this is a good transition, eight to 15 stories. The bottom, again, the base would be eight. You could use the bonuses to get to 15. And Kirk's going to explain that.

The west edge and the east edge, the eastern side very familiar, a lot of the older apartment, condo buildings, same thing here, would have a base of six. And you could go to 10. So a little bit denser than...
your traditional walking, shopping streets. Very much in character with what's out there now. You start to take a look at the scale, the full block development of these buildings, and the heights there now. So we think the base is fine. And at 10 stories there's a cap that you bonus up to that 10 stories.

And last but not least, is the university link. We think in relation to existing buildings and maybe future buildings, six to eight stories would be the approach there. And again, there's only one site that's susceptible to change. And that would be the infamous Burger King site on the corner. So six as a base. With some bonusing you could get to eight.

So we want to first talk about these two character zones and then eventually we're going to get to the next two characters. But that's really the first part of the discussion. And I'm just watching the clock, Mr. Chair. So I think we've just got to make sure we stay on the character zones as we're showing them now. Kirk, do you want to --

MR. BISHOP: Yes. Let me talk briefly. John described earlier in the slide a kind of, two numbers for building height. Three to five, six to 10. And I
just want to explain what that means.

For each of the character zones we're recommending consideration of a base building height, a height that would be kind of allowed as of right for new projects coming in. And then a higher allowable building height or a taller allowable building for projects that meet set objective criteria for contributing public benefits to either the City as a whole or downtown-specific geography.

And those public benefits would come from a menu. Again, a formula-based system, objective requirements for how you could get above the base from three up to four or five for the traditional areas or from six to 10 for some of our edge areas.

And the menu of allowable bonusable items, if you will, public benefit bonuses, in working form or conceptual form, is described here. And it addresses things like building sustainability, contributions to new park and open space and plazas within downtown, helping to preserve landmarks, either on adjacent sites or nearby sites, sometimes called Adopt A Landmark Program where financial assistance is given to owners of landmarks. Financial assistance given to arts and
cultural organizations to help sustain and promote their mission might be another bonusable item. Sidewalk amenities, the provision of green roofs, the attainment of certain sustainability levels for green buildings, either as measured by the Green Building Council's LEED system or some equivalent type system, could be another bonusable item. Streetscape amenities, the provision of daycare or child care, even adult daycare, might be something to be considered as an addition to the public benefit bonus system.

And as a result of discussions that we've had previously, and it came up again tonight, we're suggesting that maybe it might be appropriate to include affordable office space, the provision of affordable office space within either a new building or assistance to rehabilitate other office space and to keep it affordable for a set period of time to sort of nurture the local economy, the independence, the services that are so emblematic of what downtown Evanston has historically been, would be another thing that could be added.

Now, I want to describe in conceptual terms, because it is just a concept at the moment, some ideas
for how zoning could implement or carry out some of the
recommendations coming out of the development framework.
And so here is kind of the same map that John just
showed with the edge names on it. And we're converted
it into what could be a zoning map.

And what we've described for the edge areas of
the development framework are a series of what we're in
beginning terms calling residential downtown transition
zone. Because by and large, the exception would be the
university area, these are interfaces between downtown
and often residential character neighborhoods that lie
on the other side of the street or to the alley behind.
And so we wanted to give them a sort of different name
than the traditional D or downtown nomenclature.

And then so we've crafted it, a series of
concepts for three residential downtown transition: RD1
for the university line; RD2 for the east-west and
southern edges; and then for the northern edge in RD3
classification, a very straightforward downtown
traditional classification for the traditional areas.

And consistent with the development framework,
this concept draft for zoning shows maximum allowable
building heights, both in terms of a base as of right
building height standard and a cap that one could achieve only if they dip into the pool of available public bonuses. And those caps in building height terms are also accompanied by floor area limits that are again, bonusable.

The bonus system would be based on additional floor area. A base limit, for example, for the university link, the district that allows a base height of six up to eight, would have a corresponding FAR of 2.75 as a base, 4 as an absolute cap. If you need to accommodate the additional floor area that comes from dipping into that bonus pool, you could get up to the eight stories in height. And consistent with the development framework, heights for the east, western, southern edges from six to 10 and three to five FAR.

We're suggesting that the City may want to consider upper story building coverage limits as a way to sort of disguise buildings as they get taller or sort of mitigate the way they feel from the street by sort of stepping back the upper stories. The downtown transition, consistent with its existing character, would be a district that allows a very broad mixture of residential and mixed-use building types. It's really
the only district that would permit stand along or
single purpose residential buildings. Because that's
kind of the character. It's a mixture of courtyard
buildings, apartment, condominium-style buildings, and
even single-family structures today.

Now I want to compare briefly how that
framework for residential downtown transition zoning
compares with a very predominant zoning classification
that exists in the area today, particularly, I think,
along the western border and southern borders of the
edge transition areas. The predominant zoning is R6
under the City's existing system. And that is a zoning
classification today that allows building heights of up
to eight stories or 85 feet.

And so as a framework, that provides a useful
frame of reference for considering the recommended
framework for zoning in the RD classifications where the
RD1 would allow building heights of between six as a
base and a cap of eight, just as today's zoning would
do. It establishes upper story building coverage limits
that don't exist today.

I should point out that some people have
interpreted this as a kind of a misrepresentation of
what you can do under R6 because it's read, and
understandably so, as a building that's sort of, is
built lot line to lot line. In point of fact, R6 zoning
doesn't require setbacks. So this is really just an
illustration of the coverage of the maximum building
envelope, not necessarily the entire lot. So it is kind
of an apples to apples comparison if you view it in that
way.

RD2, building height base six up to 10,
slightly higher than the R6, admittedly so, but only,
again, by availing yourself of the public benefit bonus
system. And then for the northern edge, because of the
approvals that have been granted in that area, a cap of
15 stories as opposed to the eight or 10 in the lower
category districts.

The downtown transition, really
straightforward, three to five stories. A very strong
emphasis, because of the existing character and
cherished nature of those areas, on what happens at the
ground floor, how you handle the parking, how the
building interacts with the sidewalk to enliven the
pedestrian experience.

And this is of course an area where maybe it
would be appropriate to think in terms of some greater exemptions for parking. Although that's not recommended currently in the draft, it's something we'll surely consider.

Standards I mentioned at the ground level for the amount of, the ground floor facade that needs to be comprised of glazed window elements, doors, and how, again, how that can really enliven the pedestrian experience.

Comparing that with existing zoning today, the downtown transitional area is by and large a zone D2. That's a zoning classification that allows building heights of 42 feet. But then the Ordinance allows you to go up an additional 43 feet through the use of allowances. So the maximum building height really in D2, if you play by the rules in the book, is 85 feet. Under the framework proposal in the draft the recommendation would be three stories base, five stories as a cap, far less, frankly, than the 85 feet allowed with allowances today.

Again, the building height recommendations for the edge or downtown transitional and downtown residential transition districts are based on the
existing development pattern, the range of building heights and intensities that exist today, projects that have been approved and not yet built, and to some extent on existing zoning.

So, are we going to break there or --

MR. LAMOTTE: I think we should. Because we try to do --

MR. BISHOP: I think the idea was we'd break on those two and then take up the core next.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Just a point to make sure I understand. For RD3, which allows 15 stories and between three and-a-half and six FAR, if, even if I have the maximum, if I get the maximum public benefit of a six FAR and only build an eight-story building, I could only cover approximately 75 percent of the lot as long as my parking was underground. Is that correct? Since I got an FAR of six, height of eight, if I don't lose any area for parking or anything else and I got about 75 percent lot coverage, --

MR. BISHOP: You're -- That is correct.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Or if I build it 15 stories, then I'm actually only covering 40 percent of the lot.

MR. BISHOP: Rather than a base with a
stepback, you're saying?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. Yes, I'm just trying to give people a picture here of the fact that the FAR has a profound impact in terms of what you can actually do. Although you have a zoning envelope in terms of these stepbacks and stuff, you can't, even at the FAR, actually build out to that envelope.

MR. BISHOP: Yeah, that's correct. That's a correct analysis.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Colleen?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Hi. I know at the last meeting, I guess it was two weeks ago, that I mentioned about the benefits. And I really believe that they need to be more clearly defined and more of an explanation of who the reviewers will be. Will that be staff? Will they be arbitrarily saying, okay, daycare for 10 people off site, you can get so much allowance? And more of an explanation of what are the financial incentives. Also talking about affordable housing again, being on site versus allowing developers to buy their way out.

I have real concerns about the benefits are really sort of not clearly articulated on what is a benefit. And so I think that that needs to be brought
back again instead of developers just writing a check to
the City or someone else and then they get to go up
however many stories. I have real problems with that.

MR. BISHOP: I heard two concerns there. One,
that the formulas or the decision criteria for when the
bonuses would be granted may be arbitrary or not clear
enough in the Ordinance. And the other that the ability
to pay into a trust fund for affordable housing as
opposed to providing, integrating the units into the
project is wrongheaded in your --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right. And they can
also pay into financial incentives for open space, not
necessarily on the site. They can pay into commitments
for daycare, not necessarily on the site. So really
they can pay into whatever they want to get as big a
building as they want without really doing necessarily
true community benefits. And that's my issue.

MR. BISHOP: And is it, is the list of
bonusable items not, in your mind, an appropriate list
of benefits?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No. I think that the
list is appropriate. I think that it's not clearly
defined what that list means. It could be, okay, the
LEED-certified, does it need to be silver or does it
need to be gold?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Actually, it's very detailed
in here in terms of, if you, for example, --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Not really. Not --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes. Yes, it is.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: -- for the money that
supports, for affordable housing or how much daycare --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think it's very clear.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I would beg to disagree.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: If you go to page 103 and
page 104, there's a very, there's a formula in terms of
how much you get for what you provide.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I've read through it.

And I don't think, I think that it could be interpreted
versus --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: How many daycare,
how many kids for daycare, for instance?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Item 5.16.2.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: How many kids?

How big?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, it's minimum.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. But how many
kids fit into 3,000-square feet? The question is, for
instance, daycare. I think there's some --

PARTICIPANT: State law governs that.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's state. It's all covered
by DCFS. And you can't do anything about that.

MR. LAMOTTE: If I could clarify, Mr.
Chairman? If I could clarify, Mr. Chairman? One of the
things I mentioned earlier about open space is that
we're probably not wanting the open space on site in
many of these cases. Because you want them to
contribute to your public spaces and in either some sort
of a pool or actually physically changing the open space
that would target it. So if someone says, I'll put five
dollars in to fix XYZ space, that would probably be
better than them saying, I'll cut the back out of the
building and say here's your open space.

So, and I think also we need to clarify too,
because there was three questions in the audience --
you're not approving the hardline zoning tonight or in
the future. It's you're approving the plan as a guide
that says A, you want caps, bases and caps, and B, we
want a very defined list of bonuses. And then if that's
the guide approved by you and the Council, then all the
detailing out will be done in the next round after the plan is done.

So I think Kirk's point about, is the menu there? Some of this is going to have to be off site. Some of it's on site. But we can't probably stack the whole thing on every single site. And if someone had another creative proposal for helping a landmark down the street or some affordable housing thing, but the intention is either on site or off site or a combination, that's what it is.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, and for some of these would it be possible to tally the public benefit in certain zones for either on site or off site based on expectations about that zone?

MR. BISHOP: I think that's entirely possible, that not only could it be tailored for different zones, that the City, other cities have sometimes established priority rankings in a given area. Our emphasis is on X. Ten years, five years down the road, we've had enough X. You start with Y and work your way down the list.

There are any number of options for refinement of that bonus menu. I do think, however, admittedly, we
could do a much better job of putting up there in chart form land values downtown and how the formula would work. We haven't done that. And we probably should to kind of explain that.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: There are certainly equations in here that I don't really understand.

MR. BISHOP: It took me a while. So --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: But I know there's an equation, so --

MR. BISHOP: Yeah. Your point is well taken about the fact that there are a lot of numbers and equations that we haven't used in some time in our lives. And we could do a better job of doing that. But there really isn't much room for discretion in the bonus system as currently written.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Can I follow up with, also going back to my comment from a couple of weeks ago, too, about the affordable housing and being on site. And once again, if we're going to give developers and unbelievable amount of height, we should at least require them to do affordable housing on site. And I think if the City is really making a commitment to be an integrated community, then we need to seriously look at
that instead of being a segregated community, which in
this type of bonus system really makes available to be
more segregated than integrated. So I have a real
problem with that.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Robin?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, with regard
to the traditional areas, first I'd like to make a
comment that the 1989 plan is very strong about the
preservation of existing buildings and adaptive reuse as
opposed to taking a three-story building and replacing
it with a new three-story building.

I would suggest that the distinctive character
of the traditional areas of downtown gain their
significance through the actual architectural fabric of
the existing buildings.

And I think some of the strong language in the
1989 plan needs to be either replicated or, replicated,
yes, I'm an academic and so I think -- and replicated
would be fine for me. Some of this language occurs on
say, page 74: areas which give character, and I'm
reading, "areas which give distinctive character to the
downtown due to style, material profile, detail, and
scale. Redevelopment should not be encouraged in these
areas because in the aggregate they established an
identity for Evanston's downtown. Character-giving
buildings provide the humanizing counterpart to steel,
glass, stone towers which could be "anywhere USA".
Programs in these areas should include rehabilitation,
adaptive reuse, store front renovation, improved
signage, and preservation."

On page 78 it says reuse. And there's a whole
section on reuse. The language supports reuse in the
traditional areas rather than the destruction of
buildings.

And then on page 87, for instance, the need to
maintain scale and character, which states maintaining
the character of the downtown means preserving existing
buildings.

So in terms of the language of the overall
planning where we'd work out the detail later, but I
would really like to see some stronger preservation
language in the traditional areas. Because that's the
area we're focusing on, that.

The other issue I have, it's an issue of
concern with regard to our vintage store fronts and
other buildings which aren't landmarked, but are
important to the fabric of our downtown. In the
shurette during the summer there was a wonderful slide
which indicated some facade preservation programs for
downtown. I do not see that in evidence of the new
plan. And I was sorry not to see that. Because it was
one of the elements of the shurette that I
wholeheartedly supported, especially in some of the
transitional areas on Davis, for instance. I think it's
826 Davis, although I may be incorrect. We have a
wonderful building.

And I really think in the transitional, as
well as the traditional zones, some of our historic,
important character-giving buildings may come under
threat. Again, not necessarily this year or next year.
But we as Plan Commissioners are looking 10 to 15 to 20
years out. And I for one am very indebted to the work
of people in the 70s, 80s, and 90s who protected,
through D2 zoning, the downtown. And I'd like to see
that implemented in the map plan. Thank you.

MR. BISHOP: That's, and I think we're very
open to consideration of pulling that preservation
language in there. The reason we didn't is because we
think by virtue of our height and FAR limits and the
bonus menu, that we've done far more through the
recommendations in this plan to ensure preservation,
reuse, rehabilitation of that building stock than any of
the words that you read from an advisory plan.

There is a serious economic disincentive to
knock down a building that could have been 85 feet in
height, assuming you're playing not by the PD exception
rules, in which case there is no rule, and to go to a
system that says, three base, five tops, and four and
two are only if you dip into the pool of available
bonuses.

So in all honesty, we thought that that
language was a stronger statement about rehabilitation
and reuse. But we are happy to try and integrate the
language that you're providing there in footnote or in
full text form.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Thank you. I just
want to sort of -- back on a comment that Commissioner
Hunter made at the October 24th meeting. And it's that
words do matter. We, with the 1989 plan, have one that
set a certain tone for downtown, both in terms of
zoning, you're absolutely right, but also in terms of
tone.
And I think it's really important that up
until the 708 Church proposal, no big PD proposals have
occurred, if I'm not mistaken, in the D2 area or the
traditional area. And so it did work. And I think it's
a two-fold. And I'd like to really see that language
continue for the next 20 years.

MR. BISHOP: Fair enough.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Is there a way, also through
the design guidelines aspect of this relative to how the
design guidelines apply to particularly the downtown
traditional areas, that that could be strengthened in
terms of architectural character?

MR. LAMOTTE: As you know, design guidelines
are becoming design standards --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: -- to the form-based code.

They're going to be put in there stronger. So if
somebody said, I've got to tear by building down because
it's obsolete or it's falling down or it doesn't meet
code, then they would have to fit that tooth in there
very carefully, following some very good design

guidelines.

Our first crack at it is in here. You've got
some already in your PD guidelines. We want to combine all those so it's global for the whole downtown. But in the next round, when you then start going into the zoning like you're doing for Central Street, that's when you've sharpened the pencil.

But we planner, designer, economist types are saying, you've got a glass store front. You've got to hold the corner. You've got to have breaks in the store front. You've got to articulate the architecture. You've got to do stepbacks. So if someone had to replace a building in any of your zones, they've got to follow good standards.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think the intention of the Commission would be that if and when a building get replaced, it's gets replaced with the same level of quality as the Davis Street Land Company building.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Sorry. You also didn't answer my question about facade preservation programs that were in the shurette and not in final plan. Or draft plan, sorry.

MR. LAMOTTE: Those are brought up as ideas. I mean, we can talk further about what staff, what
incentives are out there. I mean, if someone says, I'm in a three to five range, as Kirk said, and there's not a lot of development potential there, even if they had to take the building out, and you know, they're following the guidelines, we put a new building in, articulate it, hopefully with the high quality, but if there is some options there for facade rebate or facade programs, sometimes merchants have told us they don't really care about the financial incentive, but they just don't want to deal with architects and engineers, planners, and contractors. Is there some help there? So there are all kinds of creative programs, either to help them with the technical or some funding. And that's something we can look at.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Okay, I'd like to go back to the development bonuses. And I would like to say I completely agree with Colleen. I don't like the idea of letting a developer spend their money now, today, to provide a benefit that may be here today, but necessarily two years, 10 years, 20 years from now. Because we're going to still live with that building. The building will still be there long after we're all gone, particularly condos. And I
think it's very important that we really think hard
before we put in this language that allows a developer
to buy, you know, a park two blocks away. I think
that's a great and noble, I think parks are great. But
the park might not be there. It might show up as a
redevelopment 10 years down the road.

Also I would really like you guys to think
about looking at affordable daycare as something that
should be required on site for new developments.

There's a pretty significant body of work. And I can
share that with you later. But it says that this is
actually a good economic development tool, that it is,
it makes money. It provides places for people to bring
their kids and not driving further distances.

Also if you have a daycare center downtown,
you're having people come downtown every day, twice a
day. And you know, just getting something further away
from a downtown site would not necessarily be the best
thing for downtown.

MR. LAMOTTE: Let me just clarify the open
space. Because I'm a little confused. So ideally we're
showing where they should go, either new or existing
renovated, in the plan. And if a developer came in and
said, I want to do bonuses to add floors and I want to 
put 10 bucks into the park or I want to build it myself, 
the timing may not be the same. And ideally, again, we 
may not want to chop a hunk of their block out and put 
some, you know, windswept open space in the back versus 
in the front where people can use it. So I'm a little 
unclear. If someone --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I totally agree. Like I 
don't want to have this sort of like, not very, you 
know, sort of little, not a very user-friendly like 
plaza in front of a building that, you know, isn't going 
to welcome. I'm not going to live there. I'm not going 
to go to use it. I might use the park two blocks away.

But I don't, I don't really like the idea of 
letting that developer today put money in today's 
dollars toward a park that there isn't a guarantee that 
that park's going to be there in 10 or 20 years.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, let's look at it this way. 
Because I think the open space is something very 
important in this plan, that we get the open space we 
have renovated. Because there's not a lot of dollars to 
do Fountain Square and others as well as new ones.

So I think in the zoning redo, when that comes
before you, that kind of thing needs to be sharpened up. Because it may be, okay, this park is going to be done in 2009. This one's 2010. There's got to be some certainties there. Because if it's just a pool that it goes out there and we hope to get to it some day, you know, that's not going to work. But on the other hand, it could be revenue to help fix those parks. And bird in hand money and -- to move those park fix-ups up. So we've just got to get the formulas and the math done. But I don't think we're going to have it all detailed out in this.

We're basically saying we want open spaces a menu item. We want open space in the right locations unless you come up with a really creative open space on your site. Because we want you to hold the corners and street walls. These are the open spaces we want you to contribute.

Then the hardlining will be, all right, what's the capital cost to do Fountain Square? What's the cost to do Oldberg Park? All right, you're chipping into that. Or as Kirk said, you might even do it within a geographic thing. If you're within three blocks, you hit the first open space that's near you.
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Well then maybe we should just require, if you're going to build in this downtown boundary, you have to contribute to a park. Like why can't we just say, make that a rule?

MR. LAMOTTE: We've got to look at all these things. I mean, there's base zoning and then there's bonuses. I mean, I think one of the things that you've heard me talk about is balance.

I mean, there's a lot of people that have asked -- in the focus groups, you know, well, I'm not opposed to height in the right locations as long as we get something for it. And I think getting something means a balance.

Because if we say, okay, Mr. and Ms. Developer, you're going to do underground parking, platinum-certified affordable housing, daycare, green roof, open space on site, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera, then development's going to stop. I'll just tell you that right now. You know that. So we have to have a balance.

We say, okay, we've got a base. You've still got to do a good looking building. Because I think there was a question about how much we're going to
control base. You've still got to control base. It starts with staff. Staff is going to be the technicians here. So you don't have to do it. Because you're an appointed Commissioner. And then that base, if you don't want to bonus up, then that will fit a really good looking building profile. How much do we ask for in that base? Then you start getting the incentives. And let's get real incentives. I think we just have to be careful of balancing that.

Because we're in one town right now, they want everything three stories, underground parking. It's, they'll never see a new building. So what is the best balance?

I think we're saying, is recommending a menu list of bonuses that will help the downtown realistically -- And Jim's right. There's a lot of detail there. But that's going to be detailed out like you're doing Central Street, detail the zoning out in the next round. It's not bait and switch. It's just the amount of detail we need. Because there may be a money formula. It may be a square-footage formula. It may be no, you will contribute to Fountain Square, which is going to cost X dollars to do. So that's all. It's
a balance.

It's a great question. Should the base zoning contribute to something? You're talking about like an impact statement? Okay.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: You know, and, oh, I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Since I'm new on Committee and it's late at night and we started early this morning with breakfast Rotary Club, I'm not ready to really kind of take all this on at the moment. But I do want to say that I disagree a lot with, although I can see there's a lot of talent here, I disagree with a lot of the things that have been said by the Committee members over the last 10 or 15 minutes. Not really completely with respect to the substance and the concerns, but I see what they're saying as really kind of a narrowing thing.

And really your last comment articulates. I'm glad you did that better than I feel able to right now. But we need to retain flexibility in this plan. And we need to figure out ways to make certain that it can be controlled and that, you know, some evil person later after the good people that we are, you know, comes in doesn't do something with it that we didn't intend.
But I think it is a mistake to try to basically, at this point in this plan, kind of narrow it down to the point where you've got to have this, you can't have that. I think we need to be able to look at a spectrum of things, certainly at this point as we're moving forward.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes. I was just going to say, and again, this goes back to when it goes into zoning and planning. But there are some fairly easy ways to identify, for example, the park issue.

The zoning can say that you have to contribute X amount or by some formula to a City-designated park. And then that gives the Council, that gives the City as we move forward the opportunity to have a list in the capital program, for example, that they'll take donations too. And that list may change between 2008, 2012, 2015. But it is, it is the City's plan to address a specific park. If there are no parks available, then that bonus kind of goes away. There's nothing to apply it to.

So all I'm saying is there are ways to address these issues with some flexibility in the zoning tied to something specific for the time in our governance,
our -- plan. So I wouldn't worry too much about it yet.
Because I think you're going to see, when it, when you
get to the zoning and you get to the part of detailing
it out, those things can work out.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay. Next?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: We'll open it up to --

MR. LAMOTTE: Open it up? Yeah.

PARTICIPANT: Mr. Chairman, do you want to
follow the same format?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay. Let's line up and
let's get started. Microphone is up here on the table.
Again, state your name and address.

MR. WHITACRE: Dick Whitacre, 1400 Chicago
Avenue.

The bonus plan idea may sound like something
that will help developers feel more comfortable about
building in this town. And I know you guys are
balancing a lot of forces off against each other here.
But why does the City abdicate its responsibility to
make decisions on parks? Why does it give that to a
developer? Don't you know that you need a park or not?
Why don't you just address what is being done at a
given site or what's being built at that site and not
anything else in the community, not affordable housing,
not something else?

Don't give the developer the right to do
things in this town. It's the City of Evanston and the
Plan Commission that should be doing those things.
Developers have a certain agenda. That's not our agenda
necessarily. So you guys have got to take the
responsibility for making these decisions, not
developers. Thank you.

MR. GOULD: My name is Oliver Gould. I'm from
1730 Hinman Avenue. I've been a resident of Evanston
for about nine years.

And I recall some of the comments that have
been made recently. I'm recalling a quotation that
those of us who forget history are doomed to relive it.
And I spent from 1956, we moved into the Hyde
Park area and we were part of instruments in trying to
build what we called at that time an integrated
community of high standards through economic diversity.
And that result is, we moved out to come to Evanston.
Because what happened in Hyde Park was simply, the Hyde
Park Kenwood area, the first three blocks in from the
lake were pleasant and delightful, relatively calm and
pleasant. But that was the only part that was left to
us outside of fear of crime and those attendant
concerns. So again I ask, please let's not relive
history.

I am interested in the fact that on page 85, the building profile of the plan, 4.3 says that only
projects that provide extraordinary public benefits are eligible to build up to the top stories. In this case,
in the area involved in the community that we're very much involved and concerned about, up to 42 stories.

What are extraordinary benefits? I don't know that just a park is an extraordinary benefit. But that's what we're requiring according to the Plan Commission. It's in there on page 85. So I think, again, the comments that have been made, we've got to define what are extraordinary benefits to allow a building in the downtown to be over 25 stories?

One of the other things that I think you might want to consider is, I have just been recently, as of this morning, again, talking with an architect deeply involved in the Bethesda, Maryland area. These folks live in Cherry Chase and are involved very much with Bethesda as architects and as attorneys.
Bethesda has converted the main street, Bethesda Avenue, into a, what they call, a Rodeo Drive-type of community with those types of stores. They've limited development to three stories in that downtown district. They have courted name brands. And of course, I'm not familiar with those name brands, but the name brands that you folks are perhaps involved on North Michigan Avenue, are the types of things that are involved there, which we could use to compete with the other stores at Old Orchard as opposed to what's there.

Those architects in Bethesda came to the conclusion that people will not move into a retail store and go in to buy if that store is the ground floor of a skyscraper of a tall building. They just will not tolerate that kind of community in terms of commercial appeal. I think you should consider that. And I don't, I think the Klutznicks should be expert enough at knowing what they can do with that kind of thing.

But it is a deep concern that they have. And they have kept their downtown district to three stories and built a Rodeo Drive community.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: I appreciate your concerns, but the reality is that we're really talking about RD1,
RD2, RD3, and DT right now, not downtown core districts.

MR. GOULD: I apologize. Tell me when I should be back with the other story. I'll be back with -- Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It'll probably be the next meeting, based on time right now.

MR. ANGELL: Tim Angell, 1432 Wesley.

Chairman, I'd like to ask you a question, what you just based upon. Do you want comments on the central core and the rest of them at the next Planning Commission meeting?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's looking to me like it's going to be the next meeting.

MR. ANGELL: Okay. Then I'll just make my comments regarding what's been said so far. I applaud the use of the form-based code and the design guidelines that are set forth in the plan. I think they make perfect sense for Evanston. I think they make perfect sense for downtown.

Downtown is the peak for the City of Evanston in terms of the development, density, and population. And this plan makes a compelling case for the zoning code revisions for the downtown.
I would say that one of the terms that overall
in the plan that I like the most is livable environment.
And I think form-based code gets us that. And I think
one of the aims of form-based code is to make sure that
we don't have that give and take of PUD negotiations
between the City Council and the developer.
And if I could point out on page 68, I would
like this, facetiously I like this in bold. And I'd
like to give that to each of the City Council members.
Residents of Evanston see downtown development review as
an ad hoc case-by-case assessment where decisions are
made by City Council without significant consideration
of the principles of comprehensive planning and the
tenants of good urban form. I couldn't agree with that
more strongly.

Some of the things that we talked about,
briefly, I believe that we, that this downtown plan
should be an advocate for affordable workforce housing.
It's needed in downtown so that our downtown area has a
variety of folks from different socio-economic strata.
I don't know if I would agree with the
characterization made by one of the Commissioners that
developers can buy their way out. Inclusionary zoning
works well in Highland Park. And I know that the City
of Evanston has used Highland Park as an example of
where affordable housing preservation and creation works
well. I'd say that's a good template for us.
I'd say that the zones that we've talked about
so far are very good segways from adjacent residential
land uses in the surrounding neighborhoods to downtown.
So I think the consultants are well on target on that.
And that's everything I have for right now. Thank you.

MS. ALLEN: Hi. I'm Deborah Allen. I live at
1319 Chicago.
I have two comments. First of all, I think
the agenda tonight was a little bit unfortunate in that
the first two items were, to my mind at least, much less
important than this topic, which I think is really the
meat. And unfortunately it seemed like half the
audience might have left at the break. And so I really
hope that at the November 27th meeting that you'll
actually revisit a little bit of this at the beginning
of the meeting and give people more time to talk about
it when their brains are a little fresher.
My second comment is that, so far as the
public benefits go, I have a little bit of concern about
public benefits like daycare, things that could
disappear, I think, pretty easily when the building is
completed and is going to last for a long time. I think
that I'd look at that list carefully.

Maybe public benefits ought to be something
that are a little more, like, physical like the LEED or
you know, alley improvements, things like that. And
perhaps daycare is something that's better addressed by
tax, tax advantages and incentives in that way.

MS. WESTERBURG: Hi. My name's Chris
Westerburg. And I live at 525 Grove.

Just a couple questions about the transitional
zones. Could you bring back the map that just showed
how those ring around downtown? Thanks. That helps.

I want to commend you for looking at these
zones. And I also want to thank the Plan Commission for
considering this as well in some of the recent meetings.
Because I think these areas are important. And most
residents of Evanston understand that they kind of are a
transition, not only for going into downtown, but going
out of downtown.

What I'm confused about is the fact that I
don't understand your rationale for different heights in
different areas rather than a standard height for all
transitional zones. I think in RD2 you've got from six
to 10 stories. And then in RD3 you have up to 15.

Now, I understand that there are taller
buildings as you move south into downtown from RD3. But
across the street you have some eight-story buildings.
You've got single-family homes. What's the rationale
for going so high there?

I think in the study, in the study you mention
that there were projects already planned for that area.
Well, I understand that, I guess. Those were somewhat
controversial to begin with. And I think even the Plan
Commission questioned that height. So if we've made a
mistake before, why should we repeat it, I guess would
be my question.

MR. LAMOTTE: We didn't think it was a
mistake. And so we looked at all these factors that
Kirk had shown. We've got a wide --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Go ahead.

MR. LAMOTTE: We've got two tall buildings that were
approved. We've got a huge core in here that's already
developed and active. It's not way off in the western
edge like RD2 or RD2 over is here. And there's not much
really development opportunity sites in there. So we
basically have had the minimum and the cap at 15.

It's downtown, the big buildings are nearby,
you've got a big, wide street. There's zoning for
multi-family across the street. It's not a local
street. There's a lot of cars going back and forth. So
we felt comfortable with that. I mean, you take issue
with it. But that's the rationale.

MS. WESTERBURG: Okay. And you're right. I
would take issue with 15 stories at that point.
Similarly for, I think it's RD1.

I like your idea very much, that gateway from
Northwestern. And the, I think it's six to eight
stories, makes sense there. But you come down to RD2
where you're actually not, you're actually closer to
residential areas than say, an institutional use. And
you wind up from six to 10 stories there. And I
question that as well.

That's an area where there's only about a
block and-a-half between multi-use and true residential
as you get closer to the lake. And I would recommend
you reconsider those heights as far as possible for
those transitional zones. It's the context of the zones. I realize the characters are all different, but they all share that context of moving out of downtown.

MR. SANCHEZ: My name is Peter Sanchez. And I live at 2228 Pioneer Road. And I'm a Professor of Political Science at Loyola University.

And I've sat through three hours of meeting. I thought that this was going to be much more of a public forum. And I've prepared a statement because I thought that was the preferred way to do it. And since I've sat through three hours I'm going to go ahead and read it. And if you all don't mind, I'd prefer to address the majority.

There is no doubt that the proposed downtown development plan will lead to increased density and congestion in Evanston, altering the City's character and quality of life.

While I have lived in Evanston for only five years, I have been attracted to this city since arriving in the Chicago area in 1993. I made it a point to visit the downtown area a number of times in the past two weeks. I quickly noticed how much the City has changed already in ways...
that I consider negative: more cars, aggressive driving, more honking, and numerous police officers on the streets on the weekends. Our downtown is already quite congested.

While some of these changes that have occurred may be considered positive, more restaurants, shops, and increased vibrancy, changes for the worst are also present, including traffic, noise, pollution, and greater demands on City services. I can't imagine what kind of Fire Department we're going to have to pay for with a 49-story building.

The new plan will, without doubt, accelerate these negative byproducts of rapid growth. Before we proceed with this plan I believe that all Evanstonians, City officials, and elected representatives need to consider the following points.

First and most basic, Evanston is in a very coveted location. We are the first community north of Chicago next to the lake with easy access to the L and the Metra. This is precisely the reason the developers want to build a skyscraper and more high-rises in our downtown. Our prime location, however, means that we should not be acting like an underdeveloped nation.
desperately seeking foreign investment.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Excuse me.

MR. SANCHEZ: I wasn't expecting applause.

But thanks anyway.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: No applause. You know the rules. And let me make one other statement here.

Everybody has to understand that what we're talking about today, the downtown plan, ultimately has nothing to do, by City Council decision, with 708 Church. They're unrelated.

MR. SANCHEZ: Can I continue?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: He may have not said it literally, but we all know what he was talking about.

MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. I have to catch my place. Sorry.

Are we really in such an economic crisis to warrant frittering away the City's enviable quality of life?

I agree with architects and developers that the planning process should be streamlined and more predictable for both residents and developers. But this has nothing to do with the increased density that the new plan allows. We need to negotiate from the position
of strength, making planning more predictable and
preserve our City's character. The City should ensure
that buildings are kept as low as possible and that
higher buildings are allowed only after receiving clear
and substantial benefits.

Second, City government has not adequately
explained to the residents why we must open up the City
to high-rise development. We hear mention of the need
for a larger tax base. But I have seen nothing to date
that clearly and in detail lays out why we must trade
our City's character for a larger tax base. Without
convincing proof that we are in financial crisis we
should never accept a plan that will forever change our
City. City officials and elected representatives,
therefore, owe us a clear and precise explanation for
the need to approve a new development plan. Also, even
if we agree that we are in financial crisis, we should
explore all options to get out of that crisis before we
accept an option that will forever change the City.

Third, even if we ultimately decide that we
need to accept more growth and density, we should not
rush approval of a new development plan. The last plan
was approved in 1989, 18 years ago. That plan has
allowed for both growth and the preservation of historic buildings. Neither we nor the developers are going anywhere. There is no need to rush. We should never, in any case, rush a plan for the benefit of non-residents, especially if residents are not fully convinced that it is our only option.

Fourth, any new plan sure to change the City must have full and effective resident participation. Simply allowing residents to attend so-called visioning sessions or allowing residents to speak out at an open forum as we're doing right now does not translate into effective resident participation. Visioning sessions and venues like tonight's meeting are meaningless unless resident concerns are incorporated into the decisions that the City makes. Democracy isn't just the ability to vent, but the ability to affect policy outcome. If most residents are against the new development plan, yet it is still approved, the process was patently undemocratic regardless of how many times citizens are allowed to vent in public sessions.

Finally, the City and elected representatives must make every effort to inform residents fully when they are undertaking a plan that will transform their
City. The current plan, even though available in libraries and on-line, is not truly accessible to residents in that it is long and involves many complex issues, some of which are not even addressed in the plan itself. All aldermen should be engaged in a dialogue with their constituents. The City should have asked the consultants to put together a summary of the key elements of the plan, thus making the plan more accessible. Residents should be fully informed as to why we must have growth, what the alternatives are, and what the cost and benefits are before any major step is taken. And some of this downtown plan should be put on hold until the policy process is carried on properly. The City and residents of Evanston will both be the better for it. Thank you.

MR. BRUGLIERA: Vito Brugliera, 1304 Wesley, engineer by training.

I make only one comment in that regards, preserving buildings. The most ecological and greenest use is to reuse a building. Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Jeff Smith, 2724 Harrison.

And I'll start by echoing what Vito said. I agree completely. And I think Bill McKibben has made a
habit of using that as a mantra, that the greenest building is one that's already built. You can't grow your way to greenness.

I'll limit my comments to the RD zones and the traditional zones, although some things apply to more than one.

First of all, I'm in favor of many elements of the plan. The form-based coding, I think, is a good thing in general, although I'm not in favor of totaling abandoning references to what are proper uses. I think that a city has an obligation, especially in its downtown, to do more than just say, well, as long as it looks nice, we don't care what's in it. The whole purpose of zoning, at least originally, is to try and determine what's a good place for something and what's a bad place for something.

I love the elimination of site development allowances as they're referred to in the plan. Planned development allowances, I think there's a general consensus that those have been, I'll say, abused.

Upper floor stepbacks are a positive thing. Having the three types of districts as a basic format for looking at downtown made a lot of sense. And I
think the boundaries of the districts are by and large sensible.

There's a lot of good things, a lot of good observations to like in this plan. There's even some of, what I would arguably say, is down zoning. Although on the balance, I think the plan amounts to more up zoning in its current format than down zoning.

I'm going to give to the Commission, because this wasn't in the plan, there was a lot of useful data. You can each pass these down. There was a lot of useful data, including some charts and graphics of the current zoning and of the proposed zoning.

But there was nothing that was the equivalent of what the planners called the fallen souffle map to show what it would look like in a three-dimensional sense if everything was built up to the new proposed base heights. And it was hard to compare what exists, what can be built now in a particular zone over.

And so I took the liberty of overlaying the current zoning map with the proposed new base heights. And it would be better if I had more sophisticated mapping tools and I could put it in 3-D or with different colors. And with more time and unlimited
wealth, I indeed could do that. But, but I could not.

So this, you'll have to make do with the numbers. The numbers here, and I wish I could put this up in Power Point, but basically what it's showing is that in some of the transitional zones we've got a minor lowerance of the base height. In a few sub-portions of the traditional zones we've got a significant lowering of the base height, although that's somewhat illusory because nobody's going to tear down the Orrington Hotel, for example. And so I say that. You know, we don't know. We don't know.

And one of the points I'd like to make is that there's some assumptions made in the plan as to what are development opportunities. And that sort of assumes that only the development opportunities will get developed. Well, maybe it's because I think like a developer. I see opportunity everywhere. I'm an eternal optimist, believe it or not. And so I look at something and I say, this could be developed.

In fact, and since I've lived in Evanston, every place that I've looked at that I thought could be developed and that I would have liked to develop had I had the capital, has been developed successfully,
including places that people said, nobody will ever want
to develop that. Who'd want to live in an old storage
building on the other side of Green Bay Road, you know?
So I think it's important to look at what could be
developed under new base zoning.

And most of the map amounts to significant
increases in base height. And that's even using a
conservative estimate of 12 feet per story. I think
that's a conservative estimate because we had an
argument the other night as to whether you could, and I
think Commissioner Wood said you can't build a three-
story building at only 32 feet. So I'm assuming you
need a little over 12 feet or more to build a story.
And in fact the Chase Bank building only goes up to 20
stories. That's 27, that's 275 feet. So that's almost
14 feet a story. So all my numbers here, in fact a lot
of the negative numbers, would disappear. And then all
the numbers would be higher if you assume that.

And some people, for that matter, I mean,
there's no limit on what a story could be by definition.
Some people would say the Eiffel Tower is a three-story
building because it's got three stages. Of course it's
not a building, it's a tower.
But anyway, I think some of the transitional
districts are perhaps going a little too tall or maybe a
lot too tall closer to residential. But overall, again,
I like the concept of the three districts.

With regard to these districts in particular,
I'm a little concerned by the discussion in the
objectives because it says that the number one goal is
to maintain the, basically maintain what we refer to as
the traditional districts. And the second goal is
talking about the human scale and attractiveness of the
traditional areas. But under objective one it gets
renamed, optimize economic development. And then it
says that we should develop Sherman south of Davis,
Davis east of Orrington, and Orrington north of Davis,
which are about our three most traditional downtown
streets, and make them active, open, two-sided
commercial streets.

Maybe it's a matter of semantics, but because
these semantics in the plan end up getting implemented
when we get to the nuts and bolts of zoning, if that's
not what's meant, perhaps it should be cleared up.
Because I thought the point of this plan was to
preserve, by and large, the look and feel and the
Another comment I would have along with that is that something that I don't see mentioned in this plan is what's called view corridors, which is an urban planning term referring to what you can see when you're in a certain place. And part of the attractiveness in the feel of even a traditional area is what you see when you're in it, not just in the, you know, half block up and down, but in the distance.

For example, in San Francisco, in the east San Francisco plan, they'd take some pictures of what you can see from certain vantage points and what will be seen if it's built.

The people who were planning Ann Arbor in their redevelopment plan, which recently came up with a fairly similar type of concept to what we're talking about now, actually had animations with fly throughs, which you can find on-line. And you can zoom through the streets. And they show as it looks now. And then if it went up to this level, if it went up to this level, and if it went up to this level.

And that software's been out there for three years. And I'm not saying that, you know, we should
throw a lot more money into animations and graphs, but it's interesting to look at those.

And I don't see any real mention of the view corridors right now. And some of these traditional view corridors could be wiped out if right next to them are some extremely tall skyscrapers.

I agree with a lot of the objectives. Obviously, nobody's going to argue with sustainable green buildings or a strong multi-modal transportation system. But as I said with the Central Street plan, it comes down to how the zoning implements that.

And what I'm concerned about is that the most concrete things coming out of this plan mainly have to do with the density bonuses and the form-based zoning that's in Chapter 8 of the plan. And most of the other things, the things that we all like so much, the pictures of beautiful parks and the way the pavers and everything could look, is not necessarily enforceable.

And we could be in a situation where the City says, well, we just don't have any of the money for that. But meanwhile the other stuff's on the books. And so we get the things we don't like. And we don't get the things that sold us on what we do like unless we
try and make it part of zoning, in which case Bill Dunkley's saying, oh, we can't do that through zoning. You can't say, you know, we have to have these kind of bricks, etcetera. I mean, you can do it, but my concern is that unless it's made part of the Ordinance or made more specific in the plan, it's not enough, the meat.

Objective two is especially important for the traditional and transitional areas. It says, like many previous plans, that we should encourage rehab and adaptive reuse. Unfortunately I don't see anything in the plan that's really, well, it's certainly not mandating it. But I don't know how you encourage it.

I just have a few general observations about the plan, some of which apply to other areas. But these apply to the RD and the traditional zones as well. Is that I'd like to see all plans have some end state goals.

A word that's used a lot in this plan is striving towards optimal. But it doesn't say what optimal is. To me a plan, when I make a vacation plan, it has a destination. I suppose you could say we're just going to have some sort of strategy and we'll see where we are in 10 years. And we'll go on and go on.
But I think at some point, Evanston's landlocked unless we, Northwestern starts building a lot more -- which I would oppose.

And so, you know, we are limited. And there is an excellent history given at this story on 708, the hearing on 708 Church, of Evanston's population and how we've gone up and down and this and that. A biologist looking at Evanston would say, well, we've already achieved our optimal population. And that's why we tend to go, hover up and down a little bit above and below it. Because for the number of square miles that we have, it's a pretty good number. And that's why so many people want to live here. But if you let everybody live here who wants to live here, it won't be desirable anymore. It's like Yogi Beara said, you know, nobody goes there anymore. It's too crowded.

I would like to know when is population overpopulation for this town? When is dense too dense? I would like to see a finding before we encourage new growth that downtown has insufficient residents or insufficient traffic or insufficient cars. Perhaps we are already at or past optimal.
If we're going to largely abandon zoning as a way to guide uses, what goes into buildings, then I'd like to see some references to the theory. And perhaps the consultants could, you know, give us that. I'm sure they have the backup where it's been tried in other cities. How has that worked out? Have people been happy? Or do they find out that in fact you don't end up with the general merchandise store you like.

I thought the marketing survey in this plan was fascinating. Because it really doesn't show a lot of growth in businesses. It doesn't show a lot of decline. It shows that there's been some ups and downs. But since 1990, I think, was the base line, and then there was an interim number, what we've largely done is swap out general merchandise stores, food, apparel, drugs, etcetera, for restaurants. And maybe that's not necessarily a bad thing, but you know, I can't eat out every night. So I'd like to see a little more sociological discussion.

There's in the traditional, especially in the RD3 zone, I was concerned about putting high-rises next to Mount Zion Church and surrounding it with a lot of dense mass. And the church is, this was once called the
City of Churches. It was also called the City of Homes.
I don't think we can adopt a policy as a city that says we're going to foster churches. There's 1st Amendment problems with that. But neither can we have a policy that, you know, seeks to, you know, burden them as well. But I think they are part of our social fabric in the downtown structure, given that the only museum officially that we have is the Francis Willard House. Preserving the churches is part of the fabric. At least they're not providing an incentive to do a tear down on a church, I think is important.

I would liked to see the word African-American or black appear once in the plan. There's the word, a minority, and homeless. Affordable housing doesn't really appear until Section 8 in the bonus densities.

So I think we need to really think about the ripple effect on Evanston land values. The only real discussion of that was in the market study where Ms. Goodman said that putting 2,000 new units into downtown Evanston should increase the values of other Evanston homes.

And I had a hard time getting my head around that. I could think of some possible explanations. But
sort of, at least on the surface, it violates the most
fundamental principles of supply and demand, which is
that if you increase the supply, price goes down.

And given that 30 percent of the condo owners
are said to be Evanstonians who are relocating, I would
have like to see more discussion of the current market
conditions and the at least near future and what may be
long future conditions in the housing slump.

On the one hand, the plan says very
optimistically, I think, that you know, we will continue
to have demand in Evanston. If that's so, then I think
we need to be less concerned with all these things that
we say stop development. We're saying, oh, if you put
all these controls, then nobody will build anything.
I think that Katrina could happen in Evanston and people
would still want to develop here. Because nobody's
making anymore lake front. Nobody's building anymore
train lines. And it's still going to be largely a
desirable place to build and a desirable place to come.

The devil's in the details when it comes to
density bonuses. And the entire success or failure of a
cap and bonus plan depends on where the base zoning is
set, which is one of the reasons I passed out that map.
I would encourage everybody to take a look at three recent articles in the Austin Chronicle by Katherine Gregor, G-r-e-g-o-r. Austin, Texas just adopted a plan with density bonuses very similar to our. Austin, of course, is the state capital. But it's also a college town. And significantly, the planners there spent a lot of time talking with the people out in Portland, which also has a bonus density, although I think they have 150-foot cap that they've put in. And I won't reiterate what Ms. Gregor says, but it's about one of the best, at least public media discussions of form-based, excuse me, not form-based, but these issues that we've seen.

As a general principle I have a problem with questions that don't ask the right questions. You have to, if you want the right answers in planning, you have to ask the right questions. To me asking what Evanston can handle is not the right question. If we want to get to what's optimal, what's best, what is the most livable, what is the most walkable? We've got a slogan on our website that we're going to be the most livable city in America. So the question isn't, what can you handle? Somebody could ask me,
Jeff, could you go the next 24 hours without food or sleep, you know, working on planning issues or zoning issues? Now see, I could handle that, you know. But if you ask me, would that be the best thing for me or for you guys, no, it wouldn't be. So I think it's important to sort of re-examine the question.

I've read a lot of these plans. I'm not a planner. I don't even play one on tv. But, I by now have gone out, looked at Portland and Fort Collins and Austin and Santa Monica and East San Francisco and four different sections of Atlanta, etcetera, etcetera, and it appears that there's a new rhetoric of planning. And I like a lot of the smart growth principles, although I'm not completely sold on it. Because I'm not sure that smart growth isn't an oxymoron.

But what I've discovered is that every single plan these days is buying into the, at least the rhetoric of these. And you know, this is not with any disrespect to Mr. LaMotte and the team he assembled, but I am convinced that if we were given a plan that called for an eight-lane super highway down the middle of downtown Evanston, it would still begin and end by saying that the goal is to make downtown more livable.
and walkable.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Can the eight-lane highway go
east-west so we can get to the tollway?

MR. SMITH: So we can get to the tollway?

Yeah. But what I'm trying to say, what I'm trying to
say is that when I was kid we had spin too. It had
different words. What I was promised when I was a kid
was that all the growth of that era when they were doing
all the building was going to lead to cities with flying
robots and moving sidewalks and quiet, lightning-fast
anti-gravitational monorails. And here we are years
later. And instead of a kid I'm a young adult. And
instead of moving sidewalks what we have are states and
cities with no way to pay for their crumbling bridges
and roads. And instead of monorails we have CTA service
cuts. So I'm concerned that the verses have changed,
but the song remains the same. And the only chorus
that's consistent is growth, growth, growth and
development, development, development with a different
rationale.

We talk about optimizing economic development.

When I go downtown I see Optima Towers and Optima
Horizons and Optima Views. So some could say that
Evanston's already been --

CHAIRMAN WOODS: Optimized plenty.

MR. SMITH: Okay? The speaker before me asked me, why are the heights different in some of the traditional zones? And in all seriousness, and I'm not saying that the planners are doing a bad thing, but it appears that what the plan is doing by and large, and I'm here even talking just about the traditional and transitional districts, it's following what's been done.

And the word that you see over and over in the plan, if we're going to deconstruct it like it was an English essay, is relevant. And the problem I have with that is that I would rather a plan be citizen driven and community driven rather than seeking to ratify or codify the status quo or the very soon-to-be status quo. That rather than say, well, it's been done, I guess I'm an old-fashioned person in the sense that I prefer prescriptive to descriptive dictionaries.

So when the plan says that the height limits have been exploited through the planned development process, I of course agree. But I don't agree with saying, well, so the old zoning's no longer relevant. I think it's very relevant. If people were going 75 miles
an hour down Ridge Boulevard every day we wouldn't say, oh well, the speed limit's no longer relevant. Let's make it 75. We'd say, no, let's enforce the speed limit.

And a city has an option of doing that. If we do that I don't think we'll chase development away. I think Evanston will still be a good place to build. But it will be an even better place to live.

CHAIRMAN WOODS: And as it is two of eleven, I'm going to cut this off right now. And we're going to continue this on November 27th at 7 p.m.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Could you comment on the format of the next meeting, as this format probably caught some citizens perhaps off guard?

CHAIRMAN WOODS: The format of the next meeting will be to continue the discussion of the residential downtown zones and the traditional areas and then get into downtown core. And then at the end of the downtown core will be a chance for open comment.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: And will the, there's one -- on page 23. There's additional documentation mentioned. It's in the real estate market section. So is that going to be available to us at
that?

MR. BISHOP: Yes. We think that will be available on Friday. We'll have it on-line Friday and in the libraries, in the Clerk's Office and in the Planning Office. So we'll do that as quickly as we can. (Whereupon, the hearing in the above-titled cause was concluded at 11:00 p.m.)