CITY OF EVANSTON

PLAN COMMISSION

RE: CONTINUATION - DRAFT DOWNTOWN PLAN AND ZONING RECOMMENDATIONS

RE: ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT PUBLIC HEARING

ZPC 07-06-T B1 District (Special Uses). To consider amendments to the text of the Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 9, 'Business Districts' (and any other related sections), to affect those regulations regarding the B1 Business District, including though not limited to, amending '6-9-2-3: SPECIAL USES.

Transcribed Report of Proceedings of a public hearing on the above captioned matter, held February 13, 2008 at the Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, 2nd Floor, Evanston, Illinois, at 7:00 p.m. and presided over by S. Opdycke, Vice Chairman.
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D. MARINO             J. AIELLO

C. RUIZ             B. DUNKLEY
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: We will call the
meeting to order. There is a quorum. I'm Stu Opdycke,
I'm Vice Chair of the Plan Commission. I'm serving as
Chair tonight in the absence of Jim Woods who could not
be with us.

First order of business is approval of the
minutes of the January 16 meeting. Is there a motion?
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Motion to approve?
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Is there a -- yes,
that's what I mean. Is that a motion?
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes.
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Is there a
second?
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Second.
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All those in favor?
(Chorus of ayes.)
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All those opposed?
(No response.)
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: The next item, number
III is the Election of Officers. You may recall that at
our last meeting, we held an informal luncheon of the
Plan Commission officers and committee chairs. And I
say informal because it was an official agenda item but
we had an election nevertheless.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Could I move that we legally affirm that election?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, just one moment and I will ask for a motion. But the results of that election are as follows: Jim Woods was nominated as Chair, Stu Opdycke as Vice Chair. Colleen Burrus is Chair of the Rules Committee. Johanna Nyden, Chair of the Zoning Committee. Larry Widmayer, Chair of the Downtown Plan. And Al Hunter who is rejoining us as an Associate Member to serve as the Chair of the Neighborhood Committee.

And the following nominations to serve as liaisons were also made. They include Colleen Burrus as Housing and Development Committee, Dave Galloway-Parking, and Johanna Nyden-Economic Development Committee. And all those nominations were received and approved unanimously. And I am seeking now for a motion to ratify the approval.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Associate members? Don't you have --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, we're appointed as Associate Members.
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All right. Larry and Al were approved as Associate Members.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Committee Chairs but also as Associate Members.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All right. And, okay. So, with that addition, is there a motion to ratify or approve the election of officers and the appointment of Associate Members of the Plan Commission?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: That's a motion. Is there a second.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Second.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All those in favor? (Chorus of ayes.)

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Opposed? (No response.)

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All right. Now, we have item number V on the agenda is the Zoning Ordinance Proposed Text Amendment. And I'm going to --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Can I ask a question?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: We were given the January 9th minutes this afternoon. Are we approving those in
this meeting or will we be approving those next meeting?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: There was some note
about possibly we might want to do it later, wasn't
there?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, might as well
just wait for the whole transcript.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: For the transcript --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, why don't we
approve the minutes as submitted to us? And perhaps at
our next meeting we can include any additions to the
January 9th minutes? So, you had the chance to read
them?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, but let's not
approve them. Just leave them until next time because
if you approve them as amended at the time, you can
approve them in an --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: So, we're backing up
then?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: If I understand --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: We're backing up on
the agenda. We will consider again the approval of the
January 16 minutes. Somebody want to undo their motion
and second?
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, no, no.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: We're talking about the 9th.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Not the 16th. The 9th is not on the agenda.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: The one before that, the regular meeting.

MR. MARINO: So we just table the 9th until the next month?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: They're not on the agenda anyway.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: That's not even on the agenda.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I know, but she's just pointing that out.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: We just, actually, could we have a note to put them on the agenda for the next meeting?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All right. Getting back to the item number V on the agenda which considers the amendment to the B1 District to add, I think, single family residence to Special Uses. I know it sailed through Committee and I want to see if there is any
interest amongst the public in attendance tonight on this particular amendment. And if so, I would like to know the extent of that interest. And if not, is there an interest among the members of the Plan Commission to get into a debate regarding the merits of the amendment?

With that in mind, I'd like to take item number V as the next agenda item and turn it over to Arlova.

MS. JACKSON: Sure. It's a citizen-driven text amendment request that would add single-family detached to the special uses to the B1 District. In your packet, you have the transcript of the Zoning Committee meeting on January 9th and two staff reports which basically talk about the impact in terms of the number of single-family detached residences that already exist in the B1 Districts and I guess as a way to assess what the impact of change would be.

It was requested because a property owner of a single-family home in B1 District under the current ordinance isn't allowed to make any structural alterations. And therefore, they wanted to do, you know, a simple dormer addition but there is no avenue for them to proceed. So, to give them an opportunity to
maintain their property, the ones that already exist, but not to diminish the character of the neighborhood business type uses where you have the ground floor level retail, upper level residential, we decided it was a better idea to add to the special uses instead of permitted uses. So, they still have to go through a review process if someone wanted to add to a single-family detached. I don't know if the owner is here but that was the gist of it.

And there's draft findings in your staff report and I just want to make a correction at the bottom of page 2. It says that the amendment will also add a housing type to the list of 'permitted', that should be 'special uses' in the B1 District.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Is there any discussion? Any questions?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Is it my understanding then that at any time, any residents in the B1 District subsequent to our docking this amendment would then have to go before the Zoning Committee to approve any alternations if they were proposed?

MS. JACKSON: Yes. As opposed to nothing.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: As opposed to nothing,
okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I mean, the poor guy wants to put a dormer on his house and that's a nonconforming legal use. But he can't even put a dormer on there unless we change this to a special use to be able to do that.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: If he's approved.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: And there are some 25 similar properties other than that that are situated so. So, will we move to approve first or, Joanna, would you be prepared to read the findings?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Okay. This here?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes, right up there, 6-3-4-5.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Okay. 6-3-4-5, Standard for Amendments, The wisdom of amending the text of the Zoning Ordinance or the Zoning Map is a matter committed to the sound legislative discretion of the City Council and is not controlled by any one standard. In making their determination, however, the City Council should, in determining whether to adopt or deny, or to adopt
Based on the documents and exhibits and testimony placed on file in connection with this case, we, the Plan Commission, find that the proposed text amendment meets the following standards for approval:

A. Whether the proposed amendment is consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan as adopted and amended from time to time by the City Council.

The proposed amendment supports several goals, policies and objectives of the Comprehensive General Plan. Please include the following:

Goal: help to enhance the existing assets of neighborhoods while recognizing that each neighborhood contributes to the overall socioeconomic quality of Evanston. Objective: recognize the benefits of annexing residential, commercial and institutional uses in the neighborhoods. Policy/Action: preserving the character while supporting the development efforts that add to neighborhood desirability.

Objective: recognize the effect of housing on
the quality of neighborhoods. Policy/Action: support
efforts aimed at improving Evanston housing stock. The
proposed text amendment will support the efforts of
existing single-family detached residential homeowners
to stay in the community and make improvements to their
property. Currently, owners of such uses have no
ability to make additions or structural alterations to
their homes. The amendment will help preserve existing
residential uses and support their continued use and
maintenance.

Goal: maintain and enhance the desirability
and range of choices in terms of style and price that
the housing stock offers both buyers and renters.
Objective: maintain and enhance property values and
positive perceptions of housing in Evanston.
Policy/Action: encourage collaboration among
neighborhood stakeholders, property owners, residents,
businesses and institutions and staff to improve housing
conditions that are negatively impacting surrounding
property values. Policy/Action: support individual
property owners and neighborhood-based businesses
engaged in efforts aimed at improving Evanston's housing
stock.
The proposed text amendment will directly assist homeowners of single-family detached housing in B1 Districts by providing a mechanism to make improvements to their property. The amendment will also add a housing type to the list of permitted uses in the B1 District, increasing the range of housing options. Goal: retain and enhance the diversity of business, commercial and industrial areas as desirable locations of economic activity. Objective: promote the growth and redevelopment of business, commercial and industrial areas.

Policy/Action: encourage the location of new or expanding businesses in existing commercial and mixed use locations that would benefit from redevelopment including the Evanston Plaza, Dodge Avenue and Dempster Street. Objective: recognize and support the strong role that neighborhood business districts play in Evanston's economy and its identity. Policy/Action: protect and enhance the traditional character of neighborhood business districts, carefully examine proposed design changes using the zoning and design ordinances and site plan and appearance review.

The proposed amendment will protect the
existing neighborhood business uses by limiting new
single-family detached residential uses to approval via
a special use process. This will help preserve the
class character and maintain the stability of the existing
business districts while providing an avenue for the
construction of new and the rehabilitation of existing
residential uses.

B. Whether the proposed amendment is compatible with
the overall character of existing development in
the immediate vicinity of the subject property.

There are approximately 25 single-family
detached residential uses located in the B1 Business
District representing 11.5 percent of all structures.
The proposed text amendment will not change the
class character of the existing districts by introducing new
uses that don't currently exist in the area. In
addition, if new single-family detached uses seek to
locate in the district, they will have to go through a
public hearing process and meet the standards for
special use approval.

C. Whether the proposed amendment will have an adverse
effect on the value of adjacent properties.

The proposed amendment will not have an
adverse effect on adjacent property values as it will allow owners to make improvements to existing single-family detached residential uses. Such uses would not diminish the value of existing business, but instead serve to further support them.

D. **The adequacy of public facilities and services.**

The proposed text amendment will not place undue strain on existing public facilities and services. The proposed amendment will allow for new residential uses to be developed. It will not introduce new ones that are not currently present nor will it increase permitted density or land use intensity.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I move to approve.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Second.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All those in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Opposed?

(No response.)

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Motion carries. All right. That takes care of item number V.

Now, we move to item number IV which is a
Continuation of the Draft Downtown Plan and Zoning Recommendations.

We closed public comment, you may recall, January 16th. And it is now to the Commission members to discuss amongst ourselves the merits of the various sections of the draft plan. But before we do that, I'd like to get a status from Dennis and perhaps from John or Kurt as to where we are.

MR. MARINO: Right. First of all, I just want to call attention to the outline that you received on December 14th. Tracy distributed additional copies of that this evening. This is intended to be our guide which we started using at the last meeting as we worked through the plan.

And what we did at the last meeting is really address Objective 1 at some length and part of Objective 2. And what we're going to do tonight is turn it over shortly to Kurt who is going to walk us through some of the editing that already has occurred with Objective 1 and then to walk us through the rest of the process.

I also want to acknowledge Judith Aiello who is here tonight, the Assistant City Manager. Judy is here pretty much as a resource for us. She has been our
staff leader in the Downtown for the last few decades. And she's an incredible person who is experienced in sort of a layer of so many different things going on in the Downtown. So, we thank her for being here tonight and encourage her participation and encourage you all as members to ask questions of her as well as we go forward.

We also have Carlos Ruiz here who will give us an update related to Objective 2 in terms of what's going on with the Preservation Commission. And then we have Bill Dunkley who is one of key zoning experts to help us in terms of the current zoning and where we are. So, I think at that point, Stu, if it's okay with you, I'll turn it over to Kurt.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes. How many decades is that, Ms. Aiello?

MS. AIELLO: That would be three --

MR. BISHOP: Thank you, Dennis. Mr. Chairman, Plan Commission members, one of the many things that we began to discuss last time was the desirability of maybe making some of your suggested changes to the draft plan sort of real time. And so we're going to try and accommodate that tonight.
The thing that I just passed out and is also displayed on the screen in front of us are our attempts to reflect the comments and suggestions that we heard from the group last time, focusing on building reuse and rehabilitation as one of the key ways in which new businesses, changes in character could be accommodated Downtown. Perhaps, I think the thinking was that too much emphasis on new development as opposed to rehabilitation and reuse, more of an emphasis on independent retail and service businesses in the Downtown, use of under-utilized spaces, some adjustments to the language regarding the recommendation that's in the plan for exploration of the two-way street concept along portions of Sherman and Orrington Avenue, and a bullet point or two addressing a range of housing types for people of various incomes, age levels, ability levels and so forth.

We've inserted a placeholder as a major objective to flesh out this rehabilitation reuse, adaptive reuse concept at your last meeting. The Landmarks Commission representatives sort of volunteered at your suggestion to sort of take that on, to more fully develop, so all we have at the moment are...
placeholders. So, really just in short, what I've
distributed tonight and all we've done to date is to try
and reflect some of the comments and suggestions that
we've heard last time.

Among the many things you may want to discuss
tonight is if we got that right, if we dialed in those
adjustments correct. But otherwise, we stand ready to,
as possible, try and make suggested changes on the fly
real time tonight. There may be other instances where
some more further sort of thought will be required and
we'll diligently take those notes and be prepared to
share them with you at our next meeting to the extent we
aren't able to perfect proposed language change tonight.

MR. LAMOTTE: And just one other quick thing
is just keep following our outline as far as I think it
might be easier on everybody to just keep chipping away
point by point by point so we're in the objective zone
so to speak, going to Objective 1, 2, 3, 4. Okay?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: So, did we get through
Objective 3? I notice the blue words are new, is that
correct?

MR. BISHOP: That is correct. The underlined
text is of course proposed new language. Strikethrough,
of course, proposed deletions of old language.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Under the Goal section, something appears to be missing, correct me if I'm wrong. Before Objective 1, we have "Based on this goal, Downtown Evanston in 10 years will be:", and one bullet point we had added right in the goal section part of the adaptive reuse and preservation and then are going to use some of the language from the Downtown Plan regarding reuse on page 78 and 79.

MR. BISHOP: 78, 79?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, that was going to be a goal and its own objective, but I think it was supposed to go on the goals.

MR. BISHOP: Yes. I think we missed your intention to add that as a goal. Happy to do it.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay. Yes, just pop it in.

MR. BISHOP: We did, as you can see there, include that to the placeholder.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, I know, I saw that.

MR. BISHOP: The language from the 1989 --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. So, can you
just pop it in the goal now and we can move on?

MR. BISHOP: And so, the goal would be, will be --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: You should see the transcript for it to get it exactly. But if you just put a placeholder saying "A goal regarding adaptive reuse and preservation as a goal" --

MR. BISHOP: All right.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Now, weren't we going to wait for Preservation to sort of weigh in --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, they're going to put in, it was going to be a goal and they're going to fill it in as the goal. And we're going to use similar language from the '89 plan. So, Carlos should get us a more specific bullet point but I just wanted it in there so we knew it would be filled in. Just, again --

MR. LAMOTTE: A placeholder.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, placeholder.

Exactly.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, and I think that's the key thing because if we can wordsmith now quickly and
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, then we can later on say, oh, what's the --

MR. LAMOTTE: If not, we just make sure that we always redline where we're going to slip something in.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, great.

That's how it should work well.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Are there any comments about Objective No. 1? I mean, take a little time and look at the additions there. And we may well have covered all of that but see if there are any items you have questions about on Objective No. 1.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Chairman, if I could? I don't know if this is a good time to say but I just thought at the end of the session, you know, packets for the next session, if we can get a print out of this, then we can make sure at the beginning of the next meeting, oh, everything is sort of, we have gotten their changes on Friday.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right. Right.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: That would be
really handy if we could check ahead of time and then we
just come and say, oh, this, this and this. So, as we
move forward, maybe we can get a change sheet ahead of
time in color.

MR. LAMOTTE: Sure.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, because this is
really helpful having the draft changes in the blue.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: It's great. It's
fantastic.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: It's very helpful.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, I mean, if we can, when
you've got a short bullet point, if we can wordsmith it
right here it would be great and then we're done.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Oh, yes. But if
not --

MR. LAMOTTE: But when we have to go and do
some cleanups, especially one of the things is the
format. If someone says, well, here's five pages from
the old plan, we can boil it down --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: You don't want to sit
here and type really fast?

MR. LAMOTTE: And talk at the same time?
MR. BISHOP: I don't know if you're going to get your money's worth.

MR. LAMOTTE: But I think the key is, you know, let's just, and if we're taking parts of this, as the Chairman is doing, this is an objective and if we're all good, and then the changes that he made. And I think this is also a strategy where we're giving guidance to the outside world that we want to see a mix of things in these buildings, mixed strategies accommodating little guys, big guys, local and national and region.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Any comments on 1? If not, we'll move on to 3.

MR. MARINO: Carlos, is this a good point to just give us an update in terms of the process you're following with the Preservation Commission?

MR. RUIZ: Sure. I wonder if everybody had the opportunity to check your email this afternoon --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: What time?

MR. RUIZ: Around 3:30 or so. But I have hard copies here so I'm going to circulate these.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, we may do some redundant double checking as we're going around the conversation.
just to make sure that we are scratching it off the list
like --

MR. MARINO: How are people doing with the
glare of the lights? Should we try and turn the lights
out on that side? Or are we okay?

MR. LAMOTTE: Can you split the lights? Can
you split it half and half?

MR. MARINO: We can, we can.

MR. LAMOTTE: That's better, yes. Yes.

MR. BISHOP: Easier on the eyes.

MR. RUIZ: Okay. So, first of all, I'll
quickly review what the Chairman of the Preservation
Commission put together with my participation at the
same extent that basically we wanted to do something
before this meeting and they didn't have the opportunity
to meet as a commission because I was mentioning this
next week. But he wanted to even put a first overview
of this new text as **Objective No. 2**. And Objective No.
2 is defined as "**Protect and Rehabilitate Character**
Giving Building Structures and Sites. **Promote the**
rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of buildings and sites
that provide historical and architectural context to the
Downtown."
The Commission also was asked to develop some strategies and we listed five of them.

1. Establish a Downtown Conservation Overlay District coinciding with the traditional zones to provide additional guidance and architectural controls in those areas deemed to provide the greatest amount of historical and architectural context to the Downtown.

2. Extend Evanston's Facade Retention Program to buildings in the Downtown.

3. Establish a Rehabilitation/Adaptive Reuse Fund from funds contributed through the bonus system for new Downtown developments which seeks to match funds from existing owners who desire to rehabilitate and/or adaptively reuse existing structures and sites. The Fund will be administered jointly by the Preservation and Plan Commissions.

4. Encourage and promote the designation of additional local landmarks from 10 properties identified in the Downtown Evanston Building Condition Survey Preliminary Report as prepared by the Preservation Commission.

5. Promote the use of existing local and federal
facade retention programs.

So, those are the strategies. And at this point, I'd like to make sure that we're still exploring what is out there because we know of the, for instance the Federal Register programs like the 25 percent tax credit. We know of the Cook County Class L and we know about the facade easement through the Land Mass Illinois. But we want to put addendums to this so that people who are reading the documents can actually refer to those documents either directly from the Plan or make referrals to either the Plan Commission or the Preservation Commission to get that information.

And then, we've provided a bit of narrative at the second paragraph about the character and the businesses that are in the Downtown. We have exhibits of the 29 locally designated landmarks. We also identified another 10 buildings that were originally deemed to be landmark worthy. And also, we refer back to the 1990 Downtown Plan. There's a reference that earlier that Ms. Schudlenfrei made as far as the retention of landmarks.

And the last paragraph, we are introducing the Facade Retention Program that we are recommending to
establish a fund to be available to buildings owners who
wish to participate and take advantage of working
directly with the City staff, the Plan Commission and
the Preservation Commission. At this point, we are
promoting a 50 percent participation so that there would
be a limit on the amount and also in terms of the number
of store fronts.

So, this is where we are at this point.

Again, we're going to bring this back to the
Preservation Commission as a full commission next week.
And we already sent an email to request their
additional comments and text that they would like to
include, any other suggestions they would like to make.
And we would like to come back with additional
information and additional text and we'll be looking
forward to hear your comments even at this preliminary
stage.

I don't know if we're going to be able to have
a special meeting after the 19th to continue working on
this, but we will be trying to keep up at the pace that
the Commission is going on this point, the Plan
Commission. If you have any questions about the current
text, I'd be happy to answer them.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: This looks really good. We had talked also at the last meeting about a glossary of terms or something at the end, what did we call it?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: A glossary.

MR. RUIZ: Yes. We didn't get to that point yet.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, I just wanted to see where --

MR. RUIZ: We will do that.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: It's on your --

MR. RUIZ: It's on our things to do.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right. And I think it wasn't just for Preservation but we would have other stuff as well.

MR. RUIZ: Yes, it was --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: A zoning glossary.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right. Yes. This is --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I think it's an excellent start.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Fabulous.
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: It's more information than I expected tonight.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENREI: And thanks for so quickly as well.

MR. RUIZ: Well, we try. Yes, actually Jordan Cramer took the initiative to, you know, do it this day even though he didn't have enough time, we were able to put it together.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Thank Goodness for email.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Larry?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, I'd like to know more about how a Conservation Overlay District would work.

MR. RUIZ: We already have provided that information to the Conservation District by the way and if you recall -- with regard to being in the National Register only would not necessarily mean that all developments will be going to the Preservation Commission as if they were landmarked. But there were certain programs that qualified under the Federal Register only. And that gives more flexibility to the
owners to get the incentives that are provided through
the National Register.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But I mean, is this
nothing more than a designation? Or does it also carry
with it a burden?

MR. RUIZ: Well, that's the thing that it
would not carry the same type of review as if they were
local landmark or local historical structure. It would
have a different objective which would be to allow those
properties to be able to participate in any federal
setting program. And they do not have the same type of
review.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, it would be more
like a national historic district?

MR. RUIZ: Right, it would be a national,
well, Conservation District.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Such as the one we
have on the south side?

MR. RUIZ: No, that is not a Conservation
District, that's a National Register historic district
which is different in terms of the number of buildings
that you have that contribute to the significance is
greater than a Conservation District where you have
buildings that may not necessarily qualify as a landmark but they provide character to the district. In a historic district, you have a larger number of buildings that could easily become landmarks by themselves. When you have an accumulation of those, it makes a historic district. Whereas a Conservation District looks at the different types of contribution of each building that may not necessarily be a landmark really but an accumulation of those providing a certain character. So, it's a more relaxed type of designation.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, it provides benefits to those who want to improve the building without adding additional layers of approvals in and of itself.

MR. RUIZ: Because it's not a locally designated district. It would be a federally designated district.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Are there some Conservation Districts that we might be aware of in this area?

MR. RUIZ: I know I have a bunch of documentation in my office right now that I've not been able to review. But I cannot tell you off the top of my
head -- Conservation District. We tried in Evanston a few years ago to have a Conservation District for the African American community but that didn't come to fruition through certain circumstances. But that was for cultural reasons for a Conservation District. So, Conservation District, we have different levels of governance.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Stu?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I would like to know, when you bring back that information, I'd like something more definite about the, really kind of answering Larry's question because if I own a building in that and we have an overlay conservation district and I want to know whether or not that's going to limit, you know, what I can do with that building. The overlay district on Central Street was purposely to basically change the zoning and keep the levels down. And when I hear conservation overlay district, it makes me think that this is just another way to basically keep the property owners from developing their real estate. I'd like to know that's not the case before I'm expected to go down there.
MR. RUIZ: In a federal district, if you are not using federal funding or state funding, you can do anything you want, even demolish the building. For instance, the Lighthouse is a national historic landmark and also a local landmark. If it was not a local landmark, anybody who owned that property could tear it down as long as they're not using federal funding. There is no protection unless it's a local landmark. That's the difference.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I think Mr. Staley's point is though if we can see something, you know, addressing that very point?

MR. RUIZ: Oh, sure. Sure.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: And I think the discussion has to be on how will the overlay conservation district further affect our goals in this area versus, you know, other options which might be to, you know, revise the zoning as, you know, as described in here or other options.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, how would it work in conjunction, I guess maybe it's the rehabbing part. Maybe that's, you know, that's a very positive thing.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But how would it work in conjunction with the form-based code which could be built in such a way that it defines a look that is keeping with what's there. If one affects new construction and the other enhances rehabilitating existing buildings, that could be a great marriage. Well, we need to know how it might work together and make sure that it's not throwing an increased burden but giving increased opportunity to meet our objectives.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right.

MR. RUIZ: I think the key is that the conservation districts at this point are for the traditional areas where you are --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, I'm talking about the traditional area.

MR. RUIZ: Right, and that's --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, let's focus on the traditional area. And I think, you know, I'm guessing by the time we get through here, the form-based coding definitions of zoning for the traditional area will be much more intense than in the other areas to begin with. But those affect new construction, you know, future development. And that's why I'm saying if
that is a marriage with this and this is primarily to
encourage rehabilitation of what's there in keeping with
what it is, then that's a good marriage.

MR. RUIZ: That is the goal, to encourage
rehabilitation.

MR. LAMOTTE: The other, notice back to the
form, I mean that's the whole intent of the code now is
just to, you know, taking your vanilla zoning and adding
your design standards on there that you want to
articulate the buildings and open up the storefronts on
the ground level. If we need extra pieces for the
traditional, then you could add it in there without
doing an overlay.

So, we may want to keep that, instead of
establish, you must establish an overlay, is consider
these things when the hard zoning comes out at the end.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, and that's why
I'm saying --

MR. LAMOTTE: Because hard zoning at the end
of the book is the recommendation for further study by
this group and --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And if that either
addresses the new and this addresses the old and they're
both saying the same thing but one is providing funding
to maintain, you know, and help people keep buildings
from falling down if you will, then it could be a good
blend. If it's just adding more layers, then it's not a
good thing. So, that's why, I think that's where my big
question is in terms of how this would work with
everything else.

MR. LAMOTTE: And I'm thinking that maybe for
the sake of time, instead of, you know, getting into the
nuts and bolts of getting into a conservation overlay
right now which is all the hard zoning questions will
come up when you get into that actual code, is maybe to
consider a Downtown overlay if needed beyond the form-
based code.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, if it's to
encourage rehabilitation of what's there, it's meeting a
different objective.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right, right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And so, if that's the
case, and that's where I'm a little cautious of, but if
that's the case, then it should be included.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes. Consider versus establish.

This says you go ahead and do it.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, that's fine.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes.

MR. RUIZ: As far as I can tell, the intention is not to prevent redevelopment. The intention is to retain the character within the traditional areas. The intention is to provide the mechanisms by which you can do that without -- you know, there has to be a line where you can say you define a goal in that whether or not a building should be changed. And if the answer is no, then you have those guidelines.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Dunkley?

MR. DUNKLEY: Although I would personally look for nothing better than for this Commission to come out with the ready-to-adopt voting code, I caution you to keep in the front of your mind what the goal is and not, because it's a downhill slope once you get into actually writing the code specifying the specific mechanisms and going past the goal and the objective which is totally necessary -- that includes the whole public process of, as an implementation.

Again, we want to go there, I'm happy to wait for it, but I'm saying that, keep the process moving forward because it is a very intense piece of work.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: At this point, we're just talking about what we expect the zoning to provide. Yes, we're not going to sit here today and design the traditional area zoning.

MR. LAMOTTE: The code, right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But I think it's certainly important at this level to come back and say we expected to accomplish this when we get it done.

MR. DUNKLEY: More of us --

MR. LAMOTTE: That's what we've got to code to. And again, just that word establish sounds like you're saying you must establish an overlay versus consider if needed.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Consider is fine.

MR. LAMOTTE: Then, all the work that you're going to do after this on the code makes it go in there --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That's fine.

MR. LAMOTTE: -- whether it's needed or not or what it's going to look like.

MR. RUIZ: It does make a difference. I realize that.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes.
MR. RUIZ: The thing to remember, this is your
document the Commission is going to recommendation so as
far as I can tell when I talked to Mr. Cramer, he said,
you know, you are the ones who are going to decide what
the text amendments say. You are going to be the
foundation and you'll develop, so I don't think that
that language is set in stone.

MR. LAMOTTE: I mean, it's very similar to the
traffic thing. We're saying consider in the broader
traffic thing, if two-way works versus you must do two-
way and you must establish two-way.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: No, that's fine. My
only concern is that we understand the objective.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right, what are we trying to do
here.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: In the overall plan,
what part of that objective this is meeting.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Because I think we
have an objective to preserve, we have an objective to
enhance, we have an objective not to overburden.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: But because it's
under Objective 2 which specifically says protect and
rehabilitate character-giving buildings, structures and
sites, I read that as an objective directly.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That's what I was
hoping I was reading.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But I wanted to make
sure it wasn't a carryover.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay, yes. I
think that that's fine. I think that's, I'm basing on
all of this, that's a fair assumption, right, that they
key in to what objective --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Right. Mr. Magardo, I
know you had a question but we are not tonight receiving
public comment. It's just amongst ourselves. However,
once this leaves the Plan Commission, it will go on to
the City Council, the P&D Committee of the City Council
and public comment will be received at that time.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: And we're planning
on having a few more --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Events like this.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: If you have a
question, let me put it this way, Robin, if you have a
question of some member of the citizenry that's sitting
out there, you're free to ask that question of that
person.

MR. MARINO: Carlos, would it be appropriate
to add another bullet much like the last one, and this
one will be promoting the use of federal tax credit
programs, both the 10 percent program and the 20 percent
program? Just see if the Preservation Commission would
consider how that could be used more effectively in
Evanston?

MR. LAMOTTE: As either an end bullet or under
the retention program where just some of these programs
are --

MR. MARINO: IT could be combined.

MR. LAMOTTE: Combined, either one, yes.

MR. MARINO: Yes, it could be combined with
the last one. But I just don't want to lose that
federal tax credit dimension because we have some people
who use it well and I'm concerned that we have others
who don't really know about it. And that includes the
10 percent for older buildings as well as the 20 percent
I think it is for National Register properties. We'll
add more details for that but I think that would be good
because we're trying to use other people's resources as well.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Actually, I think most building owners, a great many don't understand many of the programs. And if we're going to actually to push some rehabilitation where possible, these will become very important. Part of this says that the City should make a concerted effort to make sure that all property owners understand what programs are available.

MR. MARINO: And I think there's a technical assistance dimension to that possibly.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Could we add a bullet? I think we should move on from this because I think this looks good and it's going back to Committee, but I wonder if there wouldn't be one more bullet point, would be establish an active program of notification or, I can't --

MR. LAMOTTE: Promotion?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, to add a program to that so that that would in fact be --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Rehabilitation ombudsman.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, no extra positions. I think --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: It's an unpaid position.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It's a concept position.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, I think this is great because encourage and promote the -- promote, but I think we could add establish a program with a brochure --

MR. LAMOTTE: Marketing.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Marketing.

MR. LAMOTTE: Of all these things that are available because most people don't know them.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Of available programs --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Assistance in understanding and making sure that they understand them.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. So, maybe one more bullet point about a program.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That's good, yes.

MR. RUIZ: When you talk about information, last year we had a workshop on a Saturday, we had about
50 people or so. We had two very good speakers that spent, you know, three hours or so talking about all these incentives. And we can continue to do that.

MR. LAMOTTE: That's I think what you're saying.

MR. MARINO: And that was the last one, program -- learned a lot from it. My thought is how do you translate that on the street with property owners? Not necessarily establishing the structure of network kind of thing per se, but having some function, maybe it's part of someone's existing, but then gets devoted to working property owners in traditional areas to make sure they're aware of the whole layer of resources that might be available to them.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, a property owner would come in and say here is my building, here is what I think I want to do, how do I do it, what's the benefit, how do I get help.

MR. LAMOTTE: And what's all the tools available.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, yes.

MR. RUIZ: That could be a part of what the Preservation Commission areas --
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It could very well be, yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right, say Downtown --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, that gives you another ten hours a week.

MR. RUIZ: A branch of --

MR. LAMOTTE: And then, and looking for creative ways to get into the owners, in the buildings so they come out to these meetings than knocking on doors, shoe leather it to door to door.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I think it's important because a lot of times if you talk to them, they say I just can't afford to do that.

MR. MARINO: And it's too much paperwork.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, no, I mean, not even too much paperwork. I can't afford to fix the facade, I can't afford, and they totally don't understand that there are, you know, the impact may not nearly be as great as they think and if we're really going to try to preserve as much as we can of the stuff that's worth preserving, then we should --
MR. LAMOTTE: As well as improve it.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, actually it's a distant point. The Preservation has done a survey of the Downtown buildings already and so if they had a leaflet or they could approach some of those owners anyway as part of the program because you know what buildings could really use a facade improvement, I'd bet, right off the top of your head even.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I think your point should be --

MR. RUIZ: We have two new bullet points including programs and Mr. Marino's federal tax credits.

So, we will include that.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, the question is, Kurt is kind of tracking it right now so we're trying to get this stuff right under the thing so it might save you doing double duty.

MR. RUIZ: Well, what I'd like to do is actually verify the language that is going to be --

MR. LAMOTTE: Oh, okay, yes. So, if you want to write it, that's where it's --

MR. RUIZ: -- we will do it after the final version.
MR. LAMOTTE: So, then on our checklist, then we have a new Objective No. 2. We wordsmith, then kind of run it around the table. Should we check that off the list?

MR. MARINO: Yes, I think subject to Preservation coming back.

MR. LAMOTTE: Double checking, yes.

MR. MARINO: Until the full Commission has a chance to look at it, they may want to add other things which we could --

MR. LAMOTTE: All right.

MR. MARINO: So, with that understanding.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: So, ideally what we're talking is it would go back to Preservation, Preservation would get their final document to you, and then we'd see the change order before the next meeting. And then next meeting we'll just check it up.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, it might not be by the next meeting because we'll see how much wordsmith we have to because ideally we give you the kind of a whole cleanup list that's going to the Council of all these things and they can then send us. But right after the meeting we would show you what we just typed in and --
MR. RUIZ: I will be sharing that --

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, good.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: We probably should be moving on a little bit quicker than we are if we're going to get to actually the meat of it.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Objective 3, Improve the Quality of Physical Environment. Comments?

MR. LAMOTTE: That will be the new Objective 3. We're going to shift it down in numbers. And that is the whole discussion of raising the bar of quality whenever we do any new development or rehab.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: The only thing I would add on this one would be on the very last bullet, "Revisit and change the Downtown way-finding system," incorporating new signage throughout Evanston, add that it might be or an entry point to Evanston.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, it's not just when you're in the Downtown but to get to Downtown which is a big issue for every community.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes. Right.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: **No. 4, Sustainable "Green" Buildings.** No. 4.

MR. LAMOTTE: No. 4.

MR. MARINO: This is one area where I think the Parks Department wants us to weigh in in terms of looking for additional opportunities for open space and green space. I think the Parks Department is very pleased about the parking lot behind the main library being turned into green space in the plan, a park, an attractive one. One of their suggestions is, and this really comes later but I'll just mention it here under this objective, is for the City to take a look at all publicly owned opportunity sites identified in the study and propose redevelopment at these sites as potential new park or open spaces. And that's already occurred with the library site in the plan. I think you've also looked at a site service parking lot over next to the Y as well, YMCA.

In addition, they would like to see open space opportunities examined within all future development proposals. One other area more specific to zoning is substantially increasing developer bonus percentages. Make it, it's currently 10 percent, to at least 20
percent associated with open space related public
benefits.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, those would be new, either
new or just --

MR. MARINO: Right. The second one is, right.

MR. LAMOTTE: And then, and we would just take
those from you if everybody discusses the best number to
put them in.

MR. MARINO: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: And then, Dennis, could you just
read the one about incorporating open space and new
development? Does that suggests that it should be
looked versus hard incorporation?

MR. MARINO: Open space opportunity should
also be examined within all future development
proposals.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Is that, can we be sort
of clear about that open space? Because as we know,
some developers claim open space but it's really only
for the residents of that building versus open space for
the public in general. And I think that that needs to
be really clearly defined of what open space is for the
general public.
MR. LAMOTTE: Or it's leftover space or it's the loading dock --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right. Or it's open space on a terrace three-stories up and no one in the public except the people that live in that building who could be probably wealthy folks like you want there would enjoy that.

MR. LAMOTTE: But I think also it goes back to the approach. And as I think we've talked about it one night and we got off track was ideally the plan is defining the open spaces and the developers are framing the streets and the corners and not coming up with chipped things in the back that we can't use.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right. Right, exactly.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, that's why I was looking for more of a suggest look at versus you must do it on each site again. Then we're going to get to --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I think that's a different thing.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And I agree.

MR. MARINO: -- a preference, I think like clearly the stronger preference is the public space turning into basically a park like the parking, surface
parking lot behind the main library. That's the higher social good by far. I think then secondarily, it's sort of where are other opportunities to create that same situation with new green space but then within existing developments when it's feasible to find a way to create some open space. It doesn't distinguish between public or private but obviously, you know, the desire would be where it can be public that's a good thing. That's a higher social benefit.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, let's take that to the next step though because it might be contrary to what we're saying. So, then if someone said okay, I believe in the Downtown Plan, I want to fill in Site X and I know we're going to need a park and a rehab park here but I'd like to put a third floor space for my people in the building to --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Well, I don't think it's an objective then.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But I don't think that because --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: That's fine, they can do that but that's not --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: They can do that but it
shouldn't be a bonus.

MR. LAMOTTE: Oh, no, no, no. They wouldn't get a, no, no, it's just if they find other opportunities for some space for the 20 people that live in the building or something, that's not --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right, but they shouldn't, right, be given the bonus on it.

MR. LAMOTTE: No, no, no.

MR. MARINO: In the spirit of an objective discussion rather than into the details which are important, too, in the objective discussion, this kind of language may be more appropriate: providing additional public open space in the Downtown is critical to ensuring a successful Downtown consistent with the City strategic vision of creating the most livable City in America. I'm not sure we want to include that entire statement, but as objective statement there probably needs to be something stronger there than what exists now in the draft sort of pointing this out as an important thing within the Downtown or near the Downtown.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Doesn't the last bullet say exactly what we're talking about? "Reduce
the impact of stormwater and add greenery to existing
and future public spaces and private properties where
feasible."

MR. MARINO: It's related but I don't think it
calls the issues out as strongly.

MR. LAMOTTE: It's more of a reduce stormwater
and add greenery versus the space itself.

MR. MARINO: It's the first phrase.

MR. LAMOTTE: Your wordology or wordsmithing
or whatever for some of the objectives is probably good.

MR. MARINO: But if people agree with the
spirit of that, I think we can wordsmith it and go
forward. Tracy, anything you want to add to that?

MS. NORFLEET: No.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Well, can you go back,
we're going to just --

MR. BISHOP: Well, I was just kind of trying
to capture things I was --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I like that, I like that.

Maybe examine open space opportunities in all new
developments that are open to the public.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: This is public
open space.
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: No, when I'm saying open, because public is one of those, you know --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right, you're right.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Open to the public.

MR. LAMOTTE: We had one community where they said it's green space and it's a park and then said could I come up your elevator and go up on your eighth floor and go on it? And they said no, it's just for the people in the building. Well, that's not public.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Right. That's exactly what I'm getting at.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes. So, what it's saying is if you have a big enough block or site or whatever that you can do more than what we already have in the plan and it makes sense and it's logical and people can get to it, then let the Plan Commission and the Council look at it.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: It's not saying you must do it. It's just look at these opportunities. Okay? Okay.

So, the only question before we scratch this one off the list is if he's got that wordsmithing which is some of that, a little more beef on the objective, Dennis, or
you want to just hand that off to us for wordsmithing?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, could you, are those from --

MR. MARINO: No, these are my summary of discussions.

MR. LAMOTTE: With the Park folks?

MR. MARINO: Right.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Do we have copies of that?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Definitely a conflict of interest that I do have is one of those two on the Y because the Y has not, unless there is some plan here to build a parking garage for the Y, the idea of turning either of those two sides into parks is basically absurd from the Y standpoint. They have no, the biggest problem for the Y right now is parking.

MR. MARINO: I think for the objective statement, we should leave specific sites out.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Leave it, yes. Okay.

MR. MARINO: -- within the hour hopefully --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: -- objective will come down to it.

MR. MARINO: -- to some of these sites and
then I think your point is a good one, good ones there.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: The geography versus the
objective.

MR. MARINO: With regards to the library site,
we did contemplate underground parking assuming that's
financially feasible. But your point about the Y is a
good one and we've heard that from others as well.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: And we're going to
take that on tonight I'm sure because we're going to
talk about public spaces.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, let's move on. So, new
objectives 3 and 4 are okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Next one is, what is
this, 5, Strong Multi-Modal Transportation System.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Just with regard
to bicycles, bicycle parking is an issue and I think
that that would go basically along with any of the
biking commentary. So, implement the City's new bike
plan, accommodate bicycle travel -- sorry, under Strong
Multi-Modal 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, I propose that one.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, add bike parking?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. I'll just
read it out. To implement the city's new bike plan, get
rid of the 'and' there, this proposal, yes, and then
bicycle travel, I think we can get -- no, no, where
you've got it, all the way down and I'd leave it all the
way to travel. I propose to get rid of the word
feasible. I think we should just, this is a goal. It's
a strategy.

MR. LAMOTTE: It's big picture, right.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: It's big picture.
So, bicycle travel, comma, and bicycle parking because
that's a big issue. If you see bikes everywhere because
they're not tied to street signs and things, that
doesn't look good. And it encourages, I think it's
great Maple Street Garage has a public bike parking.
It's great for the Farmers Market. So, I'd like bicycle
parking and --

MR. LAMOTTE: And then that's something even
you could pull out into the code down the pipe and put
bike parking spots in garages.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, this is,
that's all I have for this.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I would like something
about requiring responsible bicycle riding.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, actually --
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And that was brought up a bunch of times about enforcing that.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Enforcing traffic laws on bicycles so that this whole system is safe rather than targets.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right. I think we should, could we do it in a public way which could be encourage a public program of information for bicyclists?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Require. Require a public program of enforcement.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Enforce.

MR. MARINO: I should add here that there is a multi-modal transportation study that's just getting underway, the Two Islands, the City has a contract with a number of subcontractors that would include Susan Pinsof and Associates who is the noted bicycle consultant. And I know that's been considered.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: We've got somebody to come in in time for this?

MR. MARINO: No, but I think this should acknowledge somewhere in this section of the document that this multi-modal transportation plan is underway.
and will be concluded next year addressing a number of
different things that we collaborate on.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Do you want to add
that as a strategy though, the education and
enforcement, or is that --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, I would.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay. Let's
finish that before we get to this other one. So, I'd
put program of education, comma, enforcement and make
sure --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Wait. Is that getting a
little -- there must be other ways to handle --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I don't care how, just
handle it.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: -- got to have a plan.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, enforcement
means --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It's most dangerous
downtown with people with their heads down going right
across, when you've got a green light and you're seeing
more and more of this and as we encourage a bicycle
plan, if we don't encourage it with enforcement --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I dodge bicycle
messengers at LaSalle Street everyday.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, but they're legitimate targets.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: No, I'm walking and --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Oh, then you're a legitimate target.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, but also related to that, you also see on the bicycle paths cars double-parked, trucks double parking. You see policemen actually just sitting right there also, so I think it would be --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, it's a two-way street.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Let's say enforcement of all traffic laws for all modes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: There you go.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: That's a very multi-modal statement.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: -- got to keep it safe.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Bullet point number 5 talks about "Consider the feasibility of changing
streets to two-way direction." I say we scratch that.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. I think --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: We wait until we get

something on the Fountain Square before we even go down

that road.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, I agree, Stu. I

mean, there were so many citizens that came out just

against doing that.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, I'm not saying

it's a bad idea. I'm just saying let's put that off for

another day, you know.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, the only thing is though

is now you're talking about a new Downtown Plan.

MR. MARINO: It's saying consider --

MR. LAMOTTE: You're saying consider it,

you're not saying you have to do it.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: No, but I'm thinking

it only makes sense if you've got a pretty good idea of

what the new Fountain Square is going to look like, if

in fact we have one. Without changing Fountain Square,

there is no purpose.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, Fountain Square, the size

as it is today or larger is still the same space with
the curbs. It's just the street flow in and out the Fountain.

VICE CHAIRMAN O'PDYCKE: Well, there's a couple of different pictures in here of proposed different changes to the Fountain Square area.

MR. LAMOTTE: We're just increasing the open space though. It won't have the traffic impact. If you were going to knock the curb out and bump the corners and cut the intersection out, then you would. I think it's key because what we're trying to do is address two things here. One is a lot of folks like the system today. And there are those that came out and said the cutting across five lanes with traffic and getting to parking spaces on the other side is not safe. Plus, in the retail world, getting people to the stores quicker than going through four, five blocks down and having to make a loop street. So, this doesn't say you must do it because we need that feasibility.

VICE CHAIRMAN O'PDYCKE: So, you're saying it's something we should consider irrespective of what goes on with Fountain Square?

MR. MARINO: Absolutely, yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: Correct.
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: And may decide we don't want to do it but consider it.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right. And you're giving it --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: -- it should be looked at in a newer --

MR. MARINO: And it's a comparative assessment.

MR. LAMOTTE: It's a comparative --

MR. MARINO: Which is what we have now, the system we have now, compare it to an option possibly to change.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

MR. MARINO: And an important part of that is then the cost benefit analysis.

MR. LAMOTTE: Exactly.

MR. MARINO: There may be some benefits, but is it really worth the cost.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Is it worth the cost, right.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: And that's in Objective 1, so it's in the --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. I take it then most people want to keep that bullet point --
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I don't but that's okay.

I'll --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Or you can take it out because it's already there.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: If it's already, where else is it?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: It's already in Objective 1.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: If it's Objective 1, why don't we take it out of Objective --

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, you need it under transportation.

MR. MARINO: Because it's the more appropriate place for it.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay. Take it out of Objective 1.

MR. LAMOTTE: You know what, I thought we did that though. We did.

MR. BISHOP: No, we just changed, we just softened it, study the feasibility.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: So, why don't we --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: You don't need it
there.

MR. LAMOTTE: Oh, yes. Okay, so we take that off.

MR. BISHOP: Take it out of 1 now?

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes. And it's really the transportation system even though it is linked heavily to economic development, too.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: That's fine. Great.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: No. 6, are we ready for that?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Go for it, Stu.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. **Objective 6, Enhanced Arts and Cultural Opportunities.** Comments?

I would like to add as a strategy, consider restoring Varsity Theater to a performing arts center.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Second.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: It wasn't a motion.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: It is.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Complete with marquee although we won't put that in there.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Maybe we can use the marquee.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Encourage private sources. Because there's no money, I mean, you know, it's going to be 20 years before the City can look at this. But one of the things we don't do is encourage private, you know, foundations, private organizations. VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Right. Or private individuals.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: To come in and, you know, help us rebuild some of this cultural thing. And I think that should go in there as something to encourage.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. In fact, a new bullet point that says public-private initiatives for cultural --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes. Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: We could have a Bill Gates Day, invite him in.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: It's not in the Gates Foundation mission.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Encourage private developments.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Or private funding, private foundation.
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Something like that.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Something.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, here is the directive.

You're saying that the next step beyond the plan because this might be a good idea for Downtown is consider restoring it, then some initiative has to follow up as to who, what, when, feasibility study and all that.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Commissioner Widmayer makes a really good point and I think we should add a bullet point, a new one which says actively encourage public-private, I think public-private partnership --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That's fine. I think that's a good point, yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, actively encourage public-privates partnerships for cultural --

MR. LAMOTTE: As a separate --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: We keep talking about a lot of things but everybody says let the other guy pay for it. And in fact, I think Downtown, you know, what we need is a citizen thing.

MR. MARINO: Right. It would be nice to weave
that public-private language into the Varsity Theater as well because that truly --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That's fine, yes.

MR. MARINO: Yes. So, where we place this public-private is critical, it's an over-arching one I think that often --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, as we talk about, you know, the art center or a cultural center or something.

MR. LAMOTTE: And it's a wide range. It could be public art, it could be, right.

MR. MARINO: Right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Okay. Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Buildings and programs maybe? Or is that too specific?

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, arts, are you talking about that last bullet --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, I mean, that's arts and culture, everything is under there.

MR. MARINO: We have a cultural arts division that does the programming. There may be other things they could do.
MR. LAMOTTE: I mean, what's nice about all this is you're sharpening up your directions as to what do we do next, you know. To get to this objective, let's go through these. It's almost like a little work program for the next five years.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I would add also somewhere in there local artists.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: New bullet point.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Or not even, it can just make --

MR. LAMOTTE: I thought we did that one.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: All right. Go for a new bullet. There are three --

MR. LAMOTTE: Encourage participation, and that could be guidance, it could be the actual art work, participation of local, by local artists.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I'm impressed he's not actually hunting and pecking. He's really doing typing.

MR. LAMOTTE: We wouldn't last in the field long.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I'm not sure why the bullet point, consider like creating the Civic Center is actually under this objective because I don't know that
it's arts or culture. Nothing against public service but I don't know that's where that belongs. And particularly, I don't, I'm also not sure if it's, I don't know, possibly under --

MR. LAMOTTE: You know, you're bringing up a good point because we discussed this, what category. It's really more economic development because if you look at a village or city hall bringing activity and visitors, arts and culture, this is more civic as well as economic.

MR. BISHOP: Well, I think it's the word civic and cultural centers under the objective that led us to include it here although --

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes. So, rethink civic and cultural uses? Unless our objective gets changed to Arts, Civic and Cultural Opportunities, because then we're covering that now.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, no, I -- yes, I almost see it as more of a possible economic development generally particularly if, heaven forbid we lose, you know, the 110 businesses Downtown that we're going to possibly be losing to bring in more people that will come to Downtown for the civic center. That makes more
sense than I think the culture, because I don't think
it's, I mean, it's a public activity that people come
here but sort of like civic or cultural arts, I don't
think --

MR. LAMOTTE: That's not that category.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, they're doing that on a
regular basis like a city hall does.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right, but I'm saying is
they don't, I don't think anything in this building is
what you would consider cultural or arts for the most
part. And I could be wrong, there may be a lot of
different things happening here.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, should be click it and put
it over to economic development?

MR. BISHOP: I moved it to economic.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Thank you. I'm not
willing to go to, you know, on the mat to it. So, I
threw it out.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Are we on to 7?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: No, we're not.

MR. LAMOTTE: Uh-oh.
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I don't think "Install public art throughout the public real and on private properties" is strong enough. It doesn't address a public art plan that is integrated into the Downtown Plan. And I thought that a public art plan was in this document somewhere or referenced somewhere. In other words, to establish specific sites where public art would be encouraged.

MR. LAMOTTE: And mechanisms to --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: As opposed to, you know, I've got a piece of public art but how am I going to find a place for it? I mean, there's a plethora of nodes and terminational points in town.

MR. MARINO: We do, we have --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Maybe we ask the Art Committee to weigh in on locations. Do they have locations?

MR. MARINO: Yes. If you remember, the Downtown Planning Committee sometime ago had a discussion with the representative from the Arts Council, staff representative about maybe not this exact issue but close to it. So, what we'll do is follow up with him between now and next meeting to see what they
have currently in their portfolio what the planning to
do and whatever strategies.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Okay. The fact that
that exists or the strategy could occur should be part
of the Downtown Plan.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I mean, it doesn't
mean we're creating anything new, we're just recognizing
that --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: We agree.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: What it is, you know,
as Dave says. If we're going to give a bonus for public
art --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Then here is the place
where we would encourage you to put it.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes. Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: So, we're asking them to
put in a place holder?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes. What's the place
holder called?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Public Arts Plan.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Arts Council.

MR. MARINO: I think the Public Art Plan
language should get in there or the strategy. And then we'll reference it over to the Arts Council.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes. And then, for the a follow up on that, if there is one that's fresh, relevant and approved, then boom, let's go. If it's like needing to be done, that's where you're going to --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, but you know, five years from now, a new one may be needed or seven years from now, it's in the plan, it's part of the program.

MR. LAMOTTE: And, plus, we're creating new spaces that would open up opportunities. Okay, so in that one, we've got to do --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Public Arts Plan.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: See notes from Arts Council.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Next?

MR. LAMOTTE: Objective 7, new 7.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Predictable and Sensible Development Controls. Comment?

The objective refers to a form-based master plan that reduces or eliminates the use of planned developments. I would propose that we consider
referring projects in excess of 30,000 square feet and
30 units to the Plan Commission to ensure that the
design standards and guidelines are met and whether
bonuses are to be allowed.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I second that.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: New bullet.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Okay. I would like to
just throw out one thing, especially in the traditional
area. Two years ago, three years ago, we looked at
forming an appearance review, defining an appearance
review committee. And at that time, City Council said,
well, you shouldn't run into any problems. Well, as I
understand it, state legislature just passed along and
says you don't have any problem anymore.

The Plan Commission, even though we have some
architects on it, and City Council even though they have
no architects on it, really I don't think have done a
great job in terms of evaluating architecture based on
admitted cases on what ended up being approved. And so,
I'd throw out the idea of having at least the
architectural part of it reviewed by professionals. You
know what I'm saying?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, are you
suggesting that we remove that from the public realm?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: No, no. This is a public realm. They have to go to an appearance review committee in Winnetka.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Would the public be allowed to voice their opinions?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Sure. Yes, absolutely. And in terms of the other things, I understand coming back, the question is should the review of actual architecture be done by groups that will have a real great track record having done a really great job of doing it.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, were you, was that what you were saying then? Because I understood what you were saying to be later in the plan on the presentation and the public process has been eliminated. And I took what you're saying --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, the objective here --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Ah, the objective -- not to do that and to continue the public process and Plan Commission. Then as a different bullet point would be to essentially strengthen SPARC or create a new kind
of SPARC, but to keep Plan Commission in over a certain amount of --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: The concept of an appearance review committee is usually maybe a combination of staff and professional. And you know, the bonus program is a review program, but you know, if you're reviewing architecture as it matches the form-based code and you're reviewing whether to offer, you know, the equivalent of a planned development but not a planned development, reviewing whether extra things should be allowed for the bonus structure, it just seems to me if they're not asking for anything extra and their architecture is being reviewed, by bringing it back to a commission, you know, if it's pretty plain vanilla but the architecture has been protected, we're --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: So, a project should be referred then to a, for example, Design Evanston, a body of --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: No, well, it would actually be --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Of architects.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It would actually be a commission like the Plan Commission.
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: So, a creation of another commission?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Design Review, which we wanted, which was looked at by Council very seriously three or four years ago until -- came back and said no, you can't do that because you could get in trouble.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I don't know the status of that legislation but I think it's pending. I'm not sure that it has passed. Judy, do you know?

MS. AIELLO: I don't know.

MR. MARINO: I think it passed. We'll confirm that for you.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I think it's passed.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: This would enable, this would mean that you could have enforceable design standards.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Which is what you're talking about by putting it into the form-based coding.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Not so much, I mean, the standards would already be in place after they're incorporated into the form-based code. I think the improvement here is that you would have a committee of design professionals that would be rendering a design
critique and design judgment on projects that otherwise
would have absolutely no review by design professionals.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: That's going to be
awfully subjective, isn't it though? Every architect,
except for the ones on the Committee, have high egos.
And I've refereed fights between major architects in the
City and everybody is going to be there. How are we
going to decide whether it's pink or blue or what shade
or how the reflection is when the sun is at such a
degree? How are you going to do all that?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, you can make the
same criticism of any committee of any professionals
whether they be lawyers, doctors or accountants. And I
think to a certain extent that, you know, architects
have gotten a bad shake on that. There are many
different ways that this can be advanced. And I'm not
so sure that we need to specifically call it out here.

One thing we might say is that, Stuart's
suggestion to bring certain projects of a certain scope
to the Plan Commission for a review I think is a worthy
one because those projects of that scope also require a
review for planning and for overall compliance with the
goals and objectives of the City as well as their
architecture. And given the presence of architects, let's say on the Plan Commission, they could probably get a decent review of their architecture by that body, and the public would also have an opportunity to come and voice their questions and concerns.

Those projects that might be under that threshold then could fall prey to less than high quality design. And under those circumstances, then maybe those projects come before a different body. Whether it's a SPARC which is augmented by a number of architects, of staff, maybe architects that reside in the City or whatever, and the SPARC meetings get moved to an evening where, you know, public testimony can be received as well, or whether it's a separate body all together like I think what you were talking about.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: What is the public -- I understand if you're going for the bonus structure because that's a, you know, yes, you meet our objective or no, you're not offering enough. But if it's a plain vanilla, what is the purpose of the hearing?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Because Evanston citizens like to get involved in these kinds of things. And a project of that dimension in the Downtown area is
going to generate a lot of interest and no doubt a lot of controversy.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But if it meets the new zoning in terms of the form-based code, you can't say no. So, why, you know, why are we going through the process?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, I think we can look at the guidelines and standards to make sure that they are in fact --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But the Planning does that. Zoning does that right now and that's the function of the Zoning Department.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, do they look at fenestration, for example? Do they --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, you know, it depends on what's in the zoning.

MR. DUNKLEY: To help this discussion, we actually just had a planner attend a symposium on the current state of best practice of design -- we can be sure it will add time to the process. That's probably the only sure thing. I'd be glad to distribute that as a -- for the symposium. This will give you an idea of whether you think it's valuable to look forward as an
objective or to fall back. But as far as the actual structure of such a committee, the governance, how they operate, it's been done before. So, there are some choices out there.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I think we're going to like territory that's not for the Plan Commission to decide on how we create bodies to start making decisions.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I think we should do a lot of considering adding committees that deal with this and leave it --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, my only point is when we've come up with this approach where we say eliminate the use of -- no, well, first of all, eliminate the use of planned development. So, basically, they either meet the zoning or they don't. They can't ask for something beyond the zoning. Now, there is an issue if they're asking for bonuses on evaluating the bonus.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, it talks about --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: -- of planned
development, you know, making all of these planned
developments, that would be gone.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, it says to
reduce, reduce or eliminate. Now, what you're saying is
we should eliminate them.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, maybe we've
already got it proposed here to eliminate.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, it says reduced
though. Reduced or eliminate.

MR. MARINO: Kurt has developed some language
here that might --

MR. BISHOP: I do think that probably I could
take up the question of planned development in the
strategies as well as in that opening sentence. But it
seems to me that what I'm hearing is, although not
agreement on what process should be used, that there
should be a defined process that replaces the planned
development review process. Whether that's an
administrative review conducted at staff level, whether
it's a design review board, whether it's the Plan
Commission, I think we're a ways away from deciding
that. But there needs to be something transparent and
predictable in its place. And whether, I tied it, in
tying it to replacement of the existing planned
development language the way you want it or whether it's
projects that avail themselves of the bonus system have
a defined review process, I don't, I wasn't clear.

MR. MARINO: And projects of a certain
threshold, whatever that should be.

MR. BISHOP: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: And the other thing is, I mean,
design review committees are very popular around the
country. They're either architectural review or design
review or appearance review. One of the things we found
around the country is that you could put ten architects,
five landscape architects and five architects, whoever
on there, that they do need tools. That's why you need
the code and standards because they'll have eight
different opinions.

But if it says we don't want cinder block
bunker buildings, we want open glass storefronts, that's
good guidelines for them to start to say, hey, here is
what's going on. And so, you can do that but that's
really down the pipe as you get your teeth into this
form-based code and say this is now our next step. You
can say I'm comfortable with these standards, we should
do it, staff should do it, together we'd do it. It is an extra layer if you go into design review. And Commissioners have to be careful because then they don't go in to architectural design and let the other ones do it. But the idea is to cut the amount of time down, the amount of administration down so that it's very clear. And it's a big threshold. And even if somebody doesn't come in for bonuses, they still got to do the design stuff. They've still got to articulate the storefronts and the buildings.

And so, if I came in with a 40-foot storefront and fill a new tooth in there, that doesn't mean I can do anything I want. I still got to go through all those design standards that you're going to shape and finalize after we're done. Everybody has got to have some good design.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I think the concern isn't that the applicant wouldn't have to go through those design standards as much as it is, well, who is going to determine that they have adequately gone through those design standards and who is going to be there to encourage, cajole and even maybe find other opportunities to improve the design without, you know,
being a detriment to either the owner's budget or the
time process. And that's what, you know, that's what
we've heard from so much the public testimony before us.
So, I mean, I believe we're probably going to have to
revisit this.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, when we get to that. Yes.
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: But there needs, then
we may even want to come back to this after we review
the additional information that we're going to get.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All right. More
comments on this objective? This Objective 7?

MR. LAMOTTE: 7.

MR. DUNKLEY: If I could just comment on the
planned development?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes.

MR. DUNKLEY: We've gone through this argument
at the -- level and what we found is that there is a
real semantic difference between, we sometimes say
planned developments when we really mean an excess of
development allowances. They're two very, very, very
different things. One is a blank check and the other is
the ability to do creative things but within, based
really on what the zoning district allows.
Planned developments have a place. They're very, very useful in certain instances. Just I'd caution you to be specific about what it is you want to address.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: We'll revisit this. I have one further comment on this, and that is day care, the last stop, as a possible bonus item. And I don't, I think they ought to be scratched.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I agree with that.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I think we should, I agree with that, I think we should add something about affordable office space under bonus system.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, I think that would be worthy.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I mean, because we're -- I'm sorry?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: They have it there.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. MARINO: In fairness, I just did it. I just remembered that we talked about it before.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Okay, because I have to keep taking my glasses on and off because I can't read
with them on but I can't see that without them on. So,
I apologize.

MR. LAMOTTE: If you remember the discussion a
couple of months ago, we added that. And then also
recently, the retail as well. So, we just added that in
this section because this is the checklist in the back,
it's the real bonus thing, okay?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: That's super.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Good.

MR. LAMOTTE: Excellent.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Folks, now we'll move
on to Public Space Improvements. If you'll turn to page
55, we'll start out with the Northern Plaza.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Is this just a little
triangle or is it on both streets? This doesn't look --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Comments on the
Northern Plaza?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I think it's a good
kind of improvement upon what's there at present. It
certainly provides a formal front yard for the Optima
Horizons building. At the same time, I think, you know,
it screens the parking that presently I think is used
for the ground floor occupants of the office building.
MR. MARINO: It's also used by the condo as well.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Is it really?

MR. MARINO: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: Quickie parking, yes. And remember, for everybody again, these are just concepts to show you how it could work. The message is that you want to improve that so it's more visible and more useful for everybody.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: Not just three people sitting back that you don't see. So, whether they pick --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: -- use that?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: It's private.

MR. LAMOTTE: It's privately in this one. We're encouraging them to make it a little more open. We're not saying they have to but we're encouraging them.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes. No, it's so hidden right now you don't even notice it.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right. And as we talked many times during the summer is any little chip of good open space we can get into Downtown, so this is saying,
owner, can you work with the City and make it a little
more visible and inviting to people. Okay?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Next one, Chicago

**Avenue Park.**

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: This is one I'm
particularly excited about. I'm wondering if we can't,
while I realize we may need the parking that would be
displaced by this park, if indeed the parking can be put
underground and the park can be put on top of it, and if
we can garner private and public and government funds to
create shall we say a Woman's Power Park. If you'll
notice, we've got the WCTU residences and, you know, up
the street --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: It's just so funny
coming from you.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: It just goes to show
there's a --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I know.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: There's the Women's
Club at the south and with women prominent in politics
these days, I think it would be a fabulous --

MR. LAMOTTE: Idea.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Fabulous idea. They
would fortify, you know, the WCTU residents.

MR. LAMOTTE: The whole block.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: The entire block, ties the entire block together. And maybe by virtue of that kind of a marketing program, we can get the kind of funds we need to put the garage below grade.

MR. LAMOTTE: If at all, if it's even needed.

That's the key thing.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, if it's even needed.

MR. LAMOTTE: The multi-modal study can look at that and look at those spaces and say is that a critical need for that kind of money.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Those parking spots are needed.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: You know, they support the Women's Club and they support the restaurants on Chicago Avenue.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: And the Carlson building.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And the library and the Carlson building.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Can you change "If needed, consideration" to be "Strongly consider placing the parking spaces"? Strongly consider? Just get rid of "If needed, consideration", just "Strongly consider".

MR. BISHOP: Okay.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But you know, I think that there is a way to do something on it because the WCTU, those buildings and then there's some, a little bit of open space there, it's very under-utilized along with the Women's Club. I think there could be some restructuring happening over there if those two organizations along with the City could come to some sort of agreement because there is just a lot of junky open space that's sort of just sitting there. And I know that WCTU, I know that they're looking for funding as well. So, they're under-funded and if there is a way to --

MR. LAMOTTE: Tie it all together.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Tie it all together, that would make a whole lot sense.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes. I mean, the improvements could go in and around the buildings, like a little campus kind of thing.
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: This could be a recognition park, I mean, there are a lot of women that have made substantial contribution to democracy and they could be recognized in this park.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, I'm not disagreeing with that at all, but I do recognize there is a, you know, similar to what Chuck said before about the Y parking, people have strong feelings about this parking as well. I'm just saying not to eliminate all of it and do something more coordinated.

MR. LAMOTTE: Broader and coordinated, right. Okay.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: And maybe, this is what -- people say that this is an easy spot to park in. And I think that some of the parking garages with the tickets and the paying and the machines and the ramps are a little bit daunting. So, I think emphasizing that this is an easily accessible metered lot, that that would go a long way.

MR. LAMOTTE: And we had some folks say that the whole parking under the library should be revisited as to who, what, where and is that the best spot to get to -- rather than outside and all kinds of things. So,
that's what we're just saying, so just globally at the parking. And then, you know, you probably could, because we were in the alleys back and you could probably even go up a couple or three more buildings to tie in the landscaping even more.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: You know, to the north.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right, exactly.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, that's an initiative once this starts. It's, you know, how do you design that space.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, tie it all together.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, that would be a good parking lot, too, for the parking to be looked at for one of those, the test cases where you're putting, instead of the individual meters, of having the machine --

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, one thought, just because we wouldn't replace all the parking, but look at the back of the lot, look at the alley. I mean, if you could tie in the other lots, then you could maybe do head-in parking down the alley, clean and lit, and then
keep it just plain open space and not go under. But that's a feasibility study that would have to be done.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: Could you take those spaces and go on ground behind as well as go under.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right.

MR. MARINO: Let's not lose Colleen's point about a unitary parking pay station. That would get away from the clutter of all the meters.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: That would make a huge difference.

MR. MARINO: That's an important prototype, too, we've been --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right. And I think there are so many other, I was just in Park City recently and all of their streets do it that way. And it just does make it a lot easier because you can pay with a credit card, you can pay with bills versus, I don't know, searching for all your quarters.

MR. LAMOTTE: It's much cleaner and it's great for the City's --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes. Meter is so outdated.
MR. LAMOTTE: Okay. So, Northern Plaza, Chicago Avenue Park, and we noted New, that's good and there's some good ideas and that's a separate initiative right there to follow up on. Okay?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Oldberg.

MR. LAMOTTE: Survey says?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I like Oldberg. It took me a while to get used to the concept of, you know, a restaurant on the park, but I like it. I would suggest, however, to change your drawing a little bit, because it really looks like there is a barrier at the end of Orrington to block the street off.

MR. LAMOTTE: Those are just cross-hatches --

MR. MARINO: That's just depicting materials.

Pavers.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, I understand, but most people who look at it have said that a dead end is there.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Because it's looks like the same hatching on the --

MR. MARINO: Yes. So, those are intended to be safety pavers as well as streetscape.
MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, and I understand.

I understand.

MR. MARINO: I know, but maybe they need to be marked in a way.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: A different color, make them darker gray or something.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Or make them white and then cross-hatch them, I don't know.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: And we're going to make up for the loss of parking, is that right, on Clark Street by putting them on Sherman?

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, there's little cut-ins and things we've done including on Elgin and on Sherman.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: And then there's space behind the building that, whatever the number of spaces, I can't remember what it was, how do you reconfigure so we're losing as little as possible, that's the key.

Okay.

So, again, you're not approving this specific design, you're just saying let's look at combining the concept of the asphalt into a new park space.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: The concept of it, yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: And make this tremendously more safer. Now, the traffic study may find some turning movement things. A detailed design study would find out how to address that so things would flow across better, but it needs work. And that's what you're really basically saying here.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I think the even the concept of these restaurants on the park kind of thing, you know, is really interesting.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right. With this stuff, you could do the big cafes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Absolutely.

MR. LAMOTTE: On the front, like you've got over on Orrington.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Like right now.

MR. LAMOTTE: Central Park and Orrington.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: So, we like it, is that the consensus amongst the members?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I like it.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: We like it the way it's depicted here or something like it?
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Something like it.
The concept is here.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, the concept, right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It's really interesting.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Bookman's Alley.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I think it's fantastic if we can make it work.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Can we back up one second on that?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: We're back to Oldberg Park.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I know we had given some discussion to developing the alley between Orrington and Sherman. Some discussion at some point in time. I think it sort of dropped out of the --

MR. LAMOTTE: The equation, right.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: The equation or the focus because of the lack of feasibility.

MR. LAMOTTE: You know, I think we had a hard time back there because so much stuff is opening up onto that alley, where if you go to Bookman's, there's a lot
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Oh, yes. Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, you can do storefronts. But that doesn't mean that, when you come back and design all that park and that whole thing, you can look at the whole block. And maybe at least we can do the pavers or something back in there if they're sensible, if it makes sense.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: As opposed to original garage and all of their parking back and forth all the time.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes. And it might be a matter of just everybody, you know, kind of corralling your garbage dumpsters, cleaning up, painting back there and people going through there, anyway let's clean it up, that's all. So, would you want us to add a little note on that under Oldberg Park thing?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I would like to see a note that, you know, considers the development of the alley between Orrington and Sherman, you know, as well as, you know, an additional path could come off of that to the north between the existing buildings and the new
building.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right, right. And that's all got to be part of the design.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, but I think in the --

MR. BISHOP: Right through here?

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes. So, we just need to get it in a bullet.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, I think Arnie Oldberg would be very pleased.

MR. LAMOTTE: Consider improving alleys around the block as alternate pedestrian path or something like that.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: And one thing this does is removes that God-awful, awkward intersection.

MR. LAMOTTE: Oh, it's terrible.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I agree.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: At Sherman and Clark. I mean, people get to that and they just go I don't know what to do here.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, you really get a three, actually a four-fold that you get the improved traffic, you get the better crossings from the university and...
back and forth, you have a better development parcel in
the corner, and then you get the open space fixed up.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right. Yes. And my
impression of the restaurants and the retail
establishments that exist in existing buildings are that
they've got a pretty well established plan. And I can't
think of perhaps, you know, better establishments that
would be less adversely affected by this plan than
those.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It could actually
enhance. If they're eating or whatever, if you have
outdoor --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Oh, yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: With the park
atmosphere and what have you.

MR. LAMOTTE: Some of the folks in the summer
brought that up, that if the mound in the park was flat
and it was more comfortable to walk in, more people
would come there not just to cross through there.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, it could be quite a space.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, to benefit them.

MR. BISHOP: Which alley?
MR. LAMOTTE: Just alleys around the block so they would be this alley and this to the south --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Potential alley or pedestrian circulation --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Question for you. Did you, I know Chicago has a really wonderful green alley program. Did you consider that at all for Evanston?

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, again, that's one of the broader things that would be looked at under sustainability and the code. If people, well, people would be the, you know, the public sector right now probably are doing the alleys maybe with some help from adjacent building owners but it should be looked at, you know. All sustainable things in any of these, including inside the Plaza. And maybe even alternatives even more pervious than even the alley.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, and that just helps the drain water, storm water if you've got, it's going into the ground rather than just running off. It's just so much --

MR. LAMOTTE: Right. We just finished the Marion Street streetscape in Oak Park. We've got a
water rain barrel cistern underneath the street that collects the rain water and then it goes in and irrigates the trees.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, once each one of these initiatives goes, then people can evaluate all that, especially if you're going holistically for the whole block.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: I mean, there's some neat stuff you can have.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, if you're adding in any language about alleys generally, then you'd add that in there.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Judy?

MS. AIELLO: The plan, the public -- is doing some investigation regarding initiatives and --

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes. Robin, I would say it's probably a little too specific here. But then, when everybody sinks their teeth into the zoning, you can look at standards and things and including for private developer who may want to rip up an alley to put some utilities in and what do they put back on top of that,
you know, as a surface when they finish it for the City.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, good. We've got them.

MR. LAMOTTE: And we ran into it in Central Street. Okay?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Bookman's Alley, back to that.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay, back to Bookman's.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: If we could make this work, that would be great fun.

MR. LAMOTTE: A lot of fun.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: What do you do with garbage?

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, we're seeing a lot of communities that are consolidating 15 dumpsters into three or four with nice corrals around them. So, while they're getting fixed by the garbage guy, fine, but then they close them up and you kind of ignore them like in Europe.

Libertyville has had a good success on Milwaukee Avenue. So many people are coming in from behind the stores, so they got them in nice little attractive things. They paint up the back of their
shops. Even if they don't want you to come in the back
of the shop, it just looks nicer in the alley.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: But those would extend
out into the thoroughfare though, would it not?

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, it's pretty much how
they're doing it today. And we didn't draw them in here
but if they're there now for the garbage trucks, they'll
probably stay unless we can wrap them somewhere, but to
just make them look better, that's the key. Including,
if you can look at the left of the image, and I'm
pointing to this image right here, you know, and maybe
we encourage some of the owners to punch some glass to
the sides of those things. Even some false storefront
to make it more active.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Well, I mean, because
currently that alley, the one dumpster for the Gallery
building, that's really set back.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And then, for the
church, it's also, the alley is more wide there so
that's also set back. And then the dumpster for
Bookman's Alley is in that --

MR. LAMOTTE: Inbound.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I walk that, I've been into the club a lot and so I walk that way. So, none of those are sticking out currently and they could be actually probably incorporated.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, the only thing, and not to worry about designing it, is if you look at the inside of the court there, you know, whenever the design would go forward, you'd start to see where are they located today, should we reshuffle them, can we tuck them somewhere else, can we bring them together.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: And they may be in the alley but I think the question that was raised during the summer, too, is can trucks still get through here. Yes, we took the little bollards right here, that was a little image mistake. But it's like Europe, you drive through there when you need to but it's folks that are walking there that are encouraged --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Well, you can also drive through the one side and then also just cut down to the back.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, that's right. Okay. So, Bookman's is good.
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: *Fountain Square*. Any comment on that?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Just a comment on Fountain. Well, I don't know whether it needs to be cross-referenced to the encouraged development of the theater, but there was a semi-circular space behind the theater building.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Which is highly conducive to a reception area or an entry area for a new theater particularly if this alley is activated.

MR. LAMOTTE: Three people brought that up during the summer to take the creativity to the next level. If that ever happened, how would you fold it into the alley?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right, well, I would encourage this graphic to move in that direction and to show that maybe as a possibility, since we've already established that this is one of our objectives, can you show that semi-circular area behind?

MR. LAMOTTE: I'm not sure scale-wise what we've got. I mean, we could probably add it. I'll see if we can do that --
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: It would just take out -- right?

MR. LAMOTTE: This was our, the strategy is let's get Bookman's Alley looking way better and working better. And then it's, you know, all the walls, it's the facades, the bricks, the things sticking out on top, getting into the theater or getting into the garbage, everything, lighting.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: No, I'm with you on that.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, I'll see how much we cropped off for this drawing, but if we can add it, we'll try and do it. Okay? Okay, Fountain Square.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: You know, I don't think we ought to get too exercised over all the details here.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Because I mean it's a dream, it's a concept, it's something to think about. Something to hope for.

MR. LAMOTTE: You're saying in the plan what you want to see in this area as a strategy. You're not saying the fountain goes left and the statue of -- goes
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Right.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: The obelisk.

MR. MARINO: John, just a quick overview of A and B.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay. So, if we just quickly refresh, A is the Fountain Square space as it is today. There is no additional space added to that actual thing. So, A is leaving the Fountain Square building, the little B on top of there, see that on the A concept? That little brown slash is our symbol usually when we do this facade renovation, okay?

So, Fountain Square building would stay, a facade of some sort would be on there. You'd obviously redesign, bring up those lower steps up to grade level, open this thing up and redesign the whole thing. But this concept says let's go a next step and let's tie all four corners, five corners in together so that visually they feel good. When you shut those streets down for festivals, they all hold together. And if we can even get on the northeast corner by the big building there, we're a little worried that there's bollards and stuff underneath that several people and we saw it ourselves,
can we get that down to flat grade so people don't have
to go up or down to get into places.

So, your direction as the Plan Commission,
let's forget B for a minute, would say okay, yes, we
want our Fountain Square to be a central piece again as
a good design space. We want the design to also tie in
all these other corners. And one other thing is this
also shows the potential for taking Orrington out and
making a bigger space to correspond to it, kind of
talking to each other. Where the little plaza is now,
you'd have it like quadrupled in size if you took
Orrington out.

Some of that was because of the confusion
going around the loop there with the one-way traffic.
Some of it was an opportunity that if we didn't need
Orrington as a direct connection, we still can get
around two-way. We could add to that plaza which
everybody likes because it's just a nice plaza there,
and you'd have two complements to Fountain Square. And
then when you do shut down, you've got a lot of
amenities already in place, benches and fountains.

The second one, B, was if the Fountain Square
building to the north was taken out, you would double,
maybe double and a half the size of Fountain Square. So, if the old building comes out and you re-skin the historic building on the other side, then it's just to show you the bigger scale. The rest of it is all pretty much the same. Okay?

So, your objective is what do we want as a space, not whether two fountains or three fountains. And then, if you want to recommend to the City Council both options still be in play, you could do that. Or you could pick one or the other as a recommendation and let them go from there.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I think the primary thrust is to maximize the space as a central communal and green space.

MR. LAMOTTE: As much as we can.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: As much as you can. And certainly tying in all corners, trying to make it comprehensive, cohesive, and a strong urban space is essential. How that is done, you've shown two options here. There might be two or three more depending upon what happens.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right, right.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I don't necessarily
want to chime in with a vote on one particular option or another option or to create a third one other than just simply urge that this be a goal to redevelop this entire area and to tie all the corners together.

MR. LAMOTTE: And do it first class and --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Do it first class and consider these options as well as other options.

MR. LAMOTTE: And if I could just also remind people, because I think just in the thought process is the detail but I think it's important, when you look at what we did on the plaza, the team looked at filling in the building space on the corner. That was also looked at by the owner. The idea was to hold the corner not have a big open space there. So, this can be an in-fill and some architectural character tying in to that complex. That space then would be similar to what's there today. This would completely triple, quadruple it, but then these two would tie together. You can have shops, restaurants on that corner closer so it's not just floating back into that big building.

If you did this building today, I think ultimately you'll probably pull it back out onto the street corner to hold the corner with a nice plaza.
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: John, are you saying Orrington is going to be one-way north? Because I'm just trying to imagine, you're on Sherman right where the dot was.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: And you want to go north.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, in this concept, because both of them takes Orrington out as a concept to get the space, we would have two-way traffic in and around the block. This, now you've got the one and then, oops, you've got this and then you're coming back out this way. This piece would be in the way. I mean, you could do a little dogleg but the traffic guys are going to look at that in the next round. It's just that it's an option that you could look at and it's an opportunity. And without worrying again about specifics, at least this should be explored further by the traffic study and at the minimum tie all the corners and even if Orrington stays open and do way better in design, that's a great direction.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I kind of have to question the tearing down of the Fountain Square block conceptually within these options but yet the building
up of the plaza at Chase. It seems strange to be taking
down -- of a building and at the same time saying we
need to build more buildings right at the precise place
where we want a park.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, that's a great question.
This one, and can you please switch the -- never mind,
I'm sorry. That's right, we can't -- here is the base
of the Fountain Square building right here. This is it
today, what you have, and this is the space. And also
something subtle that the traffic flows, if you're
looking to bump some of these corners out, it creates
some better diagonal parking and can make the crossings
better. So, if we can shoot a little more open space in
there, that's something they can look at as far as
turning radius.

So, this space widens a little bit and then --
the front. This faces that building out. Both of them
show we're recommending that we try and get that corner
held with some shops or restaurant because the space is
so big over there.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. Right, but
I'm just saying you've got nothing there now. If you
really improve that plaza, it seems silly to be adding
building right where we want public space. So, I'm just
wondering if another option which to consider is whether
that would be other good public space, that's all.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, then if you said, okay,
this stage is a concept. This corner could stay notched
out and then you'd have to look at how do we dress that
out.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, no. I guess
I'm talking just conceptually in both of your plans, I'm
certainly not articulating this properly, if I
understand the drawing correctly, you're recommending
bringing out a new building right next to what is
referred to as the A. And it's precisely the place
where we want public space and --

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, no, no, no, no. You've
got, this corner is the best public space. That's the
key.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, that's what
I'm asking.

MR. LAMOTTE: It is big but it's elevated a
couple or three floors. You'd have to do some design
work in there because people don't want to go up or
down --
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: This is a building?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Because there's parking underneath.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, we -- this building.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: There is a planned development that was approved to do that.

MR. MARINO: Right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Judy, what's the status of that?

MS. AIELLO: They are, they would like the City to participate in the relocation of that drive which we want to do. It's scheduled to have discussion again with the Planning & Development Committee on February 25th. They have an approved PD to build new in-fill retail and they will hopefully then -- contractor who'll be working on the construction --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, those buildings you show really are part of the PD.

MS. AIELLO: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: This here, right.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay, that's -- sorry.
MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, right here.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I think that's the answer, right, because it's not a conceptual --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: One of the reasons they exist is that plaza space never really worked all that well and by virtue of the fact that it was raised, it never, it was very difficult to pull into the rest of the spaces.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right, but -- on the highway so I think that way it doesn't provide a tremendous problem per se.

MR. LAMOTTE: This is a good clarification because we have massed a bunch of different things in here, I mean, trying to do the plaza. But this is the actual footprint from the PD to show you how that PD was set up.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay. Now, you go back to the different spaces, work with what we have today and tie in the corners. That's kind of the minimum on it. The second one would be, okay, if we can bump corners when that big slash comes out that goes down to the parking or other corners, then that would be B. You got A/B now
but I'm just talking about increasing --

The next one would be, if we can incorporate all that, the next one would be if we can pick that up.

So, there's varying degrees which is why I think we need to get in there with the traffic experts first to see about the two-way flow or one-way flow. The bumping, we take that ramp out being there we're going to create some really nice streetscaping here instead of that ramp right there. And then we go from there.

The question I think is do you as a Commission want to make a recommendation to Council on Fountain Square building in or Fountain Square building out. If you want to keep both options for them to discuss and debate, leave them on the table.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: If one of the goals and benefits would be to keep as much office space as possible, I think we keep the Fountain Square building in. I mean, we can't just keep reducing the amount of office space in Downtown, I mean, not that open space isn't a good thing. But if we're talking about economic development and, you know, having more people, we need to keep that building.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: And Larry, how
much do they have on leases? I mean, is that like
affordable?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I think it's about 22
to 24.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: So, it's pretty
affordable probably.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, I've been looking
down there, they're pushing 30.

MR. MARINO: Is that --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, it's gross
plus --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, I'm not so sure I
want to make a recommendation for either one because I
think a lot of what will happen there will be by
conversions of various circumstances at a particular
point in time. And I think we need to keep our options
open in that regard.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, you're saying more let's not
show the building out. You're saying let's keep the
options open as we move forward. I'm just trying to, as
we discussed, this is a great debate. We've been
wanting to have this debate with you for a while.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes. And I agree with
you in the fact that if something happens where this
building does come down, they should have an option to
say this is what it could look like, but I'm saying that
I don't necessarily think we should encourage that
building to come down if in another part of the plan
we're saying we should be keeping affordable office
space. It's sort of contradictory.

MR. LAMOTTE: It's not only a goal but a
bonus, too. Right.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right. Exactly.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: But something might
occur that the property east on Davis might be developed
as an office building which could replace the office
space in the Fountain Square building and as part of
other developments on there. So, I'm saying let's just
keep our options open and not say yea or nay to either
one because --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I would agree.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Who knows what might
happen? And I'm certainly not in a position to predict
or say emphatically, oh, the building must stay or the
building must go.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, I'm just saying that
to put some language there, you know, we're not
encouraging the destruction more office space is where
I'm going with that.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: But that leaves the
impression that we want to keep the building, and I
don't know if I want to take that position. I want to
leave both options right smack in front of us to
consider down the road.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Within that
can I just add more options? Under improved
facade of existing building, can we have improve or
restore facade of existing building? Because that
building is --

MR. LAMOTTE: Where are you at again?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: B, on Option A,

note B.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay, B, note B.

MR. BISHOP: I can't actually edit that.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: You could just put

a little star above that.

MR. BISHOP: Yes, I can do that.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, and I think it's not to
just say improve willy-nilly, it's to do it nicely, do it, character of the building --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, in the instance that you've shown as taking the skin off and creating kind of a new, is that new?

MR. LAMOTTE: Oh, no. No, no, the one -- Kurt, here, if you go to this one here?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Oh, that's --

MR. LAMOTTE: This is the 3D sketch of program moving some facade back on the ripped off building.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: That's the B.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, that's the B.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: That's the B option.

MR. LAMOTTE: That's the dead wall of the whatchamacallit --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: That's the Hando.

MR. LAMOTTE: Hando, it's a new --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Those brown stripes were a little disturbing.

MR. LAMOTTE: Which ones?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: The brown right here, that little --
MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, that's our symbol where we're just showing, you'll see it elsewhere, it's just facade improvement.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Just new facade, old facade.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, yes. It's just hard for us to show that. We really want to call this out.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Oh, okay. So, okay.

MR. LAMOTTE: The stripe is fix it, and then this one is they just took the skin of the Hando building and they did a picture of it and morphed it onto the side because that would be a raw wall.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay. I stand corrected. Thank you.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, what's the pleasure on Fountain Square? I think I'm hearing consensus that we need to do something really great in that whole space tying the whole intersection together. That may be, you know, and then eventually the traffic study has to tell us more about what we can or cannot do with traffic flow. We also I think heard a lot about people wanting to get that ramp underneath redone so it's not a big --
there. So, those are pretty sold things.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Those are the
comprehensive, it has to be looked at as a comprehensive
design challenge.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: And not addressing the
piecemeal basis.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Right.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right. And it goes back
to, you know, what Johanna mentioned and many residents
have mentioned about this sort of traffic, weird dogleg
thing. So, all of it, even how this is now, it's still
a little convoluted. I imagine a lot of people going
down the wrong way.

MR. LAMOTTE: It would have to be --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Tickets and revenue.

MR. LAMOTTE: You have to either do one-way
northbound on Orrington so if you're going to come
around the dogleg, or two-way. They're going to need to
solve it, the traffic engineer. And we wouldn't want to
put anything in it that's not even close.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: As a concept, we're
saying that we want to kind of have a big area that we
can shutdown and have, you know, lots of people there
when we light everything.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Without a doubt.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right, right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And then open it up to
traffic and --

MR. LAMOTTE: And then if Orrington could come
out there, then you've got a little bonus, or a big
bonus -- if it can't, it can't. I mean, the traffic
folks will tell, because this is your direction to tell
them to make sure to study this intently and make it
work.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I think it's worth
trying the concept on that.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, do we have
language in here that stipulates this must be addressed
in a comprehensive manner?

MR. LAMOTTE: Let's see. Let's do a quick --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: You know, and --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: And maybe undertaken in
a, I mean, addressed and then undertaken, I mean,
because you just want to say --
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes. Well, you understand --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes, like you don't want the one thing to happen, like one quarter to happen without the --

MR. LAMOTTE: Without the other stuff, right.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, it needs a comprehensive design. It could be phased.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Otherwise you'd have to wait 30 years.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Sure, absolutely it stays, but I don't want you to say we're going to invest in this corner and then when we get the money for the opposite corner or we can get the agreement of that, if you can establish a phase, plan, schedule, fine. Obviously you can have everybody working on the same corner at the same time. But like --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right. Especially when they're different property owners.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Right. But once you have the property owners in agreement and the funding in place, like phasing, whatever, you need to get everybody in agreement with what's going to happen because if one
person --

MR. LAMOTTE: Right. So, I think on the first paragraph, I'm watching Kurt here now, is maybe we do something that it's critical that a comprehensive design approach is undertaken for the whole intersection, all corners, or something like that.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, it's like, yes, let's fix it but especially it's got to be done comprehensively.

Something to that effect.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Earlier you said --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: And tying all four corners together and expanding the public and green space.

MR. LAMOTTE: Wherever possible.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Wherever possible.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay. So, that's the front end, right out of the box, let's get a take on it. So, a design in terms of -- must be approached comprehensively, in a comprehensive manner, that ties or connects all four -- how many intersections or corners we have?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Five?
MR. LAMOTTE: Five, six with the other. Six corners.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, six.

MR. LAMOTTE: That addresses all six corners and intersections. Yes, generally you're right because then even if you can't implement one piece right away because of private sector money, at least it's designed together.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right.
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Right.
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: That's right.
MR. LAMOTTE: Okay? Okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: John, getting back to a point you made earlier, you still think we ought to have a traffic study irrespective of what is done with Fountain Square?

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, the multi-modal study is going to be looking at the Downtown fully. They've already built the model with these concepts.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, they will be drilling down and telling us one-way, two-way, can't turn left, a T intersection to Northwestern versus the timing is great.
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay.
MR. LAMOTTE: Okay?
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Got you.
MR. MARINO: Can we take a break, Chief?
Since it's 9:00 o'clock now.
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, let's take, yes, it's 9:00 o'clock, we'll take ten minutes.
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: One more.
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Something else on Fountain Square?
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes, hold on.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Let's just finish Fountain Square.
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, let's finish Fountain Square, yes.
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: One thing. Several people have talked about the War Memorial aspect. And so, I'd like, we need like stronger language because I know, I'm not sure -- but I think it's a little bit more than consider the potential relocation of war memorials to a different corner. I think there's a little bit more of a process there.
MR. LAMOTTE: You know, I think we should get
the specific geography out of there. My guys were just defining them --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Then, good, okay.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, let's just do something like sensitively place the war memorials in more visible locations or accessible locations.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Sensitivity to the historical significance of the corner because I think --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right. And also, maybe something like we're definitely maintaining a wall that is not going away, that it has to be there and that we're not getting rid of it.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: But the 'there' could be anywhere within that whole thing.

MR. LAMOTTE: Exactly.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Absolutely.

MR. LAMOTTE: But sometimes we find that older war memorials didn't quite get located the right way to get maximum effect. So maybe features are --

MR. SMITH: They have to be maintained within Fountain Square and not saying northeast corner --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: The Fountain Square,
what are we calling it? The Fountain Square development area?

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes. Features include maintenance of the war memorials, or retention of the war memorials in visible and accessible locations.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: It should be placed in a prominent --

MR. LAMOTTE: Prominent.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Prominent site.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Within the Fountain Square area.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, within the area, exactly, not just the Fountain Square.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Right.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right. Because we may find something in designing this that it's better in another corner or across the street or something.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right, right.

MS. AIELLO: Can I just add that the Council has committed to the -- that they be part of a plan and every couple of months --
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Did you want to just add that? Please add that in.

MS. AIELLO: No, I just agreed with you.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, that's part of the initiatives to come -- okay? So, scratch that one off our checklist and we'll come back to Raymond Park?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes.

(Off the record.)

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All right. Next item, Raymond Park. Comments?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: There are several people who felt that Raymond Park was just fine the way it is.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Especially if we're going to spend a lot of money elsewhere, I think --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: There's a reference to redesigning the pedestrian paths. Well, I live two blocks from this park and I always cut through diagonally, and I could tell you if there is not a sidewalk that cuts through diagonally, there is going to be a dirt path. Paths of --

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, this is one that I think they were just saying, everybody is saying what a great
space it is but could it be better without us trying to
design it right now, to say it must be this or that.
And one initiative that may be low cost is could the
community and the Park folks said it's okay, it was
raised during the process, what other things could we
do? It might be just putting in another piece of street
furniture or a gazebo or whatever. But one of the
discussions at the workshops and charrettes were can we
have a little more festival space lawn sitting up for
little concerts and running around and then bring the
top lot to the stuff to the east.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Right.
MR. LAMOTTE: And that's just a quick
portrayal of it. So, you would be saying as a
Commission, we think further study should be done to see
what other things we can do to make it even better.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Good, because that --
that you have there, that little brown thing?
MR. LAMOTTE: Yes. And we brought the top lot
to the east.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I do want to want to
make sure, I do want to make a statement that the top
lot should not be the dominant element in that park that
precludes other activities from occurring or precludes
the visual appearance of that parking multi-faceted.
Presently, that's what it does.
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes, I agree.
MR. LAMOTTE: Right.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Because there's
not enough trees and greening though, right?
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: -- in their place,
we're going to create a special place for them.
MR. LAMOTTE: That's exactly right. We went
out there and said that's a cool thing and we need that,
that it does dominate versus this one segment of a
bigger space. That's the same thing we ran on Central
Street with the park where others wanted to get in there
and do things and -- on people and it wasn't open and it
just needs a fresh look. And it may be a two-dollar
bench that you put in there or it might be three more
trees. It doesn't have to be a wholesale redo.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I'm just saying, a two-
dollar bench?
MR. LAMOTTE: Well, when you start getting a
hundred at a time. No.
MR. MARINO: -- got to be objective -- to open
up the west side -- Downtown. The feeling is not enough Downtown office uses or residents make use this of park.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right. And it's a grass type green space rather than a plaza, that even doing a great job on Fountain Square to have a bigger concert without shutting down the whole space, here you could have a little something out there, you know.

MR. BISHOP: The young professionals during the charrette week spoke at length about their desire to use Raymond Park for lunchtime activities. They gravitate towards it but they don't find it that hospitable for sitting down and eating their lunch.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: It's not. Can you imagine some noontime concerts at the gazebo?

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: You know, you go out there and there a couple of, you know, some wrought iron tables and chairs and you bring your lunch there, you get --

MR. LAMOTTE: It would be like the park in New York which I'm drawing a blank on that Good Morning America does their thing there. Bryant Park where it's multiple use, it's so great. Everything goes on there,
and it's a great size, it's not too big.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, and I think the concept here is perfect.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Public-private.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay? Off the checklist.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All right.

Maple/Grove. Right across from the YMCA.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Well, it's actually owned by the Presbyterian Home and I think they have ultimate plans probably to expand on that and -- develop -- because that's -- the big concern is with the Y. That King Home and -- the Presbyterian Home and they basically control that and they're good enough to let the Y use a part of it. And it's very critical for the Y.

So, you know, and I think it will ultimately be developed. We're losing a part of that space.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, how can we encourage development there that would also provide parking for the Y?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: By buying it.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Well, the Y, I mean, that is an issue. The Y is basically a build-out
without some incredible zoning permission. With the new
addition to build it out, it's covered to the point
where there is no room left to build a garage. There
are a couple of lots around and there's the old Masonic
Temple that's not used. So, there are some
possibilities in that area for parking to kind of take
care of everything in that area, but nothing --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: How much of the
parking lot south of the Y does the Y control?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: South of the Y?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes, on the south end.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: The whole, well, that we
own, we own the whole lot.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: We is?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: The Y, the Y. I'm
still, I'm not on the board anymore but just like my
clients -- the Y owns it but the Y has a contract with
the City of Evanston. City of Evanston runs the meters
and so the Y doesn't get all the -- in there because
they don't need it all day long. Some of the parking
used to be all-day commuters, I don't think that's the
case anymore but I don't know for sure. And the Y
shares the funds.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Some of it is permit parking back there.

COMMISSIONER STaley: Is it?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: But the Y owns the entire lot parcel? Or the residents?

MR. LAMOTTE: This one here or the one south?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: The one south.

COMMISSIONER STaley: No, there aren't many residents that have cars, just a few that are --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Okay. Judy, do you know --

MS. AIELLO: Yes, the Y owns the whole thing.

MR. LAMOTTE: Oh, the whole thing, okay.

MS. AIELLO: But the City owns the one kitty corner from that for the Police Department --

MR. LAMOTTE: Right. A little bit more of a theory here was that when you look globally at the whole neighborhood, I mean, not neighborhood, that district of the neighborhood's area there, we thought there is more of a need for a Downtown plaza. The beautiful garden is farther down but it's not just walk over and have your coffee kind of thing. So, if you're west of the tracks,
a corner plaza or even a center plaza, if Pres Homes wanted to do the whole block, it's basically where we can pick up some space and you can work it in the bonus system and basically say, yes, do the green space but don't put a fence and lock everybody out. We'd like to make it public, let's work it through the bonus system.

So, this is the concept, not saying you must do it on a corner with a fountain in the middle. The other thing that could happen there is because they have other functions in there besides just housing is maybe some of those -- can be brought out to the corner. And staff and us went and took a look and maybe even encourage a little bit of retail going up into the Davis area. So, if Pres knocks on the door and says I want to do half a block, okay, let's work with this. If they say they want to do the whole block and incorporate all their other stuff in there, maybe it's the center plaza where we can go over and have coffee and not feel like we're in someone's private thing. And the design could be just great because you could do it all up front on the big block, you know.

So, you would be giving direction to the Council as we'd like to see that incorporated working
with Pres Homes on the bonus system.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, I'm fully in favor of the concept. But as a Y member, I'm also aware of the lack of parking. And I wouldn't want to delete this as a goal or as an objective of desire, shall we say, by virtue of the fact that the Y may not have enough parking --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Could you just -- possibly with underground parking? A little more underground parking?

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, I think there might be something else there because we've run into this --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, they probably will have it anyway.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, I mean, they own the lot now. They could close the lot tomorrow.

MR. MARINO: Again, they being?

MR. LAMOTTE: Pres Homes. They could close it off tomorrow. So, if --

MR. MARINO: -- about the Y parking, there is an agreement now. But once the Presbyterian Home decides --

MR. LAMOTTE: To do something, right.
MR. MARINO: That goes away.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, let's take that to the next step. If anybody said I'm leasing a space or somebody in their good graces let me park there and there's 20 spaces that we really need for our use, they would have to work something out with the developer of that site to say, hey, can you put 20 spaces in, we've got to work out financially how that works so that our Y people could park in your parking area.

So, say they put a parking deck inside or back off the alley, they could say work with the developer and get together and see if you guys can incorporate that. And that could be called out to some need and then figure out a payment schedule, you know. I need 20 in and what would it cost for me to buy or lease them from you as part of a deal. And obviously triggering, this would be triggered by a development obviously that would come along. So, I wouldn't want to lock them into underground parking because it might be in the building.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: We'll just leave it and move on to Grove then.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Grove Street.
COMMISSIONER STALEY: The Y does own that I believe.

MR. MARINO: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Very small, you only get about 20, well, 20 cars? 16?

MR. MARINO: More than that.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Like 30, I think.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Well, wait a minute.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That's the one to the west of that.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: To the west across the alley.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Yes, that's what I'm thinking. I didn't realize you could get that many.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, where you've got three rows of parking in it.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Oh, like three rows.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And that is really stark there.

MR. LAMOTTE: It's bare back in there, yes.

So, the theory here then would be, again, if somebody is working with the Y and the developer -- globally on parking, we solve that in another location and can we
say that little chip of land, let's green it up so that
it doesn't look like it's a bare asphalt thing. And
again, things have to be like at Fountain Square falling
in place before you just take them out --

MR. MARINO: So, as an option, John, you're
thinking green up the surface parking could be an option
rather than just take out the parking?

MR. LAMOTTE: That could be there and, you
know, some nicer fencing and landscaping and maybe a
couple of trees inside just to buffer it up. If it's
one row, it's hard to do that. If it's multiple rows,
maybe back in there and you can maybe edge it off the
alley. So, that might be an interim solution. And then
if for some reason across the street a bigger deck
opportunity came to get all the parking covered, then it
could go straight park if you wanted it to be. And we
can clean the language up to that effect.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, I would --

MR. LAMOTTE: Want to do that?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: -- move more in that
direction.

MR. LAMOTTE: All right. So, short-term is
the greening option. I'm simplifying it.
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Could I add a goal to --

MR. LAMOTTE: -- landscape buffer --

MR. MARINO: interim solution, I like the language of interim because it suggests that we're going to move on to something else.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right, that something better is going to come along.

MR. MARINO: Like a public-private parking.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, so an interim solution would be the landscaping.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Dave wants to add a goal.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I want to add a goal to the previous park. And that is that the design more sensitively address the presence of the YMCA building across the street. Point being that while this corner can serve as a public park, it could serve as a private park or green space for the Presbyterian Home building, it also can serve as, in effect, the front yard of the Y.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right. If we go corner plaza, it would be, right.
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So, that design, I would like to encourage that design address that quality or that goal. I mean, I realize it's really more of a statement but --

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, how about this? If, because we said center or corner concept, if a corner plaza is developed, incorporating the view and the massing of the Y in the design should be considered or something like that. I didn't quite get the language right but is that what you're saying?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes. For example, the way it might be landscaped might --

MR. LAMOTTE: Frame the views or something, yes.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right. Even, you know, because the Y really doesn't have outside space for kids, that might be something to incorporate, you know, that there is a playground kind of thing over there as well.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I don't know about that.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But if you're looking at
it as a Y --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: We take them to Raymond Park, that's the reason the kids are running around.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But you know, just being that close, the proximity makes sense that if it's going to be incorporated in with the Y, that there's a kid friendly environment to the --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I wasn't going that far. I was merely stating, because I don't want to impose to the Y members' children on the Presbyterian people.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: There would be a black wrought iron fence all the way around it.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: My only suggestion was that in the design, for example, there are tall trees on the Grove Street side of this park. Tall trees might just be on the east side so that --

MR. LAMOTTE: Sure.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So that when you're standing --

MR. LAMOTTE: And you're looking out, right.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: In the front of the Y and you exit the Y, this sort of appears as the front
yard of the Y. There is nothing visually there to
discourage you from making it your own whether it's just
an emotional ownership or an actual user ownership.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right, okay. Now, we could come
up with a fitness option, Judy. An urban fitness trail,
you go around ten times and then do push ups ten times
and then do sit-ups. Take like a 40-mile trail in one
block. Okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Library Plaza.

MR. LAMOTTE: Library Plaza, moving along,
Chairman. Okay.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Could we add somewhere
that there is encourage native plantings that require
low water or something like that.

MR. LAMOTTE: That will be in the coding.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Okay.

MR. LAMOTTE: When you get to the coding.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Some native plantings can
be nice.

MR. LAMOTTE: And low maintenance, too.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes, low maintenance.

Yes, environmentally friendly.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Do you know why we
plant real grass?

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: No, I'm not saying the

prairie grass.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Oh, thank you.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I was talking about

like --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Because prairie grass

is ugly, that's all.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes, I'm talking about

like --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I think that's

subjective.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Certain shrubs that are

native to the area.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes. And that you want to get

into the code. Check.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Church Plaza.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay. Library Plaza, this is a

simple one. We were observing our guys professionally

out there and some other folks that you've got a new

landmark building there for the library and that some of

those multi some trees are blocking the whole show

there. So, not to design it as a committee right now,
it's just saying could we do a little something better
over there and thin it, prune it, make it better, that's
all. And that's the design initiative that maybe
forestry and landscape folks in the City can do a little
bit soon. That's all we're saying there. Just revisit.
Okay?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Were you just talking
about the Library Plaza?

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay. So, that's off the --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Church Plaza.

MR. LAMOTTE: Church Plaza, okay.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I highly agree with this
one because the planters that are there are so low you
don't want to sit on them around the trees. But if they
were a little bit higher, it would become much more of a
place where people could gather and have lunch.

MR. LAMOTTE: Even just for a little break
when you're walking. And when we have these little chip
corners and things, they could be better if we really
address them.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, so, if all those
were just raised a little bit.

MR. LAMOTTE: Good.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: This is where --

MR. LAMOTTE: It's in front of the Shan Mornahan.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Shan Mornahan, yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Streetscape.

MR. LAMOTTE: We were asked to be thorough by the staff so we were out there looking at every space. Streetscape, this is the broad one. So, again we're not designing it. There's a lot of great streetscapes in this town. We've got mayors and managers and planners from other towns to your City to see it. But there's been a lot of discussion even back, Dave, if you remember, with our 2004 Visioning, that we need to connect it better.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: And there's good looking stuff and then it falls off or it's not as quality as the other. So, it's not throw it all out, it's just connect the tissue better here. And here are some general ideas and spaces.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, I have --

MR. LAMOTTE: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: The Benson Avenue, the Church --

MR. LAMOTTE: Market thing?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Marking thing, I really don't know if that's a good concept. I can't, it's hard for me to envision, one, how that would work, and the danger of that street alone, the traffic would be a little tough.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Did we skip the other two?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, I was just jumping. I was just jumping.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Oh, okay.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, she's pointing to a specific concept that was sketched out.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right, yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: But I think the first thing before you get to it, because you're right, is the broad brush description of streetscape, and I don't mean broad brush in the negative. I think everybody is identifying we've got to do better. We've got great stuff. Some of
your pavers are some of the best we've ever seen and your raised planters with your decorative rails. It's just missing pieces and viaducts and things that need to be cleaned up.

And I think a lot of folks in '04 especially were talking about making the district look like a whole district rather than pieces and parts.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right. Yes, and I was just down in Boulder over the weekend which has very similarities to Evanston. And the streetscape, everything was so unified with, from, you know, the gates to the signage to the lighting to the pavers. And you really felt like there was much more coordination, and even the signage telling you where to go and things like that.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I think Ogden Park kind of has something similar, row of oak trees, what do they have, like something on the garbage cans, the benches, the lamps.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: And so, again, just to make sure everybody is clear because it was a very good discussion with staff and with folks at the workshop/charrettes,
that we're not saying throw it all out and start with

scratch. It's just knit the good parts together, that's

the key. So, that's the statement you're making to the

Council, we agree with that.

And then, more specifically, we called out a

few of these blocks. We didn't every specific. But

then your question about this Benson market --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, I guess --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Can we, I would like

to see some bullet points on the streetscape as opposed

to a paragraph.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, I'll give you

one bullet point if I might. Consider placing London

style heavy cast iron bollards at strategic points in

the Downtown area.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: What are they?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I mean, you see these,

for example, all over London. They're these very

heavy --

MR. LAMOTTE: Thick, right.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Cast iron bollards

around corners to prevent trucks from going over

sidewalks and things like that. But they can be very
decorative and I think they add a very lovely aspect to the Downtown.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: And they create a more safe pedestrian environment by creating a boundary between the two.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, they keep the bikes off the sidewalk.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: You would have to be careful with the ADA access on the corners. That's the one thing to think about.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Oh, yes. I mean, I'm not saying you put them every 18 inches. But I mean, you know --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, I know.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Here and there.

MR. LAMOTTE: It's more of a car thing. In some of it, what we find is they just have a physical presence that this is a pedestrian area and this is a driving area rather than just float right out onto the street, you know. So, that would be, again, an initiative, a Downtown Planning initiative that comes out and you say okay. Somebody can then revisit the streetscape.
We did the audit after the '04 charrette or workshop, so there's a lot of information. And then just go block by block and fill it in. And we came up with three categories. One was just, you know, a couple of trees and you finish the block off with some paver fix-up. Two was to be a little bit more, and three was more intense, you've got to do the whole streetscape. And so, that's an initiative then that would follow up and you look at bollards, look at the whole show.

Okay. This Benson thing is a more specific concept rather than work on the streetscape. This is can we dress up the viaduct with this market idea, European kind of style. The question is, is it viable to have newsstands and candy stands and flower stands out there.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: But I'm not willing to leave the streetscape paragraph before that.

MR. LAMOTTE: Oh, David is still -- okay, all right. This one here. Yes.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: We did this audit.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Of the streetscape.

And we've discussed and batted around this concept of
connectivity, trying to connect all the, if you will, neighborhoods of the Downtown. And one of the means by which that could be done is through consistent paving materials, consistent lighting, consistent park benches.

MR. LAMOTTE: Planters.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Planters, newspaper kiosks, and so forth. And I would, unless it's somewhere else in this document that I haven't seen, I would like to see those things listed as bullet points or means by which the streetscape can be addressed, and to make sure that one of the goals is to achieve connectivity with all Downtown pedestrian areas. You know, and your idea, your statement of new street trees every 25 to 35 feet, sure, that's good. Consistent paving materials, strategically placed art, and that can go back to reference the master plan for art.

And what did I say? Consistent park benches, kiosks, newspaper --

MR. LAMOTTE: Trash cans.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Trash cans.

MR. LAMOTTE: Fountain, water fountains.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: And God, please, give us some of those attractive, integrated newspaper
vending things, whatever they call -- what do they call those?

MR. LAMOTTE: Those are newspaper box corrals for lack of a better word.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Box corrals, great.

MR. LAMOTTE: Very expensive on State Street but we've done them a lot less extensive but they look great and you can put your brand on them, you know, your sign or something on them.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes. So, we need to list all --

MR. LAMOTTE: -- free speech of the press, you know.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, and list all those things because I think, I just think it's very important that that menu be made aware and reinforced.

MR. LAMOTTE: If the Commission so approves, because that's going to be a long list of things, Lakota can give this, we'll put the list in there for you for the final vote because we have our list of all the different parts and pieces. Otherwise, we'd be typing them in.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Okay. You've already
got them --

MR. LAMOTTE:  But I'll bullet underneath there, you know, the lighting, the benches, the cans and things.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY:  Yes, yes.

MR. LAMOTTE:  Yes, okay.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER:  We have nothing in here on encouraging improvement of viaducts?

MR. LAMOTTE:  Let's rewind that movie because we really want to encourage that. Somewhere, that was in.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE:  It's missing page 62.

MR. LAMOTTE:  Those two pages.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE:  It's the back of page 61 which was intentionally left blank.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS:  You're right. 62 is blank.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE:  That's the viaduct page.

MR. LAMOTTE:  This is what we wanted the viaduct to look like. Larry, you don't get the concept for the viaduct?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER:  Yes, unfortunately, I
do. It's the blank one.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But it has made, the viaduct, the new one on Church has made such great improvements.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Oh, absolutely.

MR. LAMOTTE: Huge, huge.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: And you know, you could put in -- on the one on Emerson --

MR. MARINO: Judy, do we have any others in the pipe line, viaducts?

MS. AIELLO: Any others?

MR. MARINO: Any other viaducts in the pipe line?

MS. AIELLO: We have, from the CTA, there is Planning money to finish them all and we have no more construction, at least not in the current allocation from CTA but it is a constant issue that both --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But I think we ought to have something in there that just says we think it's very important that that never stop until it's done.

MR. LAMOTTE: Larry, if we could clarify, on page -- Tom, what was that?

MR. SMITH: It's on page 8. There's just a
MR. LAMOTTE: Then on page 39, we actually have a strategy to improve them. Here is what we say, they are encouraged -- oops, let me find it here. "Enhance the pedestrian experience along each block within each public space including alleys, viaducts, street crossings, sidewalk cafes, architecture, and signage through targeted capital improvements."

So, that was the strategy that we put in there. And then, Judy has been talking about the bigger capital improvement and where we get the money to do that. And maybe there are some interim things. If somebody comes back and now does streetscape design and there are some interim painting and cleaning --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, I think that's what we talk about here maybe --

MR. LAMOTTE: -- to wait for the big money to come.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, yes. If we can add something here. I mean, even as crazy as it looks, the brown cloth --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I know.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: It does look better.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That they put over the one on Green Bay and Emerson, it still looks better than --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: You have to wonder what's going on behind there though.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I don't ask.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: The bridge is rusting away, yes, but --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: -- drop by one day and the bridge will be on grade and the club will still be up there.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: At least it looks better until it falls.

MR. LAMOTTE: And Larry, if we follow that, you've got these new bullets then, and obviously we'll get your more specific components list, something about interim physical improvements. So, the following streetscape things should be done. One is interim physical improvements of viaducts until viaduct replacement or something kind of thing.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes. When we did the original charrettes for what was then the Research Park
area, one of the things that was discussed was lighting the viaducts, underneath the viaducts, the bridges.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Commissioner Widmayer, Commissioner Staley had a really good idea with the viaducts. Couldn't we, you know the children who paint the snow plows in town, couldn't they paint the viaducts?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: That wasn't exactly my idea. Mine was more we merge this with our local artists.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I didn't want to get specific. I just said, you know, improvements. Well, one of the things was the lighting, someone was talking about, well, maybe we could do lighting like they have between the two united terminals or something because it's dark. And so, going from one, there was a big concern nobody would go from the old Downtown to the new Downtown because of the dark. Some of those type of things that could be done.

MR. LAMOTTE: And the interim things could be as, you know, it could be some plastering of the walls, cleaning up of the colors, getting the lighting in there better, and maybe some public art. Then you're good for
five or six, ten years until the moneys come along.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Patch the walls and light the walls and then draw your visual attention away from the decaying of the viaducts.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: We make everything else look nice and then you come up to the viaduct. And unless it's been replaced --

MR. LAMOTTE: So, why don't we do this? I think Kurt has got interim physical and appearance related improvements to the viaducts.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And I think I would, going back to the sort of like the vending kiosk things, those under the viaducts, you know --

MR. LAMOTTE: Would liven them all up.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, would seem to make more sense of keeping --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: -- maybe we should call the viaduct that same plan.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But if you have something like that, that would actually sort of continue the business retail sector linking the two sides of Downtown in a way.
MR. LAMOTTE: Right. And we've even, lately some folks have talked about how we try and encourage on the side of the dead walls of stores some fake storefronts. They'd put in little -- with some product in there, you can do that. If you couldn't stick out too far, you can even put the fake windows along there and have stores put their stuff in there to liven it up.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: We could even have illuminated posters that advertise local merchants and so forth.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Say you give it to us, we'd put it up there and -- for free.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, there's a relatively inexpensive --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay, folks. We'll move on now.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Can I just add one sort of like, no, no, it's global. It's not about this particular, it's actually global about the public space. And sort of, we're talking about, you know, adding benefits, bonuses for public space. We might want to talk about ranking the public space of what is the most
important. Is it the Fountain Square that's the most important that we should be putting those bonus dollars toward, instead of, you know, I guess -- different places and saying, okay, this is our most important public space. And if those dollars are coming in for public space, then it's going to go for that first.

Just a thing to throw out and talk about in general instead of saying, yes, of course, these are all really great ideas, but what is the most important thing that will have the biggest bang for the buck.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, and it's not Northern Plaza.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Maybe Parks & Recreation can give us their feedback because there might be things that --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: That might be something that's just looked up through City staff or Council as they perceive the need.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, don't forget that you've got the whole process yet to craft the form-based code. And the team, through Duncan's expertise, they've put a whole kind of base for you there, then you might say, well, one gets more merits than the other because it's
more important to us, we want it sooner than later.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, and I'm just throwing it out as something to think about.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Now we can move on, sorry.

MR. MARINO: One quick thing. Benson Avenue from Church to Clark, there was some concern raised about this. Public Works actually think that it would be feasible to still have parking up on both sides diagonal. And some of us are excited about the idea of one day turning it into a Farmers Market through this street and then having the kind of vending opportunity that you see here on the west side as kind of the market for the rest of the week. And some of that may be a little bit over the top in terms of how much space are we really talking about, but it's the idea of trying to create kind of an eclectic enterprising place that's regulated but does create a dynamic on the street that sometimes to me seems way too --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Absolutely.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right. And that's a great point because if it's doing double, triple duty, it might just
be a little simple kiosk with the bench or something that everybody can use. But that has to be looked at on the streetscape design. Next phase.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Don't take my parking from the front of my club.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay. We're going into --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I want to underline Dennis' point about Farmers Market in that location. I think that would be, I would like to encourage that that be investigated.

MR. LAMOTTE: Investigated, all right. So, we'll put that on the streetscape as well.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I think that would be a fabulous location for it.

MR. MARINO: Wasn't the ones there, was that the initial location for the Farmers Market?

MS. AIELLO: It was, yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All right, folks. We're on to Districts, Traditional Districts. Directing your attention to page 46-47.

MR. LAMOTTE: If I could, while you're looking at it, I think we just better get something in here about the Farmers Market should be considered for Benson
or something I think on the third bullet.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes, sorry, I didn't mean to rush you.

MR. LAMOTTE: I just want to make sure we get all the little tidbits.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes. No, I think that's an excellent point, Dave. I think that's a great site for the Farmers Market.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes. The lights are linear and all those -- and you're far closer to all the entertainment venues in the Downtown. You're closer to mass transit.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay. So, we're on to Development Framework?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Development Framework.

MR. LAMOTTE: And for those of you that need to see it, behind the, Commissioners, it's the one on the, second from the right. Development Framework and the districts that are recommended.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: And we're going to consider the traditional --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: What page is this?

I'm sorry.
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Taking you to 46-47, right in, jumping right into the core, we're going to start with traditional. It's getting late.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, again, taking the lead from the Planning Committee of the Plan Commission, taking the original kind of sub-area zones and adjusting them based on input and field work and whatnot, that map there is what we've got on the table. And then we've got the -- and I think it's, some of the geography on the East Avenue we've been talking about in and out of the Commission, with the public, so it's boundaries as well as use as well as the inside, the zone so to speak.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It says here the west end from Ridge but it really, we don't show it --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: No, it's that alley.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It's the alley behind.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Alley behind the --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: This post office, right? Is that right?

MR. MARINO: Yes, right.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes. So, it's not all the way to Ridge. It's, are we taking these one at a time or are we just jumping in and --
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes, let's start with West.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, West Traditional.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: And probably take it to Ridge then in that.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: No, I don't think so because it's really changes, that's residential.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: There was some talk about extending that all the way to Ridge to cover those apartment buildings that are presently three stories.

Now, we're not talking about the eight-story one but we're talking about the series of three-stories.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I think they're actually four but that's --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: That's okay, three to five.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Three to five, it's perfect. What's the issue with that?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Find a traditional area not as a residential area but as a retail area with residential above it. I'm not sure we want to confound it then by going over to areas which are hundred percent residential.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right, but the idea is that you need to protect things that need to be protected. And so, having something that's defined as business in a residential area rather than something with a higher zoning on it seems to make a lot of sense. I don't think they're going to start putting in storefronts in those residential apartments, so I don't think you have to worry about it turning --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Oh, you know I could make more money if I took that first floor apartment and turn it into a store.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, then we could write something in zoning that would take care of that but I mean protecting the landmark buildings makes a lot of sense. And we did hear a lot about this.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Which ones are you talking about? Are you talking about --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: The series of buildings north of Davis along the east side of Ridge.

MR. LAMOTTE: And I'll point it out on the map but I'm going to get behind it so --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes, between Davis and Church.
MR. LAMOTTE: It's right here.
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: On the east side of Ridge.
MR. LAMOTTE: Here is this West Traditional Zone in Davis, and it's these guys right in the middle.
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes.
MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, which are bigger and older and more traditional looking. So, again, most of these buildings are here for the long term, but if somebody wants to tear one down, then what is the zoning direction and --
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, if they're four-stories and they can go up to, what's the --
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Six to ten.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, what you're doing is, unless you're very careful, same building, building never changes but you had now changed it from a residential to a mixed use zone.
MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, yes, yes, because we have retail at the base in the traditional.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, the building does change if someone wants to tear it down because --
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: No, no. No, no, I'm talking about leaving it as it is, same building. Same old, same old, I can just take out those first floor apartments and turn them into stores.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, I share many other Commissioners' concerns about those buildings and about preserving them.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: And I'm wondering if there isn't some other way we can address them other than incorporating them into a traditional zone which heretofore has been mixed use retail. You know, essentially an intimate shopping district.

MR. LAMOTTE: Here's the feeling -- you've got the little shops in here or institutional, then we would jump in, pick this up, if they stay residential forever, great. If they said uh-oh, now I can pull out my lower apartment and put in retail, the question on the building is really -- or something. And in the future if they came down in 50 years or something, then they would be in the three to five category. If they stay in this zone where they're more the size that they are today, kind of doing one for the other --
I think the question would be is do you want the retail at the base. I think in the future, 20 to 30 years, if retail -- well, that's the question.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, no. We don't want that.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, do you want the parcel to start at Ridge? Not to get too gateway- y on this right now, that's the question.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Is it thought? Because I think the question is, the thing is if you're zoning traditional on three to five stories, that for me is the important part unless we can down zone parts of Zone B here, right? So, I think the larger question is are we protecting these buildings properly. And then it's a question in other places, too. You can build up to ten stories. I'm much more afraid of the three-story building with the option to go ten-story than I am to put in retail because I think in the code we can say these have been historical apartments right here and City can't put storefronts in. But if we keep it in the zone, there is no way we can say you can't build to ten stories. And so, destroying an entire building as opposed to -- code about the retail is going to be --
MR. BISHOP: I think in the traditional
district, what we're trying to do is say you actually
have to have retail on there. That's really the goal.
And I think the point that you're making is different.
You're saying in those transitional districts, maybe the
height limit should be stricter.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: So, we're talking,
this isn't height.
MR. BISHOP: Yes, that's what I'm talking
about.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: So, this is the
same question then. So, if traditional is not about
height, it's only about what kind of businesses are in
there --
MR. BISHOP: No, no, no. It's about height --
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: It's about the
class of the retail building. It's a --
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, I'm worried
about the destruction of the building --
MR. LAMOTTE: -- good solid building, the one
thing would be if somebody picked off the bottom of the
building to put in some retail spaces -- may be in that
architecture. The building today is bigger than the
ones on the Davis Street Traditional, and I don't have
my map with all their heights on it. But I think it's
that zipper courtyard building is, it looks --
elevated base, right.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Elevated base.
MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I'm not talking,
I'm talking about these buildings on the edge of Ridge.
MR. LAMOTTE: That's what we're talking about,
right.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And actually, I would
agree with Robin on this in that those buildings
predominantly have stoopings in those buildings. It's
not, they're not kept really well and they're okay. But
I could see that these buildings could be torn down
pretty easily and large ten-stories -- are they
landmarked?

MR. RUIZ: Yes, there's --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Okay, all right.
MR. MARINO: Carlos, can you say that again?
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Thank you. Right, yes.
Sorry, I wasn't looking at -- but that's a really good
point. That could go really tall along there because I
believe that those buildings are owned also by a single owner, is that true?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And so, they could amass a large parcel here to put in a pretty substantial building as well as we're not sure what's going to happen right across the street on Ridge. I know that -- right, thank you, they were going to put it in, now they're not. So, we're not sure what's going to happen at that site, too. And so, this could become a whole well of really tall apartment buildings along there. So, just to sort of think of that.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, you know, there was another suggestion, and that was that you end the Downtown at the alley.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And leave those zones --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Out.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, leave those zones as they are.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: What do they have on there right now?
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: R-6.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: R-6.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Are they R-6 or R-4?

MR. MARINO: R-6.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: That would be a good idea, don't you think?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: And you could do the same thing on the Hinman, I mean if you wanted to for those --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, that would win, that would be a win-win.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, let's be careful. I mean, it's a tall building now. That's one of the reasons we got so many contexts for these sites trying to blend them all.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes, it's R-6.

MR. LAMOTTE: It's a tall six-story now, so it's in the six to eight range of the transitional. If you go to R-6, again if we can remember our heights, if we leave it as it is today with that zoning, what could it be?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: That's true.

MR. LAMOTTE: That's the question.
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: That's right.

MR. LAMOTTE: It's 85 feet.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: If we exempt it, it can still be used, the old, if we exempt it from the Downtown Plan, then we can use the existing problem, not existing we have today and so that's problematic, too, I'd rather turn it into a traditional area and put into the code that we don't want storefronts. It's not appropriate for storefronts.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But then you're really bastardizing the traditional area.

MR. LAMOTTE: I mean, Robin, one of the things this is --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Why?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Because it's a retail area. I mean, that's the definition of it.

MR. LAMOTTE: We went street by street, block by block, site by site. And I mean we finally had to get to a point where what really looks susceptible to change in the short term, could somebody stay on renting cheap space to students and now I'm going to go to condo, sure. But most of the Downtown is not that susceptible. I want to make sure everybody clear that
it's not the wholesale turning down of all these buildings that are going to happen because the zoning is there.

Somebody could say, hey, the furnace blew up and I got to do the whole new building, for the most part they're not going to change that much. Is there an incentive to tear it down and go to do the -- they could do that but we just don't see it right now with the conditions and the character.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right, but we're thinking of a 20 to 30-year plan. And I think that if we're going to define traditional as a storefront rather than height, then we're going to have to really rethink --

MR. LAMOTTE: No, no, no. It's three to five.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: No, it's both. It's a storefront, it's a retail area of short buildings is what it is.

MR. LAMOTTE: And as Kurt showed it the one to two meetings ago, there was, this levels it out. I mean it goes actually down in some cases with the new traditional when he showed what it is today and what it would be today. So, it basically says in the
traditional, forgetting architectural character, you have two, three, four, five stories in that. We kind of averaged it out. You bonus up a little bit, but that's your traditional thing, architectural character and articulation.

So, it's protect the image, control the height, encourage retail because that's what they mostly are is the little shops, not the big box on the bottom of the building.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Well, why can't we just reduce the number of, the base height and the maximum bonus on --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That would be the easiest way.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Because the only reason, I'm assuming, which I could be wrong, that the why you've put that at such height is because -- buildings that are currently there to conform to that. But I don't know that we necessarily, because we've made mistakes in the past, that we want to continue that trend. So, if we take that west edge and just lower and make maybe the base height is also the maximum height.

Base height is four or five, and then the maximum is,
let's say, six or eight instead of bringing it up to the ten stories. Because ten stories is really high right there.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: But nevertheless, look at the north and the south boundaries of that. The north boundary up there at the University Place could handle a six to ten-story building very well. And in fact, that might be something we would want to encourage.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, I think you have eight or ten-story buildings in this --

MR. LAMOTTE: The west edge.

MR. MARINO: In the west edge as well.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: -- they're going to be there for the rest of eternity.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Right, and then that's sort of --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, more of an industrial kind of space there. That's already been approved and will be going up. But I don't think we want to encourage that further, that we'd want something that dense.
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Where? Up here?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, no, no. I think that's fine. I'm saying I don't think we want something that's being built here --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, I would be sensitive to that, yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay. So, we -- the west edge to --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: The only thing I'm wrestling with here is we start to get sort of spotty in our zoning. I'm not saying we shouldn't do it.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: And I'm just saying that going forward we don't want ten-story buildings.

MR. LAMOTTE: On that corner.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: What's going to happen -- tall buildings already in this area?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: It's fine but we just are looking forward --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: -- if they burn down, then can they be rebuilt?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Of course, but not at the same --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Well, it can't be
rebuilt at that height.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, how do you ensure them --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But you're doing this the same thing as if you're, they can also come in --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: How do you ensure them? How do you, you know, what you're telling me is I've got a ten-story building that's worth a million dollars, if it burns down I can only build a building worth $500,000.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: -- Central Street and other places where you've changed their zoning?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: What are we talking about now?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: We're talking about down zoning in areas where, you know --

MR. LAMOTTE: The context --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: -- prominent down zoning.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: This plan has very little down zoning in comparison to up zoning. So, I guess the question is does this mean we can up zone
tremendous sections of this Downtown but we can't down zone?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: We really don't have a lot of up zoning.

MR. LAMOTTE: No, yes, we down zone. It's kind of shown in that image, the traditional came down.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Most of it is down zone.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: How tall is R-6? 85 feet. All right. So, that's how many stories?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Eight stories.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Eight stories.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And you've got an eight-story building there right now.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Hello?

MR. LAMOTTE: Carlos, are you just waving or you got anything?

MR. RUIZ: Both. Okay. I guess I'm trying to -- concerns that some Commissioners have expressed over the last few months. One of the concerns was that transitional areas, just by the name themselves tend to give the wrong idea that everything goes, that there's nothing permanent. So, the landmark buildings that are
within that transitional area are susceptible to change and even if they are protected under the preservation ordinance, the Commission's ruling, say if somebody wants to demolish a building could be a kick to the Council. And in fact, they can demolish a building if the developer shows that, how they would propose it might create benefits -- landmark.

So, by indicating those landmarks within the transitional area, you will probably make them more susceptible to change then. And I think that we need to be careful as to, you know, maybe -- in the text not necessarily in the transitional area as defined but in the text that maybe there are certain buildings that are landmarks that even though may be falling into certain areas are protected. So, we take a strong emphasis on that rather than just leave it, you know, to interpretation.

I don't know if that helps on that, but I think that you should -- because you're trying to emphasize across the document that character and traditional areas are important but certain buildings fall in certain areas that are susceptible to change even though they are protected under the ordinance.
because it's not hundred percent bullet proof.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Right, right. Exactly.

I guess that goes back to, you know, to Robin's point that, yes, those buildings are there now but you don't know about that status, they could be gone pretty easily. We've seen it happen over and over again.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, how are we leaving this, yes, the traditional area? I'm content to leave it where it is.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, I don't want to see the, I mean, I have some concern over those landmark buildings but I don't want to address it by incorporating them into the traditional area.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But I think, I don't think that's what's on the table. I think what's on the table is bringing down the stories --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: No, we're talking about the traditional zones right now.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, but I think, no, I know, I know, but I mean --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: We'll table this and we can revisit this.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, I agree but I don't
think they should be included in the traditional zone.

COMMISIONER NYDEN: Even though there are,
say if it's zoned R-6 and that's roughly eight-stories,
and B is six to ten-story --

MR. BISHOP: I think what Colleen is saying is
that this is a big area right here.

COMMISIONER BURRUS: Right.

MR. BISHOP: Maybe it has some districts
within it where heights vary, okay. And this is a big
area, too, so you can have more definition of those
areas. But I think what other people who have been on
the Downtown Plan Commission have said is that this is
the shopping district and that's what the traditional --

COMMISIONER BURRUS: And I agree, right --

MR. LAMOTTE: Exactly, right.

COMMISIONER BURRUS: And I think that makes
sense for what David and Larry are saying is not to
extend it out.

MR. LAMOTTE: Bring traditional out? No.

COMMISIONER BURRUS: Not to bring the
traditional out.

MR. LAMOTTE: Think of a different approach.

COMMISIONER BURRUS: But to fix this thing
with the B.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, right. To fix
the transitional in some other manner.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, for that corner. Right.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I mean, I don't want
to discourage the kind of developments that is indicated
at the north and the south ends, but if there's a way in
which we can further preserve those landmark -- which
are so essential to the character along Ridge, then I
think that's important.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Well, I think anything
taller than these buildings is going to upset the
character of these buildings because you dwarf them.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right, and that's
why --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: But look at what's
there already. You've got eight-story buildings to the
north and you've got an eight-story building to the
south. It's unlikely that those are going to be torn
down to build a ten-story building.

MR. LAMOTTE: I mean, if you look at D which
is colored the same as our edges, and I think to clarify
again why we call them --
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: D?

MR. LAMOTTE: Letter D? Up by Northwestern University link. We colored, I'm sorry, we called the edges edges rather than transitional because people were kind of hung up on that and it sounded like traditional. So, anyway, that's where we're at with that. But the university link is six to eight rather than six to ten. So, we could do something like that, same color but just call that out with, like we did, maybe it's the West Link or the Community Link or something or Ridge Avenue Link or something, because then when we got closer to Northwestern, they weren't up at 10 and 11, they were down a little lower. And plus, we had tighter blocks in there. We don't have enough, you know, distance between.

So, maybe that's what that --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I just want to be sure we don't put a limitation on it so that someone who's got a building now and it's destroyed can't build it back.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right. No, I think that would cover it because as Dennis and I, we're just -- it's tall floors that stretch to the base, it's six to seven
now. So, if God forbid it did burn, then they would be
in the six to eight range rather than six to ten range.

And one other clarification to D because I was
going back and forth between the zoning, we were at 85
if we do the allowances based on what you were shown, we
can still do way more than 85. Is that correct? In the
D-6. So, right now, if we left that D-6, you can go
eight and a half stories and then start allowancing
yourself up. And R-6, I'm sorry. R-6.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: -- the buildings,
they'll probably go to 49 stories.

MR. LAMOTTE: There you go.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, that would never
happen in Evanston. Zoned 85 feet?

MR. LAMOTTE: So, back to the clarification
where Kurt was trying to say some of this stuff is being
tightened down and controlled. And the bonuses are
going to be a lot tighter than the allowances that there
are today. So, I think that might be a way to do it is,
I don't have a name yet but West Link, Ridge Road Link
or something.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: We'll get to it when
we get to the transitional areas.
MR. LAMOTTE: All right.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, I guess, all I'm saying, all I meant to do was to get a closer, tighter definition of the west end of the west core.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. So, we're leaving the West Traditional as it is. Now, let's move on to the North Traditional.

MR. LAMOTTE: K.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: On the West Traditional, no, you're not leaving it as is.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, we are.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: We're not taking it all the way to Ridge. It says from Ridge Road.

MR. BISHOP: We're adding the alley east of Ridge.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: From Ridge, oh, geez.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Okay, the alley east of it, that's good. Okay, that's good.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, the West one is set. Now, we go to, Mr. Chairman, do you want me to go to K?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay. That's, I'm sorry --
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I kind of have a question on K.

MR. LAMOTTE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Is there a reason the U shaped building on the north, is there a reason this was included?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Is that the bagel place? Is that the --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes, Einstein Bagel.

MR. MARINO: That's a landmark, right, Carlos?

That's where -- Drug used to be?

MR. RUIZ: The one at the corner, right?

MR. MARINO: Right.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: You're going to be going through an alley where you're going through a gangway if you include that in the --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, it's not.

It's not --

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, I mean, it doesn't necessarily have to be an alley. I mean, it could be, you know, a property line or something. But I think the question is why that is in one and not the other. That
is a good question. I'm trying to remember the size.
We don't have our height map here. We have a map with
all the heights in Downtown.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, that's, the
buildings that are there right now are one-story
buildings according to what I took off of --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Judy, do you recall
the height allowed at the Orrington? Remember what --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: We're looking at, for
the apartments above this --

MR. MARINO: I'm guessing but I think it looks
like four stories, ballpark.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That's still in
effect, isn't it, as -- to the corners also.

MR. MARINO: I think that's -- we would have
to check that.

MS. AIELLO: Yes --

MR. LAMOTTE: So, that was, I think it was a
massing thing. The buildings are bigger there. They're
not one-story.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I think there are some
four-story buildings.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, they are. Right. That's
why the massing in that whole block was different than
the --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes. The parking lot
for the Orrington.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: At the last
presentation, you talked a lot about where the plan is
lower than the existing. How are we going to -- if we
are down zoning, what happens if the building did burn
down?

MR. LAMOTTE: I mean, sometimes things get
down zoned and it's happened all the time. In Lincoln
Park, they did 21 down zonings in one bang. Tom should
know better than --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Part of the PD.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: You know, but
these things have raised a lot of --

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, let's clarify it.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Wait. We're talking
about redevelop, the PD redevelopment of the Orrington.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I know you are.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Gave them the right to
put apartments -- parking garage in the future.

MR. BISHOP: -- it really is sort of based on
what's there or what's recently been approved, okay?

Then scale has changed in recent years, okay.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Whoa, that's a bombshell.

MR. BISHOP: But we'll have to debate that, I mean --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: We've got two discussions going here.

MR. BISHOP: -- single family home in a B District, okay? You know, not being able to restore that or not being able to rebuild or make some minor additions to it is quite unusual.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes. So, the question I had was there's a lot of places where they have down zoning like the presentation on the 16th about the areas that the plan does call for down zoning. So, how are you going to take care of that?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, the question is there are actually structures within that down zoned area that exceed the new down zone.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right. Right.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Has anyone looked at that?
MR. LAMOTTE: Yes.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: But it's not --
MR. LAMOTTE: What Kurt was saying, and please correct me because you've said it, was that the zoning today with the allowance and everything else, you can do more along Davis than what we're showing. We're showing three to five. And the buildings kind of average out context-wise. So, you're really not taking a lot away.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay. So, you don't have anything above what you're down zoning.
MR. LAMOTTE: Not much, no, if anything. And so, if someone said --
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, I mean anywhere.
MR. LAMOTTE: No, I mean, if someone says, uh-oh, you're taking me from eight down to five, it's always a tricky thing and we have to be very careful with it.
MR. BISHOP: I don't think we do. I don't think to a building we've recommended zoning that is less --
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Less than the
zoning itself.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: So, we're not going to get ourselves in that --

MR. LAMOTTE: You're taking it --

MR. BISHOP: On a theoretical level, the whole thing is a down zone because there is no limit to what can be approved.

MR. LAMOTTE: Right. We are tightening the whole thing down.

MR. BISHOP: So, when we say down zoning, potential down zoning, that's okay. When we actually --

MR. LAMOTTE: Cut the building up --

MR. BISHOP: Cut the building in half, then we have a problem.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I understand, thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Larry, you had something?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes. We include here the, in K, the garage for the Orrington.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: That's presently on the east side of Orrington and Sherman.
MR. LAMOTTE: Okay. Let me go back, I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: There is still an open planned development allowance to the --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Let me make sure that he can find it.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, that's on Sherman, on the east side of Sherman.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: At the north edge of the K.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Right next to the, just south of the alley.

MR. LAMOTTE: All right, here. Right there?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes, just south --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: There is still an open area of the planned development which was part of the planned development they got for redoing the hotel which allows I think four more stories.

MR. MARINO: I don't remember the exact number of stories.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Three or four more stories.

MR. MARINO: On top of the garage.
COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Of apartments or condominiums they could build on top of that.

MR. LAMOTTE: On top of the garage.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, on that thing, if I remember back is how high is that --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: It's about three stories, four --

MR. LAMOTTE: I would say four, yes. So, if they go three to four, they would be exceeding --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: I think it's four --

so they have the right at least until that expires or -- or something to go up to seven, at least to seven.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, they're vested. They're vested. Yes, if they come back and say, oh, we want to do that, well, that's, you know, that's a signed agreement.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But that gets back to our question then of down zoning it if --

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, no, no. Correct me if I'm wrong, Tom and Kurt, we're not dropping that one down. That one is locked into that PD.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: No, we can't change
MR. LAMOTTE: Right. So, if they knock on the door, they can do what they say --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Okay, because they're still in the PD. But what about --

MR. LAMOTTE: We put it in that zone because of the --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But what about --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: When does that expire?

MR. MARINO: We'll check on that tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: -- Marshall Fields?

MR. LAMOTTE: Let's look at that.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: What about it?

MR. LAMOTTE: The west flank?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: What do you want to know about it?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Can they replace them over time.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Oh, can they rebuild?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: What do you mean rebuild? What are you talking about?

MR. BISHOP: Because it's in the traditional
area, is Marshall Fields in excess of what would be
allowed if they were to rebuild.

MR. LAMOTTE: That's the question.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Sure.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Probably.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes. That's just what Robin was
asking for clarification, right. So, they extend over
the little storefront, two, three, four-story guys
because they're so big. And they're in the traditional.

And then if they had to rebuild, they would be --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: They burn down and
they got to get bonus points to get up to the five
stories.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, but they're not, they're
five stories that --

MR. BISHOP: There is nothing locked in stone
about the traditional rule about rebuilding a
nonconforming building that is destroyed by act of God.

There are numerous jurisdictions throughout the world
that don't use that, if it's destroyed to the extent of
50 percent or more of it's value, it's got to be built
only in compliance. I mean, that rule is in play here
as far as I'm concerned as a zoning strategy. It makes
perfect sense to do it in a lot of instances.

MR. LAMOTTE: To rebuild to their old number.

MR. BISHOP: Yes, is to allow people who

suffer an accidental loss to rebuild to their envelope

that they have now.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Maybe you just write

that in as part of --

MR. LAMOTTE: That is the perfect example.

That's the one that does pop up out of the traditional.

We've got the traditional look in the building with

storefronts but it's much bigger, it's huge. Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So, we need to note

that in.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: -- as far as the

penthouse --

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes. So, let's make a note.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Make a note of that in

here somewhere so we've got that covered when we go back

to the zoning.

MR. BISHOP: Sure.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, let's put that -- Fields

building, right, okay.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: And then, did somebody
also mention to add to K over the -- all of Marshall
Fields? Because that, I don't know if those are
separate buildings or parcels or --

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, that hasn't been brought
up. We --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: The public brought that
up.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, it was
brought up like a zillion meetings ago.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, yes, it is all
one building because their garage goes in there. So,
you've really got to take that over to cover the whole
building.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes, okay. So, we
move K west to half a block there?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: To Benson?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: To Benson, yes, south
of the alley. Okay, Kurt, you got that? It's pretty
tough when a house is cut in half in two zones.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Can we, in light of
what Larry has said about what the Orrington can do,
what their four-story garage building which looks like a
retail apartment building, do we want to discuss the
buildings across the street at the north end of K?

MR. LAMOTTE: The Clark Street ones?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes. Because partially --

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, that's where we were. I'm sorry, we got sidetracked because we --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: We got sidetracked, yes. I was thinking --

MR. LAMOTTE: We had a profile I think as Stu had said like four stories --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: There's four-story buildings there already.

MR. LAMOTTE: Profile, right.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right. And presently it's in the University Park district for lack of a better term for six to eight stories.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Wait, which building? Could you --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Einstein?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Square off the top of K.

MR. LAMOTTE: So, reverse courtyard.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I thought it was
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes, taking the Einstein building, right?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Einstein building, yes.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Yes, I agree.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So, well, I felt better, I felt a little more strongly about that until I discovered that in the Orrington you can add three or four stories to their four-story building right in the center of this entire block.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: That is an option they have.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, I mean, there's arguments to be made. I remember the discussion in-house with all our planner designer types and that was that that block is facing hopefully the new Oldberg Park.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Right.

MR. LAMOTTE: Framing that park.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: So, it could be --

MR. LAMOTTE: Scale-wise, you can do something nice there. And then across, some day, you know, you got some balance to whatever Northwestern does if they
turn over any of their buildings. So, six to eight
seemed to make sense including with the Burger King
site. But it would be going east-west rather than
north-south down Sherman.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.
MR. LAMOTTE: We felt they related more to
Clark and the north face rather than Sherman and the
west face.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: And you have the
potential now of that garage being six to seven.
MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, three or four more on
there. Yes, that's --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: If they do that, so
that would kind of flow.
MR. LAMOTTE: Right. And the scale which
they've added on to the top nicely put the penthouse --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Yes, I don't know --
MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, we don't know -- it's in
front that big.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: J?
MR. LAMOTTE: Well, we're not off the K.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, I don't think
we're finished yet. I think we have to resolve this
thing here. Do we keep K as is or do we move it up to
Clark Street and include those couple of buildings there
on Clark?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, then which one?
Now, do we just include the Einstein building which is
the one that's shaped like an N?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: No, well --

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: A lower case n, am I
correct? I'm looking, for those of you who are looking
at the colored thing, you might want to turn to page 55.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, it's right here along
Clark, in the little leg of Clark there. And again, we
saw it facing north with the plaza.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: From a massing standpoint. So,
right now on the table, K would be extended west to pick
up the little annex of Fields. The question is, as the
Chairman said, do we want to pick that corner up or do
we want to leave it so it masses together across from
the university?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, I would think if
it's facing it, it would be just an extension relative
to the garage.
MR. LAMOTTE: Right. Yes, you already potentially have that in there as a massing behind it.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, I guess I'm content to leave it the way it is with the exception of moving K to the west half of --

MR. MARINO: To the west half a block south of the alley?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Right, right.

MR. MARINO: And pick up the remainder of Marshall Fields.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Right. And Keep Einstein Bagel and the other buildings there in D. Okay.

MR. LAMOTTE: All right. And I'm sorry, we were having a sidebar. So, we're leaving it as is?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Leaving it as is except for the west of --

MR. LAMOTTE: Except the annex, okay. So, then the north, K is done, now we go to J to the south, which has some of Davis character and some of the Sherman character. And then in the South Sherman area, we have a couple of gaps in there, missing teeth with the parking lot, or one parking lot gap by the pub.
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: North of the pub, yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes. I'm not sure it's a full bay, at least a row of parking is in there.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, it's owned by one of the buildings there. Actually, there are two of those. One next to Prairie and one in -- next to the pub.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: So, I'm wondering why, other than existing D-2 zoning Downtown, I'm just wondering why you didn't bump up along Davis Street east to the alley there because there's two very low-lying buildings -- not landmarked but good looking buildings. Do you see where I mean Davis Street?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Where on Davis Street?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Where on Davis?

MR. MARINO: East of Chicago?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: East of Chicago, one more block where you've those two-story storefront buildings, perfect traditional zone by your criteria. Why those wouldn't be in the traditional zone just one-half block to the alley?

MR. LAMOTTE: And Robin, let me just clarify. To the northeast and southeast corners of Chicago and
Davis, right?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: No, southeast. Just the southeast.

MR. LAMOTTE: Southeast, got it.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I mean, you could include the northeast but the building is tall, it doesn't matter. It would be that southeast corner to the alley, there's two really nice buildings there. One on the corner that's got -- design in it. The next one is a number of storefronts, high-level vintage facade,

beautiful -- stone.

MR. LAMOTTE: Great storefronts, right.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, really good.

So, I would really encourage --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Wasn't there a proposal to take those down and put up a big building?

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, but I think it got --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: It's free to put into the traditional zone.

MR. LAMOTTE: That's a good discussion for the group.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Well, part of me,
well, I love that one building, that stone -- is that
two or three-story building? It's two-story.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Two. And then ten
stories feet deep.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: But I also like the
integrity of ending the transitional zone west of
Chicago Avenue so that we can play up the buildings
across the street from each other. And to take this --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I like the
integrity --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But it would also --
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Just let me finish,

geez, geez, relax, ladies. To have that little segment
that's standing across the street --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Creates a nice
transition. And I think actually you argued for this,
to keep that the way it is when we were against the big
tall building going up.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, its just a
textbook case of traditional, and then lots of jogging.
And if you look at the bottom of J, I mean, this is a
gerrymandered map and it's based on --

MR. LAMOTTE: Ooh.
COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, okay, this is a map with interesting jogs and I think that you can't argue --

MR. LAMOTTE: Jogging map.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: If you look at the bottom of J and you look at existing fabric and I think we're hundred-year-old plus city, I think we really have to look at the built environment very carefully. And I see no reason under these criteria why they shouldn't be included.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: On the other hand, it is right across the street from the old North Shore Hotel. How tall is the hotel, Dennis?

MR. MARINO: Eight stories.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Eight stories. And it's also right next to, what is the other one? 500 Davis which is --

MR. MARINO: Nine stories.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I think we should go right up to the border of where things start to be tall.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Maybe there should be a park right there. A little park right next to these two
tall buildings, you'd like that?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: No?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I'm actually not in favor of tearing down buildings for parks and otherwise.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: It's presently now in D-4.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: What's the height, Judy, do you know on D-4?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: 120?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: 85 feet.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: But these are under.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Well, it's 120-something roughly.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, I know but it's presently, the buildings you're talking about, I like those buildings very much. They're lovely buildings but they're in D-4. They could tear them down and put up --

MR. BISHOP: It depends on the lot size. But you're talking minimum of 13 stories with the parking
allowance. And if you have a bigger lot, you can go up
to 15 --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: So, I mean, if we --

what is it, you wanted to put that in the traditional?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: They're
traditional-looking buildings with this existing scale.
They could burn down tomorrow and you could build, you
don't have any of the other problems, it fits all the
other criteria. I think it's the one spot that I would
argue is absolutely textbook traditional. And for
reason, I believe, of 1515 Chicago project, it was left
out and because it's in R-4.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: What do you think the
owner would say about this?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: I don't know. He
can just come and he can say, but I think, you know,
there's a lot of up zoning, I think there can be some
down zoning. And I think this is the perfect case where
we have excellent buildings, we have beautiful
storefronts, we have independent retailers. I think
this is one of the textbook cases where this should be
in the traditional zoning. I'm sorry it happens to be
in R-4 in history --
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: You're going to tell the owner that he can't put up a ten-story building, that the most he can put up there is three, maybe five if he's lucky? That's down zoning also.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: But it's not more than he has now.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Well, no more than he has built now.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: That's what I'm saying. That's no more than he has built.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: True. But he is foreclosed, once this goes in the traditional district, he is foreclosed from putting up a ten-story building or whatever it is.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, but that's part of doing any plan. Things change.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. All right.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: I mean, it's not like --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: You can only --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: You're basically using a traditional zone to landmark this building which is what you're doing.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, you're not
landmarking. You can still --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Of course you are for
all practical purposes.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: No, but that's the
effect of it. I love the buildings, I wish it could be
preserved forever, I really do. But you know, you've
got to take into account what the impact on that owner
is.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, but -- R-4,
that's a -- distinction.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: No, this is D-4.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Sorry, D-4.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Not when he bought it
this year. This year, last year.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Oh, really?

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, actually I'd
like to see it in the traditional zone but --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Yes, but then owners buy
buildings and come in and try to up zone them all the
time.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: But this one hasn't.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: He hasn't done that.
COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I think we should, I mean, we need to factor in the building owners but I think we can't let our decision -- how we're going to zone Downtown for the next 20-30 years necessarily play into one building owner's decision to buy property.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: I absolutely see both sides of the argument but I think we need to think about things like what we've been talking about -- pedestrian streetscaping and all the things that make a cohesive Downtown. And I agree, I think we need to think about preserving the traditional elements of this space and not necessarily think about every last building owner because if we do that we'll be here for like --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: But this is surrounded by, this is a little different than that. I mean, if this were just sort of sitting here, but this is surrounded by tall buildings. You're looking at it and saying that, you know, it's distinctive and it's beautiful, but it is surrounded by tall buildings and he owns it, he or she and --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: The other areas we looked at really are zoned at that level now. And what
we're doing is protecting that zoning.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: In some places.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: By eliminating planned developments --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: No, in all places.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: All the other, the traditional areas.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, I mean, if you're taking --

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: -- this one --

MR. LAMOTTE: We were just sidebarring on the,

it's 105 feet now, that eastern flank that they're in.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: D-4?

MR. LAMOTTE: D-4. And then allowances, I mean you're getting 13, 14, 15, we're capping it at 10 with the bonuses. So, he's not way down zoned but he's got some zoning in there.

And I think Johanna's right. The what if scenario, we've had people come in the next day and say, oh, I'm going to tear it down because I'm ready to go because I can't own the building anymore, and others stay there for 25-30 years. And that's where we get back to encouraging facade renovations and streetscape improvements and things.
It's really, these are more character
districts than this is this and that. We're trying to
balance and average these things out. Somebody said to
me, oh, the core isn't really 28, well, the last three
or four or five buildings are 25 to 28 with all the
allowances. And there's massing and scale in there and
it's the active Downtown core. There is an argument to
be made for that.

So, I think we just have to keep going like we
are going now and discuss a little bit broader than
every single thing.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right. And so, if
you're looking at character as a distinguishing factor
than I think not in existing zoning and building owners,
then that's the most, that's the strongest case you
could possibly make for keeping that traditional.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, no, no, no. We went the
other way. We said this whole eastern flank, whether
some folks in the audience or in the community think
that this should be in or out of the Downtown. This is
a bulky, courtyard, tall, dense, filled out to the
street district that we felt some day if they did tear
down and went six to ten stories, it would fit that gap
fine. So, that's the character we saw.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: But if you move south, if you will move across the street and you look to the east, of course you can make that argument. But obviously with the Downtown and many of these parcels, if you look south, that's a low building, possibly going to be redeveloped soon but still. Then you have a landmark on the corner and right across the street. They're not that tall.

And so, it just depends which way you're looking which is fine. You can look any way you want. But if you're really looking at the character of those facades and you're looking at the character of Davis Street, almost all of Davis Street is in the traditional zone. I've just long wondered.

Now, I understand it's because of the new owner. I understand because it's existing owner and because it's existing zoning, but that's a different argument. It's not --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: How are we going to resolve these issues? Because Robin and I are going to cancel each other out, and then how is it going to go in there? We can leave it to the rest of you.
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: You'd like a notch there, wouldn't you? Talk about --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No. Not if it's any different than anything else.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I don't want a notch in this corner.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: We have a notch over at where the other --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: You just argued for a notch.

MR. MARINO: It's right here in the --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Right, that's exactly it. Right?

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, here is another consideration. Because what we are hoping to get from everybody thinking this through, especially at your guidance when you handed the town to us with the character districts, it's character for all of it. It's H-1 has character. It's not just the character of the traditional.

And so, if you walk down some of these streets and it's got a solid brick, eight, ten-story, you know, old courtyard building character, that's a character,
too. And if you look at across the street from the
Tommy Nevin's pub, the big, you know, bunker Best
Western there, you could say we'll make both sides of
the street three to five. But that's a big development
opportunity for the City and your Downtown has eclectic
heights now.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, and it's not
a problem.

MR. LAMOTTE: And so, you know, so then being
big across from that wouldn't be different than two --
they may come in tomorrow but they're not -- the
building is in good shape.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Two stories --

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: Wait, can I say one
thing? I just want to call everyone's attention that we
have heard people -- passionately about removing the
Hinman boundary and turning it into the alley boundary
because there is the concern that we are creating
possible commercial uses on what's predominantly
residential street. So, the notch doesn't seem so
abrasive. I mean, if we talk about C first and then we
go back to J or something, because that might make it a
little bit more palatable.
COMMISSIONER BURRUS: We're at 10:30 now, we haven't gotten to G or H. And H is obviously going to be a knockdown drag out.

MR. LAMOTTE: Oh, come on.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I think we should defer that. I'd like to be fresh before I --

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes. We're going to call this --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: It's a tough battle.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: -- at the end of traditional discussion.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Yes, it's a tough battle.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: We're calling that, you know, we're going to be --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Well, the other question is whether we take it back to the public on the issues that we can't decide on. We had talked about there would be a list of issues that we are going to be deadlocked on and this is probably a perfect example.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I don't think we'll be deadlocked.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, no, I think --
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: No, we're not going 
back --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: No, no, because I 
think it would put it in, -- what we did talk about is 
putting issues that we happen to don't agree on, this 
is the first --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: The only one that we've 
been --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: And putting in the 
parking lot -- facilitating term of something that we 
come back to.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Yes, I agree with that.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: So, we punch through and 
then those three, five items that are contentious, they 
have now been put in the parking lot and we're going to 
come back to that. Is that a -- I'm sorry, it's a 
facilitation term.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: On the shelf.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: On the shelf, in the 
cupboard.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Sounds good.

MR. LAMOTTE: You know what, we were talking 
about the issue here. If I got you right, you're trying
to boil down what are the ones that we've really got to
roll the sleeves up on. I think that's what we're
doing. We're going piece by piece.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes.

MR. LAMOTTE: We're getting through
traditional and we're going to transition --

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Yes, so we can
make a document that has the things that were still
outstanding after that.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, here is the document. We
just highlighted that section. This is what --
introduced through us and staff. We're highlighting
that piece by piece by piece.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: No, I think the only
thing we're saying is maybe we don't --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: But she's augmenting
that to say maybe we don't get --

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Get through and the
things that, so we can just sort of clear off the plate
instead of like getting stuck here.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: We could argue for
two hours on this.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: So, we're trying to make
it more like get things done.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I'm over it, you can take me down.

COMMISSIONER BURRUS: Let's go now.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: We can have a high noon session on the unresolved aspects of the traditional area.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: -- a list called unresolved aspects in place, traditional zone, southeast corner Davis.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Just put J.

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: Just put the notch, no, the notch.

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: It's not only J.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: But we aren't going to decide on J until we decide on that.

COMMISSIONER NYDEN: We can't even decide what's going to go on the list.

MR. LAMOTTE: Yes, you know what? I think we're over complicating this. So, let me take a crack at it because we've done it.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Of course we are, that's part of the planning process.
MR. LAMOTTE: The idea of chipping through and working our way through this and it's getting late would be to say, okay, we're down at the districts, now we're down to traditional. That one is set, this one is set, adjust that and set, and just go around the room and look for consensus. And if at the end of that discussion, no notch, you know, no jog to the east, then that's the consensus.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: No, we still want to think about it.

MR. LAMOTTE: Oh, that's right, hold it for the next meeting.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Do you want to start a list?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So moved.

MR. LAMOTTE: Well, the list is this. Here is the list right here, okay. Robin, if you see something different, I'm unclear on what you're saying. Here is the list. We've got to finish the list next meeting, okay?

COMMISSIONER SCHULDENFREI: Okay.
VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Is there a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER WIDMAYER: So moved.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Second.

MR. LAMOTTE: All right.

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All right. All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

VICE CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: March 12th, next meeting.

(Whereupon, the hearing on the above-titled cause was adjourned at 10:38 p.m.)