

# **EVANSTON, ILLINOIS**

## **Central Street Corridor Plan & Streetscape Design**

### **Workshops #1 & #2 Summary**

#### **Prepared for City of Evanston by The Lakota Group**

The following provides results of a Visual Preference Survey conducted during community visioning workshops on February 1 and February 8, 2007. A separate memo provides a summary of other input generated by participants during those initial workshops. The Lakota Group, Infrastructure Engineers Inc., and Gewalt Hamilton Associates, the City's consultant team, will incorporate the information into the planning and design process.

#### **Visual Preference Summary: February 1, 2007 and February 8, 2007**

For the Visual Preference Survey, workshop participants were presented with a series of images showing a range of developments (townhomes, condominiums, mixed-use buildings, and retail buildings) and streetscape designs. Participants were asked to rate and provide comments on the images to gauge community preferences on such elements as setbacks, architecture, height, sidewalk width, and general streetscape character.

For each rating given to an image by a Visual Preference Survey participant, a numerical value was assigned (strongly dislike=1, dislike=2, neutral=3, like=4, and strongly like=5). For each image, an average rating value was calculated and a few representative comments were listed.









<b>Image</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Sample Comments</b>
Townhome 1 	<b>3.79</b>	Like the pitched roofs and setbacks. Works on western end of Central Street. Good setbacks for far west or far east Central. Ticky-tacky – like a subdivision.
Townhome 2 	<b>2.48</b>	Looks like converted factories. Massive front and walk-up bad. Like the urban feel but it needs a setback. Much too big for Central.

Image	Rating	Sample Comments
<p>Townhome 3</p> 	<p><b>2.42</b></p>	<p>Too stark! Good green space. Maybe east of Metra station. Looks like a housing project.</p>
<p>Townhome 4</p> 	<p><b>2.60</b></p>	<p>Appropriate for perimeter of business district. Too tall and too close to street. Like the bay windows. Fun! Has character. Like the urban feel for the east side.</p>
<p>Townhome 5</p> 	<p><b>2.77</b></p>	<p>Walk-up bad for seniors. Too suburban looking. Stairs are too high but like variation. Wrought iron fence out of place on Central.</p>
<p>Townhome 6</p> 	<p><b>2.22</b></p>	<p>Not in character with neighborhood. Awful! Wrong character for Central Street. Modern look doesn't fit character, don't like architecture. Like varied heights.</p>
<p>Townhome 7</p> 	<p><b>2.49</b></p>	<p>Like "texture" of façade. Very, very crowded feeling. OK...for west Central or near hospital. Too city-like, too homogenous. Older look is appealing.</p>
<p>Townhome 8</p> 	<p><b>3.38</b></p>	<p>Nice improvement to what was there. Nice setback. Like brick, traditional look. Bland! Evanston can do better. Too repetitive.</p>

**Image**

**Rating**



**Sample Comments**

<p>Condominium 1</p> 	<p><b>2.35</b></p>	<p>Too bulky and too high. Not for Central Street...too suburban. Looks like are retirement home. Like setback and landscaping.</p>
<p>Condominium 2</p> 	<p><b>3.08</b></p>	<p>Has character! More visually rhythmic. Too high and heavy looking. Like mixed materials. Good for busy street.</p>
<p>Condominium 3</p> 	<p><b>1.96</b></p>	<p>Too urban and too vertical. Schaumburg! No setback, very boxy. Bland!</p>
<p>Condominium 4</p> 	<p><b>2.42</b></p>	<p>OK for transit-oriented development. Too large, too tall. Overwhelming. Interesting architecture – maybe at a smaller scale.</p>
<p>Condominium 5</p> 	<p><b>1.79</b></p>	<p>Too close to sidewalks. Too monolithic. Too high and needs bigger windows. Looks like prison.</p>

**Image**

**Rating**

**Sample Comments**

<p>Condominium 6</p> 	<p><b>2.29</b></p>	<p>Too tall but the articulation is better. Roof peaks are overdone. Best of the condos – like the grading and setback. Looks like a mental hospital.</p>
<p>Condominium 7</p> 	<p><b>1.80</b></p>	<p>Hodge-podge! Too modern for Central Street. Not for this part of town. Nice angles, different materials. Not enough space for trees.</p>

**Image**

**Rating**

**Sample Comments**















<p>Mixed Use 1</p> 	<p><b>2.52</b></p>	<p>OK...near the Metra NWRR. Too homogenous and no visual interest. Kind of ugly. Upper setback unappealing. Like concept and setback, but details are lacking.</p>
<p>Mixed Use 2</p> 	<p><b>2.23</b></p>	<p>Don't like parking in front of building. Too suburban for Central Street. Might be OK near Gross Point Road. Hate parking – too car-oriented.</p>
<p>Mixed Use 3</p> 	<p><b>2.33</b></p>	<p>Like the density but needs more setback. Way too large in scale. Too massive, but storefronts are OK. Better than M-1</p>
<p>Mixed Use 4</p> 	<p><b>4.35</b></p>	<p>I'd like to see this on east Central. Mansard-like roof is nice. Much better scale. Lots of character.</p>
<p>Mixed Use 5</p> 	<p><b>3.04</b></p>	<p>OK...want more pedestrian space. Attractive but no setback. Like scale, awning variations and plantings. Too high.</p>

Image	Rating	Sample Comments
<p>Mixed Use 6</p> 	<p><b>3.13</b></p>	<p>Smaller is better. Needs awning and more green. Like varied entrances and angled roof. Probably OK at street level...but it's so cheesy. Progressive architecture.</p>
<p>Mixed Use 7</p> 	<p><b>2.52</b></p>	<p>Know it well...hate it! Better than it used to be. What happened to the sidewalk? Like roof design...dislike setback.</p>
<p>Mixed Use 8</p> 	<p><b>1.41</b></p>	<p>Bad setback! Where's my sidewalk? Terrible! No character. The reason why we're all here. Ugly.</p>
<p>Mixed Use 9</p> 	<p><b>3.61</b></p>	<p>One story too tall. Love soft corner. Big...but nice curve. Nice if 2-3 stories. The tall trees sell this one too.</p>

**Image**

**Rating**





**Sample Comments**

<p>Retail 1</p> 	<p><b>3.24</b></p>	<p>Like the entry inset. Like inset, awnings and signage. No distinction and not attractive. Looks like Evanston</p>
<p>Retail 2</p> 	<p><b>3.28</b></p>	<p>Too modern... not a good fit. Ok if close to train station. Love the arcade and plaza. Plaza – yes! This works...people hang out here.</p>
<p>Retail 3</p> 	<p><b>3.01</b></p>	<p>Too modern for Central. Rounded corner would fit Central. Too modern for our 100-year-old neighborhood. Nice scale. Pretentious.</p>
<p>Retail 4</p> 	<p><b>3.61</b></p>	<p>Right size, pretty – like place to sit. Good sidewalks and trees. “bump-out” questionable for Central. Good people space.</p>
<p>Retail 5</p> 	<p><b>1.86</b></p>	<p>Barren-looking. Strip mall. Too many cars. Not on Central Street please. Yikes!</p>

**Image**

**Rating**





**Sample Comments**

<p>Retail 6</p> 	<p><b>3.11</b></p>	<p>A little modern...good open sidewalk. Unique. Has character. Quirkiness is good for Central Street. Nice corner – colors are too much.</p>
<p>Retail 7</p> 	<p><b>3.38</b></p>	<p>Re-hab done well. Neighborhood feel – like window boxes. Doesn't fit in. Great design. Good graphics and color.</p>
<p>Retail 8</p> 	<p><b>2.39</b></p>	<p>Not a big upgrade from gas station. Hate strip mall feel. Blah! Looks like a gas station. Ok...where it is.</p>
<p>Retail 9</p> 	<p><b>3.21</b></p>	<p>Good for west Central. Light and airy – good on Central. Encroaches on sidewalk...no greenery...building boxy. Not correct for Central.</p>

**Image**

**Rating**




**Sample Comments**

<p>Streetscape 1</p> 	<p><b>3.48</b></p>	<p>Nice sidewalk and greenery. Too much brick. Looks upscale but needs more greenery. Nice planters and seats.</p>
<p>Streetscape 2</p> 	<p><b>3.84</b></p>	<p>Better than raised bed. Too narrow but pretty. Good pavers and planters. Bricks need to go. High maintenance?</p>
<p>Streetscape 3</p> 	<p><b>1.87</b></p>	<p>All concrete! Wrong focus. Too barren. Too concrete...too commercial...too modern looking. Too sterile.</p>
<p>Streetscape 4</p> 	<p><b>4.37</b></p>	<p>Love planters. Almost too many planters. Great curved planters. Trees and planters separate pedestrians from cars.</p>

**Image**

**Rating**

**Sample Comments**

<p>Streetscape 5</p> 	<p><b>2.44</b></p>	<p>Too much brick and asphalt. Awful for the trees. Needs more greenery. Barren! Hydrant placement is a hazard to pedestrians.</p>
<p>Streetscape 6</p> 	<p><b>2.96</b></p>	<p>Clean look...a little modern. Narrow. Only in a dense, retail area. Artsy, college town. Depressing...all concrete and stone.</p>
<p>Streetscape 7</p> 	<p><b>4.02</b></p>	<p>Like seating pockets. Creative. Seems forced. Interesting, inviting – seating seems to create community.</p>