

1 CITY OF EVANSTON  
2 ZONING COMMITTEE OF THE PLAN COMMISSION  
3 CASE NO.: ZPC 07-03-M&T  
4 RE: WEST EVANSTON ZONING CHANGES. Consideration of  
5 amendments to Chapters 8, "Residential Districts;" 17,  
6 "Landscaping and Screening;" 18, "Definitions;" 3,  
7 "Implementation and Administration;" 7, "Zoning  
8 Districts and Map;" and any other related sections of  
9 the Zoning Ordinance.  
10 CASE NO.: ZPC 07-05-M&T  
11 RE: CENTRAL STREET ZONING REVIEW. Consideration of  
12 amendments to Chapters 8, "Residential Districts;" 9,  
13 "Business Districts;" 10, "Commercial Districts;" 15,  
14 "Special Purpose and Overlay Districts;" 17,  
15 "Landscaping and Screening;" 18, "Definitions;" 3,  
16 "Implementation and Administration;" 7, "Zoning  
17 Districts and Map;" and any other related sections of  
18 the Zoning Ordinance.  
19 Transcribed Report of Proceedings of a public  
20 hearing on the above captioned matter, held August 22,  
21 2007 at the Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue,  
22 2nd Floor, Evanston, Illinois, at 7:14 p.m. and presided  
23 over by J. Woods, Chair.

1 PRESENT:

2 J. WOODS, Chair

3 S. OPDYCKE

4 A. JACKSON

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1           CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay, I'm going to call to  
2 order the Zoning Committee, the Plan Commission meeting  
3 of August 22, 2007. We have two items of business this  
4 evening. The first item is ZPC 07-03-M&T, West Evanston  
5 Zoning Changes. The second is ZPC 07-05-M&T, Central  
6 Street Zoning Review. And we're going to roughly split  
7 the evening in two. And I think we're going to only  
8 spend an hour and-a-half on each so that we will get out  
9 of here at 10 o'clock tonight.

10           So for the West Evanston Zoning Changes, what  
11 we're going to do first, Arlova's going to talk about  
12 some of the concerns that were raised last time and  
13 address some of those things. And then she'll have  
14 Susan talk about some of the other stuff since then.  
15 So, Arlova.

16           MS. JACKSON: Good evening. Can everyone hear  
17 me? My name is Arlova Jackson. I'm the Zoning Planner  
18 for the City of Evanston.

19           This is our second public hearing for the West  
20 Evanston Zoning Changes. The first one was held August  
21 1<sup>st</sup>. This is a meeting of the Zoning Committee of the  
22 Plan Commission, which is the sub-committee of the Plan  
23 Commission that hears text and map changes to the Zoning

1 Ordinance.

2           So at some point when we get to a decision,  
3 this Committee will be making a recommendation to the  
4 Plan Commission, which will discuss it some more. And  
5 the Plan Commission then will be making a recommendation  
6 to City Council. So the ultimate decision-making  
7 authority for map amendments and text amendments is with  
8 City Council.

9           This process is the public hearing process to  
10 allow public comment and deliberation to the  
11 recommending bodies and ultimately to the decision-  
12 making bodies.

13           The last time we had a staff presentation and  
14 a short presentation by our consultant about the West  
15 Evanston planning process and previous planning  
16 processes. That led to the recommendations that were  
17 discussed in the public notice. We had a question and  
18 answer period with public comments, some requests for  
19 additional information.

20           Outside on the table there were a couple of  
21 pieces of information. One is a staff memo dated August  
22 16<sup>th</sup> where I attempt to address the concerns raised at  
23 the last hearing. There's also a memo dated August 17<sup>th</sup>,

1 which has a table which compares the R4 and the R3  
2 residential districts, and a third memo dated January  
3 19, 2007, which talks about the proposed changes to  
4 Gilbert Park. Finally, there's another staff memo from  
5 Susan Guderley dated August 17<sup>th</sup>, which she'll talk about  
6 in a minute.

7           Couple of comments from the last meeting  
8 regarding the public notice that was sent. Amendments  
9 to the map and/or text of the Zoning Ordinance require  
10 three forms of public notice. One is a mailed notice to  
11 owners of property within 500 feet of any property being  
12 affected. The second is a published notice in a  
13 newspaper of general circulation. And the third are  
14 posted signs on the property.

15           The notice for this hearing was posted in the  
16 Evanston Review on July 12<sup>th</sup>. Approximately 742 notices  
17 were mailed to taxpayers of record for properties within  
18 500 feet of the areas affected. And three signs were  
19 placed in locations within the master plan area.

20           At the last meeting some attendees felt that  
21 rental residents, who wouldn't normally be notified, may  
22 not have had an opportunity to hear about it. We got  
23 some addresses from residents and sent additional

1 mailings out. And I handed out about a dozen or so  
2 packets of information that were also to be distributed.  
3 So that is what has been done to date.

4 For the discussion about Gilbert Park, there  
5 was some, there were some questions about the existing  
6 zoning designation and if it was changing. Currently  
7 Gilbert Park is zoned R5 General Residential. So the  
8 master plan is not proposing to change this designation.

9 What the plan shows is redevelopment of the area for  
10 residential use and the creation of two new park areas  
11 to make up for the difference.

12 Currently Gilbert Park is approximately 31,000  
13 square feet with about 18,000 square feet devoted to  
14 active recreational space. The proposal creates two new  
15 parks, one that's approximately 17,800 square feet and  
16 another that is approximately 16,600 square feet, for a  
17 total of around 34,000 square feet, which actually  
18 increases the total amount of park space that's  
19 currently here today. The memo that's with the staff  
20 report goes into greater detail about how the parks are  
21 laid out.

22 There were also questions about the impact of  
23 the zoning change and the creation of either non-

1 conforming uses or non-complying structures. I failed  
2 to mention, there was a one-sheet memo entitled,  
3 Re-zoning, that's also out on the table that has some  
4 frequently-asked questions about re-zonings and what  
5 that could mean for your property.

6           Generally speaking, I tried to define and  
7 provide examples of non-conforming uses. Non-conforming  
8 uses are generally uses established prior to the  
9 effective date of the Zoning Ordinance which do not  
10 conform to the use regulations of the district in which  
11 it's located. So that might include, because the Zoning  
12 Ordinance was last updated in 1993, that would be any  
13 use that was legally established prior to 1993. That  
14 may change if and when proposed base zoning district  
15 changes are proposed.

16           If the base district changes and a current use  
17 becomes non-conforming, the use is allowed to remain  
18 indefinitely. It doesn't mean anyone has to tear  
19 anything down or stop operating. They can make repairs  
20 and maintain the property, however, you would not be  
21 allowed to enlarge the use or expand.

22           And if for some reason the use is not  
23 continued, if it goes out of business, if it's a

1 residential unit that's vacated, if it's not in use for  
2 12 months, it expires. So as long as it continues, it  
3 can stay forever. The proposed changes would only  
4 affect redevelopment of the property if it was torn down  
5 purposefully or if it's abandoned.

6 Similarly for non-complying structures, that  
7 structure's constructed, legally constructed prior to  
8 the effective date of the Zoning Ordinance that don't  
9 comply with all of the zoning regulations. So that one  
10 includes things like setbacks, building lot coverage,  
11 floor/area ratio, height. These are buildings that were  
12 built prior to 1993, as most of the buildings in  
13 Evanston were, that were not subject to the same  
14 regulations that are in place now.

15 So if it's a legal use, so if it's a single-  
16 family house that has a three-foot setback instead of a  
17 five-foot setback, if it were torn down completely, it  
18 could be rebuilt with the same three-foot setback. You  
19 just can't increase the level of non-conformity. So you  
20 can't build it with a less than three-foot setback, if  
21 that makes sense. If five is required, you can't go any  
22 worse than what's there today.

23 Our Zoning Ordinance goes on to differentiate

1 between uses that are non-conforming and complying  
2 versus non-complying structures. I can go into that if  
3 people have questions. It's unnecessarily complicated.

4           The West Evanston Plan proposes to simplify  
5 that and simply allow non-complying structures to be  
6 maintained so long as 50 percent of the total floor area  
7 remains intact. So they're just applying a simple  
8 number. If it's damaged or something happens, as long  
9 as 50 percent of the area is preserved, the use can be  
10 maintained.

11           Exemptions, excuse me, exemptions to that  
12 would include single-family homes and buildings that are  
13 historic structures that keep their street facade,  
14 meaning any single-family home that exists could be  
15 rebuilt regardless of what zoning change is proposed.

16           The other issue that was raised, excuse me,  
17 was the recommendation to re-zone quite a portion of the  
18 master plan area to the R4 district versus the R3 zoning  
19 district. Several attendees expressed the desire for  
20 the less dense zoning district.

21           What I did in the memo was try to provide a  
22 side-by-side comparison of the two so that everyone  
23 could get a sense of what the differences were. In

1 terms of uses, they're largely the same except the R4  
2 district allows for townhouses and multi-family  
3 buildings, whereas the R3 district only allows single-  
4 family detached and two-unit buildings in terms of  
5 residential buildings.

6 For special uses there's quite a few  
7 institutional-type uses that are allowed in R4 versus  
8 R3. Community center, retirement home, long-term care  
9 facility, so on and so forth.

10 For lot size, which would result in density,  
11 the R4 district is less restrictive. For two-family  
12 dwelling units the lot size requirement in the R3  
13 district is 3,500 square feet per unit. In the R4 it's  
14 2,500 square feet per unit. So for a two-unit building  
15 in the R3 district, you'd need 7,000 square feet. In  
16 the R4, you'd only need 5,000.

17 The height requirements are exactly the same.

18 The yard requirements vary slightly. For the  
19 rear yard for a residential building in the R3, the  
20 requirement is 30 feet. In the R4 the requirement is  
21 25.

22 For non-residential structures, the side  
23 yards, there's a five foot difference. And for the rear

1 yards, the same five foot difference.

2 For building lot coverage, the R3 actually has  
3 a higher allowed building lot coverage. It's 45 percent  
4 in R3 versus 40 percent in R4. And consequently, the  
5 impervious surface area is the same. The impervious  
6 surface area if we go to R4 is actually less than R3.  
7 It's 55 percent that's allowed versus 60 percent.

8 And lastly, in the R3 district all newly  
9 created parking areas must be accessed from the alley if  
10 the lot is actually served by an alley. In the R4  
11 district there's not a requirement that you use an alley  
12 to access off-street parking.

13 That's the main points that I'd like to cover.  
14 I don't know if Susan wants to talk. And then we'll  
15 take questions at the end. Okay.

16 MS. GUDERLEY: As Arlova mentioned, there's  
17 another memo, there was a memo out on the table that I  
18 prepared. This memo addresses specifically some of the  
19 questions that came up with regards to the proposed R5A  
20 zoning.

21 The memo notes that the proposed, the changes  
22 that we are, that were proposed for this zoning hearing  
23 to change the R5A in that area of study area that is

1 roughly defined by Green Bay Road on east, Emerson  
2 Street on the south, and the western edge of the former  
3 railroad right of way, arose out of the discussions from  
4 the Canal at Green Bay Road planning process, which ran  
5 basically between 2000 and 2003.

6 This discussion of this, the R5 zoning, was a  
7 very divisive one amongst the participants of the  
8 planning process. Opponents to the current R5 zoning  
9 express the concern that this designation conflicts with  
10 their sense that this area, although many of the units  
11 have been converted to two or more units, still resemble  
12 single-family structures. Those same opponents also  
13 were very much opposed to the maximum height permitted  
14 by the R5 district, which is 50 feet or five stories.

15 Proponents, those who supported the R5, the  
16 current R5 zoning, noted that to change the R5 zoning to  
17 something less would decrease greatly, greatly decrease  
18 the property values of many of these properties. And  
19 they also noted that to, to down-zone this area would  
20 make it more difficult to, to develop affordable units.

21 At the request of the then alderman, the  
22 development, there was a development moratorium placed  
23 on this area to allow time for discussions as part of

1 the planning process to develop a zoning that would try  
2 to find common ground between these two sides.

3 After numerous discussions, what was the  
4 compromise that was crafted was the proposed R5A zoning.

5 This district would retain all the R5 regulations with  
6 regards to lot, width, lot area insofar as unit  
7 generation, but would reduce the maximum permitted  
8 height from, down from 50 feet to a maximum of 42 feet.

9 And this 42 feet, the figure of 42 feet, was arrived at  
10 by analysis of all the structures there. And that is  
11 the tallest building that is currently there, the  
12 tallest mean height of the existing structures. So  
13 that's where the 42 feet came from.

14 At our last meeting there was again calls to  
15 consider down-zoning to either R4 or R3. And, you know,  
16 my memo notes that this basically revisits many of the  
17 same discussions that we had at that time regarding  
18 property values and affordable units and creation of  
19 non-conforming structures.

20 Since the adoption of the Canal-Green Bay Road  
21 report, however, the Zoning Ordinance has been amended  
22 regarding maximum permitted heights in residential  
23 districts. Since that time the ordinance has been

1 changed to now grant that any building or structure that  
2 was legally existing and conforming with the zone's  
3 building height requirement, they are granted the status  
4 of legally permitted structure or use, not a legal  
5 nonconformance, which means that any building within the  
6 R5 zone that is there right now, up to and including 50-  
7 feet tall, may, in either the case of being accidentally  
8 destroyed or intentionally destroyed, could be rebuilt  
9 to the same height.

10           So, in a sense, that, what that currently does  
11 is, guarantees current property owners who have a legal  
12 height to rebuild their existing buildings to that  
13 height. And so that the remaining, the only remaining  
14 zoning district standard that has the greatest impact  
15 upon their property values, is the minimum lot area,  
16 which, from which they can determine the number of units  
17 they can have in their structure.

18           On my memo I displayed two tables. The first  
19 table is a subset of what Arlova's memo shows, basically  
20 displays the minimum lot requirements for each of the  
21 residential districts, R3, R4, and R5. And the second  
22 table displays the count and zoning status of the  
23 existing dwelling units under each of those three

1 zonings.

2           The memo notes that the area currently  
3 contains 86 structures, which include or which, in which  
4 there are 174 dwelling units. Currently under the  
5 current R5 zoning, seven of those residential structures  
6 do not conform with the R5 zoning, meaning that they  
7 have, they exceed the number of units that would be  
8 permitted under the R5 zoning to the tune of about 20  
9 dwelling units.

10           Nevertheless, even with those seven units in  
11 excess of their permitted units, under R5 that, this  
12 area under R5 zoning could actually produce 197 or  
13 another 23 units. Because there are a number of lots  
14 that are either vacant or do not, have not been  
15 developed to their full potential.

16           Under R4 zoning there are a total of 24 non-  
17 conforming structures or 28 percent of all of the 86  
18 structures that contain a total of 55 non-conforming  
19 dwelling units. The minimum lot requirements for this  
20 zone would also reduce the total number of dwelling  
21 units achievable in this area by about 10 percent, down  
22 from 174 to 156.

23           While the R5, R4 zoning permits the same mix

1 of units as R5, none of the existing lots as they are  
2 currently subdivided could, could house more than three  
3 dwelling units under the R4 zoning. Of course this  
4 could be changed if two or more units, two or more lots  
5 were put together and created a larger zoning lot. But  
6 that's not the case right now.

7           And under R3 zoning 75 of the existing  
8 dwelling units, or 43 percent of them, are, would be  
9 non-conforming. Also about 42 percent of the 86 units,  
10 or a total of 36, would be considered non-conforming  
11 structures. There could only be a maximum of 113  
12 dwelling units permitted on these same lots under R3  
13 zoning. And under the zoning, as Arlova mentioned, only  
14 single and, single-family units and duplex units are  
15 permitted.

16           I just would like to add, Arlova correctly  
17 summarized the discussion of Gilbert Park insofar as the  
18 replacement, the two parks in Sub-Area 1 replacing the  
19 Gilbert Park area. But our consultants also total up  
20 the total of park space in the total of the master plan.

21           And in addition to those 34,000 square feet in Sub-Area  
22 1, there's another 20,000 square feet in additional  
23 parks, as well as about another 30-some thousand in a

1 greenway trail that stretches basically from Lake Street  
2 up to Church Street.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Excuse me, I have a  
4 question.

5 CHAIRMAN WOOD: Okay.

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: In your outline in the --  
7 and Ms. Jackson talked about -- referenced zoning and  
8 everything. There is really no definition as to what --  
9 overlay zoning, how does that work and what all does  
10 that imply? So if you could speak to that, I would  
11 appreciate it.

12 (Inaudible response.)

13 MS. ESTER: Hi. My name is Betty Ester. And  
14 I stay at 2114 Darrell.

15 And my question is, in the material that was  
16 handed out giving definition as to what zoning is and  
17 what Ms. Jackson and Mrs. Guderley went through, they  
18 did not address the issue of overlay. And I would like  
19 for them to explain how overlays work and all of, and  
20 its whole implication. Because somewhere I read in  
21 something on the internet for the city site says that it  
22 could be carried over into some other area or not. So  
23 if you could explain as to exactly what is it meant by

1 an overly district of zoning.

2 MS. JACKSON: An overlay district is a zoning  
3 district that, if you think about it, is meant to layer  
4 over an existing district. So it may have regulations  
5 or requirements that are more restrictive or less  
6 restrictive.

7 But it's meant to apply to a specific area  
8 often for a particular corridor or a particular part of  
9 town where there's a, you're trying to achieve a  
10 particular goal. So the more general use categories  
11 don't get at everything that you're, you're trying to  
12 accomplish.

13 So the overlay may be focused on design or not  
14 unusually, not so much use, but sometimes you want to  
15 allow particular uses and particular locations without  
16 changing the base zoning district without making such a  
17 drastic change.

18 So we currently have, I believe, three overlay  
19 zoning districts. We have one that's, we use for the  
20 hospitals, as a hospital overlay zoning district.  
21 There's a redevelopment overlay zoning district. And  
22 then there's one that we've actually never mapped. It  
23 was created, but it hasn't been mapped anywhere.

1           It would be the same process as a zoning  
2 change. So if you want to add an overlay over a base  
3 district, there's a hearing process which is, you know,  
4 partially why we're here now. It can be mapped anywhere  
5 the city feels it's appropriate.

6           And if you want to make amendments, it's the  
7 same process as a text amendment or map amendment that  
8 we do for all of our base districts. It's just meant to  
9 refine, or narrow in some cases, what's permitted for a  
10 particular property to achieve a particular goal.

11           For this process the overlay could apply to  
12 the entire master plan area if that's what the Council  
13 decides, if that's what this Committee recommends and  
14 what the Council decides. Or we could say, you know,  
15 the overlay should only go for the industrially-zoned  
16 property or it should only go for this corridor. It's  
17 completely up to the Committee, the Plan Commission, and  
18 the Council to discuss and make decisions about where  
19 it's appropriate and where it would make sense.

20           If it's adopted, we don't necessarily have to  
21 map it right away. It just gives an option in the  
22 future for a site where it makes sense. Obviously it  
23 was designed for the West Evanston Master Plan area. I

1 can't imagine it being used elsewhere, but I suppose  
2 that's possible.

3 MS. GILES: My name is Priscilla Giles. And I  
4 guess I have a question on that then. With this re-  
5 zoning that is, that's not, that, we're here for a  
6 meeting and yet, and still we're not, we don't know  
7 what's going to happen. And that's not up to us to make  
8 this decision.

9 What benefit does the, is this re-zoning going  
10 to be for the 5<sup>th</sup> ward who were promised when this was  
11 brought to our attention the first time that this would  
12 be a benefit for the residents that were living in the  
13 5<sup>th</sup> ward? What is the, what benefit do we get from this  
14 re-zoning?

15 MS. JACKSON: Well, the re-zoning is the  
16 recommendation. The re-zonings proposed are based on  
17 the recommendations from a planning process that took  
18 place that was aimed at being pro-active in determining  
19 how the area's going to be redeveloped. And so instead  
20 of reacting to proposals from developers, the city  
21 decided to take a look at this land that probably is not  
22 going to be, is not feasible to be used anymore for  
23 industrial purposes, and figure out what they'd like it

1 to be, what's the best use of it.

2           So the plan process took place. A plan was  
3 proposed and adopted. The re-zoning is simply the  
4 vehicle to implement the objectives in the plan so that  
5 it has some teeth, so that when proposals come through,  
6 the strategies and objectives and desires that are  
7 talked about in the plan are actually given some weight  
8 and people are required to comply with them. So it's  
9 given a little bit more certainty about what type of  
10 development to expect.

11           AUDIENCE MEMBER: I don't feel that's  
12 answering the question.

13           MS. JACKSON: I don't know what more to say.

14                   (Question from audience member.)

15           MS. JACKSON: I can't give you guarantees  
16 about what proposals may come, but --

17           MS. GILES: What are the benefits for --  
18 Should I come back up there and say that you need --

19           MS. JACKSON: I guess I don't understand what  
20 you're --

21           MS. GILES: Maybe the question is just too  
22 simple. I would like to know, since it was brought to  
23 the West Evanston, I guess, by the city, was brought to

1 the, the people of the, of West Evanston, that, I mean,  
2 I just can't, we were asked what we would like to see to  
3 make it better. We asked for jobs. That was the main,  
4 I think that was the main thing.

5           So with this, this redevelopment, I'd like to  
6 know how is it going to benefit the people who are there  
7 now. Is it going to, are these new structures with the  
8 new zoning going to price out the people who are there?

9     Are they going to be unable to remodel, to rebuild?  
10  Are their taxes going to go up so that they will not be  
11  able to stay in the community? Are their children,  
12  grandchildren, going to be able to live in the community  
13  that they were raised in?

14           I mean, what benefits does this have for the  
15  people who live here now? Not the new people who are  
16  coming in, but the people who more in the meeting asked,  
17  being asked how this was going to benefit what we'd like  
18  to see? And whatever industry, whatever businesses that  
19  are already there, why do they need to leave if this is  
20  what we asked for, that we'd like to have jobs, we'd  
21  like to have industry, we'd like to have people, a place  
22  for people to work? What's the benefit of this re-  
23  zoning for the people who are there?

1 MS. JACKSON: Well, I think the re-zoning is  
2 meant to attract development that the city wants in the,  
3 in the area. And the current zoning was seen to not be  
4 adequate. And so when you have an area that has land  
5 that's zoned for a use that's not being attracted to the  
6 area, it could have all sorts of negative impact. So if  
7 you have vacant properties that can't be redeveloped,  
8 that has a negative impact.

9 So the changes, I think, are designed to  
10 attract the type of development that the city wants, to  
11 provide opportunities for new development, not just to  
12 benefit new people, but to provide a more stable  
13 community.

14 It's hard to look in a crystal ball and say  
15 this zoning change is going to have this numeric impact  
16 on a given area. We put the tools in place to attract  
17 the development that we want. I don't know if --

18 MS. GUDERLEY: I'll just add, I think Arlova  
19 hit the nail on the head when she said that both because  
20 of the Canal-Green Bay Road planning process and also  
21 because of the discussions surrounding the West Evanston  
22 TIF, there was a lot of discussion about some of the  
23 uses that are leaving. We are not having, we are not

1 encouraging industry to leave. What we're observing,  
2 though, is that some industry is leaving.

3           And as Arlova mentioned, rather than waiting  
4 for a large, and most of these industrial uses are  
5 large, involve large parcels of property, so rather than  
6 wait for a situation where a large land owner sells, a  
7 developer comes in and proposes, has his own individual  
8 proposal to develop that site, the city involved  
9 residents, many of you, property owners, and businesses  
10 in a planning process that asks them to look ahead  
11 before developers were there, before there was a  
12 specific development, and ask people to say when and if  
13 these businesses leave. When and if they leave, not  
14 we're making them leave. When and if they leave, what  
15 would you like to see here?

16           And we had three months of neighborhood  
17 meetings where that was discussed. And we had workshops  
18 and we had consultants working with residents to develop  
19 these plans. The benefit from this plan is that rather  
20 than waiting for a heated, kind of eleventh hour  
21 discussion over a specific development proposal that is  
22 proposed by a developer, this plan involved the  
23 community in discussions as to what they wanted to see

1 built there.

2           It is not, it was not a job space plan. From  
3 the beginning we talked about it. It is a land use  
4 plan. It is a design plan. It is an urban design plan.

5 When it was adopted the Council asked us also, asked  
6 staff to also look at measures that the city can take in  
7 terms of encouraging affordable housing, encouraging  
8 jobs, and encouraging ways to counter gentrification.  
9 And that is also underway right now.

10           CHAIRMAN WOODS: I'd like to add one more  
11 thing to what Susan said. I think one of the concerns  
12 of the city is that if an industrial or commercial use  
13 leaves town and sells the land to a developer. We  
14 looked at each and every parcel as it comes before us as  
15 an individual project. And rather than thinking of it  
16 as we are trying to now, holistically and develop a  
17 master plan that involves things like streets that  
18 continue through the neighborhoods and things like that,  
19 that we don't think of things as isolated little islands  
20 unto themselves, but there is an overall vision for the  
21 neighborhood rather than dealing with each individual  
22 project as it comes and having none of them tie into or  
23 relate from one to another.

1 MS. WILLIAMS: Can you hear me? I attend  
2 church at 1321 Foster. And I was born and raised in  
3 Evanston. My name is Nicole Williams.

4 When I look at this plan and the great  
5 question that was asked, what are the benefits when you  
6 have allowed nine flats, six flats, five flats, the  
7 people who occupy those buildings generally have a less  
8 sense of community. They don't necessarily care about  
9 the property, let alone their neighbors. They just live  
10 there. They have not vested interest into the  
11 community.

12 So when you say this benefits us or benefits  
13 the community, actually when you create these new  
14 streets and there's only one way in or one way out, I  
15 ask you to consider the City of Chicago. They are  
16 actually redeveloping all of the projects. And there  
17 are definite areas in the City of Chicago where they  
18 created a new street and it's actually a trap. You  
19 create a huge park where there's only a one-way street.

20 What do you think is going to occur there when  
21 there's one way in, one way out and we can monitor that?

22 The police officers will have a hard time monitoring  
23 the activity that occurs in large parks where there is

1 basically what I would consider a triangle.

2           If you study and if you look at large  
3 metropolitan cities where you have large numbers of  
4 apartment buildings, there are no community members  
5 there. The owners of that property more than likely do  
6 not live in a nine-flat building. In a two-flat usually  
7 the owner, usually the owner probably stays in one of  
8 them.

9           But when you build or create a plan that  
10 encourages the area to be more dense and more populated  
11 with people who have no vested interest, the benefits  
12 are outweighed by the costs for police officers, rapes,  
13 murders, burglaries, you ask it, it's there. It's  
14 there.

15           COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Miss, I have a  
16 question. What would you do? Are you saying we should  
17 do nothing with this, this expanse of land? Do  
18 absolutely nothing? And that includes the industrial  
19 property that is, that has been used for industrial  
20 purposes?

21           MS. WILLIAMS: That's a very extreme, you're  
22 asking an -- that's very extreme.

23           CHAIRMAN WOODS: Nicole.

1                   COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: That's what you're  
2 suggesting.

3                   CHAIRMAN WOODS: Nicole, are you suggesting  
4 that what you're opposed to is the six flats and the  
5 nine flats?

6                   MS. WILLIAMS: I didn't hear you.

7                   CHAIRMAN WOODS: Are you opposed to the six  
8 flats and nine flats?

9                   MS. WILLIAMS: Because the people who occupy  
10 those buildings do not have a vested interest in the  
11 community.

12                  CHAIRMAN WOODS: Can I make one comment on  
13 that?

14                  MS. WILLIAMS: Sure.

15                  CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think that largely depends  
16 on the price point of the units.

17                  MS. WILLIAMS: It's going to be a, it's not an  
18 apartment?

19                  CHAIRMAN WOODS: Just because it says  
20 apartment building doesn't mean it's an apartment. It  
21 could very well be condominiums.

22                  MS. WILLIAMS: Usually your, your large, if  
23 you say it depends on the price of the dwelling unit,

1 most land, the tenants that some of the landlords may  
2 seek might actually be those who are not actually paying  
3 the rent. And so when those people steal, meaning  
4 someone else is paying their rent, so I don't want to  
5 offend anyone here, but if they have Section 8 tenants  
6 that come in that's guaranteed rent money, they still  
7 don't have any vested interest in the community. That's  
8 my point. So when you get a nine-flat building, you  
9 think everyone there is going to care?

10 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Let me ask staff a question,  
11 okay? Because we've said six flat, nine flat, whatever  
12 building, flat sort of conveys to people that it's not  
13 owned, individually-owned units. But I don't believe  
14 that that's the case for what's being proposed here.

15 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think, I think that that's  
17 going to be up to a developer ultimately to decide. And  
18 my guess it, based on land value, that these will be  
19 owned units.

20 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. Okay. That, that could  
21 be. I mean, I'm looking at --

22 CHAIRMAN WOODS: And so --

23 MS. WILLIAMS: I'm looking at a diagram.

1           CHAIRMAN WOODS: I, yes, I understand that.  
2     And that's why I want to get to whether it's an issue of  
3     terminology that's leading us to a certain set of  
4     expectations versus what may in fact be reality. And  
5     obviously at this point we just don't know what reality  
6     might be. And maybe we need to make things clearer.

7           MR. GARRISON: Daniel Garrison. I live in the  
8     5<sup>th</sup> ward and I'm a co-chair of the 5<sup>th</sup> ward development  
9     committee that reports through our alderman here.

10           My question relates to the, what's recently  
11     now been pointed out, that a lot of the new development  
12     is going to be on former industrial property. It is for  
13     many axiomatic that former industrial property is going  
14     to have abatement issues and huge abatement costs  
15     because of petroleum distillates and whatever else  
16     that's been dumped into the ground and buried over the  
17     generations that it has been put to that use. My  
18     question is, who is going to pay for this abatement?

19           MS. JACKSON: An individual property owner  
20     would be responsible for the environmental remediation.

21           MR. GARRISON: The purchaser or the vendor of  
22     the property?

23           MS. JACKSON: The owner. Whoever --

1                   CHAIRMAN WOODS: That's to be negotiated  
2 between buyer and seller.

3                   MR. GARRISON: And how is the abatement cost  
4 to be determined?

5                   CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well, abatement costs have to  
6 be taken care of by either the buyer or the seller. And  
7 that all of the abatement is governed by Illinois  
8 Environmental Protection Agency. There are very strict  
9 standards for clean up of sites.

10                  MR. GARRISON: And those standards would be,  
11 will be observed at the time of the transfer of the  
12 property? Because whether property is affordable for a  
13 buyer is going to hang a great deal on what the  
14 abatement costs are going to be.

15                  CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely. And that's why I  
16 say, it's up for the negotiation between buyer or  
17 seller. To have a transfer of property you have to have  
18 a willing buyer and a willing seller. That's why  
19 they'll negotiate it.

20                  Just like when you go to look at a house that  
21 you want to buy. Before you actually go to, you know,  
22 final closing and things like that, you have a home  
23 inspection done, there are certain things that get

1 identified, and you go into a negotiation with the  
2 seller relative to, is there something you can take off  
3 the price.

4           So on an environmental, on a industrial site,  
5 a buyer is going to make sure that there's a full  
6 environmental assessment done of that site. And then  
7 they are going to negotiate their price that they're  
8 willing to pay based on the cost, either if they're  
9 going to do it themselves or the land may be more  
10 valuable if the seller is going to clean it up  
11 themselves.

12           MR. GARRISON: But the buyer or the seller  
13 assume that responsibility --

14           CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely.

15           MR. GARRISON: -- before it is given  
16 development. For, for example, how is it --

17           CHAIRMAN WOODS: Before it can be developed,  
18 it will have to be cleaned up. That doesn't mean that a  
19 buyer can't buy the property and let it sit for some  
20 period of time.

21           MR. GARRISON: Yeah. That's turned out to be  
22 a huge issue for the actual redevelopment of this former  
23 property. And as far as I know, no one's talking about

1 it, except to say that it is somebody else's problem.

2 CHAIRMAN WOODS: No.

3 MR. GARRISON: And I think the problem is the  
4 city's problem.

5 CHAIRMAN WOODS: It's not the city's problem.  
6 The city has, bears no responsibility to clean up these  
7 sites. They did not --

8 MR. GARRISON: No. They don't bear  
9 responsibility, but they have the problem.

10 MS. JACKSON: If, you mean if, if  
11 ultimately --

12 CHAIRMAN WOODS: The city in, in general  
13 terms, yes. The community --

14 MR. GARRISON: Yep. Right.

15 CHAIRMAN WOODS: -- has a problem.

16 MR. GARRISON: Right. But we're talking about  
17 community problems here tonight and that's one of them.

18 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely. But again, a  
19 property has a certain value based on the potential for  
20 its development and the cost of that development. And  
21 that's why, you know, maybe the land isn't worth what  
22 the, what the seller would think it's worth.

23 MR. GARRISON: Right. Right.

1           CHAIRMAN WOODS: But, by and large, if there  
2 are motivated developers, it gets worked out.

3           MR. GARRISON: Thank you.

4           MS. MOSS-MASON: Good evening. My name is  
5 Beverly Moss-Mason. I live in the nineteen hundred  
6 block of Dewey. And in the area I think that this, the  
7 property behind my house is included, I have two  
8 questions.

9           The first question, has that property, is that  
10 still property for sale or has that been sold? Or do  
11 you know, the Bishop-Freeman area in through there,  
12 that's an industrial site that, is that property still  
13 up for sale?

14          MS. JACKSON: To my understanding, the  
15 property, there is a, --

16          MS. MOSS-MASON: A bid on it?

17          MS. JACKSON: -- a developer who is working  
18 with the current owner in a purchase agreement. But I  
19 don't know at what stage --

20          MS. MOSS-MASON: Okay. There's no done deal.  
21 Okay.

22          My second question is to the gentleman in the  
23 gray suit. And you asked a question to someone, one of

1 the young ladies, what would you do with that? What  
2 would you do with that?

3 I must apologize. I did not attend the  
4 developing meetings. And I knew they were existing, but  
5 my life was in another direction. However, I think it's  
6 wonderful revitalizing. I'm real excited. I'd like to  
7 see a change. And I'm, I'm all for it. And I would  
8 like to make a suggestion. And perhaps I would be  
9 willing to work very hard on making some of this happen.

10 And I will, when I pass by this evening, I  
11 will call the Bishop-Freeman. I did call about three  
12 months ago, left my name and number, and he didn't call.  
13 Because I wanted to, the idea first came to me at that  
14 time. And it's been with me for a long time. But I  
15 would like to see something our city needs for our  
16 youth.

17 We have a problem in Evanston with our, our  
18 youth, our children from the age of nine to 15, nine to  
19 17, 18. It's dormant. And they've turned to the  
20 streets, sex, and drugs because we do not recreate them  
21 right. We educate them very well. We have wonderful  
22 educational facilities here, but we don't recreate them  
23 well.

1           And I'm going to kind of put emphasis on our,  
2 our American-African community where we need to  
3 recreate. Our kids don't move, they don't dance, they  
4 don't do anything other than the streets. They don't  
5 read write. Their scores are down. And if they  
6 recreate, it's part of life.

7           I would like to see a multi-cultural unit in  
8 that area there that provided types of cultural  
9 recreation that our kids need. We need a skating rink.  
10 Our kids need to move, dance, sing, feel. Bu Ku is  
11 wonderful. I'm so happy with that. And that all adds  
12 part in.

13           And this isn't only for African-American, but  
14 it's for our entire community at that age. To include  
15 within that area, -- works wonderfully there across the  
16 street. So I'd, I'd like to see that. And I'm going to  
17 investigate in the cost. And then I'll contact, try  
18 Oprah, Tiger, and Michael Jordon, and see what we can  
19 do. And the community. Because I think that we need --

20           And I'm, I think it's wonderful that we have  
21 redevelopment. It's absolutely necessary. But we need  
22 to provide for that age, our youth. Thank you.

23           COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: If the area that you're

1 talking about is R4, I'm not sure that it is, but if it  
2 is, there is a provision under a special use for a  
3 community center. So there would be no prohibition  
4 against having a community center at, at that site.

5 MR. ELLIS: My name is Cameron Ellis. I live  
6 at 1239 Leon Place.

7 I have kind of a quick yes or no question.  
8 And that was, in reading the consultant's reports, my  
9 understanding was the form-based design code or the  
10 form-based zoning was to be implemented throughout this  
11 TIF district and the consultants were, where the  
12 consultants, the area that they were looking at and  
13 addressing.

14 My question is, if that form-based design code  
15 or form-based zoning code goes into effect, will the  
16 developer be able to come in, and under TUD  
17 arrangements, get variations or a variance to those  
18 zoning codes as they now can do with the standard  
19 zoning?

20 My chief concern, regarding especially either  
21 the vacant or industrialized property which we're all  
22 speculating on turning over to residential or some other  
23 use at some point is, when I look at places like 1930

1 Ridge which is zoned R5 and has allowances that are  
2 grossly in excess of R6, including number of units,  
3 density, setback, and so forth, I look at the Cyrus  
4 Project at Hines Lumber which I believe was zoned at R4,  
5 somebody correct me if I'm wrong, they had variations  
6 and variances granted in excess of R5. They have a lot  
7 coverage which is in excess of R6. The R6 limit is 65  
8 percent. They are closer to, excuse me, R6 is 65  
9 percent limit. They are closer to 75 percent. I  
10 believe it was .74.

11 And I want to know, if you do the form-based  
12 zoning code, are you going to remove that avenue for  
13 developers to use? Because otherwise I feel this whole  
14 process is just a farce. Because the property we're  
15 talking about developing is huge. And it's only going  
16 to be large developers coming in to do it. And you know  
17 the PUD process is going to be an automatic unless you  
18 remove that. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I gather, you know, you're  
20 opposed to it. And I think it's fair to say that the --

21 MR. ELLIS: I'm sorry. I am in favor of the  
22 form-based design --

23 CHAIRMAN WOODS: You're opposed to PUDs being

1 allowed?

2 MR. ELLIS: Yes, yes --

3 CHAIRMAN WOODS: And my understanding of the  
4 current proposal is that planned development is not  
5 contemplated for this area. Therefore the only  
6 variances you can get would be the normal variances from  
7 a normal zoning process, as opposed to a planned  
8 development which allows increased density and  
9 development. And obviously, the allowances in terms of  
10 heights and stuff like that. So, for example, rather  
11 than --

12 (Question from audience member.)

13 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Right. Rather than taking a  
14 parcel that currently would show 13 town homes on it,  
15 let's say, somebody couldn't come in and propose an  
16 apartment building of eight stories on that lot. What  
17 they would be able to do is come in and say, we really  
18 need two feet off of the setback on the side yard  
19 property line or we're going to do a slightly different  
20 dorm or configuration or any of those more "normal"  
21 zoning variance kinds of issues. You know, get, get  
22 those percentage differences in terms of lot coverage  
23 and things like that that anybody can get or apply for

1 on a house, for example.

2           However, I will say that you better continue  
3 to be a part of this process as it moves forward.  
4 Because I think that issue needs to be addressed with  
5 City Council.

6           COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: I second that. I don't  
7 think we contemplate PUDs in this area. But that has  
8 not been settled yet. So if you're opposed to PUDs,  
9 keep the heat on.

10           MS. PAYTON: Hi. My name is Tina Payton. And  
11 I live at 1122 Emerson and have several pieces of  
12 property here in the 5<sup>th</sup> ward.

13           I first want to state that I did not receive  
14 notice, not for this meeting, not for the last meeting,  
15 and not for any of the meetings before. And the only  
16 reason I'm in attendance of many of the meetings,  
17 because I hear it through the grapevine, not because I  
18 was properly notified. And I am within 500 feet. We  
19 have a property at 1507 Emerson, which is at Emerson and  
20 Jackson. And I never received notice.

21           Also I want to know, which I asked during the  
22 West Side planning process, who's paying for these new  
23 streets and alleys? And I never got an answer.

1 Infrastructure, lights, and everything. And I'm  
2 assuming it's the city, the taxpayers, as normal.  
3 Because they would never answer the question of who's  
4 paying for this.

5           And I went back and I looked at my original  
6 West Side planning flyer and it says three to four  
7 stories for apartments or anything. And, you know, you  
8 say, oh yeah, that's, you know, what this is going to  
9 be. And now you're in here saying that it's going to be  
10 something else.

11           And I've attended not only these meetings, but  
12 Central Street. And when Central Street people came in  
13 and they said they didn't want five stories, they  
14 demanded only three and four stories, that's what they  
15 got. And that's what we want. And we're not getting  
16 it.

17           And then you say, which I asked before, and  
18 they say apartments. They keep putting apartments on  
19 this six flats and so forth. When I asked a long time  
20 ago during the planning process, I said, well, are these  
21 really going to be apartments? Well, we just title them  
22 apartments. But most likely they'll be condos because  
23 we cannot afford to make them apartments because we

1 would have to charge \$2,000 a month for rent.

2 And so you say a low income. Who is that?

3 Not \$2,000 a month. And they won't be able to afford

4 apartments nor these units that you say will be

5 \$400,000. So please answer the questions that I've

6 asked repeatedly.

7 MR. SUTTON: Carlis Sutton, 1821 Darrell.

8 My first concern is I, like two gentlemen, I

9 would like to see development. But your question should

10 be answered more appropriately.

11 Why can't development fit the current zoning?

12 Why do we have to have development that is in direct

13 opposition to what the residents want and is direct

14 opposition to the character of our community, which is

15 in direct opposition to us maintaining our own homes in

16 this community?

17 You're going to speed up gentrification.

18 We're going to pay for the sewers. We're going to pay

19 for the extension of the streets. That nobody of my

20 color will be able to afford to buy a \$400,000 town home

21 or to move into these units.

22 So my concern is that you tell us about form-

23 based zoning and you mention that form-based zoning, 90

1 percent of it when they first started, requires citizen  
2 participation and meeting the needs of the citizens.  
3 Then you come with R5, which is in total opposition to  
4 everything we've been requesting, the elimination of  
5 businesses without even contacting people.

6 I'm really concerned. And I'm glad a couple  
7 of my alderman are here too. Because I need to know,  
8 who is going to stand up for us? Why do we have to come  
9 to these meetings and currently remind you that we're  
10 not going anywhere, that we're going to be here as  
11 property owners as long as we can stay?

12 And you may try to get rid of us. But you're  
13 not going to do it this particular process. Either you  
14 live up to the letter of the law by giving us  
15 notification, secondly, coming up with some plans that  
16 are more compatible with what we think our community  
17 ought to look like, or we're going to continue opposing  
18 very, very vehemently anything that you propose like  
19 this that's going to change the character and the  
20 content and not only that, the ability for black people  
21 to remain in Evanston.

22 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Carlis, Carlis, if I  
23 may, I have a question for you.

1 MR. SUTTON: Yeah.

2 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: The area that is  
3 currently zoned R5, --

4 MR. SUTTON: Um-hum.

5 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: -- that allows 50-foot  
6 height there. Do you want that area to remain R5 with a  
7 50-foot height?

8 MR. SUTTON: No.

9 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: I thought you --

10 MR. SUTTON: No. The area I was talking about  
11 was originally zoned R3 and R4. There's very, very  
12 limited area in our zone, R5, in the 5<sup>th</sup> ward. If the  
13 majority of the 5<sup>th</sup> ward is R3 and R4, not R5. The  
14 overlay was all R5, which got rid of businesses, which  
15 got rid of R3, which got rid of R4. That was my  
16 concern, Mr. Opdycke.

17 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: I guess I misunderstood  
18 you. I thought you, you wanted the existing zoning to  
19 remain intact.

20 MR. SUTTON: No. Compatible. We're talking  
21 about form-based zoning, okay? And when they mentioned  
22 earlier that the buildings that they're proposing are  
23 not in contradiction to any existing building. The only

1 building in the 5<sup>th</sup> ward that's 50 feet tall is Blake  
2 Robinson, which is a recent addition. There are no huge  
3 complexes in the 5<sup>th</sup> ward of six units and nine units.  
4 They don't exist.

5 And the fact that you're going to introduce  
6 these. And at the price that you're introducing these  
7 too. And the effect that we're going to have to pay for  
8 the infrastructure because we're within 500 feet.

9 Every developer that we talk to says they  
10 can't afford to improve the streets, to put in street  
11 lights, to put in traffic lights, that it would not be  
12 practical for them to develop. So the current tax  
13 payers, who are already very belabored to trying to  
14 maintain their homes and their, we're going to be  
15 burdened. Those especially within 500 feet.

16 So there is no benefit to us, as someone has  
17 said. It's a burden to us, a complete burden to us.  
18 And I wish the city would address that in some way, that  
19 we could get all these buildings that have gone up to  
20 Optima. We were told, oh, when these high-rises go up  
21 it'll lower your taxes. You'll have a better income  
22 living. I have not benefitted from that one bit.

23 Thank god since the total assessment of the

1 city has gone up, our properties will naturally  
2 appreciate. Okay, with these buildings coming in, they  
3 will automatically depreciate and at a much higher rate.

4 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Excuse me. Just one  
5 moment. Are you opposed to the R5 being re-zoned to an  
6 R5A?

7 MR. SUTTON: I don't have my map with me right  
8 now.

9 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Which is 40, which is,  
10 which is --

11 MR. SUTTON: What area are you talking -- Just  
12 give me the streets and I can tell you.

13 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: It's north of Emerson.

14 MR. SUTTON: Okay.

15 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Wesley is on sort of  
16 the east flank. And Ashland's sort of on the left  
17 flank.

18 MR. SUTTON: Yeah, right. That's --

19 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Now that's currently  
20 R5.

21 MR. SUTTON: -- in that area.

22 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: But it's R5 right now.

23 MR. SUTTON: No. I thought where Robinson's

1 bus is R5? That's commercial.

2 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: No, that's on the south  
3 side of Emerson, right?

4 MR. SUTTON: No, no. Where he's keeping that  
5 car lot now is on the north side of Emerson.

6 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: That's R5.

7 MR. SUTTON: That's currently R5? It's not  
8 commercial?

9 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: No.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: They changed it.

11 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: No. Actually we're  
12 the, it's I2.

13 MR. SUTTON: Thank you. Thank you. I know  
14 it's not R5.

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: He said the park was R5.

16 CHAIRMAN WOODS: The park is R5. And, and  
17 one, two, three blocks to the east is largely R5. Yes,  
18 you're correct, Carlis. From Robinson's parking area to  
19 the east of there, the park, that is all R5, including  
20 all the way up to Leon, what it would sort of line up  
21 with Leon Place a little further east. So, on the other  
22 side of Green Bay.

23 MS. ESTER: Could I say something? The R5A,

1 do you have to go back --

2 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: You have to take the  
3 microphone, Ms. Ester.

4 MS. ESTER: Okay. The R5A came out of the  
5 West Side planning, the neighborhood West Side planning,  
6 which was the Green Bay, all of those streets in there.  
7 That was the 18 months where the community was going  
8 through that.

9 Okay, at the final review, as Susan had  
10 stated, that's where the R5A came into with 42 feet.  
11 Because when that process was going, the community and  
12 the alderman at that time, Alderman Joe Kent, wanted it  
13 to be downgraded to an R3 to be in the same order as the  
14 rest of the 5<sup>th</sup> ward.

15 But when the people that wrote the final draft  
16 and everything, they came to a decision that it should  
17 be R5A, 42 feet, that did not come back to the community  
18 for the community to address. But since they told us  
19 the 42 feet was three-story buildings, we accepted that,  
20 that there would be no five stories over there from  
21 Green Bay to Dewey. Or is it Ashland? Wherever the,  
22 the little park that shows that it's the R5.  
23 So, we don't have any problem with the R5A if it is 42

1 feet and if that is what it's going to be.

2 Now with the other park came the West Side  
3 Master Plan, which is supposed to be the form-based.  
4 They told us that they took the zoning height from the  
5 neighborhood plan, which was 42 feet. Well, in some,  
6 37. But nothing no higher than 42 feet, which was three  
7 stories. And that's what we said we could accept.

8 MR. CAHILL: My name is John Cahill, 1515  
9 Church Street, Cahill Plumbing and Heating.

10 I'm here really to ask a question, or a couple  
11 maybe, and maybe some redefinition on behalf of myself  
12 and the Uchtman family who own National Awards next to  
13 me.

14 And I was not at the last meeting. I was on  
15 vacation. And it seems that things change. But I like  
16 to hear it from the horse's mouth, so to speak.

17 As you know, I've been at many meetings for  
18 the last year. We've been at some staff meetings where  
19 there was going to be another staff meeting before a  
20 city meeting. These meetings don't always happen.

21 As you know, we're now zoned I2. We've been  
22 there 30 years at this address. We've been in Evanston  
23 117 years. And we really plan on staying here. And

1 you've been very kind in saying, you can stay as long as  
2 you'd like.

3           The only thing that's of concern to me now is  
4 I see that we are listed as R4 on the map. But I've  
5 been assured, as the Uchtmans were assured verbally,  
6 that as long as we stay there and we, we would be able  
7 to improve our property, we'd be able to, if I want to  
8 rebuild Cahill Plumbing or if I want to, whatever I  
9 might want to do. Or I might want to sell to another  
10 contractor some time in the future, that we'd be allowed  
11 to do that.

12           But when I see the zoning R4 and we're green  
13 on the map, I just want to be assured verbally and in  
14 writing, as do the Uchtmans, that that will stand and  
15 that I won't have any more surprises in the future. I  
16 mean, I expect that.

17           COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Susan? Susan?

18           MS. GUDERLEY: Mr. Cahill's correct. The  
19 plan, the plan itself, the master plan notes in writing  
20 that uses that are there currently, such as Cahill  
21 Plumbing and National Awards, the city welcomes them to  
22 stay and wants them to stay.

23           But we've moved onto -- The plan has been

1 adopted. And that stands. So what we're talking about  
2 now is the underlying zoning that would apply not to  
3 your operation, but when you would want to sell to  
4 something other than another contractor.

5 Arlova went through some of the discussion of  
6 non-conforming uses and non-conforming structures. And,  
7 you know, if you would want to run through that again,  
8 we can do that. But essentially as long as you, you are  
9 capable of selling to another contractor, I mean, as  
10 long as the use isn't discontinued, it can continue on  
11 as long as you would like to operate or a subsequent  
12 owner would want to operate that.

13 You can make improvements to your building.  
14 You can expand your building. And if it were destroyed  
15 more than 50 percent, the current Zoning Ordinance would  
16 not allow you to build. However, the overlay  
17 regulations that I proposed with the form-based code  
18 does permit the city to make a determination as to  
19 whether or not a certain building could be rebuilt. And  
20 certainly you've got that option to call on if, if that  
21 were to happen.

22 But as Arlova said, there's a great percentage  
23 of units or structures in the city because of the age of

1 many of our buildings and the age of many of our lots  
2 when they were subdivided that are non-conforming. And  
3 I don't know to what extent that's a problem, but --

4 MS. JACKSON: You know, I've staffed the  
5 Zoning Board of Appeals and I would say 90 percent of  
6 the cases that we see are for variations to, for  
7 properties that have some non-conforming characteristic.

8 So as long as, you know, I don't want to reiterate, but  
9 as long as it continues, it -- The problem is if it's  
10 abandoned or discontinued for more than 12 months. And  
11 then even with the overlay you still have the option to  
12 ask Council for a special review.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I wanted to know are we  
14 paying to institute the particular structure -- three or  
15 four stories -- apartments really apartments or are they  
16 condos or low-income and that sort of thing? --

17 MS. GUDERLEY: I'll take the units first. The  
18 building types that are proposed by the overlay, the  
19 zoning overlay, don't make any mention as to tenure,  
20 meaning whether it's ownership or renter. Certainly  
21 there is a need for rental properties. But as the  
22 Chairman mentioned, as you're aware as part of the  
23 planning process, we had a market study analysis of, or

1 real estate market analysis of the area.

2           And as you pointed out, because of taxes and  
3 other things, rental properties would need a serious  
4 subsidy to be affordable. However, because we do allow  
5 for a variety of unit types, everything from small lot  
6 single family to town homes, single family attached to  
7 multi, to small flats, six flats and nine flats to  
8 apartment buildings, we wanted to provide a range of  
9 unit types so that developers could construct something  
10 other than large, expensive single-family homes. And  
11 these are likely to be because of land prices likely to  
12 be condo units.

13           Some of the developers we've talked to are  
14 interested. And we also now have an affordable housing  
15 ordinance in effect so that a percentage, is it 10  
16 percent, of developments must be affordable units. So  
17 that, we're looking at developers that would have to do  
18 that. That's for planned developments.

19           In addition, in regards to the streets, when  
20 we're talking about large parcels such as this, it's  
21 typical that a developer is, when you have a subdivision  
22 ordinance, which we do not right now, subdivision  
23 regulations usually make all public improvements.

1 That's everything from streets, sewer, water, are the  
2 responsibility of the developer.

3 That being said, because this area is an area  
4 that hasn't seen development, we do want to attract on  
5 some of these sites that, as Mr. Garrison pointed out,  
6 are currently abandoned, industrial, and possibly  
7 contaminated. The city would consider, and is  
8 considering, assisting with TIF monies if they're  
9 available on some of these properties to assist in  
10 developing these, these public improvements.

11 MS. PRUDDEN: The process seems to be to get  
12 in line. So I did sign up to speak and I'm in line.  
13 Lucille Prudden, 2000 Green Bay Road, Buffalo Joe's.

14 I have a couple things to say. And I, I  
15 appreciate all the comments that have followed me. And  
16 many of you are very eloquent.

17 There was a final draft in March of 2004. And  
18 one of the objectives too was to encourage business  
19 growth, to provide services, and provide local  
20 employment. I feel that that's something we've been  
21 doing since 1989 and 1984 at our other location.

22 About 15 to 20 years ago there was a survey  
23 conducted by the city that on Green Bay Road on the

1 corner of Green Bay and Foster, there were about 24,000  
2 cars that passed by locally every day. I feel that that  
3 is definitely something to encourage the business  
4 climate of the area.

5           So that leads me to my question as to the, who  
6 determined the boundaries of these maps? And I find it  
7 rather unusual that the boundaries go down Green Bay  
8 Road, turn on Foster, go around the gas station, and do  
9 not continue on Green Bay to Emerson. And I did bring a  
10 disc to show this. But I understand this is set up for  
11 someone else's use. So I do feel in a somewhat degree  
12 that we're being singled out. And my concern is that  
13 what is the point of making us a Residential 4?

14           The lady that was here last week said they  
15 spoke to the businesses affected when you switched from  
16 this neighborhood study, which is not available as a  
17 handout today, to the new zoning which would, proposal,  
18 which would make us an R4. We own the majority of that  
19 property and we were never approached, nor were we, was  
20 it discussed with us.

21           Now, in the writeup that has been proposed in  
22 the large Evanston proposed plan, Buffalo Joe's is  
23 listed. The action, the task, is free to negotiate, to

1 assist in land assembly at Foster and Emerson. And the  
2 specifics are multiple land use owners control the land  
3 at the northwest corner of assembling the land for  
4 future redevelopment. This is the first time we've  
5 heard that that would be necessary, to take our land for  
6 future redevelopment.

7           Now, these are some of the questions that have  
8 come up in this conversation today. And one of the  
9 ladies that spoke said, one resident just wanted to know  
10 what in the, what will happen that will benefit the  
11 people in the ward? And I guess my question is, this  
12 certainly does not appear to me to be as a win-win  
13 situation.

14           We provide jobs to people. We improve the  
15 corner where we do business. And you might be wondering  
16 why I am so upset. Yes, I can continue to do business  
17 on this corner. But I cannot improve the corner any  
18 further. And I think if you go to many businesses in  
19 Evanston they can improve their locations. Our  
20 buildings go back to the 1900s. They certainly need  
21 improvement. I'll be the first one to admit that. But  
22 now we're locked in. We cannot improve and nor can we  
23 expand.

1           And if I were to show you these pictures that  
2 I have on this disc, I don't really feel that my  
3 property looks any worse. Matter of fact, I think it  
4 looks better than the gas station, than Hecky's, than  
5 the vacant property in between. And I wish I could show  
6 you the pictures of the dumpsters right on Green Bay  
7 Road in the City of Evanston. So if you're going to  
8 talk about green space and making it look better, I  
9 really can't buy all of this conversation.

10           And now you're going to tell me that it,  
11 provided my place, if it burns down and I can build it  
12 to that specification in 12 months, I can be in  
13 business. No I can't be in business. Because I  
14 probably cannot meet all the requirements of business  
15 today. Nor can I meet the requirements of the business  
16 I'd like to be in and be proud to be in. Thank you very  
17 much.

18           COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Susan, Susan, could you  
19 address the issue of, of improvement on that, on that  
20 site? Or Arlova?

21           MS. JACKSON: The property can be repaired and  
22 improved. It can't be expanded. So the size of the  
23 facility, you can't add structure. But a non-conforming

1 use can certainly be improved and maintained. It just  
2 can't get any larger.

3 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: All right, now, is that  
4 also true for the Cahill property?

5 MS. JACKSON: Yes.

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Do you guys know if there's  
7 a thousand square feet -- I'm sure you know.

8 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: What property are you  
9 talking about, sir?

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: 3000 Green Bay Road, Buffalo  
11 Joe's.

12 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Oh.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: A thousand square feet.

14 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: All right.

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I do not -- we are seeking  
16 right now. We are opposed right now to all the studies  
17 that we're paying for through Residential 4 --

18 MS. GILES: I hate to call color, but, you  
19 know, this is. We were asked when we had the meeting.  
20 We asked for jobs. We asked for betterment of the  
21 people who lived in the community. And this is just a  
22 slap in the face.

23 And it's the same thing that happened on

1 Emerson Street when our group of ministers attempted to  
2 buy the YMCA on Emerson and were told it was not for  
3 sale. That property is still sitting. And yet you're  
4 saying, if property goes 12 months without being used  
5 and it's forfeited for whatever purpose you, the city  
6 may decide. That property is, and probably not, it  
7 probably has an owner. I think it's about, slated for  
8 redevelopment.

9 But why is it that we cannot redevelop? Why  
10 is it that the city picks and chooses who can and who  
11 cannot when we already, when we have something in  
12 existence and we'd like to improve it?

13 MS. HUDSON: My name is Roberta Hudson. I  
14 live at 1941 Dewey Avenue.

15 I attended some of the meetings when we first  
16 started. And I'm a little disappointed at the city for  
17 saying redevelopment of the West Side is what they want  
18 to do. And I see the headlines in the newspaper, The  
19 City Redevelops the West Side. And yet all I see being  
20 developed is nothing but housing, which is something we  
21 need less of. Because we need more opportunities for  
22 our youth to develop. You have to develop the --

23 Developing property is not developing the West Side

1 of Evanston. I'm sorry. And that's all we see in the  
2 papers, that they are developing the West Side. Housing  
3 is something that we need less of with the problems that  
4 we have.

5           When I was coming home today from work  
6 Fleetwood Jardin is closed. Six youth sitting on the  
7 corner. Young kids. Bicycles. Nothing to do, nowhere  
8 to go. And where are the people that you're going to  
9 put in this area? Where are their kids going? There's  
10 nothing here for the, for the city youth.

11           I'm just appalled that all the city can think  
12 of is putting housing in Evanston. Evanston is a great  
13 place to have a tech center, a skills center, a learning  
14 center for our youth. There's no reason for them to  
15 fall to drugs and the, and the problems that we're  
16 having on the street. There's no reason for it.

17           There's greed from people who have property who  
18 want to make as much as they can off of the, off of the  
19 people here. We're not developing. We're not  
20 benefitting from anything that this development is going  
21 through. And the city knows it.

22           We can't even find out who owns the property.  
23 I understand it may be a blind trust someone's trying

1 to hide. If you're going to take the land and develop  
2 it at our expense, we should know who these people are.

3 We should know that this land is, is a flag for red on  
4 the real estate, in their real estate lots, deals that  
5 they have.

6 There's something more that the people don't  
7 know about, about this land that suddenly the city is so  
8 interested in developing for a few developers who are  
9 going to make it all the way to the bank with the  
10 mortgage people, with the people who are real estate  
11 people. These are the people who are going to benefit.

12 It's not the community.

13 And when is the city going to realize that  
14 they have to do more than develop land just for housing?

15 I, I still say that we had a moratorium. Joe Kent was  
16 our alderman. And we fought to have a moratorium so  
17 that our height would not be, our zoning would be no  
18 more than R3, which is in uniform with all the houses  
19 around there.

20 And suddenly these apartment complexes arise.

21 Right on Foster Street. And anyone who's been around  
22 there knows the problems we're having with traffic,  
23 noise, and everything else. We do not need this in our

1 community.

2 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Is there anyone here,  
3 I'd like to return to the Buffalo Joe's question, is  
4 there anybody here that would oppose the Buffalo Joe's  
5 block? And that is to say, Buffalo Joe's on Foster  
6 Street north on Green Bay, would oppose that area  
7 remaining C2? Because it is now proposed for R4.  
8 What's the rationale for the change there? And what,  
9 who are those who, who oppose that area remaining C2?

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: No one. Everyone --

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: When we did the meetings and  
12 everybody got together and looked at the pictures and  
13 everything, everyone agreed they wanted businesses all  
14 along Foster and Simpson and Emerson and Green Bay. We  
15 all wanted jobs and businesses there. We agreed to  
16 maybe having condos on the second floor or the third  
17 floor, but we didn't want to go R4. Nobody did. None  
18 of the tables agreed on that. At least I don't remember  
19 any.

20 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Well this had to come  
21 from someplace. What was the rationale?

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: They did it on their own.  
23 They said pick A, B, C. If you don't like it, go home.

1           AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- and then this was changed  
2 to R4 without our knowledge, without our consent or --

3           MS. JACKSON: That, that particular --

4           CHAIRMAN WOODS: Well that's why we're here.  
5 You know, we want to talk about these things.

6           MS. GUDERLEY: The reason, Leslie couldn't be  
7 here today. But one of the discussions that we had in  
8 terms of follow up on last meeting was that that  
9 particular area which she was, well, we did talk about  
10 in terms of the design of the plan, was to put, make  
11 sure that residential areas no longer had as many  
12 conflicts as they currently have with regards to being  
13 across the street from your industrial uses or  
14 commercial use.

15           The reason that area was proposed for R4 with  
16 a cluster of town homes was that if that continues as C2  
17 under its, or if it's redeveloped as C2, if Buffalo  
18 Joe's, when and if they decide to sell for another  
19 commercial use, that likely will be redeveloped so that  
20 either they'll be parking or loading right opposite  
21 houses on the west side of Wesley.

22           Again, the plan is not, is not going to affect  
23 existing uses. It's meant to govern the properties, the

1 properties when they're sold for redevelopment. That  
2 means that when Buffalo Joe's sells and no longer wants  
3 to conduct business there, if it's zoned as C2 when --

4 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes, Susan, I beg to differ a  
5 little bit.

6 MS. GUDERLEY: Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Because the reality is, you  
8 have impacted their business. Because they can't expand  
9 or improve their business in its current location. So  
10 they can't reinvest in their property in a way that  
11 transforms it from its footprint today to a new  
12 footprint.

13 MS. GUDERLEY: But if they were to sell it to,  
14 for --

15 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I understand.

16 MS. GUDERLEY: Okay.

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Why do I have to sell it?

18 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I understand your issue,  
19 believe me. Believe me. I've got to admit, I've got a  
20 problem with this. Saying to John Cahill or to Buffalo  
21 Joe's that they can't improve their property by changing  
22 the square footage of their building and building  
23 different seems incomprehensible to me.

1           AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can I say something at some  
2 point?

3           CHAIRMAN WOODS: Is there a way within the  
4 overlay district that we can change the rules?

5           PARTICIPANT: Absolutely.

6           ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: I think what we have here  
7 is some confusion. And I think that our own, our own  
8 people, okay, there's a difficulty in communicating the  
9 history and the intent, right? I think, you know, some  
10 of us need to go back to some more discussions.

11           The starting point for all of this is the  
12 Cyrus Hines development. When that development was  
13 going up some of the residents came together and said,  
14 wait a minute. What's the limitations here? You know,  
15 where are we going? How far can we go? What's  
16 dictating how far we can go?

17           And at that time we really, the plan  
18 development didn't set any kind of, of limitation within  
19 which these developers could build. And so people  
20 speculated that, look, when Cahill or National Awards  
21 goes on the market, then developers can do whatever they  
22 want to do almost unless there are some plans put in  
23 place that limit the height and the zoning, density for,

1 the density for these areas. And so that's why a number  
2 of parcels were looked at to determine how far can you  
3 go and what are the housing types that is allowed within  
4 certain zoning limitations.

5 For example, in R4 you can do town homes. And  
6 so people wanted to maintain that kind of flexibility.  
7 And folks didn't want to go to R6. There was an issue  
8 of adjacency between, you know, single-family homes and  
9 land that may be developed like Tapecoat. So that was  
10 the beginning of that process.

11 And also I know that some people have raised  
12 that now that we have a TIF proposed, we need to do some  
13 thinking, some planning, or integrate what we already  
14 have and expand it in the areas within the TIF.

15 So if we approach the process from that  
16 standpoint, that it is really about looking at what  
17 limitations we impose on future developments. Not so  
18 much that we are saying to Buffalo Joe's or we're saying  
19 to Cahill, okay, that we are really inviting people to  
20 come in and buy their properties. But we're saying, if  
21 in the future you have development, you cannot go above  
22 X height, X density.

23 Okay, then the residents would be at greater

1 ease to understand what might come in the future when it  
2 comes. Because the city doesn't have the capital to go  
3 and do any of these developments. It would be on a  
4 future developer to come in and do that if they wished  
5 to do so.

6           Because Hines was not residential, yet it is  
7 now residential. Because there was a planned  
8 development proposed. You know, people went through the  
9 policy that's established by the city and they got  
10 something developed there. I mean, it may not be to the  
11 liking of everybody there who's in the city, but that's  
12 the reality.

13           Now, I think that the problem with how we're  
14 presenting this is to say to those who own commercial  
15 property that you cannot build the same kind of property  
16 if it's either for 12 months or if it's burnt down  
17 etcetera, etcetera. We need to remove that edge. See,  
18 if we remove that, then I don't think people who have  
19 that kind of specter --

20           CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely.

21           ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: -- that there is a threat,  
22 that this discussion is threatening to their ownership  
23 or their plan or their vision. That's not what's

1 intended. And if it's how we are presenting it, then we  
2 are being dogmatic in the way that we approach zoning.

3 That may be, that may be what zoning  
4 administration does. But I'm saying that that's not the  
5 intent. We do not want to communicate this kind of  
6 specter --

7 CHAIRMAN WOOD: Absolutely.

8 ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: -- to anyone. And let me  
9 just say this about the issue of whether or not we're  
10 building to try to push people out. I think that what  
11 happens is that because the city itself does not own  
12 land, what the city can best do is to try to set some  
13 limitations. And so by setting some limitations we can  
14 control some of the things that happen.

15 If, what I had said at, at, at one of our  
16 meetings, if there is a section, a segment, a  
17 neighborhood that is dissatisfied with the proposal  
18 that's been put forth, that particular neighborhood  
19 ought to re-sit down and rethink and try to come up  
20 with, with new initiatives. Now, on new, on new  
21 initiatives.

22 But in the meanwhile, what people ought to  
23 understand is this: that if, while we are doing nothing,

1 if somebody comes and they buy a certain, you know,  
2 stretch of land, okay, and they come before the city and  
3 they go through the process that the city has in place,  
4 we at that time, we will be lagging behind what the  
5 developer will be proposing to do. So I think we have  
6 to try to understand the process, try to see if we can  
7 discuss our vision, and see what we can put in place.

8           Finally, and I'm going to sit down, with  
9 regards to initiatives for youth, I agree that we do  
10 need to do a lot more. Last year the Council voted to  
11 put money in the budget to get a Director of Youth  
12 engagement, right, in order for that individual to one,  
13 make sure that the youth are connected with the services  
14 that we already provide. Secondly, to also try to look  
15 for new initiatives, connect, better connection with the  
16 high school, try to get more training programs. There  
17 is some discussions about an apprenticeship program  
18 going on with the local unions.

19           I don't have anything of quality to give you,  
20 but I will say quantitatively, we're making progress in  
21 that light. And because of other initiatives that have  
22 been taken in, that have taken, that have taken place,  
23 people for example, at Church Street Village hired

1 community builders, young men and women who used to  
2 stand outside on the corners selling --

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: But have they finished? --

4 ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: No, no, wait, wait a  
5 minute. Okay, so what you're saying is, okay, you did a  
6 good thing, but now you don't have provisions to keep  
7 doing it. You're right. And that is why, you're right.  
8 And that is why new initiatives are being discussed.  
9 And so we should take into account any criticism that is  
10 raised. But you cannot throw the baby out with the bath  
11 water. You cannot relegate it to an absolute, as if  
12 nothing is being done.

13 Bu Ku's was built by community builders. And  
14 there's a proposal, I believe, that will come before  
15 CDBG, the Community Development Block Grant Committee,  
16 to have maybe these builders and more young men engage  
17 in the process of rehabbing some of the homes in the  
18 city that may need some assistance, etcetera, etcetera.

19 So, you know, I'm not saying that we are  
20 there, but I think that we have to not look at things in  
21 a sense, an absolute way. You know, and I think we need  
22 to sit back down, and I'm going to sit down, but we need  
23 to meet again to re-examine some of the concerns.

1           And you know, the, the fear of gentrification  
2 is real on that side of town. Central Street may not  
3 have those concerns. And so we, and so we understand  
4 that. And I think we have to be more patient in trying  
5 to walk through the process and see if we could get  
6 something that is positive and for everybody.

7           So I don't think, I don't think this is over.  
8 I think this is --

9           CHAIRMAN WOODS: You're absolutely correct.

10          AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have a question --

11          ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: I don't know if I'm  
12 allowed to answer.

13          CHAIRMAN WOODS: Alderman, go ahead.

14                            (Question from audience member.)

15          MS. HUDSON: You mentioned some of the things  
16 you want to propose for the youth. And you're talking  
17 about apprentice program, apprenticeship program. But  
18 what will these youth be really doing? Will they just  
19 be doing the back work, moving bricks around, and labor  
20 jobs that they, really no challenge to them?

21                            What we were saying is, we need a learning  
22 center, a skilled tech learning center where, you  
23 know -- I don't know if you remember, but we had a town

1 hall meeting with the District 202 and 65  
2 Superintendent. We had a lot of educators and board  
3 members at that meeting.

4 And we indicated then that we need to expand  
5 beyond the, the high school at least two years for  
6 specialized training and tie in with Oakton College to  
7 get certified, to train these youth in skills that those  
8 youth who won't go on or won't be able to go to college,  
9 they'll have, they'll become productive citizens.

10 They'll become productive citizens where they can  
11 learn skills like being a florist or, or processing  
12 food, learning to process. This is the type of center  
13 that we would like to see over there where the planning  
14 is for this housing. We don't need more housing in that  
15 area.

16 ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: Here's --

17 MS. HUDSON: And I have one more question.  
18 I've been told that it's a done deal, that this housing  
19 is going to be there and that we're here just to blow  
20 off steam and that it's a done deal and there's nothing  
21 that we can do about it.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is that true?

23 ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: You know what? Tapecoat

1 is not owned by the city. So the city cannot do with  
2 Tapecoat what it wants. Mr. Woodheimer has a contract  
3 on, to purchase Tapecoat. So, and he's been listening  
4 to our proposals and the boundaries and the limitations.

5 And he too probably feels constrained by what is being  
6 proposed here.

7           So there is no done deal about nothing.  
8 Because if we perceive something to be a done deal, we  
9 dis-empower ourselves in terms of what we can do, what  
10 we can influence.

11           This is not the meeting for the  
12 skills/learning center that you're suggesting. But I  
13 share your vision in that too. And I'll share with you  
14 some private discussions that I've had with a couple  
15 other people who some funds to try to establish a  
16 foundation for vocational training for some youth on an  
17 ongoing basis.

18           We can meet to talk about and plan and see how  
19 we could make that happen. But to make that happen,  
20 okay, to me is part of private money and to come to the  
21 Council meetings and to continue to press that, just  
22 like we pressed the injection of the trees, so that we  
23 get to the point where some of that money could be

1 allocated so we could do what we have to do. Because  
2 right now, last year we allocated \$150,000. We need  
3 more money allocated for the youth.

4           Okay, I know that there is another matter on  
5 the agenda. I just wanted to say to the Committee, if  
6 you could just, if you could just give us more time for  
7 further discussion, you know, so that we could hammer  
8 out these things, I think, I would appreciate it. Okay?

9           CHAIRMAN WOODS: I think we are in total  
10 agreement on that. And my purpose was only in raising  
11 that there must be a way to allow these gentlemen who  
12 own businesses that the city values to be able to  
13 continue their use and improve their properties within  
14 this proposal.

15           ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: Right. And to have peace  
16 of mind that they continue.

17           CHAIRMAN WOODS: Absolutely. We have another  
18 part of this meeting tonight. And so we're going to  
19 continue the matter of West Evanston to a date certain  
20 of September 5<sup>th</sup>. And We're going to start that meeting  
21 at six o'clock.

22           AUDIENCE MEMBER: I think it's too early.

23           AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could we do it --

1           CHAIRMAN WOODS: All right. For the community  
2 we're going to start the meeting at seven o'clock.

3           AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.

4           MS. ESTER: Excuse me.

5           CHAIRMAN WOODS: P.M., 7:00 p.m.

6           MS. ESTER: Could I say something?

7           CHAIRMAN WOODS: Do we need more time?

8           ALDERMAN BAPTISTE: I think there needs to be  
9 more time. And there needs to be another discussion  
10 where people sit around the table and try to see what,  
11 what it is that we understand and what modifications we  
12 need, as opposed to coming in, engaging in a hearing,  
13 you know, -- at this point.

14          CHAIRMAN WOODS: That would be great.

15          MS. ESTER: Excuse me. Before you end I have  
16 one statement I would like to make for this record  
17 tonight. And this is kind of in response to some of the  
18 things that Alderman Baptiste said when he said that the  
19 people east of Hines came and said they was concerned  
20 about what was going to happen to Hines.

21                 The people west of Hines already had worked  
22 on and had a plan in place when the Council, the full  
23 Council, approved a TIF and approved our neighborhood

1 study plan, said that we would go back and sit down and  
2 redevelop that full plan. That has not happened. We  
3 have been disengaged from that process.

4 We have been treated inferior to the other  
5 communities that had study area. The Southeast Evanston  
6 community had their planning study. When they did that,  
7 they had a paid facilitator. When the West Side was  
8 supposed to have theirs, it was promised that there was  
9 \$50,000 to pay an organizer to facilitate the community  
10 in pulling that together. That did not happen.

11 We had people from the planning community,  
12 from the Planning Commission, that -- staff to run some  
13 of those meetings. And what it turned out to be,  
14 starting out with community people, resident, line up  
15 with more business than community people.

16 You did, they did the Central Street. They  
17 paid to have a facilitator. They did downtown. They  
18 paid to have a facilitator. We did not get the same  
19 treatment. We demand the same treatment.

20 CHAIRMAN WOODS: That is not true. There is a  
21 consultant who is on board, actually two consultants in  
22 the West Evanston --

23 MS. ESTER: No. You're missing the point.

1 What I said, the West Neighborhood Planning Study, what  
2 we did for 18 months, was with the planning staff.  
3 Everybody else, when they went through their planning  
4 stuff had paid staff.

5 When the city wanted to do something to a  
6 small section, they paid someone to come there and to  
7 tell us what we was going to have. Not ask, tell. So I  
8 resent people saying to me that I was asked and I was  
9 told, said, had input. I had changed that design on  
10 there, put single-family house, and the man that was  
11 paid by the city said I could not do that. So I did not  
12 have the same opportunity.

13 As Tina said, my voice had been discounted.  
14 And I want that on the record. The people east of Hines  
15 came after we did. We met for 18 months. They was  
16 concerned about one section they had, then the city  
17 jumped on board.

18 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Okay, Betty, we understand.  
19 And obviously you're now on the record. And there's  
20 going to be continuing opportunities.

21 And based on the alderman's suggestion, we're  
22 going to continue this as a item to the September 12<sup>th</sup>  
23 Plan Commission meeting where we will identify a date

1 certain to have a continuation of these meetings. So  
2 that will allow staff time.

3 MS. JACKSON: I don't know that we're having  
4 it September 12<sup>th</sup> because of the religious holiday.

5 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I thought we are.

6 COMMISSIONER OPDYCKE: Yes, I think we are.

7 CHAIRMAN WOODS: That's where we'd left it,  
8 the last I heard.

9 MS. JACKSON: Okay.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: What is the date again?

11 CHAIRMAN WOODS: September 12<sup>th</sup> at 7 p.m. It  
12 will not be discussed as an item other than to identify  
13 when the next meeting will be. That will allow staff  
14 time to determine the plan of how to go forward from  
15 here.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Did you say September 5<sup>th</sup>?

17 CHAIRMAN WOODS: September 12<sup>th</sup>. Not the 5<sup>th</sup>,  
18 no. Sorry.

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can you define what we're  
20 doing on the 12<sup>th</sup> again?

21 CHAIRMAN WOODS: The 12<sup>th</sup>, all we're doing is  
22 identifying the date for the next meeting to discuss.  
23 But in the meantime, staff will be coming up with a plan

1 for how to go forward to maybe take into account the  
2 alderman's suggestion about meetings to look at and  
3 examine some of the issues.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And what about the people?  
5 Are the, I mean, the staff is going to do this. What  
6 about the people?

7 CHAIRMAN WOODS: The consultants are going to  
8 be involved in the process.

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: What about the people?  
10 Because the consultants made the decisions before. What  
11 about the people who live there?

12 CHAIRMAN WOODS: No, no, no. The staff is  
13 going to come up with a plan to involve the people to go  
14 forward, okay?

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Excuse me. But, is there  
16 any notice being sent out? Because I didn't get a  
17 notice for either of these. And everybody keeps talking  
18 about notice. Then it's 500 feet, used to be a  
19 thousand. I'm 500 feet and I didn't get a notice  
20 anytime. So I'm asking, you know, they keep slipping in  
21 these meetings.

22 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I understand everybody's  
23 concern about notice. And I will tell you that I have

1 seen the lists. I know that city staff does everything  
2 they can possibly do. And I'm sure if you talk to city  
3 staff you can see the list.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. My name never comes  
5 up. And we've been here a long time. And the building  
6 in discussion that's very close, 1507, my family has  
7 owned for 38 years. And I can't imagine --

8 CHAIRMAN WOODS: Please take this up with city  
9 staff.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, I keep taking it up  
11 with city staff and they keep saying they sent me a  
12 letter, which is a lie. Please record that.

13 CHAIRMAN WOODS: I understand that the  
14 Commission is a voluntary body that makes  
15 recommendations to the City Council. That's all we do.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: If that's the -- I volunteer  
17 to, if flyers are made, I volunteer to pass them out.  
18 And I came three days in a row to get the flyers to pass  
19 out. And I was told that they had not been made, there  
20 would be a push to get them made for yesterday. And  
21 when I came yesterday, they still hadn't come. So I  
22 volunteered already. I don't know --

23 COMMISSIONER WOODS: I don't know.

1           AUDIENCE MEMBER: And I guess I know because I  
2 was here last time. Because I did not get one either.

3           COMMISSIONER WOODS: Right. Okay, we're going  
4 to take a three-minute break and then we are going to  
5 take up Central Street.

6                               (Off the record.)

7           CHAIRMAN WOODS: Yes.

8           MR. DUNKLEY: If I could just ask a point of  
9 order about how you'd like to proceed. My name is Bill  
10 Dunkley. I'm the zoning administrator with City of  
11 Evanston. I was with you the last, well, with all the  
12 Central Street zoning implementation meetings. I'm glad  
13 to be here again with you tonight. Thank you for  
14 coming. Thank you for waiting for this portion of the,  
15 of the show, this portion of the hearing.

16                               We ended last time with, I believe we were in  
17 the middle of public comment. I don't think we'd  
18 finished the list. I can begin. There are some, I can  
19 at least walk through the materials that were handed  
20 out, take any questions on them. I'll identify anything  
21 that is new or changed and to kind of give a general  
22 overview of where we are. And then if you'd like to  
23 continue with questions, we can do that. Just want to