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CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: The Plan Commission Meeting for May 12th, 2010 is called to order. I'm Stu Opdycke, Chairman of the Plan Commission. The first item on the agenda, rather the second is the approval of, we do have a quorum, by the way, but the first item on the agenda is the approval of the April 14 minutes. Is there a motion or questions?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I would move the approval.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Second.

(Motion moved and seconded.)

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Before we call this to a vote, Craig, may I ask you, we went to a new system last month. Is that in place now for recording the proceedings?

MR. SKLENAR: Yes --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay, because I was looking for a, I was looking for an audio transcript, and there was none.

MR. SKLENAR: Last month was, there were no actual items.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Very good. But from now on, if there is an action item, it will be on line?

MR. SKLENAR: Right. We actually have the
transcriber and the video as a test run.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Thank you very much. Okay. There's been a motion to approve and a second. All those in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Opposed? Motion carries.

Thank you.

Next item is the Zoning Map Amendment.

Mr. Dunkley?

MR. DUNKLEY: Good evening, Bill Dunkley, your Zoning Administrator. The item tonight is Case No. 10PLND-0022. It is a petition by Gary S. Lundgren, on behalf of Northstar Trust Company, the owner of the subject property located at 415 Sherman. That is the newly assigned address identifying the southeast corner of Austin Street and Sherman Avenue. To amend the Zoning Ordinance by requesting that the City Council remove the three parcels at that address from the R4A General Residential Zoning District, and the oh Hospital Overlay District, and place them within the R5, General Residential Zoning District, for the purpose of constructing a multi-family residential building. The subject property is adjacent to or abuts the R5 General Residential District to the north, east and to the
South.

Just a quick review. The history of the property, it has been used as a surface parking lot for 18 cars for St. Francis Hospital, now Resurrection Health Care, for many years. That explains its inclusion within the OH Hospital Overlay District. It has been sold, approximately a year ago. It is now in the hands of the private sector and is being proposed for eventual development.

The Petitioner requests that the property be rezoned to remove it from the OH Hospital Overlay District, which applies really almost exclusively to hospital uses, and to also rezone it from R4 to R5, so that it is zoned similarly to the properties surrounding it on three sides.

The property is approximately 12,500 square feet. It has frontage on both Sherman Avenue and Austin Avenue. The Petitioner has included renderings and a site plan of a 12 unit residential development, single building, with accessory parking, which has been used to establish compliance with the R5 zoning regulations, should that come to pass, and also to establish the feasibility of such a development on the property. However, the item under consideration tonight
is the rezoning as proposed.

At this point, I guess I'll turn it back to the Chair, for questions or to hear from the Petitioner.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Any questions from members of the Commission? Are we to expect a comment from Mr. Lundgren? Mr. Lundgren.

MR. LUNDGREN: Thank you for this opportunity. I'm the General Partner as well as Jeff Dowling, my other partner and Bill Debb, and we represent and own the property.

Essentially, as Bill mentioned, the property was owned by Resurrection and we now are the owners. And I thought I'd just go over the justification for this, per your petition amendment, because I think it addresses all your points specifically.

Your question, your justification is to describe the development proposal or other reasons for the amendment. Well, the property was previously owned only by Resurrection Health Care with St. Francis Hospital, and it was zoned R4 for the hospital with the overlay district, and the oH Overlay District would not apply to residential anymore. As Bill Dunkley
mentioned, it applies almost solely to hospitals, and it would not make any sense for us to have an oH District anymore.

The proposed amendment is consistent with the goals, objectives and policy of the comprehensive plan of the City. We ask that this property be removed from the oH Overlay District and restored to the, or I should say, changed to the same zoning as the adjacent residential properties. And we wish to construct a four-story building. This is the design that we had come up with in working with Alderman Rainey on a lot of details and design and special aspects of the building that would make it conducive to the neighborhood. And that's what our intent is to do, is to ultimately build that.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All right. Let me interject one thing. As I understand it, we are not to consider the specific proposal tonight. It's just the map amendment from an R4 to an R5, and that's it, irrespective of what development eventually occurs here on this site.

MR. LUNDGREN: That is correct. But obviously as a developer and a property owner, we wanted to see what we could do with the property to make sure it makes
sense. So, and Alderman Rainey did ask to see renderings and designs of what our intent was, so.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Sure.

MR. LUNDGREN: So, we won't focus on that then.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Please continue.

MR. LUNDGREN: Okay. The question is, how is the proposed amendment consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the comprehensive general plan, in all adjacent zoning, other than St. Francis across the street, is zoned R5. So, we're just requesting the same zoning as our would-be neighbors and allow us to build a quality residential development consistent with other adjacent residential properties.

Another question you had is in what ways is the proposed amendment compatible with the overall character of existing development in the immediate vicinity of the subject property. Well, once again, all the other properties around us, other than the hospital, are zoned R5 and are residential.

There are several two-story and three-story and four-story projects, all within a couple blocks of us. In fact, the one building, as you can see to the right there, which is like a white stone.
building, is a full three stories and a half above
ground with, you know, they have windows all around like
a garden apartment or a basement there. So, we're only
going a half a story higher than that. And the four
story would allow us to do a first floor parking garage,
which is compatible with the parking code requirement,
and that would allow us to provide safe and secure
parking for residents. Whereas, if we did only a three-
story building, which would be the only height that we
could do at 35 feet, which is the R4, you could not
provide covered parking, and that's what's in demand
nowadays for people who want a new condo. They want
secure, safe, covered parking.

Another question you had is, what effect
will the proposed amendment have on the values of
adjacent properties, both adverse and favorable. Well,
we don't think the value of adjacent properties will be
negatively impacted at all by our development with the
zoning change. In fact, we believe that anything we do
will increase the adjacent property values, based on the
quality and the amenities of the new buildings that we
would build.

Another question you had is, what change
to existing public facilities and services will be
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required to serve the effects of the proposed amendment. There's no change in existing public facilities or services that would be required. This shows the red circle, red square is our site, you can see R4, which is St. Francis Hospital to the left, and everything around it, our site, other than the R4 St. Francis, is zoned R5. The entire area.

This is the aerial site. You can see a little bit to the north, a block away, those large buildings are almost all four-story buildings, and most of the other ones are between two and three stories. This is just a closer view. And this is our survey, you know, we have, as Bill mentioned, a little over 12,500 square feet. The property has 121 feet on Austin Avenue and 103 feet on Sherman, so we have a nice corner property, so we are hoping to design something just like we had submitted, which is very good eye appeal from any curb or anyone driving by. The main entrance that we would propose, would be on Sherman Avenue, which makes the most logical sense.

That pretty much concludes our presentation. If there are any questions.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Commissioners, do you have any questions of Mr. Lundgren? Thank you.
COMMISSIONER MEYER: I have a couple questions. One question, the parking that's on the alley, you've provided, looks like five normal spots and one handicapped spot on the alley?

MR. LUNDGREN: There's actually two handicapped spots which meet code.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: And one in the building, as well?

MR. LUNDGREN: Yes, oh, you're right, one in the building and one on the alley. Excuse me.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: So, in terms of the, I'm just wondering, there's no, other than the garage door and the entry doors, there's no openings on the ground floor at all?

MR. LUNDGREN: There's the main entrance on Sherman.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: But in terms of any sort of natural ventilation for the garage space, you want that to be an enclosed, sort of climate controlled space as opposed to natural ventilation, is that right?

MR. LUNDGREN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I again would mention the fact that the only thing we're considering is a map...
amendment here. We're not getting into the specifics of any particular development. I suspect that this would be a planned development. I'm not sure about that. No, it would not, okay. So, the only thing that's before us is whether this should be a change from an R4 to an R5.

Yes.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Nevertheless, if we did have any recommendations to make, this would be the only time we could do it, correct?

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, I don't think so. I think we have a very narrow agenda here, and it is to not consider the specific development, but the map amendment from R4 to R5. As I understand it, that's it.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: That's my understanding, too.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: That wasn't the question. The question was do we have the opportunity in the future to ask questions.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, if this is not a planned development, I don't see how this would come before the Plan Commission.

MR. LUNDGREN: We would have to get a building permit, in which case then, there would be tremendous input from the City.
CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Alderman Rainey, do you have anything you'd like to say in connection with this?

ALDERMAN RAINEY: I'm not sure that I'm allowed to speak here, because it's coming to the Council.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I would like to hear from you.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Oh, I'd love to talk. I have a short four hour speech.

My name is Ann Rainey. I'm Alderman of the 8th Ward in which this building would be located, and in which the map change would affect. I completely support this, as I said in the site plan and appearance review today. Many of you might have read in the paper about 309-311 Sherman, which is in the same block right down the street. It was probably the worse apartment building in the entire City of Evanston, the conditions. The community went to court for 12 solid months, sometimes twice a month. We eventually got rid of the slum landlord. He was a classic slum landlord. And along came, about six months ago, a developer from Chicago who purchased the building and has restored it beautifully, done a fabulous job. When we thought the neighborhood was shot, along came this developer, Gary
Lundgren, and has proposed this very decent project, which can only happen, of course, if we alter the map. So, I am, I am very, very happy with the progress being made in this very particular neighborhood, and given that it's so dense, the conditions were deteriorating rapidly, and I'm just thrilled. And I, you know, if this were the only R5, I would have an issue, but it's all R5. When he first mentioned it to me, I didn't realize everything else was R5. Once Gary mentioned that everything around it was R5, and I looked at the map, it just made sense. So, I support it.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Thank you. Thank you, very much.

ALDERMAN RAINEY: Thank you very much for letting me talk.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: It appears that we have quite a few members of the public here, and I'm wondering if anyone would like to speak to this proposed map amendment, either for or against it. Perhaps there, I'll tell you what, why don't you state your name and give us your address.

MS. HILL: Hi. I'm Cara Hill. Can you hear me okay?
1 CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes.
2 MS. HILL: And I live at 719 and 715 Austin.
3 CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Would you raise your
4 right hand please.
5 Whereupon,
6 
7 CARA HILL,
8 called as a witness herein, having been first duly
9 sworn, testified as follows:
10 CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Go ahead.
11 MS. HILL: And so I'm directly across from, on
12 the other side of Austin, on the north side of Austin,
13 directly across from the building. So, I have several
14 concerns. One is just the total lack of sunlight that
15 the building will basically block, most of the sunlight
16 for my two homes. And, there's --
17 CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Because right now it's a
18 parking lot, isn't it, and there's nothing blocking.
19 MS. HILL: Everything else on the block is
20 three stories, except I think at the very end of the
21 block, there's something that's four stories.
22 CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Right.
23 MS. HILL: My understanding was that that
24 block was zoned R4, not R5, and that this one property
25 then would be zoned R5, whereas everything else is R4.
CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Everything is R5 on that, on Sherman Avenue, south of Austin, and north of Austin.

MS. HILL: Oh, okay.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: In that area.

MS. HILL: Okay. Well, I just, I look at that space and I think something that's going to be almost five stories tall is going to be just like, I don't think most people realize how big that's going to be, how tall.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All right.

MS. HILL: So, just the lack of sunlight is going to be hugely detrimental for me, and for the other people who live in my buildings. And then the parking issue. That parking lot is filled 24/7, so you're going to displace 18 cars out of that lot, in addition to the fact as I understand, there's one and a half spaces, per unit, allocated for this building. And they're two bedroom, two bath units, so I would imagine for a $350,000 plus two bedroom, two bath unit, you'll have two working people with two cars in every unit. So there will be an additional, I think, were there 13 units in the building? Twelve? So, there will be another six cars displaced onto the street, in addition to the 18 that are in the lot. There's only five cars
per block right now. That's like, that's like three, four blocks of cars. I don't know where all those cars are going to go. So, that's another issue.

And then the final issue is just, I've been there for 15 years, and I have been trying so hard for those 15 years to create a sense of sort of, like a residential community amongst what seem to be just never ending, just noise and ruckus and vehicles. There's such a negative aspect living close to a hospital. So, having something go up across the street that's going to be almost five stories, is just yet another sort of siege on the neighborhood for it to be not quiet and residential anymore.

So, those are my reasons. I just am very much opposed to something going up that's going to be that tall.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Thank you, very much. Was there someone else that had something to say?

MS. MOSLEY: I have a couple of questions.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Would you state your name and tell us where you live?

MS. MOSLEY: Sure. My name is Alicia Mosley and I live at 711 Austin Street.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Would you raise your
right hand.
Whereupon,

ALICIA MOSLEY,
called as a witness herein, having been first duly
sworn, testified as follows:

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All right. 711 is right
next to?

MS. MOSLEY: 711 Austin is right next to her
building. It's right, just north of the proposed
location.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Go ahead.

MS. MOSLEY: Okay. So it was mentioned that
the current zoning is almost exclusively for hospital
usages, so what are the other usages, other than the
hospital usages, since it was almost exclusively?

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Dunkley?

MR. DUNKLEY: The oH hospital overlay is, the
purpose of that district is to allow development of
Evanston's hospitals within and harmoniously with its
very close residential neighbors. If you read the
regulations, the regulations only really make sense and
are reasonable in the context of hospital uses.

For an independent private sector
residential to have to operate under the additional and
rather onerous restrictions of the oH District, would be exceptional. The requirement to get a special use for any proposed development is something that's, that no, that other properties are not subject to that are in the same situation, without --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Does that answer your question? Does that answer your question?

MS. MOSLEY: So basically you're saying that there could be residential facilities in an R4 oH zone, it's just that they would have to undergo additional restrictions? Am I understanding that correctly?

MR. DUNKLEY: It may be possible. It's difficult to conceive of that happening. It's the, and I'd be glad to walk through the regulations with you of oH. It is very specific to hospital operations.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Freeman.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: It is an R4 with an oH overlay on top of that, correct?

MR. DUNKLEY: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: It isn't a residential 4 district.

MR. DUNKLEY: As is all of St. Francis Hospital.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Right. So, I'm
following up on, I'm sorry, your name?

   MS. MOSLEY: Alicia.

   COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Alicia's question. So then if it was an R4 that had a overlay on top of it so you could have hospital buildings, does that then take away all the R4 properties, the zoning properties?

   MR. DUNKLEY: I can't categorically give you an answer to that because it depends on where the regulations conflict or where they are, or where they do not.

   COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Because it seems to me that the overlay was an exception made to R4 for the hospital, not the other way around. So, it wasn't, okay, but I am not a zoning expert.

   MR. DUNKLEY: The requirements of the oH District are, the review and approval requirements are large. And there are some, in some cases there are additional allowances granted to underlying properties, but for the most part, it is an overlay district that requires strenuous review and approval of all development.

   CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Staley?

   COMMISSIONER STALEY: Following along that same line though, if the hospital isn't going to use it
anymore, isn't going to use it for hospital purposes, and someone wanted to develop and the underlying was R4, would they have to come in to the Zoning Department and get what, an elimination of the overlay part of it? What type of a proceeding would it be?

MR. DUNKLEY: The overlay district requires a hearing before the Zoning Board of Appeals, issuance of a special use permit, and the issuance of an institutional development plan, which is quite lengthy, for all development.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Is there any likelihood that wouldn't be granted, if it weren't being used for a hospital?

MR. DUNKLEY: The code requires that to be --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I'm just saying --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: The code requires, I'm sorry, that to be --

MR. DUNKLEY: The code requires that process for all development that is under the oH Overlay District.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Development, any development or hospital-based development?

MR. DUNKLEY: The code is, and was written primarily for hospital-based activities. We have, I
don't believe, certainly in my tenure here, and I have not seen any evidence of private development, residential development, occurring independent of hospital ownership or hospital activities. We would be treading new ground there, and I believe, if you've read the oH Overlay District, you will most likely agree, that it would be inappropriate for such circumstances.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: It would never unwrap the overlap, is that what you're saying? Okay.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Are there any other citizens? Alicia?

MS. MOSLEY: I just want to clarify. I know it was mentioned a couple of times, like hospital owned, but am I correct in understanding that the hospital no longer owns this property?

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: They have sold it. They have sold the property.

MS. MOSLEY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Todd, did you have something?

COMMISSIONER MEYER: I did. I had a comment, just to respond to the shade issue. I'd just like to point out that there are very large setbacks from the street itself, and then the street width itself is
actually quite wide, and that the average floor to floor height, correct me if I'm wrong, on a residential building, is it's roughly about ten feet, floor to floor. So, we're talking about four stories, with a parapet wall, we're probably not exceeding 45 feet, 46 feet in height.

So, I would just say that the scale of the building does not seem inappropriate to go to the R5 designation to me, and that the shadow, I don't know if you've done a shadow study yet, but the, you know, the shadow that would be cast across the front yard setback, which is quite healthy, as well as the street, does not seem like to me that it would impinge too much on the neighboring properties to the north. But, if we're concerned about it, a shade study might help that.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Does that answer your question, ma'am?

MS. HILL: Oh, well, it wasn't really a question.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: It was a concern, I know, and I think Mr. Meyer has just said that you don't have much to worry about, given the fact that the building will be set back quite aways from the street. Alicia?

MS. MOSLEY: Respectfully, I know that it was
a subjective statement to state that this street is pretty wide. I would respectfully disagree because I, you know, have friends who would park on the street, or if I'm being dropped off on the street, really, two cars can't pass. So, there's parking on the south side of Austin. There's no parking allowed on the north side of Austin. And if a car is coming west, and there are cars parked on the south side of the street, a westbound car and an eastbound car are not able to pass. It's impossible for them to pass essentially. Not only that, but there are definitely a lot of trucks and, obviously, ambulances coming, you know, down that street, making their way to the hospital.

I do have a couple more questions just about the zoning. From what I understand from that discussion earlier, it was originally an R4 zone, and then when the hospital acquired that property or whatever, they had to put the hospital overlay on top of the R4. What is the difference between R4 and R5? Is it just the allowable height?

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: There's a few differences.

Mr. Dunkley.

MR. DUNKLEY: I think the primary differences are the height and also the allowed, the number of units
per lot area. So, it's R4, R5 is just generally a,
allows more density than R4.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: What about the setbacks,
are they any different?

MR. DUNKLEY: Setbacks are a little bit less,
building lot coverage, you're allowed a little more, and
somewhat more impervious surface coverage. So, in all
respects it allows a more dense residential development.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: The height difference is
from 35 feet to 50 feet, and the impervious surface is
55 to 60 percent, and the building lot coverage is 40
percent to 45 percent.

MR. DUNKLEY: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I'm sorry. Todd, did you
have something?

MR. MEYER: Just curious.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Staley?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Just an observation. I
did go down there Sunday, and walked around. At first I
was a little confused because Sherman comes down and it
jogs, and for a minute I thought they were trying to
build this in the hospital parking lot, and I thought
that's a poor idea. But then I finally found it. I
took a walk over here and I found the lot and the sign's
up and I knew I was in the right place.

But looking at it, I mean, you've got a row of three flats running south, you've got a, kind of a modified garden, or not garden, but courtyard type, half courtyards. You do have the two houses across the street. Those are both duplexes, I do believe. They're, I know they're large Victorian style homes, and I can understand the issues that are being raised. But basically looking at it, and looking at the zoning, which is R5 all around it, I see no reasonable logical basis that we could not grant this, at all.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Lenny?

COMMISSIONER ASARO: I'd echo Commissioner Staley's observation. I think it's pretty obvious, based on the zoning map. The other thing I just wanted to point out to the one resident across the street on Austin, and correct me if I'm wrong -- Administrator Dunkley, but I did read that this was used as a surface parking lot. And it's my understanding, based on what I read, and correct me if I'm wrong, the reason why the hospital is no longer using this or has a need for, which I believe dovetails into the standards that we're bound to follow and consider evidence on, adequacy of public facilities and services, it's my understanding
the hospital built a parking structure, they have a
darking deck, so that there, a seven story deck, so in
order to provide for the parking for their facility and
for their use.

So, to the extent that this won't be used
as a parking, I know, I believe that the owner raised
the issue about there not being enough parking. I just
wanted to point that out as a factual matter. And
again, correct me if I'm wrong, but that's what I read
in the information that we were provided.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Freeman?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I have a question about
the drive, the proposed driveway for the building, and
this is just the response to the concern for on-street
parking. Is there a break there today, into the lot for
parking?

MR. LUNDGREN: No the break is in the
alleyway.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: And how wide, is this a
20 foot driveway? So it seems that you're proposing to
take two parking spaces off of Austin --

MR. LUNDGREN: The issue is you can't put
parking on that side of the street because of the
setbacks. You can only put parking in the alleyway.
So, if we put the entrance in the alleyway, we'd lose parking.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Okay. But we, I just wanted to point out that we are losing a couple parking spaces then, on Austin, in a neighborhood that is, so the question then was, then why wouldn't you put it on the alley, and you just told me because you can't put that on the side.

MR. LUNDGREN: And based on our four, we could build three-story buildings with nine units, and have, and still have the, you know, only have three less parking spaces with nine units, you know, instead of three more. So, there would be a worse parking situation if we built three, three-story buildings.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: Will if there's, parking is only allowed on one side of Austin, is that correct? And it's on the north side, or south side, right.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So, this is the side street that has parking. So there will be two spots that will be eliminated on that block now.

COMMISSIONER PETERS: Well, a typical parking spot is like 10 by 20. So, if this thing is 20 foot wide, that would be about --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Twenty foot long,
COMMISSIONER PETERS: -- one spot, say, but the challenge of entering the garage off of the alley is that it would then cue up parking spaces in the alley, as well as on the interior of the building. You would lose the parking on both sides, where I would agree, I would prefer to not see an additional curb cut off of Austin. But, I think it would reduce the offstreet parking that is currently being provided.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: These are issues that will come before the Council, and I expect that they will be explored fully. Am I correct, Mr. Dunkley, about that? These issues about curb cuts and setbacks and so on will all be addressed by the Council, or not?

MR. DUNKLEY: As part of the consideration of this map amendment?

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: No, no, as part of the particular project that is being proposed.

MR. DUNKLEY: The project as proposed, the conceptual project as proposed, is compliant with the Zoning Ordinance --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay.

MR. DUNKLEY: -- and would have to undergo all of the reviews that are required for any project of that
type, which would not include approval by Council.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Oh, okay, all right, all right.

MR. LUNDGREN: Yes, Bill, did Staff approve the zoning map amendment? I didn't hear you make a comment on that.

MR. DUNKLEY: City Council is the only one who approves a zoning map amendment.

MR. LUNDGREN: Per your recommendation, is your recommendation to?

MR. DUNKLEY: The Plan Commission will make a recommendation to the City Council.

MR. LUNDGREN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Anymore comments from Commissioners on this subject? Any other citizens that have a question or comment? Come forward, sir. State your name, please?

MR. OKLU: My name is Jeff Oklu.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: And where do you live?

MR. OKLU: I live at 711 Austin, in the same building as Alicia.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Would you raise your right hand.

COURT REPORTER: Could he spell his last name?
CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: spell your last name, please.

MR. OKLU: The spelling is O-k-l-u.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Raise your right hand.

Whereupon,

JEFF OKLU, called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Proceed, please.

MR. OKLU: Actually, I just wanted to second Alicia's concern about traffic. Parking would be one issue, but actually I think traffic would maybe be even more of an issue, because of the fact that, as she said, cars can't really go two at a time on Austin, if there are cars parked on Austin, on the south side. And looking at the proposed plans, I'm not sure you would only lose two spaces with the driveway, because unless you're going to allow people to park like right up to the edge of the driveway, you'd probably have to knock out probably three spaces, because there's actually not, there's not really that many cars can fit because of the post is at the end of the block, gets actually pretty deep into the block.
Secondly, I don't know if you guys are aware of the snow removal as well as the street cleaning that happens every, however many weeks. So then there's not going to be any cars on that whole entire side of the street, on top of the extra spaces that will be lost. So, just to second the issues about traffic. I hadn't heard that discussed anymore, and bring up the issue of snow removal and street cleaning.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Thank you. David?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I want to echo Mr. Staley's comments earlier, and also point out that it seems apparent to me that the problem here is that there is parking at all, at this portion of Austin. So, I mean, if I was to lean one way or the other, I would say the benefits of this project, in my mind, far outweigh any of the detriments or concerns that have been raised this evening.

But, there is one concern that's been raised this evening that I think should be addressed, and I think you should eliminate parking on that portion of the street. It's just simply not wide enough to accommodate it.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: Or widen the street to accommodate it, right.
CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Todd?

COMMISSIONER MEYER: Well, Chairman, I would just point out that the changing from the R4 to R5 is the issue, the mapping issue, and that the street width is not going to change whether we designate it as R5 or as R4. So, that I would, to follow up on David's point, would say that that should be a separate issue. If we want to park on Austin, and it's currently an issue, it's only 24 foot, according to the survey, that we should consider either widening the street to accommodate more on-street parking, and safer passage of vehicles or not allow the parking. But I think that's a separate issue than the map amendment issue.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Very good.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Chairman, we have a few questions here.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Oh, citizen comment? Come forward, please. State your name and tell us where you live.

MS. PASSIAS: Francine Passias.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Spell that for us, would you?

MS. PASSIAS: P-a-s-s-i-a-s.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Where do you live?
MS. PASSIAS: 719 Austin Street, in one of the bungalows.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. All right. Raise your right hand, please.

Whereupon,

FRANCINE PASSIAS,
called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Proceed.

MS. PASSIAS: Well, first of all, I would like to respond to Councilman Asaro. That parking lot that you are referring to, about St. Francis Hospital, I work out of my home, so I'm in my home a lot, in and out of my home a lot during the day, and I see people that are hospital visitors and/or employees that do not park in that lot, that park in front of our building.

So, they are not necessarily using that lot. Some people don't like to drive in, especially if they are elderly people, don't like to drive in enclosed parking lots. It's scary for them. So, that overflow parking lot that we have had now, has not, it was supposed to be used for people from St. Francis Hospital, but what they do is they park, guests or, you know, patients or whatever, they park on the street. So
that right now, that's a concern.

So, I am a single woman. If I come home after 9:00, 10:00 o'clock at night, I cannot find parking. That means I have to walk the neighborhood, and even that overflow parking lot is filled now. So, that is a safety issue for me and my guests.

The other thing, when you are trying to talk about a garage that is going to be entered and exited off Austin Street, in the middle of the block, this is an ambulance route. That is cause for an accident. There are children that live in that neighborhood, and all I see is that that is going to be a big hazard. Not just, it's inconvenient because people can't park. That is a hazard waiting to happen.

I liked the rendering that you have of this building. I think it's really nice. I've seen other renderings of buildings that have gone up in Evanston, that when the building goes up, the rendering does not look at all like that building. So, I mean, I would like, A, as a resident, first of all, I would like it to be a guaranty that it's going to be actually brick on the building and not some fabricated, sprayed on concrete thing, just aesthetically speaking.

I do not believe that a almost five
story building, because it looks like it's four story, but it is raising higher than the buildings around that, just even from the rendering, I do not believe that that is going to not cause shading, shadowing of that. You know, I could see a three-story building there, because that's what's like right next to it, and all those buildings on Sherman, they are three-story buildings, and not four-story buildings.

So, my concerns are safety, my concerns are parking, and that's of course not also in the winter when there's snow. As I said, it's an ambulance route. ut, we are already not being able to find the parking, so I understand what you're saying, yes, if people were using that facility, I don't know what the answer is. Maybe there would have to be permit parking, you know, maybe we'd have to go, the City of Chicago, where, you know people, only residents get to park on those streets. But, thank you for listening.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Thank you for your comments. Any other members of the citizens -- yes. Come forward, please.

MS. TOMASACK: My name is Rachel Tomasack. I live at 342 Custer. It's a three-flat. I'm one of the owners of the three-flats.
CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: You should raise your right hand, if you would.

Whereupon,

RACHEL TOMASACK, called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Proceed.

MS. TOMASACK: And I actually have a question about the footprint of the building, and I live in a building that is three stories with an English basement, so it's another building that is essentially three and a half stories, and so I do understand that we're talking about essentially the difference between a structure that is three and a half stories, and a structure that is four stories. And I just wanted to make certain, since I'm representing the other, my neighbors in my building, that 55 feet is the upper limit to an R5 zoning.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: It's 50 feet.

MS. TOMASACK: Fifty, excuse me. And so, I don't mean to ask, be asking you, and I don't even know if it's fair to ask the developer this question.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: It's fair.

MS. TOMASACK: Okay. My concern is project
 creep. Project creep up. That once you, the cost of
doing this project between now and the time that you
anticipate doing this, yes, you may come back to say
it's not economically feasible at three, a 12 unit,
three stories with the parking, and we need to raise
this. And I'm, I would be much more concerned about
that footprint than I am about the current rendering
that I see.

MR. LUNDGREN: Can I address --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. -- are you done?

MS. TOMASACK: I'm finished, yes.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Lundgren, would you
like to respond?

MR. LUNDGREN: That's a very good question.

With 50 feet, we're already at 46 feet with four stories
with the parapet. Even if we wanted to go to five
stories, we can't do it because there's no more parking.
So, we're totally limited by the parking. Originally, I
was trying to get 15 units on here. It's impossible to
do the extra five parking spaces, and it's impossible to
do in 50 feet. So, there's no way we could do more than
the four-story building that we designed.

MS. TOMASACK: Thank you, very much.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: As long as you're there,
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how are you able, as a developer, to put up a building when no other developer seems to be able to do the same?

MR. LUNDGREN: Well, President Obama has said that the market is improving, and we do see that there's some slight improvement, and we would, you know, start this project probably in the summer of next year, which means it's nine months to build it. So, by the spring of 2012, I hope to God the residential market has improved significantly.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Thank you.

MR. LUNDGREN: And we got to do something. I mean, you know, we got to keep our company busy doing something. I mean, you know, so we're down from seven projects to this one right now.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Thank you, very much.

Okay. Any other citizens have something, yes, yes, ma'am, come forward.

MS. SCHULMAN: My name is Rita Schulman.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: How do you spell your last name?

MS. SCHULMAN: S-c-h-u-l-m-a-n.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay.

MS. SCHULMAN: I'm living in a lovely complex on Austin, in between the 727, with the 15 apartments.
CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Would you raise your right hand, please?

Whereupon, RITA SCHULMAN, called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Go ahead,

MS. SCHULMAN: One of the questions I'd like to ask is, you're talking about expanding or hiring something, the hospital sold. Isn't there a rule when you're building now, that you have to make a building handicapped accessible now, if you're adding or building?

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes, the City will insure that all applicable laws are followed, and if a building requires handicap accessibility, you can be sure that that will be included in the plans and the design.

MS. SCHULMAN: Well, I'm beginning to have a better understanding now why most of the buildings are three flats, are three stories now. I'm understanding for the first time. So --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Is your question whether the proposed building will be handicap accessible? Is that your question?
MS. SCHULMAN: Well, that's one of the things I was wondering, are you planning on making it like another place like noise or Sherman?

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, let's answer the first question. Mr. Lundgren, can you address that?

MR. LUNDGREN: We'd meet all of the zoning codes and requirements and yes, handicap accessibility is a requirement, and we would meet those codes.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Do you have another question?

MS. SCHULMAN: Are you trying to do another thing like 1800 Sherman or that building on noise, I mean 1900 --

ALDERMAN RAINNEY: That's a senior citizen building.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: You mean assisted living?

ALDERMAN RAINNEY: It's a federally funded facility operated by the Housing Authority of Cook County for both disabled and seniors.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Thank you, Alderman Rainey.

MS. SCHULMAN: You're not going to try to do something like that?

ALDERMAN RAINNEY: No.

MR. LUNDGREN: No.
MS. SCHULMAN: Because my concern is what everybody else has been bringing up, the parking, and then I come, you know --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Come close to the microphone, if you would, please.

MS. SCHULMAN: I come home in a cab and like, the concerns other people was bringing up, if a car can't go by and then another car can't drop you off and there's not parking, that is a concern, and I know the street is very narrow, down Ridge, and on Austin, it doesn't seem that much, it does not seem that terribly wide.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Thank you for your comments. Are there any other citizens that have some -- yes, please come forward.

MS. COLEMAN: Hi. My name is Beth Coleman, and I'm at 407 Sherman, which is just north of the proposed lot.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Raise your right hand, if you would.

Whereupon,

BETH COLEMAN, called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:
CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Go ahead.

MS. COLEMAN: Yeah, I know that the point has been made several times, but the parking, you know, and the width of the streets, and I just want to say, you know, I have a daughter who's five, and her school bus route is right there. So, I just really want to emphasize the importance of, you know, figuring out the parking, the cars, the traffic that are going to be going in and out there. I don't have a car, so the bus that picks her up, it's really important, and it's right on the corner. And I would just hate to see a bus route changed because there's more traffic or it's not going to fit.

It isn't, I mean, even though it's been said that the streets are wide, it really is difficult for cars to come in and out of there. I've seen people have to move aside for ambulances and so it's just a concern of mine, for bus routes, for schools, because of my daughter. I would just hate to see that changed because, you know, I mean, the building does look beautiful, but I just, I really want to emphasize the importance of the parking and traffic issue.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Thank you, very much. Yes?

State your name again.
Cara Hill.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay, go ahead, please.

MS. HILL: I'm just wondering if, you know, the other issues I brought up are more personal to me, but the parking issue is going to affect everybody. Again, it's 18 cars in that lot, all the time, 18 cars are being displaced, plus another six cars from the building, from the residents of the building. So, that's 24 cars extra on the street. And then you're taking away a couple of parking spaces on the street. So, something needs to be done about that, and I had two suggestions.

Right now, the back of the proposed building allows for just a couple of spaces, because there's some green issue involved, and you could pack a few more cars in there. That would reduce it part of the way. And then also, the, let's see, it would be the northeast corner of Resurrection's parking lot is almost always vacant. There's almost nothing parked in there. But we're not allowed to park in there, and it's a stone's throw away.

So, it would be so nice, you guys have the power to make a difference, and make the parking situation easier for us there. I am encouraging them to
have some sort of an agreement with the neighborhood, where we would sign up. I mean, I think most people would even be willing to pay something to be able to park there. And right now, we can't.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Thank you, very much. Mr. Freeman.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Is there currently, it's not a permit parking for neighbors there, is that correct?

MR. LUNDGREN: We're being neighborly.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I'm sorry?

MR. LUNDGREN: Our site is being neighborly.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: No, no, I'm saying the neighborhood today, it's not permit parking, right? So, I mean, I grew up near Evanston Hospital. You had to have a sticker and all that stuff, so you don't need any of that around St. Francis?

MS. HILL: No.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Isn't that something that would alleviate parking issues? But that's not something we can address here. But perhaps, working with the Alderman, who is here today, perhaps, you know, there's something that can be done to institute some type of permit parking for neighbors, especially in
those areas. I think there is a lot of space in that
parking lot, because I do go to the hospital on
occasion, and there seems to be lots of spaces that are
not being used in that structure.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Any other citizen comments?
Any other questions, comments from Commissioners? Todd.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: I just had a question for
Mr. Lundgren. Do you know who is parking on the site
today? And now that the hospital doesn't own it,
perceivably you know, before it was hospital owned and
the people that were using it were visiting the
hospital, so --

MR. LUNDGREN: We have decided not to chain it
off, but to allow the residents in the area to park
there, and we have no agreement with them, but just by
leaving it open, they just continue to use it, which is
fine. It's being neighborly to the citizens and
everyone that lives in the area. I assume it's mostly
neighbors at night, and it may be a few people from the
hospital in the daytime. But I don't know exactly who
parks there, as we don't regulate it.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: One other question was,
if you had looked at the possibility of putting the
building a half a level below grade, in terms of the
parking structure?

MR. LUNDGREN: That causes additional cost in construction and it now has a ramp going down, which causes safety factors with snow and ice, and things of that nature, and water flow into the building, and new sump pumps you need. So, it just is something that we felt wasn't necessary. Plus, if we go, if we saved four to six feet, that puts us at, we're 46-2 feet, that puts us, if we put 6-2 feet down, we're still at 40 feet, we're not at 35 feet, which would be R4. So we can't do it. It doesn't make a difference.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: And then you have the ADA issues, as well, getting from grade level down into the garage.

MR. LUNDGREN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: Chairman Opdycke, I would just point out that the, again, the parking issue is something that, looking at the map change is what we're charged with, going from R5, or R4 to R5, essentially. And I don't see a whole lot of difference between the amount of parking that would be required by the proposed development, and the parking that it is, it is essentially self-parking, most of the units, and there's not a great difference between R5 and R4 in this case,
because there's not a large unit change in that case. So, in terms of the supporting, I support the change from R4 to R5. I think that we should note that the parking issue does need to be addressed in a separate forum.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: What would be that forum, Mr. Dunkley?

MR. DUNKLEY: The project as a multi-family residential development would be required to appear before the SPAARC Committee, on which is the represented engineering and public works. They take very seriously the loss of on-street parking, and they often can be very creative in terms of ameliorating similar situations.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, the concerns that have been expressed tonight, so far as parking goes, will that be conveyed to members of SPAARC?

MR. DUNKLEY: Should the proposed development be the same or similar to one that is here, absolutely. As a matter of fact, they were voiced this afternoon.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay, very good. Thank you. Any other comments from Commissioners, citizens?

Alicia?

MS. MOSLEY: I have one last question. I know
the term planned development was used earlier. I'm not sure what that is, that just --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I used the term, and I am informed that it does not apply to this particular proposed project.

MS. MOSLEY: And would it apply in the R4 zone? No, okay.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: State your name once again, please.

MS. PASSIAS: Francine Passias.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes, Ms. Passias.

MS. PASSIAS: I strongly urge again, it's not only the parking, but it is that entrance into the garage, off of Austin, that is a hazard, that will be a hazard, not, just a hazard.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Thank you, very much for your comments. Alderman Rainey.

ALDERMAN RAINNEY: Would you allow me to speak?

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes, please.

ALDERMAN RAINNEY: I want to address, many of these issues tonight are aldermanic issues, quite frankly, and they're not, shouldn't be of concern to you.

First of all, this parking lot has been
used as a parking lot for years, and years, and years, I
know 40 years maybe. Cars have been going in and out of
there all day long, and I don't think there have been
any ambulance or children killed or anything along those
lines. However, however, several issues came up about
parking. I don't know if it makes any sense to move the
parking to the other side of the street. I don't know
why it's on that side as opposed to the other side. I
don't know about curb cuts in front of the homes on the
north side of the street, but if parking is to stay,
then it could probably be moved across the street.

I will, first thing tomorrow, contact St.
Francis Hospital, and talk to them about some permitted
parking. One of the wonderful things that makes St.
Francis such a great neighbor is they have made all of
their parking free. It used to be a horrible situation
in the neighborhood where everybody was parking in the
neighborhood. They canceled all the fees for their
surface lot and their structure. So, neighbors have
been allowed to park on St. Francis property in the
past, and perhaps we can get maybe 20 spaces of
legitimately permitted parking in one of their lots.
That I'm willing to do.

And I'll check about the parking on the
north side of the street. I've never noticed that that is impossible to pass. We do have ambulances, fire trucks, everything else going up and down Austin. I'm sure it's dangerous if you're sitting there watching it, but I don't know of any close call, maybe close calls, but I don't know of any accidents lately there. So, I will do everything I can regarding the inconvenience of not having this free lot for parking. And it's good that the developer is going to allow people to continue parking there, but I'll get to work on that.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Thank you, Alderman Rainey.

Todd.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: If I could make a suggestion to the Alderman, as well, to look at the width of the street. Twenty-four feet is not adequate for two lanes of traffic and parking, frankly. So, we should look at the street width as a separate issue as well, in addition to the parking.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Lundgren.

MR. LUNDGREN: Mr. Chairman, can I make a closing comment?

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes, you may.

MR. LUNDGREN: I wanted to state that the Appearance Review Committee approved the map amendment
unanimously. I don't know if you were aware of that yet. And with Alderman Rainey's support, you know, I feel that this would be an excellent development for the community. And thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Very good. Thank you for your time. Is there any other comments? If not, is there a motion? A motion to change the subject property from R4 to R5. Is there such a motion? I will so move then. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Second.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All those in --

MR. DUNKLEY: I'm sorry, it's important that you also remove it from the oH Overlay District.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Oh, I'm sorry. From the R4 oH zoning designation to the R5. I so move. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER ASARO: Second.

(Motion moved and seconded.)

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. All those in favor say aye?

(Chorus of ayes.)

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Can we do it by saying aye or not?

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Well, we'll get a vote on
the standards. We're going to vote on the standards, but I thought we'd --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Don't we have to vote on the amendment? That's more significant than the standard.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: All right. We'll take then as they say, a roll call vote. Mr. Asaro, are you in favor of the motion?

COMMISSIONER ASARO: I am in favor.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Freeman?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I'm in favor.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Staley?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Galloway?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Meyer?

COMMISSIONER MEYER: In favor.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: And the two associate members do not have a vote, and I cast my vote in favor. So, it passes. Six to naught.

Now, to approve a map amendment, certain standards must be met, and you have copies of what those standards are. The first one is whether the proposed amendment is consistent with the goals, objectives, and
policies of the comprehensive general plan as adopted
and amended from time to time by the City Council. The
question is, do we believe that these standards have
been met, and we'll start again with you, Mr. Asaro.

COMMISSIONER ASARO: Based on the application,
supporting documentation, and the evidence that's been
presented today, I believe that the evidence does
satisfy the standard and that the standard has been met.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Thank you. Mr.
Freeman?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I agree. I believe the
standards have been met.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Staley?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: I also agree the
standards have been met.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I too would agree that the
standards have been met, on that point. Mr. Galloway?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I agree the standards
have been met.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Meyer?

COMMISSIONER MEYER: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Standard number two,
whether the proposed amendment is compatible with the
overall character of the existing development in the
immediate vicinity of the subject property. Let me just say that I too have visited the site, and it appears to be in the main, three flats going south on Sherman, single family residence to the north of Austin, on Sherman. But I think this kind of a building, this design and this scale, would be compatible with the existing dwellings. So, on this particular standard, all in favor, six in favor, or six believe that the standard has been met, zero --

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Are you talking about A or B?

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: We're talking about B. Have we not voted on this one? Oh, I'm sorry. Mr. Asaro?

COMMISSIONER ASARO: Based on the reasons that I stated earlier, I believe that this standard has been met.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Freeman?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I believe that it's been met.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Staley?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: The standard has been met.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Galloway?
COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Meyer.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: I believe the standard has been met. Can I make one comment?

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes, please.

COMMISSIONER MEYER: The only comment I would make would be the ground floor, and the fact that there are no openings to the interior of the building, and I would just raise that as an issue for compatibility purposes with the neighborhood, in terms of, with window openings to the garage.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: The six members of the Commission then believe that the standard has been met. The third standard is whether the proposed amendment will have any adverse affect on the value of the adjacent properties. And I guess I would say that there's no per se diminution of property values by the change in the zoning, however, it remains to be seen what effect a particular building will have on the adjacent properties. But, our mission here is narrow, and that is to approve the change in zoning, and I don't see that this will have any adverse impact on the surrounding property values. Any other comments? Mr. Asaro, do you think this standard has been met?
COMMISSIONER ASARO: I believe that this standard has been met.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Freeman?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I believe it's been met.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Staley?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: The standard has been met.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Galloway?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: The standard has been met.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Mr. Meyer?

COMMISSIONER MEYER: The standard has been met.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. And the last standard is the adequacy of public facilities and services. I find that the public facilities and services are adequate. Mr. Asaro?

COMMISSIONER ASARO: I believe the standard has been met.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Freeman?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I believe it's been met, but I'd like to make a comment again on the parking issue, so that that has to be looked into.
CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STALEY: The standard has been met.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Galloway?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: The standard has been met and I would echo the comment about the parking issue.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Mr. Meyer?

COMMISSIONER MEYER: Yeah, I would agree the standard has been met, but I think parking and the street with issue need to be addressed.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: So, we at the Plan Commission will recommend approval of this proposed change in the zoning.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Yes?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I would like to echo Todd's comment in regards to the residential context standard, and it gives me an opportunity to make the comment I was intending to make earlier, which is, I think the residential character of the building would be vastly improved if there were some openings at the first floor.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Excuse me, is your
microphone on, Mr. Galloway?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: Sorry. You want me to start over?

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Please.

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I want to echo Todd's comments in regards to the accommodating the residential character of the neighborhood, and state the suggestion which I was withholding because I didn't think I would have the appropriate opportunity to mention it within the context of our purview. And the comment is that I think the residential character of the building would be vastly improved if there were indeed some openings, if you will, at the first floor, particularly on Sherman Avenue, either side of the entrance, and on Austin Avenue, you know, either side of the garage. These could be small square window openings, with protective decorative grills, which I think would, you know, not only increase the residential scale, it would add light to the spaces within, and also convey the feeling that there are living creatures living on the first floor, as opposed to just automobiles.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Mr. Freeman?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: And I would have liked to have said that exact same thing. So, just to make
the street scape, and make the building look less
industrial on that floor. So, I would concur, even
though it's not within our purview here.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Thank you, very
much. Next item on the agenda, Evanston Plan 2030
Update. Craig?

I'd like to thank the members of the
public for coming out here tonight and voicing their
opinions and comments.

MR. SKLENAR: Good evening. In your packet
that you received this month, I have issued a memorandum
on the plans that have been commissioned since the 1999
Comprehensive Plan Update. I'm not going to go through
each one, but what I would like to do tonight is at
least facilitate a discussion on any questions or
thoughts pertaining to what could arise as critical
issues in preparation for writing the critical issues
paper that will help guide the update for the
Comprehensive Plan coming this year. Are there any
questions to begin with, or --

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I guess my question would
be what is in place currently, to insure that these
plans, the Downtown Plan, the West Side Plan, the
Evanston Climate Action Plan, the progress made on these
various plans?

    MR. SKLENAR: I think you're hitting exactly
some of the points that I found is that, the
Comprehensive Plan needs to then help support and back
up these plans that have been, that have happened and
hold some accountability to them, and place into the new
Comprehensive Update. We have this plan, here is its
goal and objective, this policy in the Comprehensive
Plan will support an objective by X.

    CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: I can see, for example, a
committee, and there may be one already, I don't know,
that looks at the climate action plan and the multi-
modal plan, you know, on a regular basis, to insure that
there's progress.

    MR. SKLENAR: The thing with something like
the multi-modal plan is that engineering and traffic use
that as their guiding document when they go out and they
do the CIP budget and they initiate new programs in the
City, like the West Evanston Street Scape Project that's
going to be kicking off shortly, or the Yellow Line
Station Study, they are current commissioning, or trying
to get bus shelters for all the bus stops, based off the
recommendations of the multi-modal plan. We're looking
at new bike lanes. All those elements are happening,
and it's really marching orders for City Staff to go out and complete those plans. But I think it would add more meat to it on the citizen side, if we pulled in those policies into the Comprehensive Plan Update.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Comments from fellow Commissioners?

MR. SKLENAR: There are a few cases like the climate action plan you brought up. One is it highly recommends a complete streets policy, which we don't have that fully flushed out right now in the Comprehensive Plan. It alludes to it, but I think it needs to have more detail behind it.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Okay. Thank you. There being no questions, comments from Commissioners, we'll go on to the next item on the agenda is Committee Reports. Todd?

COMMISSIONER MEYER: I have one comment, Craig. I would just like to see us in the Comp Plan Update, really be thinking from a sustainability standpoint, and not, I don't mean just from an ecological or environmental standpoint, you know, talking about the triple bottom line and the things that are going to support Evanston in the future, from an economic, social and, you know, environmental
standpoint, and the attributes within those categories that we need to consider. I hope that we can work to embed those into the plan. So, thinking about everything from renewable energy to water to, you know, recycling, all of the different issues that we need to be thinking about, I hope that we can embed a real, you know, sustainability focus into our Comp Plan Update.

MR. SKLENAR: Yeah, one telling change in the last ten years is that the sustainable component to the Comprehensive Plan that we currently have is only about four or five pages, where we spend tens of pages talking about land use, and I think there needs to be a greater balance in sustainable issues, within the entire document.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: David?

COMMISSIONER GALLOWAY: I would concur with what Todd has said. In fact, I think that if there's one over-arching concept that should find its way throughout the entire plan, it is that its sustainability. That should be the common element that ties all of these elements together, and gives all the neighborhood, in subsequent subset plans, strength and emphasis.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Thank you, very much,
Craig. Any committee reports? There being none, I would entertain now a motion to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So move.

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER STALEY: Second.

(Motion moved and seconded.)

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Those in favor, say aye?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN OPDYCKE: Opposed? Motion carries.

We are adjourned. Thank you.

(Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.)
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