ZONING COMMITTEE OF THE PLAN COMMISSION

Wednesday, October 11, 2017
7:00 P.M.
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 4802

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

2. MINUTES: Approval of the October 21, 2015 Meeting Minutes

3. NEW BUSINESS

   A. DISCUSSION
      C1a Regulations
      Plan Commission referral to the Zoning Committee to discuss possible retirement of or revisions to the C1a Commercial Mixed-Use Zoning District, per Aldermanic referral.

3. ADJOURNMENT

Order of agenda items is subject to change. Information about the Plan Commission is available online at: http://www.cityofevanston.org/plancommission. Questions can be directed to Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner, at 847-448-8170 or via e-mail at mmjones@cityofevanston.org.

The City of Evanston is committed to making all public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. Any citizen needing mobility or communications access assistance should contact the Community Development Department 48 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting so that accommodations can be made at 847-448-8683 (Voice) or 847-448-8064 (TYY).

La ciudad de Evanston está obligada a hacer accesibles todas las reuniones públicas a las personas minusválidas o las quines no hablan inglés. Si usted necesita ayuda, favor de ponerse en contacto con la Oficina de Administración del Centro a 847/866-2916 (voz) o 847/448-8052 (TDD).
MEETING MINUTES
ZONING COMMITTEE OF THE PLAN COMMISSION
Wednesday, October 21, 2015
7:00 P.M.
Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 4802

Members Present: Carol Goddard, Colby Lewis, Terri Dubin, Belisle

Members Absent: Jim Ford

Other Plan Commission Members Present: none

Staff Present: Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Damir Latinovic, Planning and Zoning Administrator

Presiding Member: Colby Lewis, Chairman

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

With a quorum present, Chairman Lewis called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

2. MINUTES

Approval of September 16, 2015 Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission Meeting Minutes:

Commissioner Goddard made a motion to approve the minutes.

Commissioner Belisle seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken and the minutes were approved with a voice vote 4-0.

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCE 15PLND-0080

Impervious Surface
A Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment pursuant to City Code Title 6, Zoning, to consider modifications to the maximum impervious surface coverage calculation and building lot coverage.

Ms. Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner presented the staff report memo.

Chairman Lewis invited comments or questions from the committee members.

Chairman Lewis clarified that this regulation would mostly affect R-1 and R2 districts. Ms. Jones replied that this regulation applies to all residential districts but single and two
family residences would mostly be affected. It would affect any modification to decks in excess of maximum impervious surface requirements.

Chairman Lewis then inquired as to why gravel was listed as both an impervious surface in the definition and as an acceptable pervious surface to be placed beneath proposed decks. Ms. Jones responded that the initial thought was that gravel is listed as impervious in other portions of the code but that if preferred, staff can remove that portion. There were also several other cities which listed gravel as an impervious surface. Ms. Goddard mentioned cases where some homeowners place a weed barrier down beneath the gravel. In cases such as that the surface would be considered impervious.

Chairman Lewis asked if there is a standard that could be adopted that will dictate how a demonstrable level of porosity can be administered. Ms. Jones replied that there are some surfaces which are assumed to be pervious but that staff would likely need to consult with Public Works for a more detailed listing of recommended pervious surfaces and, over time, update that list as new materials are created.

Commissioner Belisle suggested that if an industry standard exists, staff could utilize it in determining which surfaces are pervious or impervious. Commissioner Dubin asked if there was a listing that specifies what surfaces are permeable. Commissioner Belisle then stated that a specific listing within regulations is something that staff and the committee were trying to avoid.

Commissioner Dubin mentioned pavers as an example of surfaces that allow for grass to grow between them but there can be an impervious surface beneath the ground level. She also asked for clarification on the term “maintains” as it refers to maintaining a level porosity. Ms. Jones responded that if, for example, there is a surface that over time begins to break down and becomes compact and more impervious, that would be a surface that has not maintained an acceptable level of porosity. It is on the property owner to maintain porosity of the material. Commissioner Goddard stated that she felt it was important to keep the language that speaks to maintaining a demonstrable level of porosity.

Commissioner Belisle asked for clarification as to why the proposed amendment went from counting all decks as impervious to counting decks as pervious if they have a permeable surface beneath them. He then inquired if a middle ground had been considered. Ms. Jones replied that initial proposal was to simplify current practice and interpretation that all types of decks are impervious. Based on the discussion at the last meeting it became clear that the Committee perceived certain types of decks as pervious, so the revised proposal is an attempt to capture that. It was difficult in finding a middle ground that allowed for flexibility but still enabled some kind of regulation and enforcement. Staff had considered options similar to that for porches and pavers that includes only a percentage of the surface in the impervious calculation (i.e. 80% of paver surface is calculated as impervious). Ms. Jones then emphasized that with the proposed amendment, staff is also proposing to include decks as part of building lot coverage which would enable regulating how much of a lot is covered by decks.
Chairman Lewis clarified the 20% permeability for pavers as they relate to lot coverage. Mr. Latinovic stated he was uncertain how the percentage was determined with regards to the 20% discount on the impervious surface with regards to pavers.

Mr. Latinovic then explained that the wording of “maintains a demonstrable level of porosity” goes towards giving ability to staff to revisit how permeable surfaces are and make adjustments as needed. As an example, he explained that gravel when first laid out is more permeable but as time goes on, will become more compacted and less permeable which then puts responsibility on the homeowner to maintain the gravel in a way that keeps the level of porosity where it was when initially installed.

Ms. Jones reiterated a point of discussion during the previous meeting in which the committee warned against becoming too specific and placing too much of a time and financial burden on the homeowner in proving a level of porosity. She stated that this is why staff was trying to keep some flexibility in the code.

Chairman Lewis suggested adjusting Section 6-8-2-10(C)-3 with regards to paving block use. He suggested that edits to other portions of the Impervious Surface subsection could be proposed for staff to consider being that clarifying the code and lessening the effect of stormwater runoff are goal of the amendment.

Commissioner Belisle questioned the use of pavers under a deck as a pervious surface yet having them count as only 20% pervious as a driveway. Mr. Latinovic stated that staff could eliminate that section referring to paving blocks, though there is a level of porosity.

Commissioner Belisle then expressed that the updated amendment is much clearer than the initial text amendment proposed at the previous committee meeting.

Chairman Lewis opened the public participation portion of the hearing.

Mr. Andrew McGonigle, resident, introduced himself and agreed that the current revision is a better document than what was previously proposed by staff. He then referred back to the use of gravel, stating that the amount of porosity would depend on where the gravel is located and its use. For example, a gravel walkway’s porosity would be different from a gravel driveway’s porosity.

Chairman Lewis questioned whether or not to leave gravel in both sections of the proposed text amendment. Mr. Latinovic responded that the key is the phrase referring to maintaining a demonstrable level of porosity. Commissioner Dubin stated that a gravel surface under porches may be more pervious and not compacted as it is for a gravel parking area.

Mr. McGonigle suggested staff look at ASTM (American Society for Testing and Materials) standards which define permeability. He stated that the ASTM standards were put in place by the government for architects to follow and manufacturers use those standards for their products.

A short discussion followed in which it was suggested that staff consider using the ASTM standards as a guide and/or include “as indicated by ASTM standards” to maintain consistency and avoid constant updates.
Mr. McGonigle stated that finding the middle ground is important but it is also important to encourage green practices in the City. Using regulations for Willmette as an example, he then urged staff and the committee to look at lot coverage percentages the City allows owners to build to. This could help get the code in line with the City’s green and sustainable goals. Making allowances for pervious materials may encourage the use of more plantings and green space.

Chairman Lewis stated that he believes increasing the bonus actually encourages more building on a lot. He indicated that the regulations for building lot coverage still need to be considered in that case and that lot coverage still cannot exceed that maximum amount.

Mr. McGonigle suggested thinking more about the materials than actual coverage, he indicated that some surfaces typically considered pervious, such as grass is less permeable that some other pervious materials due to grass’s density. Commissioner Dubin and Chairman Lewis emphasized that the proposed regulations are dealing more with decks and surfaces beneath them. Chairman Lewis emphasized that the committee is not suggesting comprehensive reform at this time.

Mr. Latinovic asked the committee if staff should consider giving more than 20% incentive for paving blocks. McGonigle agreed with a suggestion to use “permeable paved blocks”. Chairman Lewis stated that the surfaces would be covered by pervious paving system and the regulations could eliminate “blocks”. He then stated that he believes if there is no bonus or incentive provided, the permeable options would like not be used due to cost. He continued, stating that removing “permeable blocks” would alleviate the issue with pavers being listed in different sections with conflicting levels of porosity.

Mr. Latinovic explained that the code was previously so complicated that staff interpreted all decks as impervious, so the initial idea was to revise the language of the code to be able to match the interpretation. After the last meeting, that idea was revised to allow for decks with certain surfaces beneath to be counted as pervious but count them towards building lot coverage to prevent overbuilding on properties. Additional discussion followed on the progress of changes to this regulation followed.

Chairman Lewis stated that there were two comments, one being defining the permeability of certain types of gravel. Commissioner Dubin stated that, though it needs to be discussed, that would be a different meeting. Chairman Lewis disagreed, stating that demonstrates permeability so it may need to be codified, or interpreted according to ASTM standards and leave a final determination of permeability to staff’s judgment.

Commissioner Dubin asked if the city’s building code addresses any of these standards. Commissioner Belisle stated that the building code is a separate document that would regulate a different area and buildings themselves. Commissioner Dubin asked if there were any other examples of standard manufacturing metrics being used in the City Code. Mr. Latinovic replied that foot candles as they relate to lighting and decibel levels as they refer to sound have been adopted as standards that are followed in certain policies but they are not defined in the Zoning Code.
Mr. McGonigle stated that it usually is the case that Zoning likes to have clear, specific regulations. Mr. Latinovic agreed due to various interpretations being possible, otherwise. He stated that an Issue is without zoning staff being experts there may be some issues in enforcement. It may be possible to maintain the proposed phrasing and in practice ask about ASTM standards as requests are received by staff. Staff can research the standards.

Mr. McGonigle suggested that staff include language that limits the use of certain surfaces, for example specify a non load-bearing use under certain areas such as walkways, as this would reduce chances of compacting permeable surfaces. Commissioner Belisle replied that in that instance staff can refer back to maintaining the porosity of the surface as stated in the regulations.

Commissioner Dubin pointed out that no other town referred to in the memo codifies ASTM standards. Ms. Jones stated that there are cities that may not codify particular standards but there are standards that exist that are used as guidelines by staff in actual practice. She indicated that this could be something Planning and Zoning staff can do as well.

Mr. Latinovic requested to summarize the suggestions for edits to the proposed text amendment. Commissioner Dubin noted to use “pervious paving systems” and remove “paving blocks”. It was also requested that clarification be provided for the use of pavers under the deck versus using them as another surfaces such as a walkway or driveway.

Commissioner Belisle asked if the paving block edit can be made as one motion and then have a separate motion for other changes. The committee agreed that one motion would be preferred.

Chairman Lewis stated that there are three options for the committee to consider: say no to the proposed amendment and send it back to staff to work on; approve the amendment as is and send it to Plan Commission; or approve the amendment with modifications as suggested and send it on to Plan Commission. Latinovic stated with more commissioners at Plan Commission there can be more discussion and more suggestions could be made.

There being no further discussion, Commissioner Dubin made a motion to accept the new language for zoning code with the addition of change as discussed and send the proposed amendment on to the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Goddard seconded the motion.

The motion was approved by voice vote: 4-0.

Aye: Commissioners Dubin, Goddard, Belisle and Chairman Lewis
Nye: none

4. **ADJOURNMENT**
Commissioner Goddard made a motion for adjournment and Commissioner Dubin seconded the motion. With all commissioners in favor, the meeting was adjourned at 7:55 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Meagan Jones
Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Community Development Department
Zoning Committee
of the
Plan Commission

Discussion

C1a Commercial Mixed-Use
District Regulations
Memorandum

To: Chair and Members of the Plan Commission

From: Johanna Leonard, Director of Community Development
Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Administrator
Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner

Subject: Discussion regarding C1a Zoning District Regulations

Date: August 25, 2017

Background
During the April 24, 2017 City Council meeting, Council referred the topic of C1a Commercial Mixed-Use Zoning District regulations to the Plan Commission. Specifically Council asked that the Commission look into possibly retiring the C1a Zoning in place of new regulations. Staff has done some initial research on the C1a district and corresponding regulations which are outlined below.

Analysis
The C1a Commercial Mixed-Use Zoning District is primarily located along a portion of the Chicago Avenue corridor, from Lee Street to South Boulevard on both sides of the street. The 831 Emerson site was also recently rezoned to C1a from C1 Commercial and R5 General Residential in June of this year. The District permits and currently consists of a variety of uses including multifamily residential, commercial and institutional, much of which is within mixed-use buildings. It is also adjacent to a number of different districts, including: B2 Business, C2 Commercial, MUE Mixed-Use Employment, MXE Transitional Manufacturing Employment, R3 Two-Family Residential, R4, R5, and R6 General Residential and OS Open Space (zoning map and zoning district comparison chart are attached). It should be noted that to the west of the designated C1a zoning districts, CTA/Metra railroad right-of-way acts as a boundary to other zoning districts further west.

The C1a Zoning District was established in 1993, with the overhaul of the City’s Zoning Ordinance, and then significantly revised in 2000, correlating with the completion of the Chicago Avenue Corridor Recommendations Report. The Chicago Avenue Corridor Recommendations Report came about from a two year planning process and created a document with the purpose of creating a vision that would guide future redevelopment and promote compatible economic development along Chicago Avenue. As part of the
The report's recommendations, several items directly addressed the C1a District. These are listed below:

- Revising of allowable height from 107 feet to a height within 55-67 feet (recommendation adopted into Zoning Ordinance).
- Elimination of parking floor exemption rule (recommendation adopted into Zoning Ordinance).
- Revising parking space requirements to provide for guest parking and require 1.25 to 1.5 spaces per unit (recommendation partially adopted into Zoning Ordinance).
- Review lot coverage and FAR regulations to be compatible with overall goal of reducing height and bulk of new development (recommendation partially adopted into Zoning Ordinance).

During the same time period of the Corridor Recommendation Report adoption, revisions were made to the C1a District. The specific revisions adopted by ordinance 42-O-00 (attached) addressed the following regulations within the C1a District:

- Revising the purpose statement to remove references to providing locations for the development of contemporary shopping developments characterized by large parking areas.
- Revising permitted and special uses within the district.
- Increasing the lot area required per dwelling unit from 300 to 350 square feet.
- Updating setback requirements: reducing side yard abutting a street for a building from 5 feet to 0 feet; rear yard abutting a residential district for a building reduced from 15 feet to 10 feet. Side yard abutting non-residential district for a building was changed from 5 feet to 0 feet to a height of 25 feet above grade above which a 5 foot setback is required.
- Special regulations for enclosed parking including screening, setback and aesthetic considerations to lessen the effects on the streetscape.

Approximately 9 developments have been constructed or approved within the C1a District since the 2000 revision of zoning regulations. A list of these developments, which includes information on the height, number of units, and number of parking spaces, is included as an attachment. A recent concern expressed by members of the City Council was the cumulative effect of developments such as these- with increased height, increased density and limited setbacks and sidewalk widths- on surrounding neighborhoods and the walkability of Chicago Avenue. Thus, the referral to the Plan Commission.

There are a number of possible text and/or map amendments that could address the concerns brought up regarding the C1a District. These include:

- Further reducing the height allowed by right and increasing required setbacks.
- Determine maximum heights using calculations similar those within the Central Street Overlay (oCSC) District which uses a transitional height plane to determine maximum heights based on the maximum height of adjacent lower intensity districts.
Similar to certain areas of the Downtown, require a ziggurat setback above a certain height along Chicago Avenue and if adjacent to residentially zoned areas.

- Dissolve C1a zoning district and replace with an established or new zoning district (Map Amendment required).
- Create an overlay district (Map and Text Amendment required).

**Recommendation**

Staff recommends that this item be sent to the Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission for further discussion on possible text amendments, with the goal being to bring a recommendation to the Plan Commission on text amendment that would best address concerns mentioned above by the end of 2017.

**Attachments**

- Existing C1a Regulations
- Ordinance 42-O-00
- Zoning Map
- Adjacent Zoning District Comparison
- Developments within the C1a District
6-10-3. - C1a COMMERCIAL MIXED USE DISTRICT.

6-10-3-1. - PURPOSE STATEMENT.

The C1a commercial mixed use district is intended to provide locations for the development of mixed use buildings consisting of retail oriented and office uses on the ground level and office uses and/or residential dwellings located above as well as multifamily residential. A higher FAR and building height will be permitted in the C1a district in order to encourage this type of development.

(Ord. 42-0-00)

6-10-3-2. - PERMITTED USES.

The following uses are permitted in the C1a district:
Business or vocational school.
Caterer.
Commercial indoor recreation.
Commercial shopping center.
Cultural facility.
Dwellings (except that within the C1a district lying between Lee Street on the north and Kedzie Street on the south dwellings are only allowed when located above the ground floor).
Educational institution—Private.
Educational institution—Public.
Financial institution.
Food store establishment (with hours of operation between 6:00 a.m. and 12:00 midnight).
Government institution.
Hotel.
Neighborhood garden.
Office.
Public utility.
Religious institution.
Restaurant—Type 1.
Retail goods establishment.
Retail service establishment.

(Ord. 42-0-00; Ord. No. 3-O-14, § 8, 2-10-2014; Ord. No. 81-O-14, § 35, 8-11-2014)
6-10-3-3. - SPECIAL USES.

The following uses may be allowed in the C1a district, subject to the provisions set forth in Section 6-3-5 of this Title:
Animal hospital.
Aquaponics.
Assisted living facility.
Banquet hall.
Commercial outdoor recreation.
Convenience store.
Craft-brewery.
Daycare center—Adult (subject to the general requirements of Section 6-4-3 of this Title).
Daycare center—Child (subject to the general requirements of Section 6-4-2 of this Title).
Drive-through facility (accessory only).
Dwelling—Multiple-family.
Food store establishment.
Funeral services excluding on-site cremation.
Independent living facility.
Long-term care facility.
Media broadcasting station.
Membership organization.
Micro-Distillery.
Open sales lot.
Planned development (subject to the requirements of Section 6-10-1-9 of this Chapter and Section 6-3-6 of this Title).
Recording studio.
Resale establishment.
Residential care home—Category I (when located above the ground floor and subject to the general requirements of Section 6-4-4 of this Title).
Residential care home—Category II (subject to the general requirements of Section 6-4-4 of this Title).
Restaurant—Type 2.
Retirement hotel.
Sheltered care home.

Transitional shelter (subject to the requirements of Section 6-3-5-11 of this Title).

Urban farm, rooftop.

Wholesale goods establishment.

(Ord. 42-0-00; amd. Ord. 58-0-02; Ord. 114-0-02; Ord. 122-0-09; Ord. No. 78-O-10, § 6, 11-8-10; Ord. No. 71-O-10, § 8, 10-25-10; Ord. No. 129-O-12, § 8, 1-14-2013; Ord. No. 56-O-14, § 8, 5-27-2014; Ord. No. 57-O-14, § 8, 6-9-2014; Ord. No. 81-O-14, § 9, 8-11-2014)

6-10-3-4. - LOT SIZE.

The minimum lot size requirements for the C1a district are as follows:

(A) Nonresidential uses: There is no minimum lot size requirement for nonresidential uses in the C1a district.

(B) Residential uses: The minimum residential lot size in the C1a district is three hundred fifty (350) square feet per dwelling unit.

(Ord. 42-0-00)

6-10-3-5. - LOT WIDTH.

The lot width requirements for the C1a district are as follows:

(A) Uses when not incorporated within a commercial shopping center: None.

(B) Commercial shopping centers: One hundred fifty (150) feet.

(Ord. 42-0-00)

6-10-3-6. - LOT COVERAGE.

There is no maximum lot coverage in the C1a district.

(Ord. 42-0-00)

6-10-3-7. - FLOOR AREA RATIO.

The maximum floor area ratio in the C1a district is 4.0.

(Ord. 42-0-00)

6-10-3-8. - YARD REQUIREMENTS.

The yard requirements for the C1a district are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front yard</th>
<th>Building, none; parking, landscaped setback required subject to design and project review as set forth in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## Chapter 3 of this Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(B) Side yard abutting a street</th>
<th>Building, zero (0) feet; parking, five (5) feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(C) Side yard when abutting residential district</td>
<td>Building, fifteen (15) feet; parking, ten (10) feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Rear yard when abutting residential district or when separated from a residential district by a public alley</td>
<td>Building, ten (10) feet; parking, ten (10) feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Side yard when abutting nonresidential district</td>
<td>Building, zero (0) feet to a height of twenty-five (25) feet above grade, above twenty-five (25) feet, a five-foot setback is required; parking, five (5) feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F) Rear yard when abutting non-residential district except when separated from a residential district by a public alley</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ord. 42-0-00; Ord. No. 66-O-15, § 17, 6-22-2015)

### 6-10-3-9. - BUILDING HEIGHT.

The maximum building height in the C1a district is sixty-seven (67) feet.

(Ord. 42-0-00)

### 6-10-3-10. - SPECIAL REGULATIONS FOR PARKING.

Within the C1a district, enclosed parking and appurtenant areas must be twenty (20) feet set back from any front or street side lot line, except for driveways. Enclosed parking may not be visible from any abutting streets. No devices or openings for automobile or other vehicle ventilation may be visible from abutting streets.

(Ord. 42-0-00)
AN ORDINANCE

Amending the Text of the Zoning Ordinance
Relating to the C1a Commercial District

WHEREAS, the Plan Commission held public hearings pursuant to proper notice in case no. ZPC 00-1 on January 12, 2000, January 26, 2000, January 27, 2000, February 2, 2000, February 9, 2000, February 22, 2000, and March 8, 2000 to consider amendments to Chapter 10, "Commercial Districts", Chapter 16, "Off-Street Parking and Loading", Chapter 17, "Landscaping and Screening", Chapter 18, "Definitions", Chapter 3, "Implementation and Administration", Chapter 7, "Zoning Districts and MAP", and any other related sections of the Zoning Ordinance regarding the C1a Commercial District, including lot requirements, building height, exclusion from certain bulk limitations of floors used for parking, yard requirements, lot coverage, and floor area ratio; and

WHEREAS, the Plan Commission, after hearing testimony and receiving other evidence, made written findings pursuant to Section 6-3-4-5 of the Zoning Ordinance that the application in the aforementioned case no. ZPC 00-2 met the standards for amendments to the text of the Zoning Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the Planning and Development Committee of the City Council considered and adopted the Plan Commission's findings and recommendation at its March 27, 2000, April 10, 2000, and April 11, 2000 meetings, and

WHEREAS, at its April 11, 2000 meeting the Planning and Development Committee accepted the Plan Commission's recommendation, with modifications,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY
OF EVANSTON, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS:

SECTION 1: That the City Council hereby adopts the findings and recommendation of the Plan Commission as modified by the Planning and Development Committee in the aforesaid case no. ZPC 00-1 and amends the text of the Zoning Ordinance, as more particularly described below.

SECTION 2: That Section 6-16-3 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Evanston City Code of 1979, as amended, be, and it hereby is further amended, to read as follows:

6-10-3: C1A COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE DISTRICT:

6-10-3-1: PURPOSE STATEMENT:
The C1a Commercial Mixed-Use District is intended to provide locations for the development of mixed use buildings consisting of retail-oriented and office uses on the ground level and office uses and/or residential dwellings located above as well as multi-family residential. A higher FAR and building height will be permitted in the C1a District in order to encourage this type of development.

6-10-3-2: PERMITTED USES:
The following uses are permitted in the C1a District:
Caterer; Commercial indoor recreation; Commercial shopping center; Cultural facility; Dwellings (except that within the C1a District lying between Lee Street on the north and Kedzie Street on the south dwellings are only allowed when located above the ground floor); Educational institution – private; Educational institution – public; Financial institution; Food store establishment (with hours of operation between 6:00 A.M. and 12:00 A.M.); Government institution; Hotel; Office; Public utility; Religious institution; Restaurant - Type I; Retail goods establishment; Retail services establishment.

6-10-3-3: SPECIAL USES:
The following uses may be allowed in the C1a District, subject to the provisions set forth in Section 6-3-5, "Special Uses":
Assisted living facility; Commercial outdoor recreation; Convenience store; Day care center - Adult (subject to the general requirements of Section 6-4-3, "Adult Day Care Homes"); Day care center - Child (subject to the general requirements of Section 6-4-2, "Child Day Care Homes"); Drive-through facility (accessory only); Dwelling – Multiple family; Food store establishment; Independent living facility; Long term care facility; Media broadcasting station; Membership
organization; Recording studio; Residential care home - Category I (when located above the ground floor and subject to the general requirements of Section 6-4-4, "Residential Care Homes"); Residential care home - Category II (subject to the general requirements of Section 6-4-4, "Residential Care Homes"); Restaurant - Type II. Retirement hotel; Sheltered care home; Transitional shelter (subject to the requirements of Section 6-3-5-11, "Additional Standards for a Special Use for Transitional Shelters"); Wholesale goods establishment; Planned development (subject to the requirements of Section 6-10-1-9 and Section 6-3-6, "Planned Developments").

6-10-3-4: LOT SIZE:
The minimum lot size requirements for the C1a District are as follows:
(A) Nonresidential Uses: There is no minimum lot size requirement for nonresidential uses in the C1a District.
(B) Residential Uses: The minimum residential lot size in the C1a District is 350 square feet per dwelling unit.

6-10-3-5: LOT WIDTH:
The lot width requirements for the C1a District are as follows:
(A) Uses when not incorporated within a commercial shopping center: None.
(B) Commercial shopping centers 150'.

6-10-3-6: LOT COVERAGE: There is no maximum lot coverage in the C1a District.

6-10-3-7: FLOOR AREA RATIO: The maximum floor area ratio in the C1a District is 4.0.

6-10-3-8: YARD REQUIREMENTS: The yard requirements for the C1a District are as follows:
(A) Front yard: Building, none; parking, landscaped setback required subject to site plan review as set forth in Chapter 3, "Implementation And Administration"
(B) Side yard abutting a street: Building, 0'; Parking, 5'
(C) Side yard when abutting residential district Building, 15'; Parking 10'.
(D) Rear yard when abutting residential district or when separated from a residential district by a public alley: Building, 10'; Parking 10'
(E) Side yard when abutting nonresidential district: Building, 0' to a height of 25 feet above grade, above 25 feet, a 5-foot setback is required; Parking 5'
(F) Rear yard when abutting nonresidential district except when separated from a residential district by a public alley: none.

6-10-3-9: BUILDING HEIGHT: The maximum building height in the C1a District is 67'.

6-10-3-10: SPECIAL REGULATIONS FOR PARKING: Within the C1a District, enclosed parking and appurtenant areas must be 20 feet set back from any front or street side lot line,
except for driveways. Enclosed parking may not be visible from any abutting streets. No devices or openings for automobile or other vehicle ventilation may be visible from abutting streets.

SECTION 3: That Section 6-18-3 of the Zoning Ordinance be amended by adding the following in appropriate alphabetical order:

6-18-3: DEFINITIONS

BUILDING, HEIGHT OF:
(A) The perpendicular distance at the center of a building’s principal front measured from the established grade to the high point of the roof for a flat roof, and to the mean height level for gable, hip or gambrel roofs. Chimneys and spires shall not be included in calculating the height nor shall mechanical penthouses provided the penthouses can not be seen from the street.
(B) The height of any story of a building shall be excluded from the calculation of building height when seventy-five percent (75%) or more of the gross floor area of such story consists of parking required for the building (excluding mechanical penthouse). This exclusion of required parking from the calculation of building height shall be applicable to all permitted and special uses in the B3, D2, D3 and D4 zoning districts including planned developments, with the exception of planned developments in the D3 zoning district. Where the required parking exclusion is applicable, it shall in no case be greater than 4 stories or 40 feet, whichever is less.

SECTION 4: That all ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

SECTION 5: That this ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval, and publication in the manner provided by law.

Introduced: March 27, 2000
Adopted: April 11, 2000

Approved: May 9, 2000
ATTEST:

Mary P. Morris
City Clerk

Approved as to form:

Corporation Counsel

Mayor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Max. Bldg. Height (ft.)</th>
<th>Max. FAR</th>
<th>Max # of Units</th>
<th>Max. Bldg. Height (ft.)</th>
<th>Max. FAR</th>
<th>Max. # of Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>400 sf/unit</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1a</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>350 sf/du</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUE</td>
<td>40 ft or 3 stories, whichever is less</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>4000 sf for sfdu, 2000 sf/du for 2-family, 1500 sf/du for multi-family</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MXE</td>
<td>41 ft or 3 stories, whichever is less</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4000 sf for sfdu, 2000 sf/du for 2-family, 1500 sf/du for multi-family</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>35 ft. or 2.5 stories, whichever is less</td>
<td>45% (Bldg. lot coverage)</td>
<td>5000 sf for sfdu, 3500 sf/du for 2-family</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10% (Bldg lot coverage)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>35 ft. or 2.5 stories, whichever is less</td>
<td>40% (Bldg. lot coverage)</td>
<td>5000 sf for detached sfdu, 2500 sf/du for two-family and up</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15% (Bldg. lot coverage)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45% (Bldg. lot coverage)</td>
<td>1500 sf for first 4 units + 800 sf for each additional unit</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15% (Bldg. lot coverage)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>50% (Bldg. lot coverage)</td>
<td>2,000 sf for first 2 units + 1000 sf for each additional unit</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>20% (Bldg. lot coverage)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>35 ft. or 2.5 stories, whichever is less</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Developments in C1a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>No. of Parking Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>831 Emerson Street</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>9 stories</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515 Main Street</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9 stories</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 Chicago Avenue</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7 stories</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>835 Chicago Avenue</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>9 stories</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817 Chicago Avenue</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4 stories</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>811 Chicago Avenue</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8 stories</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805 Chicago Avenue/525 Kedzie Street</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6 stories</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>737 Chicago Avenue - AMLI</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>6 stories</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Block of Chicago - Courts of Evanston Townhomes</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3 stories</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>