AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: August 30, 2017 (Joint ZBA /Plan Commission Meeting)

3. NEW BUSINESS
   A. Text Amendment
      C1a Zoning District 17PLND-0102
      A Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment pursuant to City Code Title 6, Zoning to amend the requirements within the C1a Zoning District.

4. OTHER BUSINESS
   A. 2018 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE
   B. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

6. CHAIR’S REMARKS

7. ADJOURNMENT

The next regular meeting of the Plan Commission is scheduled for WEDNESDAY, January 10, 2018 at 7:00 P.M. in JAMES C. LYTLE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.
MEETING MINUTES
Joint Meeting of the PLAN COMMISSION
& ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
Tuesday, August 30, 2017
7:00 PM
Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Council Chambers

Plan Commission Members Present: Jim Ford, Peter Isaac, Terri Dubin, Colby Lewis, Simon Belisle

Plan Commission Members Absent: Jolene Saul, Andrew Pigozzi, Carol Goddard, Patrick Brown

ZBA Members Present: Myrna Arevalo, Kiril Mirintchev, Violetta Cullen, Mary Beth Berns, Mary McAuley, Lisa Dziekan

ZBA Members Absent: Scott Gingold

Staff Present: Meagan Jones, Melissa Klotz, Scott Mangum, Mario Treto

Presiding Member: Jim Ford

Declaration of Quorum
With a quorum of both the Plan Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals present, the meeting was called to order at 7:05 pm.

Election of Joint Meeting Chair
Ms. Berns motioned for Mr. Ford to serve as Chair of the joint meeting, which was seconded by Mr. Lewis and approved 10-0 with one abstention.

New Business
1829 Simpson Street 17PLND-0037 & 17ZMJV-0065
Rita Kats, property owner, requests a map amendment to rezone the property located at 1829 Simpson Street from the R3 Two-Family Residential District to the B1 Business District (Zoning Code Section 6-3-4, Title 6 of the City Code). The applicant also requests a special use permit for a Type 2 Restaurant in the B1 Business District (Zoning Code Section 6-9-2-3), and major zoning relief for a 4.3’ east interior side yard setback for a roofed patio and one-story addition where 10’ is required (Zoning Code Section 6-9-2-7-E). The Plan Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals make recommendations to City Council, the determining body for this case.
Ms. Jones presented an overview of the requested map amendment, special use, and major zoning relief.

Arkady Kats, applicant, explained the proposal:
- Purchased the property in October 2016
- Restaurant will serve as a gateway from the west side entrance to the City.
- Restaurant will have a nice view of park to the west
- Will serve Mediterranean and Eastern European food combined with a good atmosphere and pricing
- Attended the neighborhood meeting in June to hear concerns
- Back portion of building is in terrible condition so needs to be torn down and rebuilt. New addition will be at least 4.3’ from side property line (existing is at 0’) but extending further back.
- Mr. Kats is also a General Contractor with experience
- Clarified the portion to be torn down is an old 16’ x 10’ addition and will be replaced with a larger addition that is further away from the east property line.
- Addition is needed for kitchen prep area for the bakery
- Fence will surround property to mitigate noise generated from the outdoor patio space. It will be a solid fence on the east side and open fence on the west to provide a view of the park.
- Patio won’t be used for special events; it will be used by restaurant customers only.
- Restaurant will be owner operated
- Outdoor sports field is at least 30’ north of patio on City property and there is 20-30’ of landscaping on the restaurant property to buffer from that.
- Outdoor fireplace will make the outdoor space more inviting
- Garbage will be enclosed to discourage animals from getting at refuse.
- Roll-out garbage cans are acceptable by Groot. Garbage will be picked up once a week.

Ms. Berns suggested garbage should be picked up more than once a week since this is a commercial use.

Ms. McAuley suggested Groot should roll the garbage cans out so that the cans don’t sit out on the parkway in view often. Mr. Kats responded that other businesses in similar situations pay extra for the cans to be rolled out by Groot instead of leaving them out.

Ms. McAuley noted this project should be held to a high standard given its proximity to a large park. Building aesthetics were then discussed. Applicant will attempt to restore
the original brick on the building, but it has been painted over many times so that may not be feasible. Original brick is light red.

Mr. Kats continued:
- Agree to follow the Sustainability Plan for recycling, etc.
- Old addition that will be demolished is 170 square feet and the new addition will be 320 square feet.
- Kitchen prep area will have large mixers and large tables, freezers, and rolling equipment to make the best use of the small space.
- Ovens and possibly a deep fryer will be along the east portion of the building near the ordering area and near the display refrigerators that will feature cakes, pastries, frozen dough and frozen fruit.
- Most commissary deliveries will be brought in by personal vehicle, but large amounts of flour will be delivered approximately every 6 weeks, on Simpson St. - one pallet delivery. There will not be a weekly box truck delivery like many restaurants have.
- Hours of operation are proposed from 11am - 8:30pm for customers.
- Up to 4 employees per shift
- Plenty of parking on the street so employees that drive will park on the street.
- Intend to hire local teenagers and teach them restaurant skills.
- Have experience running a restaurant - previously ran one for 3 years and then the lease ended.
- No sound system or music will be played outdoors.
- Fast-casual concept that will take 5-10 minutes per order.
- Hood vent will go through the roof 3-4' away from the east property line with a parapet surrounding it.

Ms. Arevalo suggested the vent not be so close to the residential property to the east to mitigate restaurant smells. Mr. Kats explained he can move it a few feet further west.

Ms. Berns asked for clarification about where the parapet will be raised and Mr. Kats explained it will be raised all the way around the building. Mr. Ford then asked for clarification on where the HVAC equipment would be located and Mr. Kats responded that it will be on the rooftop and be screened by the parapet.

Mr. Isaac asked if the applicant is open to installing a scrubber given the concern of the restaurant odor and close proximity to residential. The applicant answered he would look into it, and there may be other ways to address the issue depending on the hood type that is used.
Mr. Kats explained customers will only be able to enter the premises from the front door. Customers can take their food to go. There will even be an option to text your order in. Customers that eat in the rear patio will have outdoor garbage cans as well as indoor. Customer garbage is on the east side of the property.

Ms. Arevalo asked about the proposed fence, explaining an open fence on the west side of the property by the park may allow garbage from outdoor patrons may blow through the fence into the park. Ms. Berns explained the applicant is responsible for collecting all garbage within 250’ of the property per the Litter Collection Plan required of all Type 2 Restaurants.

Ms. Berns asked if it would be possible to construct a trash enclosure in the parkway, and Ms. Klotz explained the City does not want permanent structures in the parkway, but the garbage can issue could be addressed by either limiting the time garbage cans can be out in the parkway or by requiring the garbage pickup company to roll the cans through the building themselves if possible.

Ms. Dubin asked for clarification on the garbage cans and Mr. Kats clarified they will be small cans similar to residential garbage cans, not metal dumpsters. There is no alley access or other area to locate the garbage for pickup.

Chair Ford noted a continuance may be requested in writing, to a date certain. There were no requests for a continuance.

Public Comment:
Former City Clerk Rodney Greene - clarified a majority of the residents in the area of the restaurant are not in favor of the requested zoning change because it will increase traffic, and because there are many rodents in the area already even though there isn’t any restaurant waste currently. Bringing the garbage through the restaurant out to the parkway could contaminate customer food in process. The property is not a good fit for a restaurant. Many nearby residents were not contacted, including the residents immediately next door. Mr. Greene asked the procedure to request a continuance.

Chair Ford explained a continuance may be requested but those that testify tonight cannot testify again at the next meeting.

Mr. Greene continued to explain there is not ample parking for the restaurant, and street parking is often full.

Betty Ester explained she was previously told the property could not be used for affordable housing because the area was owned by MWRD. Previous request for
cabinet-making was denied due to the fumes that would be emitted. Ms. Esther asked what the correct property lines are since there is conflicting information, and will the restaurant use any part of the City or MWRD land for the restaurant or access to the patio area. Ms. Esther noted residents have not been aware of the proposal since October 2016 as stated by the applicant.

Ms. Klotz noted a survey approximately 100 years old shows the property at 152 feet long, but the current survey as well as the neighboring plat of survey show the property is 159 feet long. Either way, there is no part of the proposal that is affected by the 7’ discrepancy.

Carlis Sutton, 1821 Darrow Ave., spoke in opposition to the proposal. Building has never been a restaurant. It was a convenience store and beauty shop.

Priscilla Giles stated there was never a restaurant at the property, but there was a snackery that sold candy for a short time. Nothing was cooked on site. Housing similar to what is next door could be designed for the site. There used to be a driveway on the property where the park now is (which wasn’t there at the time) that lead to the house that used to be on the property. The rear patio invites trash and rodents to the area. A restaurant does not fit in the neighborhood.

Mr. Kats explained the property to the east is 80 feet wide and this property is 27 feet wide so it is not feasible to build something similar to what is next door.

Tina Foster, 2026 Dodge Ave., sees rats crossing Dodge regularly and is therefore very concerned about garbage and rodents at the restaurant. Ms. Foster also noted concern over the aesthetics of the building and whether it will improve the neighborhood or not, and the lack of parking. Ms. Foster prefers to park on the street rather than her driveway for safety reasons, and often cannot find one parking space.

Madelyn Ducre, 2039 Brown Ave., noted the area has lost a lot over the years. The applicant does not appear to know exactly what he wants to do at the property. The neighborhood needs to know all exact details. Ms. Ducre asked the following: If the applicant runs out of money will he request money from the City to complete the project? What happens if the restaurant does not work out, or if a liquor license is requested? What will be done with the patio in the winter?

Former Alderman Delores Holmes noted she will only speak about the rezoning, and stated as Alderman last October she was notified by City staff of a proposal to convert the building to a residence and add a second story. The building was not previously vacant - the previous owner illegally operated a business. Neighbors have said they are
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not comfortable with the property being used as a restaurant. Neighbors who are renters feel their voices have not been heard and they do not have a say. With rezoning to B1, many other uses would be allowed such as a brewery. The zoning change is not appropriate for the neighborhood.

Former Mayor Lorraine Morton, 2102 Darrow, explained public housing is located next door. Ms. Morton spoke to one of the residents of that property who is not in favor of living next door to a restaurant. Ms. Morton used to own the property and sold it to Cook County years ago for housing. The 5th Ward has had a revival and has had many improvements, so a bad project could be detrimental to the neighborhood. Parking will be an issue. There are trees surrounding the property that may be harmed. There are small animals that will get into the garbage.

Daphne Watson, 1822 Simpson requests the rezoning be withdrawn. Ms. Watson was not aware the building was sold or anything was proposed until very recently. There is no street parking available. This business will not serve the community. What happens when the restaurant fails - what will come in next? The neighborhood does not need another place that draws in people from other neighborhoods, it needs something that serves and uplifts this neighborhood such as a library.

Elizabeth Brasher stated she is concerned that Mr. Kats has not adequately answered many of the questions raised. People will not want to eat in a restaurant that garbage cans have to be carried through, and no one wants to look at the garbage cans in front of the property. It appears Mr. Kats is not aware what the community wants, and was a market study done to determine what type of food the area would want. There is not ample parking currently so there definitely will not be ample parking with a restaurant there. The restaurant will not last.

Chair Ford closed the Public Comment, and explained both the Plan Commission and ZBA are recommending bodies so it is possible the Commission and Board make conflicting recommendations that move forward to the City Council

The Plan Commission entered Deliberation:

Mr. Belisle stated he had difficulty seeing how the second standard for rezoning was met, given the more recent rezoning and that the proposed rezoning would break the continuity. Mr Isaac responded that the property has been rezoned from a commercial use, however, other properties have been recently rezoned after fairly recent broader rezoning. He agreed that the proposed rezoning would break the continuity of zoning in the area but that seems to speak more to the first standard for rezoning.
Chair Ford stated that the proposal looks like spot zoning and agreed that there may be an issue with the second standard.

Mr. Belisle stated that if the adjacent residents were property owners they would likely have concerns about the restaurant use affected their property values, affecting the third rezoning standard.

Mr. Lewis asked what could be built on the property given its zoning and current lot size and Ms. Klotz explained since the property is already existing, a single family home is permitted even though the minimum lot size is not met for the R3 District. The lot size and building setbacks are legally-nonconforming.

Mr. Isaac asked if there is any permitted use in the R3 that the property can be used for currently, and Ms. Klotz explained a single family residence is permitted but either parking would have to be added or a parking variation granted. For other R3 uses it would depend on the exact use and parking requirement, but yes some uses could locate there.

Mr. Belisle asked what the basis for denying the previous attempt to rezone the property was. Staff was unaware of precisely why the project was not approved outside of ultimately not meeting the standards for approval.

Mr. Isaac asked if the lack of public alley adjacent to the building affects the property's ability to meet standard number four which speaks to adequacy of public facilities and services. He stated that he believes that without the access to have trash picked up from an alley and having additional trash generated from the restaurant that the fourth standard may not be met.

Chair Ford inquired about the driveway on the adjacent property and if the possibility of obtaining an easement to use that driveway had been pursued. Mr. Kats stated that he looked into that but that discussions did not get very far.

Mr. Belisle motioned to recommend approval of the map amendment. With no second, the motion died. Mr. Belisle motioned to recommend denial of the map amendment, which was seconded by Ms. Dubin. A roll call vote was taken and the motion was approved 5-0 to recommend denial to City Council.

Ayes: Belisle, Dubin, Ford, Isaac, Lewis
Nays: none.

ZBA Deliberation:
Ms. Berns asked staff if the public notice is deficient with regard to the raised roof that is not shown in the plans and therefore was not stated as a variation in the public notice. Ms. Klotz responded staff is looking into the situation in conjunction with Law, so for the time being the meeting should continue to move forward with the case.

Ms. McAuley noted there has been a lot of positive work along Simpson St. and plans are to re-activate Simpson St. as a commercial corridor. However, this proposal does not meet the Standards of upholding excellence in the community for a park-side establishment. The proposal does not take into account the requests of the neighborhood given the proximity to the neighborhood and details are not finalized.

Ms. Cullen agreed, noting the parkway is not adequate for commercial garbage pickup. Without an alley, a restaurant is not appropriate at the property.

Ms. Dziekan stated there are too many unanswered details and inconsistencies.

Mr. Mirintchev agreed that not all details are set yet and noted the property is an extremely challenging lot. The property is not conducive for a residential use, but the proposal as presented is not adequate.

Ms. Arevalo agreed the proposal is not fully thought out since there were many questions that were answered with “I don’t know” and “we’ll see”. The property is appropriate for a restaurant but only if it is integrated into the community and the park for the proper cohesion. That has not been planned or displayed to the community.

Ms. Berns stated she believes the proposal is appropriate. She understands that some questions may not have specific answers at this point and that sometimes it is appropriate to wait and see. It appears that a lack of sophistication in presentation hurt the entire proposal. This proposal is extremely similar to the last request for a Type 2 Restaurant the ZBA reviewed for 2628 Gross Point Rd., where questions were raised and the applicant responded that they would do what is best for the community. That project was recommended for approval.

Standards for Major Variation:
1. No; Yes - Berns
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. Yes
6. No; Yes - Berns
7. Yes
Ms. McAuley motioned to recommend approval and was seconded by Ms. Dziekan. With a vote of 1-5 for approval, the requested variation is recommended for denial.

Standards for Special Use
1. Yes
2. Yes
3. No; Yes - Berns
4. No; Yes - Berns
5. No; Yes - Berns
6. No; Yes - Berns
7. NA
8. NA
9. Yes

Ms. McAuley motioned to recommend approval of the special use with conditions, which was seconded by Ms. Dziekan. With a vote of 1-5 for approval, the special use was recommended for denial.

Conditions:
1. Hours of operation shall not exceed 10:30am - 8:30pm
2. No amplified music outside
3. Fencing shall be installed as shown on the plans except that there shall not be a gate on the fence on the west side of the property leading to the park
4. Employees shall park in a City parking lot
5. Trash in the rear must be in a lockable enclosure
6. Lighting shall be dimmed when the restaurant is not in operation, to the minimum level adequate for safety.
7. The restaurant must have an aggressive monthly rodent control plan.
8. Commercial garbage pickup is required at least two times per week and must be picked up by the garbage company directly from the trash enclosure and wheeled through the restaurant so that at no time are there garbage cans sitting out on the parkway
9. Substantial compliance with the documents and testimony on record including Sustainability Plan

The meeting adjourned at 10:05pm.
Plan Commission

Text Amendment

C1a Zoning District
17PLND-0102
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: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment
         A Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to amend the requirements within
         the C1a Zoning District.
         17PLND-0102
Date: November 30, 2017

Request
Staff and the Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission recommend amending the
Zoning Ordinance to amend the requirements within the C1a Zoning District.

Notice
The Application has been filed in conformance with applicable procedural and public
notice requirements.

Analysis
History
April 24, 2017- City 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.

August 30, 2017- Plan Commission referred this item to its Zoning Committee for further
review. Staff performed research on the C1a district, including previous amendments to
the District requirements and information about recent developments within the District,
to be presented to the Zoning Committee.

October 11, 2017 – The Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission began to look at the
C1a Commercial Mixed-Use Zoning District and evaluate possible changes to the
Zoning Code to address concerns regarding density, height, unit sizes, and walkability
within the areas zoned C1a. During this meeting, the Committee expressed that the
intent of the zoning district appears to fit the areas where it is located but that some
amendments could be made to the code to address concerns mentioned above. The
Committee ultimately decided to send the item back to staff for additional information.
about existing conditions and possible recommendations for text amendments to the C1a District.

November 15, 2017 – Staff returned to the Zoning Committee with the requested information and recommendations for possible amendments to the C1a Commercial Mixed Use Zoning District. The possible recommendations included:

- Increasing the minimum lot size per dwelling unit (Section 6-10-3-4) from 350 sq. ft. to 400 sq. ft. per dwelling unit.
- Reducing the maximum planned development site development allowance for dwelling units from 40% to 30%.
- Further reducing the height allowed by right from 67 feet to 55 feet. Additional height could then be permitted with an increase in front yard building setback at a rate of 5 feet in height per additional foot of front yard setback provided. Alternately, the building height allowed could remain the same, but a required front setback could be established from the curb to the face of the building to allow for adequate pedestrian walkway using both public right-of-way and private property.

The committee discussed each of the possible recommendations and ultimately voted, 2-1, to recommend changing the C1a regulations as they relate to minimum lot size per dwelling unit (increase from 350 sq. ft. to 400 sq. ft.) as well as adopt regulations for a minimum sidewalk width within the district of 12 feet. The recommendation is incorporated in the proposed text amendment below.

**Background**
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 resulted 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 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, number of parking spaces, FAR and lot size per dwelling unit 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 and Zoning Committee.

Looking at the revised recent development chart (attached), there is a range of heights from 3 stories (or 37.5 feet) to 9 stories (or 103 feet). The density of these developments varies greatly from approximately 175 square feet per unit (831 Emerson St. development) to 1,378 square feet per unit (the Courts of Evanston Townhomes at Chicago Ave. and South Blvd). The exact FAR for the developments which was not readily accessible also varies from 2.73 to 4.66.

Per the Public Works Agency, the minimum sidewalk width allowed is 5 feet 6 inches. Within the C1a district, sidewalk widths vary. The recently approved 831 Emerson planned development will have a sidewalk width of 11 feet 6 inches from the curb to the building. The Main development at 835 Chicago Avenue has similarly wider sidewalks at approximately 12 feet. The area near Cross-Rhodes restaurant at the 525 Main Street development has a smaller sidewalk width of approximately 8 feet 6 inches from
the curb to the building (with the width in front of Cross-Rhodes restaurant being slightly narrower).

Proposal Overview
Based on the information obtained and discussions with the Zoning Committee, the following amendments are proposed relating to minimum lot size and sidewalk width within the C1a Zoning District:

Section 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) four hundred (400) square feet per dwelling unit.

Section 6-10-3-8. - Yard Requirements.

The yard requirements for the C1a district are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>Front yard</th>
<th>Building, none, except where required by Section 6-10-3-11; parking, landscaped setback required subject to design and project review as set forth in Chapter 3 of this Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>Side yard abutting a street</td>
<td>Building, zero (0) feet, except where required by Section 6-10-3-11; parking, five (5) feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 6-10-3-11. Special Regulations for Pedestrian Area

Within the C1a district, the pedestrian area from the curb to the building façade must be a minimum of twelve (12) feet.
Standards of Approval
The proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment regarding the minimum lot area and pedestrian area requirements of the C1a Zoning District meets the standards for approval of amendments per Section 6-3-4-5 of the City Code. The amendment will help promote a more walkable environment as is currently seen within the district. The proposed amendment will also aid in maintaining density within the transit oriented while mitigating possible negative effects of new development on adjacent properties and encouraging larger dwelling unit sizes.

The proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive General Plan’s objective to maintain the appealing character of Evanston’s neighborhoods while guiding their change as well as the policy action of encouraging new developments to complement existing street and sidewalk patterns. The proposed text amendment will not have any adverse effects on the values of the properties in the area. Instead, the proposed text amendment would seek to maintain or enhance the values of the properties.

Recommendation
Staff and the Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission believe the proposed text amendment to the C1a Zoning District meets the standards of approval as outlined above. Staff recommends the Plan Commission make a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding for the proposed text amendment.

Attachments
- Ordinance 42-O-00
- Existing C1a Regulations
- Zoning Map
- Chart of Developments within the C1a District
- Adjacent Zoning District Comparison
- The packet to November 15, 2017 Zoning Committee meeting: https://www.cityofevanston.org/home/showdocument?id=29476
- Approved Minutes from the October 11, 2017 Zoning Committee Meeting
- Draft Minutes from the November 15, 2017 Zoning Committee Meeting
42-O-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 1; 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
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:

| (A) | Front yard | Building, none; parking, landscaped setback required subject to design and project review as set forth in |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Chapter 3 of this Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>Side yard abutting a street</td>
<td>Building, zero (0) feet; parking, five (5) feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>Side yard when abutting residential district</td>
<td>Building, fifteen (15) feet; parking, ten (10) feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>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)</td>
<td>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)
## Developments in C1a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Lot Size (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>No. of Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Lot Size per unit (sq. ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>831 Emerson Street</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>42,331</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>9 stories (103 ft)</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515 Main Street</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>42,985</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9 stories (103 ft)</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900 Chicago Avenue</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>26,297</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7 stories (75 ft)</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>835 Chicago Avenue</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>30,500</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>9 stories (97 ft)</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817 Chicago Avenue</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>9,805</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4 stories (46.25 ft)</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>811 Chicago Avenue</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>19,443</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8 stories (92 ft)</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805 Chicago Avenue/525 Kedzie Street</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>13,366</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6 stories (67 ft)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>737 Chicago Avenue - AMLI</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>85,525</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>6 stories (62 ft)</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Block of Chicago - Courts of Evanston Townhomes</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>124,050</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3 stories (37.5 ft)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1,378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Zoning District Comparison

<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 fr 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 fr 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>
MEETING MINUTES
ZONING COMMITTEE OF THE PLAN COMMISSION
Wednesday, October 11, 2017
7:00 p.m.
Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 4802

Members Present: Carol Goddard, Colby Lewis, Terri Dubin, Simon Belisle, Peter Isaac

Members Absent:

Other Plan Commission Members Present: none

Staff Present: Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Scott Mangum, 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 October 21, 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 5-0.

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.

Ms. Meagan Jones gave a brief overview explaining the origins of the referral describing the existing locations for the C1a zoning district and current uses/development within the district, and possible solutions to concerns raised regarding several district regulations.

Chairman Lewis inquired whether there are other zoning districts that would meet similar intent of the C1a District.
Commissioner Belisle stated that the Zoning appears to fit the area, especially with regards to permitted uses, and that adjacent uses include 3 to 4 story apartment and condominium buildings.

Chairman Lewis stated that there has been increased development creating a more vibrant corridor than what was there previously.

Commissioner Belisle asked if there could be some provision that requires wider sidewalks similar to those created by the AMLI development. Chairman Lewis stated that there is a ziggurat setback for the rear yard which abuts less dense zoning districts in the area. He then stated that the canyon effect is not as significant on the western side of Chicago Avenue and Commissioner Belisle stated that lot sizes are also fairly small adjacent to the train tracks.

Commissioner Goddard stated that the Committee needs clarification on the Alderman’s concerns about the zoning district. Mr. Mangum clarified that Alderman Wynne’s concerns were the increased occurrence of smaller units (the lot area per dwelling unit is too small), the narrow widths of sidewalks especially next to a façade of a larger development creating a canyon effect, as well as the possibility of the C1a being expanded to other areas of the City, and keeping the streets pedestrian friendly.

There was discussion regarding how to best address the concerns raised by the Alderman, including a provision for increasing setbacks for residential floors of mixed-use buildings and keeping commercial uses on the ground floor at the lot line. A building stepback above the typical cornice height could be made to keep pedestrian walkability. This could be similar to the downtown district where there are several streets which require a ziggurat setback. The committee then addressed alleviating issues with narrow sidewalk width by adjusting the building setbacks.

A question was raised on what the intent of the C1a district is and what other districts may be able to be put in its place. Staff provided clarification on the zoning requirements within the C1a as well as a comparison to similar zoning districts. The Committee observed that surrounding districts had significantly lower FAR and could possibly create nonconforming structures if applied to the C1a zoning district. The area southwest of Lee Street is transit rich so greater density and FAR is more acceptable in that area.

Commissioner Goddard stated that a precedent had been set with newer development and that changing the zoning might not be appropriate at this point. Commissioner Isaac stated that now is time to change regulations as there are no major development projects proposed within the area being looked at.

Commissioner Dubin inquired about what current zoning regulations prohibit the goals the Alderman ultimately wants for the area. Chair Lewis stated that the front yard setback being up to the lot line seems to be a major factor. He used the recent 1571 Maple development as an example for density, sidewalk width and pedestrian scale.
Belisle used the Cross-Rhodes Restaurant building as an example of where the sidewalk becomes very narrow and discussion followed regarding possible ways to obtain wider sidewalks. Commissioner Isaac stated that the City cannot legislate giving up property for this purpose but the building setback could be adjusted. Larger developments (planned developments) enable more negotiation with regards to this concern. Questions arose of what new development would come in that would not be a planned development as there are few undeveloped lots along Chicago Avenue in this area but several lots exist that could be redeveloped.

Possible solutions to address concerns included slightly lowering the maximum height and, if a greater building setback is provided (at least at the ground level) allowing a greater maximum height in return. With regards to density, reducing the maximum percentage increase for site development allowances was suggested. A possibility of creating requirements for unit mix was suggested but it was agreed to start with adjusting existing requirements. It was clarified that unit mix is largely a market driven aspect of a development as is size of the units.

Commissioner Isaac suggested keeping the height cap within the C1a at 97 feet with site development allowances but reducing the base maximum height to encourage wider sidewalk in exchange for height. Setback for upper levels were discussed, specifically how to determine (standard height across the board versus based on use).

C1a was seen by the Committee as having the appropriate goal, and being appropriate for the TOD area, but adjustments could be made to achieve solutions for concerns raised. The zoning can be modified in order to achieve goals of a more walkable environment.

The Committee requested that additional information on the Floor Area Ratio (FAR), building height in feet, and square footage of lots with recent development be added to the chart provided in the meeting packet along with possible recommendations for code revisions.

The Commissioners voted to continue the discussion to a date to be determined in order to gather additional information.

4. **ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Belisle made a motion for adjournment and Commissioner Dubin seconded the motion. With all commissioners in favor, the meeting was adjourned at 8:20 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Meagan Jones
Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Community Development Department
MEETING MINUTES
ZONING COMMITTEE OF THE PLAN COMMISSION
Wednesday, November 15, 2017
7:00 P.M.
Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Room 4802

Members Present: Carol Goddard, Colby Lewis, Terri Dubin

Members Absent: Simon Belisle, Peter Isaac

Other Plan Commission Members Present: none

Staff Present: Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Scott Mangum, 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 October 11, 2017 Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission Meeting Minutes:

Chair Lewis requested a minor edit to the minutes. Commissioner Dubin then made a motion to approve the minutes as amended.

Commissioner Goddard seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken and the minutes were approved as amended with a voice vote 3-0.

3. OLD 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.

Ms. Meagan Jones gave a brief overview of what was discussed at the October Zoning Committee meeting, revisions made to the recent development data in the C1a chart, and provided a brief overview of what staff proposed as possible text amendment...
including: Increase in the minimum lot size per dwelling unit from 350 square feet to 400 square feet; reduction of the maximum planned development site development allowance for dwelling units from 40% to 30%; reduction of the the height allowed by right from 67 feet to 55 feet with a height incentive possible should an increase in front yard building setback be provided at a rate of 5 feet in height per additional foot of front yard setback provided or establishing a required front setback from the curb to the face of the building to allow for adequate pedestrian walkway using both public right-of-way and private property.

Discussion followed regarding the intent of the suggested amendments. The proposed reduction of the site development allowance for the number of dwelling units in planned developments and the increase in minimum lot size for the district was intended to encourage larger units. It was emphasized that this is not a guaranteed result due to the ability for Council to grant site development allowances above code requirements with a supermajority vote.

Chair Lewis inquired about how existing and proposed regulations compare to neighboring zoning districts. The zoning district comparison chart indicated the existing and proposed revisions would be in line with nearby zoning districts.

A brief discussion followed regarding sidewalks. Commissioner Goddard inquired about who provides sidewalk widths for larger developments. Staff responded that it can be either the City or the developer who push to provide sidewalks above the minimum requirement. Examples were given where the City pressed for wider sidewalks as well as instances where pedestrian area requirements have been written into the code such as with the Central Street Overlay District. Commissioner Lewis pointed out that a developer ultimately has no control of where a curb is should the City decide to widen a street or alternately, widen a sidewalk.

Commissioner Goddard expressed that she is still uncertain that the proposed amendments are needed. Dubin inquired how much the proposed amendments might reduce density and what consequences may be. A brief discussion followed regarding the optimal location of the district with regards to transit and fairly wide streets. Chair Lewis asked about the establishment of the C1a and if the establishment of the district and changes adopted in 2000 have been optimal. Commissioner Goddard responded that she believes they are but would not support increasing those standards.

Commissioner Lewis stated that he has concerns regarding the sidewalk widths, comparing sidewalks of the AMLI development to those of the townhomes near South Boulevard as an example. He stated that providing an incentive to get wider sidewalks could lead to taller buildings than preferred as well as inconsistent sidewalk widths throughout the district. Additionally, sidewalk furniture and landscaping would need to be taken into consideration.

Clarification was provided on the proposed recommended text amendments and a discussion followed regarding appropriate sidewalk widths, market demand for smaller
units and studios and possible development sites within the district. It was also stated that a reduction in building heights likely is not needed if the proposed incentive is not adopted.

Commissioner Goddard made a motion to recommend to the Plan Commission to increase the minimum lot size per dwelling unit from 350 square feet to 400 square feet and to require a sidewalk width of 12 feet within the C1a Commercial Mixed Use District. Commissioner Dubin seconded the motion.

The motion was approved by a voice vote, 2-1.

Ayes: Dubin, Goddard
Nays: Lewis

4. **ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Dubin made a motion for adjournment and Commissioner Goddard seconded the motion. With all commissioners in favor, the meeting was adjourned at 8:01 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Meagan Jones
Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Community Development Department
Memorandum

To: Members of the Plan Commission
From: Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Subject: Proposed 2018 meeting dates for the Plan Commission
Date: December 6, 2017

Evanston Plan Commission Meeting Schedule 2018

Below are the proposed meeting times of the Evanston Plan Commission. The meetings are scheduled on the second Wednesday of each month. All meetings start at 7PM and are located in City Council Chambers unless otherwise noted.

Wednesday, January 10, 2018
Wednesday, February 14, 2018
Wednesday, March 14, 2018
Wednesday, April 11, 2018
Wednesday, May 9, 2018
Wednesday, June 13, 2018
Wednesday, July 11, 2018
Wednesday, August 8, 2018
Wednesday, September 12, 2018
Wednesday, October 10, 2018
Wednesday, November 14, 2018
Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Note: Additional meetings may be scheduled as needed on the fourth Wednesday of each month.

The Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission meetings will be scheduled on a per need basis on the third Wednesday of the month.