MEETING NOTES
COMP PLAN SUBCOMMITTEE
Wednesday, March 6, 2013
7:30 A.M.
Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Council Chambers

Members Present: Scott Peters, Richard Shure, David Galloway, Barbara Putta, Lenny Asaro

Staff Present: Susan Guderley, Dennis Marino

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Member Peters called the meeting to order at 7:30 A.M.

2. CONTINUED DISCUSSION – MEMBER COMMENTS RE 2000 COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL PLAN

Comments related to Chapter 1 – Land Use

- Members requested working definitions or bullet points of critical considerations, for:
  - Sustainability – how does this apply to land use
  - Livability – aspect of this are associated with LU, sidewalk design, walkability, etc.
  - The meanings may be subjective, age-cohort related. Even with different points of emphasis, try to identify common or shared aspects.

- p. 16-17 - What are areas of the city that are good candidates for redevelopment?
- Chicago Avenue Corridor Recommendations Report and upcoming Main Street TOD study provide insights into that corridor. Central Street Plan – can there be any opportunities found in this corridor?
- Should this section only highly traditional residential/commercial development; what about industrial? Yes, highlight manufacturing areas, too.
- Map on page 18 – Review legend
  - Represents a ‘snap shot’ of the current zoning and the land use pattern it embodied? Comparison of old map vs. new map would be instructive/interesting
  - Comparison of old map vs. new map would be instructive/interesting
- Need to introduce the concept of Mixed-Use districts to an updated map; will be equivalent to mapping B&D districts where mixed uses permitted
- Map’s intent is to show generalized, schematic patterns of land uses.
- Need to add opportunity sites to this map.
- Consider mapping definitions, guiding principles, goals & objective of plan with overlays, transparencies?
- Reiterate or refer to earlier discussion of Density vs. Congestion (DG) – here or in the initial definitions or guiding principles section.
New Plan document format needs to be shorter and more readable; graphics.
Electronic document should include links to pertinent, on-line documents and allow for targeted searches for key terms and topics.
Consider creating a summary plan brochure for public distribution; maybe also separate “modules” for marketing purposes on public facilities, with links to data, charts, chapters.
Organization might also be organized in tiers: tier 1: basic stuff, Tier 2 – elaborates/describes Tier 1 stuff; Tier 3 – links to graphics?

Comments related to Chapter 2 – Neighborhoods
• Is this chapter still necessary? – Can Plan take a city-wide perspective and still recognize presence of smaller geographic units. The concept of a neighborhood is not always commonly held. Some are: Dewey-Darrow Conference, Ridgeville.
• Maybe Evanston’s concept of neighborhoods is not geographic but a state of mind.
• Meaningful concept but difficult to map – re-reading the 2000 CGP discussion it avoids geographic aspects and mostly focuses on livability/quality of life aspects. Good verbiage – should keep most of this language.
• This chapter will tap into states of mind – translate all of the objectives we’ve defined and put it in context of livable neighborhoods. Livability is tied to a place or sense of place.
• There are many components of livability/neighborhood image. Will the plan attempt to define neighborhood boundaries? Can measures of livability be mapped?
• Is it the mission of the plan to define boundaries or break down boundaries? People should be concerned about all issues everywhere - i.e. Livability City-wide
• Refer to guiding principles, objectives, goals to make neighborhoods more livable.
• Not related to real estate markets – can be illegal if “steering”, most ads refer to proximity to lake, NU, transit, etc (not even schools)
• Sense of Place + Quality of Life = Neighborhood

3. NEXT STEPS
   NEXT MEETING – Wednesday, April 3, 7:30 a.m., Room 2403

4. ADJOURNMENT
The meeting adjourned at 9:00 A.M.