



MEETING MINUTES

LAND USE COMMISSION

Wednesday, March 26th , 2025

7:00 PM

Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, James C. Lytle City Council Chambers

Members Present: Chair Jeanne Lindwall, Kiril Mirintchev, Darush Mabadi, Max Puchtel, Brian Johnson, Jameika Mangum, Loren Berlin

Members Absent: Myrna Arevalo

Staff Present: Neighborhood Land Use Planner Meagan Jones, Policy and Planning Supervisor Erin Baynes, Senior Planner Samuel Hubbard Community Development Director Sarah Flax

Presiding Member: Jeanne Lindwall

I. CALL TO ORDER/DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Lindwall opened the meeting at 7:00pm. Neighborhood Land Use Planner Meagan Jones called the roll and a quorum was met.

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: November 20, 2024

Commissioner Johnson moved to approve the November 20th 2024 meeting minutes as amended by Chair Lindwall.

Commissioner Mirintchev Seconded.

Ayes: Chair Lindwall, Commissioner Mirintchev, Commissioner Puchtel, Commissioner Johnson

Nays: Commissioner Berlin, Commissioner Mabadi, Commissioner Mangum

Abstain:

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Public Hearing | Special Use | 1905-1909 Howard St. | 25ZMJV-0006

Joy Powell, applicant, submits a Special Use application requesting to amend the existing Special Use approval granted by Ordinance 120-O-14 to expand a Daycare Center—Child, A Step By Step Learning Academy, in the C1 Commercial District (Section 6-10-2-3). The Land Use Commission makes a recommendation to the City Council, the determining body for this case in accordance with Section 6-3-5 of the Evanston Zoning Code. PIN: 10-25-113-045-0000.

Joy Powell, owner of Step-by-Step Learning Academy at 1909 Greenleaf Street in Evanston, explained that during the pandemic, the school expanded to allow for better social distancing by adding two classrooms—one for toddlers and one for junior kindergartners. She is now requesting approval to add an indoor playroom, since the children currently have no indoor or on-site outdoor play space and must go to a nearby park. The new playroom would also allow toddlers to have a dedicated classroom.

Commissioner Mangum asked Joy Powell whether drop-off for the daycare occurs on Dodge Avenue or Howard Street, seeking clarification on traffic flow and logistics related to the location of the facility.

Joy Powell responded that drop-off occurs neither on Dodge or Howard, but primarily takes place in the parking lot behind the building. Parents park there and enter through the back door.

Commissioner Putchel confirmed that Ms. Powell agreed to meet the conditions outlined within the staff report. Ms. Powell confirmed that she did.

Chair Lindwall closed public comment and moved to review the Standards

The Chair reviewed the Standards for a Special Use (Section 6-3-5-10).

1. Is one of the listed special uses for the zoning district in which the property lies: *Met, a daycare is a special use within the C1 district.*
2. Complies with the purposes and the policies of the Comprehensive General Plan and the Zoning ordinance as amended from time to time: *Met, maintaining an active storefront on Howard Ave is appropriate and this is an existing use that serves a community need.*
3. Will not cause a negative cumulative effect, when its effect is considered in conjunction with the cumulative effect of various special uses of all types on the immediate neighborhood and the effect of the proposed type of special use upon the City as a whole: *Met. This is an existing daycare that has been in operation for a number of years without any complaints.*
4. Does not interfere with or diminish the value of property in the neighborhood: *Met. This facility has been in existence for a number of years without any issue and expansion is not anticipated to create additional issues.*
5. Is adequately served by public facilities and services: *Met. This is an existing building and tenant space.*
6. Does not cause undue traffic congestion: *Met. Drop-off and pick-up are handled within the parking lot and not on the street.*
7. Preserves significant historical and architectural resources: *Not Applicable*
8. Preserves significant natural and environmental resources: *Not Applicable*
9. Complies with all other applicable regulations of the district in which it is located and other applicable ordinances, except to the extent such regulations have been modified through the planned development process or the grant of a variation:

Met. An expansion of a Special Use will comply with all existing Special Use conditions and any added as part of this approval.

Commissioner Puchtel Moved to approve the Special Use at 1905-1909 Howard St., 25ZMJV-0006, with conditions as outlined in the staff report (and below).

Commissioner Mirintchev Seconded.

Conditions:

- 1. Up to 60 children may be served by the Daycare Center - Child subject to Illinois Department of Children & Family Services (DCFS) approval.**
- 2. Daycare Center - Child operated between the hours of 6:00 am - 9:00 pm only.**
- 3. Employees are not to park on the street during hours of operation.**
- 4. Applicant to record Ordinance amending the existing Special Use with the Cook County Recorder of Deeds.**

Ayes: Chair Lindwall, Commissioner Mirintchev, Commissioner Mabadi, Commissioner Puchtel, Commissioner Johnson, Commissioner Mangum, Commissioner Berlin

Nays:

Abstain:

B. Public Hearing | Major Variations | 2206 Maple Avenue, 2215-2219 Maple Avenue & 916 ½ Noyes Street | 25ZMJV-0003

Paul Harb, applicant, of 2206 Map LLC, requests Major Variations to allow construction of a 5-story multi-family residential building with 30 dwelling units (including 6 bonus dwelling units per IHO), and 29 parking spaces (18 within the building and 11 on the exterior of the site) in the R5 General Residential District. The applicant requests the following Major Variations for the property at 2206 Maple Avenue: 1) Section 6-8-7-4, to allow 24 dwelling units (including 6 on-site inclusionary units) + 6 market rate bonus units for 30 total dwelling units where a maximum of 19 dwelling units is allowed; 2) Section 6-16-3-5, Table 16-B, to allow 20 off-street parking spaces (18 onsite and 2 offsite) where code requires a minimum of 27 off-street parking spaces; 3) Section 6-16-4-4, to allow a 9.5' x 25' short loading berth where code requires a 10' x 35' short loading berth, and; 4) Section 6-4-6-3(A)1, to allow 72% rear yard coverage with parking and loading uses, where code restricts maximum rear yard coverage to 40% for these uses in a residential district. Javier Viera, co-applicant, of the Garrett Evangelical Theological Seminary, requests the following Major Variation for the property at 2215-2219 Maple Avenue and 916 ½ Noyes Street: Section 6-16-3-5, Table 16-B, to allow 16 off-street parking spaces (with 11 of those 16 spaces provided on the 2206 Maple Avenue property) where code requires a minimum of 28 off-street parking spaces. The applicant and co-applicant may seek and the Land Use Commission may consider additional variations as may be necessary or desirable for the

proposed development. The Land Use Commission makes a recommendation to the City Council, the determining body for this case. PINs: 11-07-119-019-0000, 11-07-120-049-8001.

Paul Harb, developer and owner, introduced a proposed 30-unit apartment building on a currently underutilized, tax-exempt parking lot previously owned by the seminary. He highlighted that the project would double the required affordable housing—providing 20% instead of the mandated 10%—offering larger units with 2, 3, and 4 bedrooms. Harb emphasized the benefits of the development: addressing Evanston’s affordable housing goals, increasing tax revenue (estimated at \$250,000 annually), enhancing the neighborhood, and delivering a modern design compatible with existing buildings. He noted that while the project could have been built “by right” with fewer affordable units, he chose to push for a more meaningful proposal, despite construction cost challenges. He is requesting zoning relief to allow five additional units and concluded by expressing openness to discussion and questions.

Greg Geslicki, the project architect, discussed the design challenges and solutions for the proposed 30-unit building. His first concern was how to manage the existing surface parking lot, which is subject to a legal covenant requiring a certain number of spaces to be maintained for another party. Designing around this constraint led to a complex process focused on preserving essential parking while integrating key building functions.

To accommodate necessary amenities, they had to remove a few parking spots. The final design includes 29 parking spaces, a mix of unit sizes (studios up to 4-bedrooms), and maintains windows on all four sides of the building for light and ventilation.

Mr. Geslicki emphasized the inclusion of interior “DS” (den-style) spaces intended for work-from-home needs, citing noise issues in typical living spaces. The building was designed with energy, functionality, and livability in mind.

Architecturally, the building features a modern design with classical proportions—such as a base, middle, and top—and a two-story recessed entrance for emphasis. The aim is to create a building that fits the neighborhood without mimicking it, using a “contemporary composition with traditional cues.” Geslicki concluded by inviting questions from the commission.

Chair Lindwall asked if the “dens” shown in the unit layouts were being considered as bedrooms. Mr. Hubbard clarified they are treated as dens, not bedrooms. They won’t have full-height walls and will remain open, distinguishing them from bedrooms for zoning purposes.

Chair Lindwall also asked why stormwater is being routed to Maple Avenue instead of the alley. Mr. Hubbard responded that this was a requirement from the City’s Engineering Division. Most likely, the storm sewer capacity on Maple is greater than in the alley.

Chair Lindwall then referred to a mention in the application materials about leveraging the Cook County affordable housing property tax incentive and asked for more detail.

Mr. Harb explained that the Cook County property tax incentive for affordable housing is a relatively new program, and there is not yet much experience or feedback available regarding its long-term effects. The incentive offers about a 20% reduction on property taxes for qualifying affordable units. Mr. Harb said he is choosing to pursue the program as part of his personal commitment to increasing affordable housing, noting that he has opted to double the required number of affordable units in the project. He acknowledged that, from a financial standpoint, most developers would prefer to build market-rate units and retain higher revenue, but emphasized that this was a decision he felt was important to make. He also noted the challenge in projecting future property values, given that the project is still about three years away from completion.

Commissioner Mabadi had several concerns regarding the proposed project, specifically focusing on the scale of the request for relief and the parking arrangements. He expressed that while he supports new apartment buildings in Evanston, the requested relief seemed large, especially when considering the projected rental income for the units. He noted that the rents for the units, including studios and four-bedroom units, appeared lower than market rates in comparison to similar developments in the area, such as Tapestry Station. Commissioner Mabadi questioned how the rental prices were determined and whether they were realistic given the rising costs of construction.

Mr. Harb clarified that the rental rates were based on market research and input from real estate experts, and emphasized that the numbers were still estimates since the project is in its early stages. He also explained that the affordability component of the project, including 20% of the units being affordable, was a factor in the pricing decisions. Despite Mabadi's concerns, Harb reiterated that adjustments to the rents could be made if necessary.

Regarding parking, Commissioner Mabadi expressed concerns about the potential for increased street parking in an already tight neighborhood. Harb replied that the project had been designed to include as many parking spaces as possible, given the constraints of the lot and the requirements set by the city. He also mentioned that feedback from experts in design and planning had suggested further reducing the number of parking spaces in favor of more amenities, such as bike storage. Harb emphasized that the building's design had already incorporated significant parking, and he believed the project would not have a significant negative effect on street parking, especially given the proximity to public transportation and existing parking lots.

Conversation ensued that highlighted the balance between meeting neighborhood needs, the challenges of urban development, and the desire for sustainable and efficient designs, with Harb expressing a commitment to meeting the city's requirements while also providing necessary amenities.

Commissioner Johnson asked about the expected distribution of the six affordable units. Mr. Harb explained that the affordable units would be evenly distributed across the

floors, with two units on each of the first, second, and fourth floors. He noted that this was consistent with the inclusionary housing ordinance's requirement for an even distribution.

Commissioner Johnson questioned the building's height and its fit with the surrounding environment. He suggested that a four-story building with 24 units might be more appropriate for the scale of the neighborhood, as most of the surrounding buildings were in the four-story range. He also pointed out that a smaller building might require fewer variances and parking adjustments. Mr. Harb continued to emphasize that the design had been developed to meet city requirements while balancing practical needs.

Commissioner Mangum inquired about parking, specifically referring to the Noyes Cultural Arts Center parking lot. Harb clarified that he had spoken with the city's parking coordinator, who had indicated that there might be flexibility for parking during the construction period, but he was not negotiating on behalf of the residents. Mr. Harb noted that this flexibility could potentially be useful for the duration of the two-year construction phase.

Commissioner Johnson asked Mr. Harb why he did not consider reducing the building to 24 or 25 units to minimize the need for variances and make the project more palatable to neighbors. Mr. Harb responded by clarifying that with the inclusionary housing bonus, the building's height was within the maximum allowed under Evanston's regulations. He explained that the building height, at 61.5 feet, is within the 62-foot limit, with some mechanical components and the elevator shaft exceeding that but still within the zoning allowance.

Mr. Harb acknowledged Commissioner Johnson's concern about the scale but emphasized that reducing the number of units would not be feasible given the goal of providing affordable housing, particularly the large four-bedroom affordable units, which had never been offered in the city's history. Mr. Harb also reiterated that the project was designed to be within zoning requirements, including height, making it a largely by-right development.

Commissioner Puchtel asked Mr. Harb if he had any issues with the 10 recommendations listed in the department's positive recommendation. Harb responded that he did not have any issues with them in general but was open to addressing any specific concerns if raised.

Commissioner Puchtel asked about the sustainability aspect of the project, specifically regarding solar panels and compliance with the Green Building ordinance. Mr. Harb confirmed that the project would include solar panels on the rooftop and would be in compliance with the ordinance. He also mentioned that the building would be all-electric and aimed to achieve LEED Gold certification, which aligns with sustainability goals.

Chair Lindwall opened public testimony.

Jim Swanson, a resident of 2107 Maple Avenue, expressed support for the proposed development at 2206 Maple Avenue. He acknowledged the institutional design of the

building, similar to another property across the street, but stated that a design with greater consistency with the surrounding brick buildings would be preferable. Despite this, he supported the project due to the underused parking lot it would replace. Mr. Swanson emphasized that the proposed development offers a variety of housing options, potentially accommodating families of different sizes, and appreciated Paul Harb's commitment to recruiting families and young professionals to the neighborhood. He noted that the building being a Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) along with the lack of on-street parking passes, was a positive feature.

Mr. Swanson raised concerns about the potential impact on traffic, suggesting that parking regulations for the surrounding blocks be adjusted. He proposed making parking limited to two hours until 11 p.m. and requiring sticker parking from midnight to 5 a.m. He referenced issues with parking in the nearby Tapestry building area, where residents reportedly park on surrounding streets, contributing to parking challenges.

Stuart Cleland, a resident of 2145 Maple Avenue for 37 years, expressed support for the proposed project across the street from his home. He acknowledged the variances being discussed and suggested that compromises regarding the number of units, parking spaces, and Lot coverage are necessary. He expressed confidence that the Land Use Commission could find reasonable compromises acceptable to all parties and indicated that if such compromises are made, he would fully support the project.

Rushil Pengali, a resident of 2145 Ridge Avenue, directly behind the proposed development, expressed strong support for the project. He mentioned passing through the parking lot daily, noting that it is rarely more than a quarter full, which he finds frustrating given the city's rising rents and housing shortage. Mr. Pengali emphasized the need for more housing types like the ones proposed, especially near a transit station and major employers. He urged the Land Use Commission to approve the project without reducing its density, arguing that such housing is essential for Evanston's growth and sustainability.

James Hedstrom, a resident of 2218 Maple Avenue, expressed several concerns regarding the proposed development. He is particularly worried about the potential increase in garbage and trash issues, especially during peak move-in and move-out seasons. Mr. Hedstrom noted that during these times, there is often trash on the ground, overflowing dumpsters, and large items improperly disposed of in the alley, which can attract pests. He asked about the applicant's plans for managing trash and ensuring pest control to prevent these issues. Additionally, Mr. Hedstrom raised concerns about parking availability in the area. He pointed out that a parking study showed low usage of the existing lot, but he argued that this was because the lot is permit-controlled, and does not reflect the actual demand for parking. With more residents, he fears that street parking will become even scarcer for current residents, as parking in the area is already tight. Lastly, he expressed concerns about the health and safety impacts during construction, especially regarding noise, dust, vibration, and increased traffic. Hedstrom inquired about what measures will be taken to ensure that dust and vibration levels remain within safe limits and to minimize construction-related

nuisances like noise and traffic congestion. He concluded by asking for clarification on how these issues will be addressed.

Chair Lindwall, Mr. Hubbard, and Mr. Harb addressed concerns about trash and garbage management during move-in and move-out periods. Mr. Harb stated that they have already been asked by staff about this issue and have had two rounds of reviews, during which they developed a plan to address these concerns. Sam Hubbard confirmed that a formal plan had not been submitted by Paul Harb, but both the applicant and staff were aware of the potential trash issues in the alley on move-out days. He noted that if the applicant manages the move-outs well, it should be viable. If there were any problems, property maintenance would handle enforcement by sending violations to the property owner. Mr. Harb also reassured the commission that in previous projects, there were no issues with noise or garbage piling in the alley, and he promised a hands-on approach for managing these concerns. Regarding construction management, Mr. Harb confirmed that a plan would be required as a condition of approval, and the details would be worked out before the building permit is issued.

Commissioner Mabadi and Mr. Harb discussed the details of the solar panels proposed for the building. Harb explained that the panels would not be used to light the entire building, as they would need a much larger roof space for that. Instead, the panels would generate around 55 to 60 KW, potentially increasing to 65 KW if more panels were added to the front of the building. This energy would be stored and could be used to light common areas, but the limited roof space, the system could only do so much. Mr. Harb also explained that while there would be two rows of 16 panels, they would be spaced out to allow for maintenance and cleaning. The exact technical details on voltage and inverters were still being worked out, but the intent was to maximize the system's efficiency.

Commissioner Berlin asked about the parking covenant, specifically what the minimum parking requirements were. Mr. Hubbard clarified that the covenant being referred to was the requirement by the city to allow usage of the 11 surface parking stalls for use by the neighboring property.

Commissioner Puchtel asked staff to explain the specific zoning actions requested. Mr. Hubbard clarified that approvals for two properties were being requested. The parking lot where the building will be constructed needed several major variations, and that was the first property. Because the parking lot on the first property serves as required parking for a neighboring building on a different property, and because that parking will be removed upon construction of the proposed project, the neighboring property also needs a parking variation.

Commissioner Berlin asked the applicant about their plans to recruit families into the larger units, noting that a member of the public had expressed support for the project in part because they understood there would be intentional recruitment of families for those units.

Mr. Harb mentioned a conversation with Councilmember Burns, who had some ideas for the recruitment process. Mr. Harb also discussed plans to target potential tenants through newsletters and a website. Once live, the website would allow people to subscribe and receive updates. Additionally, social media and personal advertising would be used to spread the word about the project. Mr. Harb expressed pride in his efforts to make the project affordable and noted the challenges of satisfying everyone, especially regarding the balance between affordability, design, and parking. He emphasized that the project must be successful to ensure its completion, and while he is committed to doing his best, he acknowledged the limits of what can be done.

Commissioner Mabadi commended Mr. Harb for reaching the 20% affordability target, acknowledging how challenging it is to secure financing and meet the banks' approval. He also noted that some of his concerns about parking were alleviated by the fact that residents will not be eligible for city parking permits, so any street parking would be at their own risk, with enforcement in place. Commissioner Mabadi expressed hope that the neighbors would handle the situation amicably but recognized that residents would have to find alternative parking solutions, especially given the project's transit-oriented location. Mr. Harb responded by thanking Commissioner Mabadi and added that the project would include EV chargers and emphasized that while banks would underwrite the project at full tax value, it was his responsibility to handle the complexities of financing.

Chair Lindwall closed Public Testimony.

Commissioner Mangum expressed support for the project, particularly appreciating the inclusion of affordable housing, especially the rare availability of four-bedroom rental units in Evanston. She acknowledged concerns about parking but noted that the project is close to the train and some parking spaces are available. She also mentioned the noise from the busy street and nearby restaurants but ultimately felt that the benefits of affordable housing and the inclusion of solar panels on the roof outweighed the concerns. She suggested that the project should be approved.

Commissioner Berlin expressed support for the project, noting that the parking ratios in the packet were consistent with expectations, so she wasn't concerned about parking. She also echoed a public comment, emphasizing that building dense housing near a public transit station is a reasonable approach. She was particularly excited about the 20% affordable units.

Commissioner Puchtel expressed support for the project, highlighting the positive recommendation from Design Evanston and the site's transit-oriented nature, which makes it ideal for development. He also noted that the variances requested are reasonable, as many comparable properties in the area are non-conforming. However, he raised a concern about the recommendation to prohibit residential tenants from obtaining on-street parking permits. While he understood the goal of limiting parking impact, he found it unusual that new tenants would be excluded from a right that other renters on the street have.

In response to Commissioner Puchtel's concern about the restriction on street parking permits for new tenants, it was clarified that this restriction would apply only to the new development. The intention is to prevent tenants from opting for a relatively cheaper on-street permit rather than paying for a parking space on the property, which could worsen the parking situation. This policy has been applied to other developments, such as the Tapestry and Custer projects, to manage parking demand effectively.

Commissioner Mirintchev expressed support for the project, acknowledging that the public benefits outweigh the requested variances. He raised two architectural concerns: the lack of natural light for some bedrooms, suggesting that while ventilation might help, natural light is important for livability; and the building's height, which could impact the light for the neighboring building to the north. He recommended considering notches or design adjustments on the north facade to allow more light to reach the neighbors.

He emphasized that these suggestions were not about zoning or variances but about improving the design to better suit the community.

Commissioner Johnson expressed concern about the complexity of the parking arrangement across the four buildings. While he was not overly concerned about the volume of parking, given the building's proximity to the train station, he was interested in the public feedback, which he found generally positive. He also visited the site and stated that he was opposed to maintaining a surface parking lot in that location. Overall, he supported the project, recognizing the challenges around parking and the requested relief but emphasizing the importance of developing the building on the site.

Commissioner Mabadi shared two main thoughts. First, regarding parking, he felt the issue was resolved due to the building's transit-oriented location and the restriction on parking permits for tenants, which he believes mitigates the impact on the surrounding neighborhood. He also emphasized that parking would not be an issue for the building's long-term viability, as it would not face vacancy problems due to inadequate parking. Second, he expressed support for the project overall, noting that it outweighs the alternative of a surface parking lot. However, he mentioned that the building's height and size compared to the smaller surrounding buildings created a stark contrast, and suggested considering landscaping options to soften the presentation of the building at street level to achieve a more human-scale feel.

Chair Lindwall expressed support for the project, reflecting on how, when she first moved to Evanston, the site was just a parking lot. She emphasized that the transformation from nearly 100% asphalt to 70% asphalt with a building would be a minimal yet positive improvement for the neighborhood.

The Chair reviewed the seven Standards for Major Variations (Section 6-3-8-12.E).

1. The requested variation will not have a substantial adverse impact on the use, enjoyment or property values of adjoining properties: *Met. The multi-family use is permitted in the underlying zoning district and the commission heard testimony*

that redeveloping the parking lot as a multi-family development was preferable to the existing condition of the property.

2. The requested variation is in keeping with the intent of the zoning ordinance: *Met. The development will enhance the taxable value of land in the City.*
3. The alleged hardship or practical difficulty is peculiar to the property: *Met. The Variation is due, in part, to the unique circumstance that this property serves as parking for a neighboring site.*
4. The property owner would suffer a particular hardship or practical difficulty as distinguished from a mere inconvenience if the strict letter of the regulations were to be carried out: *Met. Should both properties be required to conform with code, particularly with regards to parking, would result in an excess of parking in comparison to expected demand.*
5. Either the purpose of the variation is not based exclusively upon a desire to extract additional income from the property, or, while the granting of the variation will result in additional income to the applicant and while the applicant for the variation may not have demonstrated that the application is not based exclusively upon a desire to extract additional income from the property, the Land Use Commission or the City Council, depending on final jurisdiction under Section 6-3-8-2 of this Chapter, has found that public benefits to the surrounding neighborhood and the City as a whole will be derived from approval of the variation, that include, but are not limited to, any of the standards of Section 6-3-6-3 of this Chapter: *Met. The property will be restricted from leasing the 11 surface parking stalls at rates in excess of what they charge their tenants, and affordable housing above and beyond City requirements will be provided, which is a public benefit.*
6. The alleged difficulty or hardship has not been created by any person having an interest in the property: *Met. The practical difficulty was created many years ago when the parking lot was developed to serve as required parking for other properties. Additionally, the surrounding properties are all substandard relative to density, coverage, and parking regulations, and this condition was established years ago when those properties were developed.*
7. The requested variation requires the least deviation from the applicable regulation among the feasible options identified before the Land Use Commission issues its decision or recommendation to the City Council regarding said variation: *Met. This is a TOD location and the variations are aligned with neighboring development.*

Commissioner Puchtel Moved to recommend approval of the variation request for 2206 Maple Avenue, 2215-2219 Maple Avenue & 916 ½ Noyes Street, 25ZMJV-0003 with conditions as outlined in the staff report (and below).

Commissioner Mangum Seconded.

Conditions:

1. **Prior to appearing before City Council for consideration, the applicant shall provide revised data for existing setbacks of surrounding properties to allow for a potential recalculation of the 24.5' required front yard setback,**

- and revised development plans (as applicable) if the location or size of building must to change to conform to the required front yard setback.
2. The property owner shall provide, in perpetuity, access for the subject property to use two parking stalls in the garages located at the rear of 2211 Maple Avenue, that have the PIN 11-07-120-005, for the parking of tenants or guests. Evidence of a recorded agreement, for review and approval by the City, must be provided prior to building permit issuance for the proposed structure.
 3. The property owner shall provide, in perpetuity, access for usage of the 11 parking stalls on the exterior of the building at the rear of the site to residents or guests of 2215-2219 Maple Avenue & 916 ½ Noyes Street. Any rent charged for usage of these 11 spaces shall be no more than is charged for parking within the garage as may be charged to residents of the 30 dwelling units on the subject property. Evidence of a recorded agreement, for review and approval by the City, must be provided prior to building permit issuance for the proposed structure.
 4. Residential tenants of 2206 Maple Avenue will be prohibited from obtaining on-street residential parking passes for street parking in the vicinity of the subject property.
 5. The applicant shall continue to work with the property owner to the west to relocate the dumpsters, and if feasible, shall make accommodations at the rear of the subject property to facilitate the storage of the dumpsters on the east side of the alley.
 6. Any large ground mounted mechanical or electrical equipment proposed during building permit review shall be appropriately located and properly screened, to the satisfaction of City staff.
 7. The applicant shall be required to revise their storm sewer connection to discharge towards Maple Avenue instead of into the storm sewer in the alley.
 8. The property shall provide 6 units in compliance with the City's IHO regulations as outlined in their approved IHO application.
 9. The applicant shall sign and agree to a Construction Management Plan (CMP) with the City of Evanston prior to issuance of a building permit. The CMP shall include, but is not limited to, the following: construction phasing/staging plans; construction hours; site access including traffic and pedestrian safety plans; contractor parking; damage control and vibration monitoring (if warranted); construction exhibits; and project communications/signage.
 10. Substantial compliance with the documents and testimony on record.

Ayes: Chair Lindwall, Commissioner Mirintchev, Commissioner Mabadi, Commissioner Puchtel, Commissioner Johnson, Commissioner Mangum, Commissioner Berlin

Nays:

Abstain:

This will move forward to City Council on April 14th.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

None

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

Jeff Smith spoke about the potential impact of the development project. He pointed out that developers often build within the allowed envelope and request additional variances afterward, referencing the economic pressures that lead to such practices. He also raised concerns about the small house to the south of the site, which could experience a loss in value if the project proceeds as planned, due to its proximity to a larger building. He further questioned the assumption that building near transit reduces vehicle traffic. He mentioned that, based on his experience in other developments, the reality of parking demand is often underappreciated. He referenced Tapestry Station, where residents park off-site, exacerbating street parking issues. Residents may not park on the street in the vicinity of the development, but they will find streets just outside of the restricted vicinity, where they can still park their cars.

Mr. Smith urged the commission to carefully consider the neighborhood's long-standing zoning complexities, real estate values, and the broader impacts on the community. While he applauded the affordability aspects of the project, he expressed concern about the potential for these units to become unaffordable or be used as student housing with multiple unrelated roommates.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Puchtel Moved to adjourn the meeting.
Seconded by Commissioner Johnson.

Meeting adjourned at 8:43 pm.

The next Evanston Land Use Commission meeting is scheduled to be held **on Wednesday, April 9, 2025, at 7:00 pm**, in the James C. Lytle Council Chambers in the Lorraine H. Morton City Hall at 909 Davis Street.

Respectfully submitted,
Justin Bock, Administrative lead

Reviewed by
Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Sam Hubbard, Senior Planner