



MEETING MINUTES

LAND USE COMMISSION

Wednesday, January 8th, 2025

7:00 PM

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

Members Present: George Halik,, Kiril Mirintchev, Chair Matt Rodgers, Brian Johnson, Max Puchtel, Jameika Mangum, Myrna Arevalo, Jeanne Lindwall,

Members Absent: Darush Mabadi

Staff Present: Neighborhood Land Use Planner Meagan Jones, Senior Housing Planner Uri Pachter, Planning Manager Liz Williams, Community Development Director Sarah Flax, Assistant City attorney Brian George

Presiding Member: Matt Rodgers

I. CALL TO ORDER/DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

Chair Rodgers requested to move the 2025 Election of Officers up on the agenda due to the change in December meetings delaying that action

II. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Election of Officers for 2025

Chair Rodgers opened a vote for Chair of Land Use Commission

Commissioner Lindwall Moved to Vote Matt Rodgers as Chair. Seconded by Commissioner Halik.

Ayes: Lindwall, Halik, Johnson, Mirintchev, Puchtel, Mangum, Arevalo, Rodgers

Nays:

Abstain:

With a vote of 8-0 Matt Rodgers will continue as Chair of the Land Use commission.

Chair Rodgers opened a vote for Vice Chair of Land Use Commission

Commissioner Lindwall Moved to Vote Max Puchtel as Vice Chair of The Land Use Commission. Seconded by Commissioner Halik

Ayes: Lindwall, Halik, Johnson, Mirintchev, Puchtel, Mangum, Arevalo, Rodgers

Nays:

Abstain:

With a vote of 8-0 Max Puchtel will continue as Vice Chair of the Land Use Commission

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Public Hearing | Comprehensive Plan - Envision Evanston 2045

The City of Evanston is proposing a new Comprehensive General Plan to guide development for the next 20 years. The draft plan includes a vision statement, goals, policies and actions related to the environment; land use; transportation; housing; economic development; placemaking, arts and culture; parks and open space; and preservation.

Public Testimony

Jennifer Drake, an Evanston resident and engineer, voiced concerns about the Plan, stating it was rushed and lacked sufficient community involvement, with only 3% of residents participating. She questioned the city's outreach efforts and transparency. While supportive of climate resiliency goals, she opposed zoning changes, citing potential negative impacts like increased density, carbon emissions, strained infrastructure, and unreliable public transit. She urged the city to take more time, involve more residents, and address these issues before proceeding.

Jill Graham, a longtime Evanston resident and former strategic planning professor, expressed support for the Comprehensive Plan, particularly the elimination of single-family zoning to allow up to four units per lot in certain areas. However, she raised concerns about the affordability of new housing if left to the private market, suggesting it may increase supply but not affordability, particularly in expensive or less expensive districts. She proposed revising the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance by lowering its application threshold from six units to five, increasing the affordability requirement from 10% to 20%, and mandating that at least one unit in new multi-unit developments in R1-R4 districts be affordable.

Meg Welsh, a resident of Evanston's Fourth Ward, expressed concerns about the plan, particularly its relationship to affordable housing. She criticized the assumption that supporting the plan is essential for achieving equity and justice, arguing that alternative strategies are being overlooked. She cited examples from other cities and suggested local measures such as property tax relief and partnerships for mixed-income, limited-equity housing. She advocated for slowing the process, bringing in more experts, and broadening affordable housing strategies to ensure meaningful progress.

Michelle Chlebek, an architect with 17 years of experience who resides at 2207 Arlington, voiced concerns about the plan, particularly regarding its pace and the proposed density increases. She emphasized that Evanston's existing diversity of housing styles and neighborhoods would be negatively impacted by a blanket densification rule. She outlined several issues including demolition risks for existing buildings, loss of historic homes, architectural disruption, property values, affordability misconceptions as they relate to how density affects it. Drawing on her personal experience moving to Evanston for its small-community feel and privacy. Ms. Chlebek urged for more time, thoughtful planning, and greater community involvement to ensure responsible development.

Betty Bogg, CEO of Connections for the Homeless, emphasized the urgency of Evanston's housing crisis, noting that her organization served nearly 5,000 people last year, including 3,300 Evanstonians. She highlighted rising rents forcing Black and Brown residents to leave, and

developers abandoning projects due to zoning complexities and community opposition. She stated that Envision Evanston 2045, while not perfect, is a critical first step toward addressing housing shortages and affordability. She warned against delaying or watering down the plan, as doing so would worsen the crisis. She called for bold action to stabilize rents, increase housing supply, and align zoning policy with equity values. She then urged efforts to combat gentrification, strengthen inclusionary housing, and resource affordable housing development responsibly.

Naqiy McMullen, a resident of 1012 Austin in the 8th Ward, voiced strong support for the zoning reforms in the Envision Evanston plan. He emphasized that these changes would enhance affordability, equity, and sustainability, citing examples from other cities. McMullen, who moved to Evanston from Florida for a better life, stressed the importance of building more housing to prevent displacement of low-income residents and avoid the affordability crises seen in cities like San Francisco. He highlighted the benefits of new market-rate housing, which supports affordability through inclusionary zoning and "filtering" that frees older units for working-class families. He urged action to address the housing crisis and called for reforms to ensure Evanston remains a welcoming, affordable community for families like his.

Jim McKee, a long-time Evanston property owner and rental housing provider, expressed strong opposition to the proposed zoning changes. He criticized the plan for encouraging the demolition of well-built vintage single-family homes, arguing it would harm the environment, contradict climate action goals, and reduce neighborhood cohesiveness. McKee also dismissed the idea that increased housing supply would naturally lower prices, arguing that the broader metropolitan market, not just Evanston, influences prices. He questioned the effectiveness of similar reforms in other cities and emphasized the need for more community discussion before moving forward.

Jonathan Seldin expressed strong support for the plan and its proposed zoning changes. He emphasized that Evanston, as a dense city, should embrace more housing to meet demand and promote environmental sustainability. He argued that increasing housing supply, even with the challenges of construction costs and traffic, would benefit the city and its residents. Mr. Seldin expressed that zoning laws are outdated and need to evolve. He urged the city to move forward with the plan without delay.

Mark Karlin argued against the claim that zoning reforms will cause rents to rise. He referenced a case study from New Rochelle, New York, where significant zoning changes added thousands of apartments without causing excessive rent increases. Mr. Karlin highlighted that rents in New Rochelle rose only 7% between 2017 and 2023, compared to a national average of 31%. He emphasized the similarity between New Rochelle and Evanston, suggesting that zoning reforms could lead to positive outcomes. He concluded that market forces alone haven't addressed rising rents and the proposed reforms could be a crucial step toward solving the issue.

Liz Nelson, speaking on behalf of Connections for Homeless, advocates for the zoning reforms in the comprehensive plan. She highlighted the negative impacts of maintaining the current zoning code likely leading to displacement of Black and low-income residents. She stressed that zoning reform is just the first step and calls for additional measures such as displacement prevention strategies, updates to affordable housing funds, and greater diversity in the Land Use Commission. She urged support for the comprehensive plan and continued efforts to address housing needs.

Lee Greenberg, an architect, expressed support for a resilient, well-thought-out future plan but believes that coupling the Envision Evanston comprehensive plan with zoning changes is a misstep. He argued that the zoning changes should not be rushed and should be considered after the comprehensive plan is fully developed. He emphasized the need for more discourse to ensure the comprehensive plan works for everyone before moving on to zoning changes.

Sarah Petersen, a single-family homeowner in the Sixth Ward, expressed her support for bold and inclusive zoning reform to address Evanston's housing crisis. She stressed the need for affordable housing development, tenant protections, and clear policies to prevent displacement. She emphasized that the comprehensive plan and zoning updates are important steps to maintain the city's diversity and stabilize property taxes. She highlighted the ongoing changes in her neighborhood, where longtime residents are being priced out, and advocated for policies that will provide more housing options and ensure the community works for everyone.

Lori Keenan expressed her gratitude for the commissioners' service, but criticized the rushed process of the Envision Evanston 2045 plan and zoning changes. She argued that the plan is being marketed as a solution for affordable housing, but lacks language or provisions ensuring affordability. She suggested that the plan will primarily benefit developers without addressing the actual housing needs of low- and moderate-income residents. She urged the commission to slow down and make a more informed decision.

Scott Roberts, a single-family homeowner in an R1 District, shares his support for increasing diversity of housing ownership and acknowledges that while the Envision Evanston 2045 plan may not be perfect, it is a step in the right direction compared to the current situation. He highlights that his own home wouldn't be allowed under current zoning, but it contributes to the diverse neighborhood mix, with both lower-income residents and larger homes. He emphasizes that zoning reform is a key solution to housing affordability and the financial challenges faced by schools due to a decreasing student population.

Alf McConnell, a developer of affordable housing, argued that eliminating R1 zoning is not the solution for creating affordable housing. He emphasized that affordable housing requires midrise buildings, which qualify for Section 42 financing and allow for economies of scale. He believes that smaller multi-unit buildings lack financial viability for affordable housing. He then expressed concern over a report suggesting zoning changes will create affordable housing and argues that such growth is not always desirable, referencing a past example from Colorado. He also expressed that it is unfair to single-family homeowners who invested in neighborhoods expecting them to remain unchanged.

Pastor Luke Harris Ferree, a renter and a member of Grace Lutheran Church in South Evanston, spoke in favor of the plan, emphasizing that, as a person of faith, he believes in the inherent dignity of all people, particularly their right to access safe and affordable housing. He acknowledged that the plan does not automatically create affordable housing but sees it as an important start. He then criticized the current zoning system for serving only the privileged and perpetuating segregation in Evanston. He urged against delaying the plan, arguing it would burden the most vulnerable people. He highlighted the opportunity for affordable housing in underused spaces, like his congregation's parking lot, should zoning laws change. He called for embracing change and working towards a more diverse and accessible community.

Roger Williams, a realtor in Evanston, expressed support for the plan and emphasized the need to increase affordable housing in the city. He shared statistics showing that the median price for single-family homes in Evanston is out of reach for many residents, particularly Black families,

who have a median income of \$55,100. He advocated for legalizing four-unit buildings across all residential zones in Evanston as a first step toward addressing the housing crisis. He also proposed modifying the inclusionary housing ordinance to require that one out of every four units in such buildings be set aside for moderate-income households. This approach would help diversify neighborhoods without displacing existing residents.

Pat Savage Williams, a long-time resident of Evanston and member of Second Baptist Church, expressed support for the comprehensive and zoning plan. While acknowledging that the plan will not solve all of the city's housing issues, she emphasizes that it is a necessary first step toward providing more affordable housing throughout Evanston. She urges the city council to recommend the plan without further delay.

Michael Zimmer, a resident in a National Historic District, expressed concerns about the lack of protection for homeowners in historic areas under current zoning laws. Zimmer argued that the comprehensive plan should address preservation more comprehensively, advocating for zoning changes to be tied to updates in the preservation ordinance to provide fairness and protect existing homeowners. He called for zoning and preservation to be better integrated to ensure neighborhoods are not destabilized by future developments.

Mary Rosinski expressed concerns about the current state of the comprehensive plan, particularly how it's been intertwined with zoning changes, such as the removal of R1 zoning, which has complicated the discussion. She emphasized that the plan as it stands could lead to developers controlling the situation rather than a balanced approach. Ms. Rosinski noted that rents in new constructions are significantly higher than in older buildings, and stressed that affordable housing cannot be left entirely to market forces. She urged the city to stop the current plan, focus on a clearer affordable housing strategy, and revisit the parks and recreation plan before moving forward with zoning changes.

Bonnie Wilson, a First Ward resident and member of Joining Forces for Affordable Housing, as well as a real estate agent in Evanston for 40 years, highlighted the importance of affordable housing in the city. She indicated that she would discuss zoning codes in more detail at a future meeting, urging city council candidates to attend Land Use Committee meetings to hear public comments on Envision 2045. She emphasized her commitment to continuing the discussion on this issue.

Peter Kelly expressed concerns about a disconnect between the Envision Evanston comprehensive plan and community input, particularly regarding the proposal for tall buildings in downtown Evanston. Residents voiced opposition to high rises during meetings in December and January, citing the plan's pro-developer stance that could allow buildings over 100 feet in height without city approval. Kelly emphasized that such unchecked development could harm the character of the downtown area and negatively affect neighborhoods. He questioned whether other properties in Evanston could bypass public input due to existing development agreements, and asked for clarification on this issue.

Melissa Appelt, representing Interfaith Action of Evanston's advocacy committee, spoke about the challenges faced by low-income residents in Evanston, particularly the nearly 9,000 people living at or below the poverty line. She highlighted how high housing costs contribute to struggles with rent and food insecurity. She then emphasized that zoning regulations often favor homeowners and fail to address the broader housing crisis, which is a national issue. She expressed support for the housing goals in the comprehensive plan and urged the commission

to use their collective wisdom to recommend balanced solutions that address both the anxiety surrounding change and the ongoing harm of inaction.

Virginia Ayers, a long-time resident of Evanston, shared her experience working at Evanston Township High School and the challenges faced by staff members who could not afford housing in the city. Ms. Ayers highlighted that this situation has only worsened over time, and she emphasized the need for affordable housing in Evanston. She argued that those who care for the community—educators, healthcare workers, and others—should be able to live in Evanston as well, and that inclusivity should be a key goal for Envision Evanston 2045.

Mary Beth Schroeder, a long-time resident of Evanston, shared her personal experience of living with her grandchildren and their mother due to the city's affordable housing crisis. Her daughter-in-law cannot afford housing in Evanston despite working in the community. Ms. Schroeder highlighted that this issue affects many families in the city. While the comprehensive plan addresses the need for affordable housing, she emphasized the necessity for further improvements. She stressed the importance of addressing the affordable housing crisis, which has been a long-standing issue in Evanston. She urged the community to work with practical solutions rather than seeking perfection.

Olin Wilson Thomas, a member of the Environment Board, expressed strong support for the proposed zoning changes in Evanston, emphasizing the urgent need for affordable housing. He cited statistics showing a significant increase in rent (57%) over the past several years, far outpacing income growth (20%), and the negative consequences of these trends on families, including his own friend's forced relocation. He called for stronger regulation of developers, including mandates for affordable housing and rent controls. He then urged the commission not to delay the vote in pursuit of a perfect solution, as the current zoning code is inequitable and urgently needs reform. He stressed that housing should be treated as a human right, not just a commodity.

Gail Kemp, a resident of the Third Ward, strongly supported the Envision Evanston plan. Having moved to Evanston in 2023, Kemp quickly got involved by attending meetings and completing surveys, and she rejected the argument that the process was rushed or insufficient. She emphasized that citizens have a responsibility to engage, particularly those with privileges such as homeownership. Ms. Kemp argued that the city's plan was essential for the community's future and expressed frustration at those who resist changes aimed at making the city more inclusive. She also urged those who care about social justice to take concrete action.

David Galloway, a resident of Evanston since 1983 and a practicing architect, criticized the current comprehensive plan, describing it as a failed document with a flawed process. He noted that while the vision and goals were commendable, the plan's language was overly generic and lacked sufficient local specificity. He recommended the inclusion of more graphics, maps, and examples that reflect Evanston's unique characteristics rather than generic stock photos. He also pointed out that the plan failed to address "missing middle housing". He argued that the plan should better examine and propose specific housing solutions tailored to different neighborhoods and street layouts. He then called for schematic designs to illustrate feasible housing projects, helping to garner support and accelerate construction.

Dan Lev, a resident of Evanston, expressed support for the proposed comprehensive plan, stating that it includes important goals such as fostering a healthy community, strengthening the economy, prioritizing sustainability, and increasing housing diversity. He emphasized the need for Evanston to evolve gradually over time, pointing out that cities must grow to remain

economically vibrant. He supported the plan's approach to increasing housing density. He also addressed concerns about developers demolishing houses, noting that even when developers preserved older homes, the resulting renovations led to higher prices. He advocated for diversifying the housing stock to provide more affordable options. While acknowledging that the plan is not perfect, Lev urged the commission to recommend its approval without further delays, as continuing to seek a perfect solution would likely prevent any progress.

Julia Forgash, a resident of Sherman Avenue in the Fourth Ward, urged the commission to slow down the process of adopting the comprehensive plan to allow more community engagement. She emphasized the importance of understanding the needs of both current and future residents and suggested opening more channels for communication to ensure that all voices are heard. Forgash expressed confidence that, with collaboration, a mutually beneficial plan could be developed. She also raised concerns about zoning changes in downtown Evanston, particularly regarding high-rise buildings with unlimited height. She questioned whether these new developments would truly provide affordable housing and expressed concerns about the impact of these developments on downtown infrastructure.

Ray Freidman expressed concern about the rushed timeline for Envision 2045, suggesting that more resident input is needed before moving forward. He appreciated the hard work of the commission and thanked those who called for a slower process. He pointed out that only 3% of residents have provided input, which is insufficient. He referenced previous projects and cautioned against making hasty choices without full community involvement. Mr. Freidman called for a slower, more deliberate process.

Timothy Ramsey, a resident of the Sixth Ward for 41 years, addressed concerns about the increased density proposed in the comprehensive plan and its ability to increase affordable housing. He emphasized that achieving affordable housing requires more than just zoning changes, it involves a complex process with financial support, subsidies, and a robust plan for long-term viability. He acknowledged that zoning changes are a necessary precondition but are not sufficient on their own. Mr. Ramsey criticized the rushed timeline for the comprehensive plan, stating that it could lead to unintended negative consequences and destabilize the city without effectively addressing affordable housing.

Kelly Burke, resident for 38-years and preschool teacher, expressed concerns about the rush surrounding the comprehensive plan, particularly regarding affordable housing. She questioned the effectiveness of affordable housing initiatives then voiced skepticism about how affordable housing is implemented and highlighted the potential for developers to prioritize profit. She also raised concerns about perceived conflicts of interest and the environmental impact of the plan, suggesting that it might exploit rather than protect Evanston's environment. Additionally, she questioned the lack of emphasis on local employment opportunities, suggesting that building more housing without addressing job creation could lead to residents commuting elsewhere for work.

Jeff Boarini, a resident of the Second Ward, shared his perspective that there is broad agreement on three points: the need to redo Evanston's comprehensive plan and associated rezoning, the desire for more affordable housing, and the recognition that this work is complex. He praised the collective expertise of the commission members, emphasizing that their knowledge of Evanston is crucial in this process. He then urged the commission not to rush the plan and to take the necessary time to evaluate the comprehensive plan and zoning changes thoroughly, as doing so will best serve the city in achieving its goals.

Tina Paden, a long-time affordable housing landlord in Evanston, shared her deep ties to the community and her concerns about the proposed plan. She highlighted that Evanston's inclusionary housing ordinance does not accommodate HUD standards. Ms. Paden argued that the current plan does not address the real needs of the community and criticized the lack of action during past housing crises, particularly in her neighborhood. She called for accountability from Northwestern University, urging the institution to contribute more to the city. She also emphasized the importance of involving and listening to the voices of Black residents and those directly impacted by housing policies. She suggested that rather than focusing on the plan's agenda, the city should prioritize helping people in need, like landlords who accept vouchers, and push for fair contributions from those who benefit from the city's resources.

Virginia Mann, a homeowner in the Sixth Ward, voiced concerns about the direction proposed by the Envision Evanston plan. She expressed a desire to maintain the current community character. Ms. Mann emphasized the variety of housing options available in Evanston today, ranging from single-family homes to condos and mixed developments. She then criticized the plan for being poorly thought out and argued it would not achieve its intended goals. Ms. Mann called for more time to listen to the majority of residents, who she believes are opposed to the plan, and urged a halt to what she sees as a special interest-driven agenda that would harm the city's character.

Jane Grover, a Seventh Ward resident and public engagement professional at the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP), expressed strong support for the Envision Evanston 2045 comprehensive plan. Emphasizing the inevitability of changes brought by technology, climate change, and demographic shifts, Jane argued the plan effectively addresses these trends and prepares Evanston for the future. She stressed that the plan should focus on the needs of younger generations, and framed the discussion around today's youth—like a current ETHS 10th grader—who will be 36 by 2045. Ms. Grover urged the commission to consider how future generations will live, work, and navigate Evanston and to ensure that the city remains equitable and sustainable for them. She encouraged the Land Use Commission to recommend the plan to City Council, cautioning against allowing short-term solutions to become long-term burdens for the next generation.

Andy Anderson, a resident of the Lakeshore Historic District at 715 Michigan Avenue and a recipient of an Evanston award for architectural restoration, voiced concerns about the potential impact of the Envision Evanston 2045 plan on historic districts. He highlighted the historic and architectural significance of the Lakeshore Historic District and emphasized its unique identity as an elite residential area with notable architectural and historical value. He requested that historic districts be excluded from any proposed changes to R1 zoning, warning that failing to do so would erode their character. He then suggested postponing final action on the plan until after the city council elections. While expressing reservations, he affirmed his support for the goals outlined in the comprehensive plan.

Dominic Voz, Director of Fair Housing at Open Communities, strongly supported the proposed zoning changes, highlighting their potential to address the legacy of exclusionary zoning and increase housing supply. He acknowledged concerns about affordability but emphasized that reform is essential and must be paired with policies like strengthened inclusionary housing, anti-displacement measures, reparations for Black residents, and support for small landlords and land trusts. He warned that without action, Evanston risks becoming a wealthy, exclusive community and urged using all available tools to create a fair and inclusive future.

Jim Slingo, a Third Ward resident, proposed compromises for the Envision Evanston 2045 plan, advocating for limiting lots to three units instead of higher-density developments. He emphasized the need to address property taxes to ensure affordability, suggesting hiring freezes and efficiency improvements for schools and city operations. Mr. Slingo also supported preserving historic areas and existing affordable housing while calling for greater respect for residents' wishes through an advisory referendum. He highlighted the challenges of transitioning to environmentally friendly housing and urged a slower approach to integrating environmental measures into the plan.

Kiera Kelly raised concerns about the process and content of the Envision Evanston 2045 plan. She criticized its release on election night in an incomplete form and questioned the lack of public feedback transparency. She highlighted missing analyses and pointed out that there were no public forums, a steering committee seemingly did not meet, and the consultant's role appeared minimal. She urged the Commission to take time to ensure the plan is thorough and worthy, recommending they avoid approving a draft and instead require a complete, final version.

Chair Rodgers closed Public testimony.

Commissioner Questions/Discussion

Planning Manager Liz Williams and Neighborhood Land Use Planner Meagan Jones presented Envision Evanston 2045

Meagan Jones began her presentation by summarizing the purpose of the Envision Evanston 2045 process. She emphasized that the process was community input-driven, utilizing various outreach methods like meetings, pop-up events, office hours, and surveys to gather feedback.

Commissioner Halik interjected and asked if questions could be asked during the presentation. He raised concerns about the early stages of the Envision Evanston process, questioning whether the community outreach phase addressed any of the more controversial issues that have been raised. He noted that the public engagement questions appeared very general, rather than specific policy changes. Commissioner Halik then asked for clarification on whether these significant issues were discussed during the initial outreach or if they were introduced later in the process.

Elizabeth Williams explained that early community engagement focused on residents' lived experiences in Evanston, asking what they liked about the city and what challenges they faced. She noted that the later portion of the presentation would be elaborated on how this feedback evolved into specific elements in the draft plan and clarified that the recommendation to allow more housing options in all neighborhoods came from the consultants' observations. These observations were presented to the City Council in July, based on the consultants' analysis and findings, and recommendations came about from those observations.

There was discussion of skepticism around the origin of some of the proposals in the comprehensive plan, noting close alignment on recommendations from a study sponsored by Connections for the Homeless. Staff stated that while community input was part of the process, the consultants' recommendations, based on that input, also played a major role. This raised concerns that the proposals may not reflect the desires of the residents, with some arguing that such changes would not result in affordable housing as promised.

The presentation provided an update on the process of developing the comprehensive plan, including consulting with other city departments, reviewing existing plans, gathering feedback from various sources, and numerous community engagement activities, which generated over 4,000 responses. Key themes from engagement were shared and Ms. Jones expressed that the comprehensive plan survey is still open and has received about 230 responses. She acknowledged concerns about the need for more data and clearer implementation strategies for the policies and goals presented in the draft.

Senior Housing Planner Uri Pachter, along with Liz Williams, addressed several public requests and commission inquiries during the meeting, focusing on data comparisons across Evanston and its neighboring municipalities.

1. **Data Approach:** Pachter emphasized the goal of comparing Evanston's data to that of similar communities, including Skokie, Chicago, Lincolnwood, Oak Park, and some neighborhoods like Rodgers Park and Westridge, using data from the U.S. Census (2020 and 2023) and American Community Survey. This approach would help highlight Evanston's uniqueness in comparison to surrounding areas.
2. **Population Density:** Evanston's population density is similar to that of Westridge and Oak Park, but less dense than Chicago. The data points reveal that Chicago's density is close to Evanston's, although some other areas like Rodgers Park are denser.
3. **Households and Group Quarters:** The data showed that Evanston's household sizes and shares were most similar to Oak Park and Chicago. Pachter clarified that "group quarters" (like nursing homes and dorms) are not counted in household numbers, which is relevant for interpreting the population.
4. **Demographics:** The racial and ethnic breakdown of Evanston shows 58% White and 18% Black or African American, with similarities to Oak Park and Skokie. Pachter explained that these comparisons are helpful in understanding Evanston's demographic makeup.
5. **Median Age:** Evanston's median age is relatively young, with only Chicago and Rogers Park having lower medians. This could be influenced by college populations in those areas.
6. **Household Income:** The household income data indicated that Oak Park is the closest to Evanston in terms of income distribution. Evanston's income range was compared to Skokie, with Oak Park showing the most similarity in terms of median income.
7. **Housing Breakdown:** In response to specific requests, detailed data was provided on the number of housing units, including the breakdown of one to four-unit buildings, which showed similarities to Oak Park and Westridge. This data also included the distribution of housing sizes by bedroom count, showing two-bedroom units as the most common in Evanston.

Uri Pachter noted that as the analysis went deeper, it often became more difficult to draw exact comparisons because of varying data points and margin of error. He concluded that while Evanston is unique, it often shares similarities with Oak Park and other nearby communities in various areas of development and demographics.

Commissioner Lindwall raised a point about the need for more rental two- and three-bedroom units for families in Evanston, noting that has been a recurring question during reviews of multifamily developments. She suggested that it might be worth investigating whether data on this specific housing type is available to help inform decisions on how to address this need. It could be a key area to explore in future planning efforts to ensure that there are enough rental units suitable for families, especially those with more children.

Uri Pachter provided an overview of housing vacancy and supply in Evanston, comparing it to other communities. He explained that the vacancy rate in Evanston is between 4-10%, with the city's rate falling at 7%. He described two categories of vacant units: the typical housing cycle (for rent or for sale but not yet occupied) and other situations (legal issues, repairs, etc.).

In response to a question from Chair Rodgers about potential seasonal variations, Uri Pachter clarified that the data comes from the American Community Survey, which spans months, reducing concerns about summer-based variations, though it might not entirely eliminate seasonal effects. He acknowledged that a margin of error exists in the data, which can be reviewed upon request.

The conversation also touched on home values, with Pachter presenting data from Zillow's index for mid-range home values in Evanston, comparing the city to similar areas. Evanston's home values were found to be on the higher end, though not the highest, particularly in larger homes (over 5 bedrooms).

The discussion shifted to employment and transportation data, showing that Evanston's workforce is largely engaged in educational services and healthcare, and that driving alone is less common in the city compared to others. Pachter explained transportation access, noting that about half of Evanston residents have access to one vehicle, and 16% have none.

Liz Williams is introducing a "Change Option Document" that the team has developed, which was included in the packet for that evening's meeting. She clarified that the document includes feedback the team has gathered throughout the process, and that some changes will be incorporated directly into the draft without requiring motions or direction from the Land Use Commission. These changes will be included in the version of the document that is sent to the City Council.

She plans to briefly explain some of these changes but will not go into detail on each one. The intent is to orient the commission on what will be integrated into the draft.

Commissioner Halik expressed concern about the document's current state, feeling that it seems incomplete and more like a list of tasks ("to-dos") rather than a revised comprehensive plan. He asked whether the Land Use Commission will see further revisions or a more complete version of the plan before it is presented to the City Council. He expressed that the plan seems incomplete and that key questions remain unanswered. He feels that before passing judgment on the plan, the Commission needs to see a more complete version with the results of the studies and data incorporated.

Liz Williams clarified that at this stage, the team is asking for recommendations from the Land Use Commission about any changes they would like to see incorporated. Once those recommendations are provided, the document would move forward to the City Council, and the revisions based on the Commission's input would be incorporated afterward. She explained that the current approach, as discussed with the Chair, involves presenting "change options" to the Commission for their input. She acknowledged Commissioner Halik's concern and explained that staff cannot prepare a redrafted plan without understanding what specific changes the Commission wants to see incorporated.

Commissioner Halik expressed his understanding then suggested a more thorough process. He questioned whether the current process is bypassing or abbreviating the Land Use Commission's review, which could lead to a less comprehensive recommendation.

Chair Rodgers urged for the meeting to continue with the presentation.

Liz Williams outlined updates and feedback integration for the Comprehensive Plan, presenting data and metrics as key components of the revisions as well as data visualizations. She also mentioned ongoing updates and responses to community concerns such as parks and open space, accessibility, and downtown core development. She also introduced potential metrics for plan evaluation and sought direction from the Commission regarding goals and benchmarks for these metrics.

Liz Williams emphasized the need for input on "change options," metrics, and additional recommendations to refine the plan before advancing it to City Council. She acknowledged the feedback from Commissioner Halik and others, including suggestions for a dedicated chapter on Community Systems (e.g., schools, hospitals, universities, and public safety), rather than scattering this content throughout the document.

Chair Rodgers guided further discussion, asking for focused feedback on specific sections, including health and metrics, while encouraging open dialogue from commissioners. The aim was to determine whether proposed ideas should be included, expanded, or revised before finalizing the plan.

Commissioner Lindwall emphasized the importance of incorporating public health and well-being into the comprehensive plan. She highlighted that traditional comprehensive plans typically focus on "people" and "place," but modern plans should address broader societal and health-related concerns, reflecting the needs and desires of the community.

Key points Commissioner Lindwall made included healthy community priorities, incorporating environmental justice policies, leveraging the City's existing E-Plan and integrating actionable health improvements, and highlighting the work of initiatives like the CARE team. She concluded by stressing that including these elements would modernize the plan and align it with current needs..

Chair Rodgers highlighted the importance of addressing environmental remediation, particularly regarding the city's brownfields, as part of the comprehensive plan. He emphasized that the health impacts of these spaces need to be considered alongside efforts to repurpose industrial areas into innovative and creative districts. Key points included prioritizing brownfield remediation particularly in areas designated for redevelopment, integration with innovation districts, and holistic consideration of brownfields into relevant chapters of the plan and how environmental conditions might impact redevelopment and future uses. He emphasized the need for a forward-looking approach to redevelopment that ensures underlying health issues related to these sites are adequately addressed.

Commissioner Lindwall emphasized the need for a chapter focused on people-centric issues, recognizing the connection between health, public safety, and livability to thriving communities.

Commissioner Puchtel emphasized the need for clearly defined metrics that are directly tied to the vision's priorities in order to effectively guide policy development and that work toward achieving the vision's goals. He cautioned that without specific, goal-oriented metrics, policy-making risks becoming unfocused and ineffective. By defining clear objectives, the city can ensure that its efforts are aligned with its vision and that progress can be tracked and measured over time.

Commissioner Halik interjected to point out that while everyone has their own perspective on what the effects of certain goals might be, there is a common misconception about the immediacy of these changes. He emphasized that while some may believe the effects of such changes will be immediate, the reality is that these outcomes will unfold over a longer period of time, requiring patience and long-term planning.

Commissioner Mirintchev raised a point regarding the metrics, stating that it is important to not only have the current value of a given indicator but also to establish clear goals for what the city hopes to achieve. He emphasized that this was a task given to HDR, the team responsible for providing a prognosis and offering suggestions or proposals for what would be best for the city in the next 20 years. He reiterated that having these goals defined is crucial for measuring success and guiding the plan's implementation.

Commissioner Lindwall raised a concern about the difficulty of making suggestions in areas where the commission lacks expertise. She pointed out that other boards and commissions may have more experience in certain aspects, particularly when it comes to improving resident health, a key goal of the plan. She proposed a potential metric to help address health disparities, suggesting that the life expectancy in the ward with the lowest ranking should eventually match the life expectancy in the ward where people live the longest. This could serve as a clear goal to work toward in improving overall health equity in the city.

Commissioner Mirintchev expressed his support for including a Health chapter. However, he raised the question of whether it could be discussed effectively, whether appropriate metrics could be included, and whether clear goals could be established within the chapter in a way that would make it actionable and measurable.

Commissioner Lindwall emphasized the need for the Health chapter to be drafted, acknowledging that staff is better positioned to determine its content and identify the relevant information to include. She expressed support of the chapter but believes the staff should take the lead in shaping its specifics. Commissioner Arevalo and Chair Rodgers agreed.

Chair Rodgers acknowledged that several aspects of the plan, like housing cost burden, can significantly impact people's health. The constant stress of housing costs, for instance, can contribute to mental health issues. However, he pointed out, many of the health-related metrics, such as lead exposure and life expectancy, are broader goals that may require input from other commissions or the city council, given their specific expertise. While there is consensus on improving factors like housing maintenance, Chair Rodgers emphasized the challenge in setting realistic, measurable goals for these metrics, highlighting that it's unclear what specific numbers should be targeted.

There was clarification that while several city commissions and committees had been working on various aspects of the comprehensive plan for months, internal staff had been focusing on health-related recommendations specifically. Staff suggested that they could provide an outline of a potential health chapter for consideration by next week, though a fully drafted chapter would not be available at that time. Several commissioners expressed interest in seeing the outline.

The conversation then moved to the change options presented. Chair Rodgers proposed a streamlined approach for reviewing the options, suggesting that the group briefly go through them one by one, addressing any concerns rather than debating each in detail. This would assume general support unless someone voiced objections, enabling the meeting to progress more efficiently.

As the discussion moved to the topic of community systems and policies, Chair Rodgers emphasized the importance of addressing school districts, including the university, and aging public buildings. They highlighted the need for a clear vision for facilities like the Civic Center, as well as the Fire and Police Departments. Chair Rodgers asked if anyone had specific issues or concerns about this topic, inviting input from the commissioners.

Commissioner Johnson referenced a line which mentioned enhancing communication between the city and Northwestern regarding long-range planning and development issues. He suggested expanding this idea to include adding language about fostering collaboration with District 65, noting the school district's potential surplus of properties and the need to address the adaptive reuse, repurposing, or disposal of these properties, should the need arise. He emphasized the importance of proactive planning for such scenarios.

Commissioner Lindwall raised a concern regarding the alignment of long-standing city policies and current goals. She highlighted that, for decades, the policy has been to acquire school properties for open space when schools close, citing the city's deficit in open space relative to the population. She noted that certain proposals, such as repurposing city parks, tot lots, and parking lots for housing development, seem to conflict with this goal of increasing open space. She emphasized the need for a high-level discussion to reconcile these competing priorities and determine whether the city should move away from its long-standing open space policy to address other community needs.

Commissioner Lindwall further expressed concern about the current planning process, pointing out that there is limited opportunity for City Council to provide input or feedback before the plan is finalized. She suggested this lack of engagement might not be the best approach to effective planning, given the significant policy decisions involved.

Chair Rodgers acknowledged the challenges of the current planning process, emphasizing that while the commission might prefer a more comprehensive or collaborative approach, the process is largely out of their control at this stage. He pointed out that the commission's opportunity to express its opinions to the City Council would come during deliberations the following week. However, unless the council decides otherwise, the commission must proceed with the process as it stands.

Chair Rodgers explained that the commission's role is to evaluate the information provided, even if it feels insufficient or unfinished. The commission must make decisions based on the materials presented, treating the city as they would any other applicant, whether that means approving, denying, or requesting revisions.

Chair Rodgers addressed the topics of utilizing city assets and future land use strategies, noting that these issues had already been touched on to some extent. He emphasized that discussions around parks and related assets fall under these broader categories. Regarding future land use strategies, he pointed out how they align with the trends identified during the May workshop, where the vision statement was developed.

The commission then briefly discussed the "Putting Assets to Work" report. Liz Williams clarified that the report is publicly available, had been received, and placed on file by the City Council. However, it was not directly connected to the Envision Evanston project. The report resulted from a grant the city received and includes an evaluation of several city facilities and lots for potential future use or development.

Chair Rodgers transitioned to land use policies, noting that several policies from past comprehensive plans remain relevant and can support the implementation of current goals. He emphasized the importance of exploring adaptive reuse of existing buildings as part of these policies.

Commissioner Mirintchev expressed concerns about the planning process, specifically regarding: density and housing, stating he appreciates the data provided by staff but is confused as to why this data wasn't considered earlier in the comprehensive plan; green space balance: noting that while Evanston's population density is relatively high (10,000 people per square mile), the city has less green space than the national standard, and increasing building intensity could further strain this balance; missing studies: a citywide traffic study to assess current transportation needs and identify problem intersections and a parking study to determine the ratio of people to parking spaces. He stressed that these aspects are basic urban planning necessities that should not be overlooked.

Commissioner Halik raised concerns about the effectiveness of using generalized numbers when discussing things like green space in Evanston. He pointed out that comparing the entire city or broad areas could lead to misleading conclusions. He mentioned that in his neighborhood, parks are readily accessible, but in other areas, like potentially the Fifth Ward, there could be a significant lack of green spaces.

He suggested that instead of just aiming for a citywide green space target (e.g., square feet per person), it would be more effective to break down the data by neighborhood or ward. This way, the city could identify specific areas where green space is lacking, such as the Fifth Ward, and address these discrepancies more effectively. He emphasized that while increasing affordable housing is important, the impact on adjacent neighborhoods should also be considered. He noted that the comprehensive plan doesn't mention this as a goal.

Commissioner Halik clarified that one of the standards for reviewing projects is that they do not have a substantial adverse impact on neighboring properties, not necessarily no negative impact, as some level of impact (like increased parking or loss of light) is inevitable. He emphasized that it's a balancing act—wanting change but avoiding harm to existing areas. He also questioned the population growth projections in the comprehensive plan, pointing out that Evanston's population has remained relatively stable over the past few decades, despite what the data suggests.

Commissioner Lindwall raised concerns about the population growth projections and the availability of housing in Evanston. She referenced data from the 2023 American Community Survey, which indicated that there are a number of vacant residential units. If these vacant units were filled, it could accommodate the projected increase of residents by 2045. She questioned whether there is a real need for additional housing, suggesting that the city may already have sufficient units, especially considering developments like the Custer project and other affordable housing projects in the pipeline.

She also raised concerns about why so many units remain vacant, speculating that it could be due to high rents, Airbnb use, or deteriorated conditions. She then pointed out that 65% of new renters have moved in since 2021, compared to just 15% of homeowners, suggesting there may be underlying issues with the rental market in the city.

Commissioner Halik added that it's important to have a clear metric for the number of affordable housing units in Evanston, as well as a defined target for how many are needed. He pointed out

that while there is a lot of talk about needing more affordable housing, it's unclear how many additional units are required. He suggested having a chart showing the annual progress of affordable housing creation over the years, as this would provide clarity on the city's efforts and needs. He emphasized the importance of establishing such metrics for better planning and decision-making.

Commissioner Mangum asked how many of these accessory dwelling units (ADUs) are being built and, specifically, how many of them are being made available for affordable housing. She was seeking more information on the role that ADUs could play in addressing affordable housing needs in the city.

Uri Pachter provided some data on ADUs in Evanston and mentioned that since the new policy was approved in 2021, approximately 40 ADUs were permitted, but only about 10 have been completed and received a certificate of occupancy. He then clarified that from a staff perspective, "affordable" refers to households spending 30% or less of their income on housing, regardless of the household's income level. He noted that there aren't any subsidized or program-based affordable units among the ADUs, although it's possible that some households might be spending 30% or less of their income on ADU rentals.

Commissioner Mirintchev referenced the threshold theory in urban planning, which suggests that every city has a population and building threshold. Once this threshold is exceeded, it can become uncomfortable for citizens. He expressed concern about whether the projected population of 87,000 in Evanston by 2045 is the right number or if it exceeds the city's threshold. He then emphasized the importance of determining this threshold and hoped that the consultants could provide clarity on whether the 2045 population estimate aligns with Evanston's sustainable capacity.

Commissioner Arevalo acknowledged the concern about potentially building housing in park areas. She also noted discussions about school district property reuse and how it might impact parks. There was mention of work being done on a chapter related to this topic, though the specifics are still a work in progress, and the Parks and Recreation Board is also involved in expanding these efforts.

The conversation then shifted to Economic Development, where Chair Rodgers raised concerns about the empty retail spaces in downtown Evanston. He suggested that financial incentives for retailers might be needed, especially since many businesses are choosing Wilmette over Evanston. The discussion revealed that zoning regulations and the complex process for permitting and licensing in Evanston are major barriers for new businesses.

Commissioner Halik shared his experience working on a task force years ago, where they discovered that cumbersome building permit rules and processes were a major issue for retail in Evanston. He asked if addressing these challenges is included in the current plan, and it was confirmed that it is.

Commissioner Lindwall suggested that the ADU policy adopted four years ago should be acknowledged in the housing chapter. She emphasized that the policy has already contributed to increased housing density in Evanston's single-family neighborhoods by allowing ADUs on any residential lot. She believes this shift towards greater density should be recognized in the city's planning and mentioned recent state-level legislation aimed at offering tax incentives for the rehabilitation of existing rental properties. She then asked if anyone had information about its status. Liz Williams stated that she did not have that information at the moment.

A conversation also covered ADUs and microhousing. It was noted that although ADUs were permitted, the demand has not been strong, raising the question of whether there is really a need for this type of housing. Micro housing was also mentioned, with a few projects having come up, and it was confirmed that this type of housing is addressed in the plan.

Further discussions turned to placemaking, arts and culture policies, and preservation policies. There were concerns about rail embankments, underpasses, and stations being controlled by entities outside the city's jurisdiction, such as CTA, Metra, and Union Pacific, making it challenging for Evanston to implement changes independently. However, it was mentioned that the city had worked on Green Bay Road embankments in the past through agreements with those entities.

On preservation, it was noted that confusion remains in the public's mind, especially about what can be done in preservation districts. There are federal and local preservation districts, each with different regulations. A call for clearer guidance from the Preservation Commission was made, along with a suggestion to reconsider the rules for historic districts. It was argued that not all properties in these districts hold historic significance, and the same level of restrictions should not apply universally to all properties in large districts.

Chair Rodgers suggested that modern technologies and materials should be incorporated into preservation ordinances to adapt historic homes without drastically altering their character. He used Frank Lloyd Wright as an example, suggesting that if he were designing homes today, he might use modern features like double-pane windows, which didn't exist when his homes were originally built. He emphasized encouraging preservation to consider contemporary building techniques and materials, as long as they do not compromise the home's original appearance. The proposal calls for the Preservation Commission and Council to look into adapting the rules to allow for this kind of integration of modern technologies.

Commissioner Halik shared a personal experience involving a zero-energy house designed by a local architect. He mentioned that there was initially resistance from the neighborhood due to concerns about the design not fitting in. However, the architect explained that the key factors were the proportions and transparency of the house, rather than the materials, like brick. The neighborhood ultimately accepted it. He emphasized that, from his experience on the Historic Preservation Commission, there can be a tendency to overly restrict modern design within historic districts.

Commissioner Lindwall expressed difficulty understanding the future land use strategy chapter. She noted that the flow of the document does not make sense to her, particularly with how the land use strategy is presented in one part, followed by the future land use plan, and then shifting into community context and main themes. She also raised concerns about the idea of centers and corridors, questioning their relevance in Evanston, given the city's eclectic neighborhoods and mixed-use business districts.

Commissioner Halik added to Commissioner Lindwall's point, saying that he initially understood the concept of centers (nodes) to be around transportation hubs and the corridors to include streets like Main Street, Dempster, and Central. The goal, as he read it, was to encourage more density along these corridors, which he supported. However, when he reviewed the zoning ordinance, he found that the plan seemed to eliminate the concept of R1 zoning and allowed for density everywhere, leading to a disconnect between the original goal of the land use plan and its translation into the zoning code.

Commissioner Lindwall expressed concerns about the land use map, specifically the statement that centers should have robust transportation options and networks. She pointed out that she doesn't believe those agencies are offering new bus routes to the employment centers. She questioned how the plan can effectively define these centers and corridors, if there is no clear plan for improving transportation. Additionally, she pointed out the mixed land use along major transportation corridors, such as Chicago Avenue and Central Street may lack cohesive connections along their full length.

Commissioner Halik added that while there is currently a mix of uses along Central Street, he believed the planning concept intended for more density to be concentrated in these areas, even though there are houses there now. He acknowledged that although the area does not currently connect to a central hub, the intersection of Green Bay and Central could be seen as a "node" due to its proximity to a Metra stop and a hospital. He emphasized that the concept of density in these areas should still be considered in planning efforts, even if the connection isn't fully established yet.

Commissioner Lindwall expressed concerns about some of the development proposals, particularly regarding the Valli site, which was previously a factory and is now capped with asphalt. She noted that this site may not be suitable for residential use due to environmental concerns. She also questioned the viability of other proposed centers, like the area around Gross Point, Central Street, and Crawford, where there have been previous development proposals. She emphasized that without a clear definition of what constitutes a "center" or "corridor," the concept might not be useful, particularly when considering the allocation of capital improvement dollars across the entire city.

Liz Williams responded, agreeing that the plan should better define and integrate the map identifying centers and corridors. Williams clarified that, in terms of corridors, they refer to major arterial roads such as Dempster, Central, Ridge, and Chicago, which link different parts of the city. She also noted that the land use along these corridors changes significantly, which could complicate how these areas are designated or planned for. She then asked if Commissioner Lindwall had any suggestions or alternatives

Commissioner Lindwall responded that she would drop the discussion of corridors and centers altogether and focus on neighborhoods. The plan needs to identify neighborhoods that lack certain amenities. Maybe we could use something like census tracts. She explained that there is a need for another organizing concept, or the plan could simply acknowledge that Evanston is an eclectic place with many different kinds of environments.

Commissioner Mirintchev stated that, besides transportation and high-density living near centers and corridors, we should consider pedestrian corridors as well. One of the biggest centers for should be the lake, and he did not see anything in the plan that connects to it. He expressed that he would love to see some of the main corridors lead to the lake because it's one of the best features of Evanston. Pedestrian zones are important, and Evanston should begin to implement them, especially in parts of downtown. There's a great opportunity to make certain parts of downtown pedestrian-only, with a focus on areas that lead to the lake.

Commissioner Lindwall shared that she believes the city's centers may not necessarily need to be high-density residential areas, as suggested by the consultant team. Instead, she proposed that Evanston's centers could be defined by placemaking—areas like the lake, Lovelace Park, the high school, or Church and Dodge. These could serve as community hubs. She noted that in the focus group meetings and development workshops, no clear consensus was reached on

what exactly constitutes a "center," because that concept does not align with how people typically think about Evanston.

Commissioner Halik acknowledged that his suggestion might seem unconventional, but he still sees value in the concept of centers and corridors, as seen in major city planning efforts like Chicago's. He believes this framework is a strong tool for managing density and transportation, among other factors. While the corridors in Evanston may not yet be fully developed, he hopes that with time, they could evolve, possibly including the lakefront area as part of the future vision for the city.

Commissioner Lindwall raised concerns about the designation of campus districts on the future land use map. She acknowledged the medical campuses with two hospitals, but questioned the inclusion of other areas like Three Crowns and Presbyterian Homes, which do not seem to fit the typical definition of a campus. She pointed out inconsistencies with the designation of the Northwestern campus, mentioning that parts of it, like Englehart Hall and certain buildings not connected to the main campus, are labeled as part of the campus district despite not being clearly connected. Commissioner Lindwall questioned the criteria for identifying campus districts and suggested that perhaps only the two medical districts should be designated as such, with other areas fitting into their surrounding land use categories as they currently do.

Liz Williams explained that the campus district designations are meant to identify areas that function as larger campuses with unique needs beyond typical neighborhood zoning. She clarified that these locations have specific programming requirements and long-term goals that set them apart, thus justifying their separate treatment in the plan. She conveyed that the intent behind these designations is to acknowledge the unified programming and broader land area associated with such campuses.

She further elaborated that properties designated as campus districts are typically zoned according to the surrounding neighborhood. However, she encouraged the Commission to consider the broader needs of institutional uses, like the high school and university, which engage in master planning for their campuses. While the Commission could choose to revert the ETHS campus back to surrounding neighborhood zoning, she suggested that the unique needs of institutions should be a factor into how they are treated in the land use plan.

The discussion shifted to the zoning of campus-like institutions such as Three Crowns and Presbyterian Home. Commissioners debated whether these should remain under the current zoning, such as R4, or be reclassified to fit more closely with surrounding neighborhoods. One concern raised was that while hospitals generate significant traffic and impact surrounding areas, smaller institutions like Three Crowns might not have the same level of impact. However, there is no data available on traffic or other impacts to make a definitive comparison.

The conversation also touched on the importance of community input in the planning process. Commissioners were interested in how public feedback, gathered from surveys and comments, would be integrated into the updated draft of the plan. Liz Williams clarified that staff would evaluate the feedback and share it with the HDR team for consideration in the next steps. Additionally, the public comments would be summarized and included in the final draft for the City Council's review.

Finally, Commissioner Lindwall and others noted a need for clearer, visual representations of zoning and parking standards, with the request for graphics that would help explain the zoning's implications for the public. Staff acknowledged the request and indicated that the needed

renderings would be provided during further zoning discussions.

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

None.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

**Commissioner Lindwall Moved to Adjourn.
Commissioner Johnson Seconded.**

Meeting Adjourned at 11:09 pm.

The **next scheduled** Evanston Land Use Commission meeting is **Wednesday, January 15, 2025, at 6:00 pm**, in the James C. Lytle Council Chambers
in the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.

Respectfully submitted,
Justin Bock, Administrative lead

Reviewed by
Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner