Name (first and last)	Address of residence or property owned	Meeting date	Agenda Item (Property address or description of agenda item)	Position on Agenda Item (as applicable)	How would you like to make your public comment?	If you are providing a written comment, please leave here:	Are you representing yourself as an individual or speaking on behalf of a group?	Please name the group of people for whom you are the designated speaker.
Anneliese Kranz	1613 Church Street	2/11/2026	Amendment to Rezoning Ordinance #59-O-24 1611 Church Street #25ZMJV-0048	Opposed	Written comment	We live directly west of this zoning site and bought our property in April 2024. We bought our home assuming that zoning of 1611 Church would be as originally proposed. We have a large east-facing window that we like to look out of while we eat meals. The current garage structures do not fully block our view; however, if a residence/dwelling structure is built above one of the garage structures to the east of our house, it will block our view of the east from our dining room almost entirely. We really would appreciate being able to have a meal and not be looking into someone else's dwelling unit beside us (as well as still having a view from the east rather than a building). We are really urging you to rejecting this amended zoning ordinance. This project has already blocked the views of our neighbors in our townhome community with the larger dwelling structure, and we're really hoping to avoid having the same with our home. We hope you will consider this. Thank you.		
John Storey Willian	864 Sheridan R	2/11/2026	Vote on Members for Zoning Code		Written comme	Dear Members of the Land Use Commission, I understand that the Commission will be appointing Land Use Commission representatives to the Zoning Code Working Group this evening. Given the scope, duration, and upstream influence of the zoning rewrite, it is essential that the Working Group's role remain strictly limited to tracking project milestones, engagement activities, and process integrity, as described in the draft scope of work. I also wish to raise a serious process concern. The City's FY2024 PRO Housing grant application relied heavily on anticipated comprehensive planning and zoning outcomes. The application explicitly references "much-needed density," "land use regulations that encourage production of additional and diverse market-driven attainable housing," and contemplated zoning actions such as "creating mixed-use zones that allow increased residential density near transit hubs," "reducing the number of zoning districts," and "eliminating overlays and single-family zoning." These statements treated specific zoning and density outcomes as enabling assumptions, not as unresolved policy questions. It is my understanding that the Land Use Commission was not formally briefed on the PRO Housing application or how these representations relied on Envision Evanston 2045 planning and zoning outcomes that had yet to be considered by the Commission the time of application. When an advisory body's work is being cited to support external grant commitments of this magnitude, the absence of a clear and contemporaneous briefing undermines informed deliberation and the Commission's practical independence. Recent planning and legislative controversies have further demonstrated how staff-driven timelines, external commitments, and alignment-oriented processes can place commissioners in constrained or reactive positions. Avoiding a repetition of those dynamics must be a priority as the zoning rewrite proceeds. Accordingly, the Commission should insist that public engagement for the zoning rewrite be genuinely open-ended and exploratory, not structured to test, validate, or align public input around predetermined policy directions. Engagement should surface unresolved tradeoffs and competing perspectives, and the Commission should require clear documentation showing how public input influences outcomes that remain genuinely undecided. Transparency around how staff-led initiatives, prior grant representations, and past process failures intersect with the Commission's independent advisory role is not optional; it is necessary to restore public confidence and to preserve the Land Use Commission as the primary forum for zoning deliberation.		

Marie Fleurima	2520 Gross Poi	2/11/2026	Zoning Work Group	Written comme	I am an immigrant, but I have lived in this community long enough to know that process matters just as much as outcomes. As the Zoning Code Working Group begins its work, I respectfully ask that the Commission ensure its role remains limited to oversight of process and does not become a place where substantive zoning decisions are shaped outside of full public deliberation. I am also concerned that when planning or zoning outcomes still under Commission consideration are referenced in external commitments, including federal grant applications, commissioners should be clearly and formally briefed. Advisory bodies cannot provide thoughtful guidance if they are not fully informed about how their deliberations are being relied upon elsewhere. Finally, public engagement must be genuinely open-ended. Residents should be confident that their participation can influence decisions that are still undecided, not simply affirm directions that appear to have been established well in advance of public or commission understanding. Transparency, clarity of roles, and respect for the Commission's independence are essential to maintaining trust in this process.		