

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.
Peter Miller	2354 Ridge Ave	12/4/2024	24PLND-0043 a	Undecided	Written comment	<p>Dear Commissioners:</p> <p>Any change to the zoning code should not diminish the provisions of the Preservation Ordinance (2-8-12) regarding subdivision of historic and landmark properties. Preservation should not assume a lesser value in the City's priorities because of changes in zoning that may otherwise encourage up to housing development. To the extent that more housing development is permitted on historic properties, the process of evaluating development proposals should remain clearly in place. Please make this a part of your recommendations.</p> <p>Here is the relevant text of the ordinance:</p> <p>2-8-12. - REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS FOR SUBDIVISION, RESUBDIVISION OR CONSOLIDATION.</p> <p>(A)</p> <p>Prior to review of any subdivision, resubdivision or consolidation pursuant to Title 4, Chapter 13, "Subdivisions," Sections 1 through 3, of any landmark, area, property, structure or site in a district, Council or its duly authorized committee shall request a report by the [Preservation] Commission regarding the effect of the proposed subdivision, resubdivision or consolidation on the landmark or district. Review by the Commission shall be advisory.</p> <p>(B)</p> <p>The Commission shall review the application for subdivision, resubdivision or consolidation based on the following standards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The design of the subdivision, resubdivision or consolidation shall: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (e) Preserve, adaptively use, or otherwise protect the landmark, or area, property, structure, site or object in the district; and (b) Provide the location and design of new structures and objects that are visually compatible with the landmark or sites, buildings, structures, and objects in the district; and (c) Not result in blocking or otherwise obstructing, as viewed from a public street or public way, not to include Lake Michigan, the critical features of the landmark or area, property, structure, site or object in the district; and (d) Preserve and protect the critical features of the streetscape associated with the landmark, or area, property, structure, site or object in the district; and (e) Not adversely affect traffic patterns, municipal services, adjacent property values, or the general harmony of the District. 2. Alteration, construction, demolition and relocation shall be consistent with Section 2-8-9. <p>Thank you for your attention and consideration.</p>		

McCarthy Jane 2130 Harrison St 12/6/2024	2130 Harrison St Disposed	Written comm	<p>I am commenting on the rezoning proposal, specifically the change to R1 designation. I have lived in my single family home here in Evanston for 30 years. It is not a home built in 1888 and is functional and has character. It has needed much maintenance over the years which I have kept up with. The usual like new roof, rewiring etc plus some kitchen (21) etc. When that house goes back on the market, I am not expecting to get a return on my investment. It is the home to live in and raise kids in and I see it as an investment in my quality of life. I want to make a return on my dollars I would do it all over again. This home will be relatively affordable to the next person that wants to purchase it.</p> <p>On the other hand, there are some single family homes on my street and in the neighborhood that are on par in terms of value to my home. They have been purchased by investors looking to make a profit. (They have been (21) believe). They have been replaced by duplexes usually and each being for over a million. (Compared to a home costing 6-700k). They are built in order to turn a profit. These homes are not affordable and do not provide the same space as a single family home.</p> <p>If you change the zoning for my home and others like it, one, investors will be looking to make a profit and will tear it down and put up expensive duplex or four-plexes with association dues etc. Two, I won't be as inclined to maintain my home with the chance that what is put up next door won't lower my home value (by blocking light or being an eyesore) or worse, an investor would purchase my home and tear it down.</p> <p>Why make these broad sweeping changes to zoning? Make tweaks if you need to but leave the process of zoning variances on a case by case basis for the existing R1 areas. I would not have purchased a home in this area if these were the zoning laws 30 years ago. We need a variety of homes to attract buyers of all kinds.</p> <p>If there is a vacant lot, like 3239 Central street, that could/should be considered for more affordable units. But I just learned that lot will now be single family homes, a developer is set to make a huge profit and it will not be affordable housing. How did that happen?</p> <p>Respectfully, Jane McCarthy 2130 Harrison St December 4, 2024</p> <p>Dear Land Use Commissioners,</p> <p>I'm Stuart Cleland. I've owned and lived at 2145 Maple Avenue, Evanston, since 1986.</p> <p>I'm a member of the Evanston Lighthouse Rotary Club, and also of Joining Forces for Affordable Housing.</p> <p>I'm writing in support of the zoning changes proposed by Evriston Evanston 2045.</p> <p>Evanston has key deficits in general housing, and particularly in affordable housing. The EE2045 plan goes a long way toward solving those problems and making our city more open to the wide variety of citizens who would like to live here, and who would make Evanston a more vibrant community.</p> <p>I appreciate the need to discuss and refine the proposals. But I urge you to move forward on these necessary changes, which will improve the lives and provide the housing opportunities that are so desperately needed.</p> <p>Many thanks, Stuart Cleland</p>
Stuart Cleland 2145 Maple Ave 12/4/2024	Proposed change	Written comm	<p>I support the new zoning map and delineations of districts and look forward to the release of what special and allowable uses will be accounted for in the new zoning code with regard to R1 and R2 specifically. It is my hope that things like corner stores and small cafes are allowed to enhance walkability and access in neighborhoods where that is sorely needed.</p> <p>The minimal density increase in R1 (allowing up to four unit buildings), which has drawn a lot of fire from those opposed in my neck of the woods (northern Evanston) should not have a deleterious effect on property values according to the Equitable Zoning Recommendations report put together by Joining Forces for Affordable Housing.</p> <p>Such increases in density, and density increases in general, are not the ultimate solution for creating the full amount of housing abundance and affordability Evanston needs, but these steps are an important and necessary piece of the puzzle.</p> <p>According to an Evanston Now article from Dec 3, 2024, related zoning also appears to have a positive effect on the rate of rent increases, something that affects many Evanston residents, including students and folks who cannot afford to purchase. The Evanston Now article says: "...It appears that three of the four communities that have relaxed their zoning restrictions — Minneapolis, Portland and Tysons — are showing moderation in rent increases that arguably are related to their move to more permissive zoning rules." (https://evanstonnow.com/well-more-housing-more-affordability/)</p> <p>This process is rushed and undemocratic. I lived in a city that passed a similar rezoning in Massachusetts and it just resulted in more expensive homes and a destruction of the culture of the city. If we want a thoughtful way to plan for the future, let's do the studies, see what actually works, and not rush this through during the holidays for what seems like nothing more than selfish gain. Shame on the Mayor and city!! This is not what the citizens elected you out!! Slow this down.</p>
Frank Hill 827 Lincoln St 12/4/2024	Zoning Districts	Written comm	<p>In favor</p>
Joel Fox 817 Central St. 12/4/2024	Rezoning of Existing	Written comm	<p>Opposed</p>
Daniel Spiewak 2519 Ridgeway 12/4/2024	Zoning of R1 and	In person	<p>In favor</p>
			Self

Name	Address	Date	Event	Response	Comments	Self
Kristi Rafferty	724 Clinton PkE	12/4/2024	Land Use Comm	Opposed	Written comm	
William Miller	811 Monticello Pl	12/4/2024	Public Hearing	Opposed	Written comm	
John Kennedy	1118 Herman	12/4/2024	Evanston 2024	Opposed	In person	
Tracy Proulx	2206 Collax St	12/4/2024	Re-zoning of 221	Opposed	Written comm	
Jeff Smith	3724 Harrison	12/4/2024	Map Amendment	Opposed	In person	
Bruce Ehrenbach	723 Emerson	12/4/2024	A & B	Opposed	In person	
Kyle Navas	1720 Maple Ave	12/4/2024	Rezoning	Opposed	In person	
David DeCarlo		12/4/2024	24PLND-0043 a	Opposed	Written comm	

I'm concerned about the pace and transparency of the proposed rezoning to the entirety of Evanston. Typically a comprehensive plan is a multi-year endeavor (like Winnetka which I understand has been very successful.) After the comprehensive plan is approved, then the city codifies a separate zoning plan. In this case, both are happening simultaneously and in a matter of months - during the holidays when residents are very busy and often traveling.

Many residents were surprised that the plan is already being reviewed by the Land Use Commission before resident input. I can't believe that there isn't a remote option to participate either.

This plan is being rushed through intentionally. I propose the city slow down and take the necessary time on our comprehensive plan and zoning code to ensure that it's viable for years to come. Evanston Evanston 2045 Rezoning Plan in its current form. Rezoning would change the character of my neighborhood and increase population and vehicle density. The current plan imposes zoning changes on people who moved to a neighborhood with the expectation that current R-1 (or R-2 or R-3) zoning would remain in place. Residents in each zoning area/neighborhood should have the opportunity to vote on changes in their area. It is inequity of residents in a given zoning area agree to the changes, then that would provide justification for the change.

I also question the desire to increase Evanston's population. Roads are already very crowded. Higher population density in residential neighborhoods will decrease the amount of greenspace in our communities. Also, if rezoning results in lower property values, then taxes will increase across the city and disproportionately more of the city's tax burden will fall on lower income residents.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

William M. Miller, PhD
811 Monticello Pl
Evanston, IL 60201

Professor Emeritus of Chemical and Biological Engineering
Faculty Affiliates, Center for Native American and Indigenous Research (CNAIR)
Northwestern University
2145 Sheridan Road, Tech E136
Evanston, IL 60208
847.491.4628

I am opposed to rezoning in my district, in particular allowing multi-unit buildings and permitting building up to the lot line. This will fundamentally change the character of our neighborhood by increasing population density and encouraging the teardown of smaller homes to make more giant, wasteful homes. These new builds not only take away from the character of the neighborhood, but also price current Evanstonians out of the area.

I am also opposed to changing zoning if the Central Street Business District, especially any increase in the height of buildings along Central Street.

I object to consideration of these zoning amendments at the hearing tonight on procedural grounds. The Land Use Commission (LUC) should continue consideration of these amendments to the zoning code and map until after the comprehensive plan is discussed, revised, and voted on by the LUC. (i.e. until at least after the next 1/20/25 hearing date on the comprehensive plan. The LUC should not agree to put the cart before the horse, a comprehensive plan is a multi-year endeavor and it is not fair to expect the LUC to make decisions on zoning code amendments that have not yet even been available. Throughout the proposed (and approved) LUC process, there have been numerous cross-emissions to new sections of the zoning code that have not yet been released to the LUC or the public, rendering it impossible to reasonably evaluate the potential effects of these changes on every home and business in Evanston.