



Meagan Jones <mmjones@cityofevanston.org>

HPC Zoning Comments

Cade Sterling <csterling@cityofevanston.org>

Wed, Jan 22, 2025 at 9:27 AM

To: Meagan Jones <mmjones@cityofevanston.org>, Elizabeth Williams <ewilliams@cityofevanston.org>, Sam Hubbard <shubbard@cityofevanston.org>, Uri Pachter <upachter@cityofevanston.org>

Good morning everyone,

I'll have to review the video and prepare the minutes to get some of the details from last night's discussion, but I'll provide some generalities so everyone is aware.

Last night the Commission spent two hours or so reviewing the proposed zoning for portions of Chicago Avenue, particularly between Dempster and Lee Street, the Main Street and Dempster Street business districts, and portions of the downtown along east and west Davis Street. They will pick up at their February meeting to continue reviewing portions of the downtown, Central Street, and the Florence/Greenleaf area. They may jump into some other areas as well, but these were the initial portions they showed an interest in looking at due to them either containing existing or eligible landmarks, being adjacent to historic districts, or otherwise areas containing fabric they feel is of a special value or interest for the community and represent tangible links to our past and current identities and sense of place.

- 1. Chicago Avenue between Dempster and Lee Street.** General consensus that the proposed M3 designation here is not appropriate particularly on the east side of Chicago Avenue where lots abut low-density single-family homes within the Lakeshore Historic District. They recommended something more similar to the proposed M1 designation, and felt four stories in this location was the appropriate building type that would be compatible with surrounding character and built forms. They also recommended that any reduction in bulk that may occur due to FAR restrictions should occur at the rear volume of these buildings and/or increase the rear-yard setback from 5' to 15'. They also discussed the west side of Chicago Avenue feeling that 7 stories was more appropriate as-of-right along the entirety of the corridor, with higher-density being appropriate as it approaches existing higher-density developments north and south of Main. General feeling was that the entire corridor should not be treated as a single zoning district, that the east and west sides should be treated differently, and that the built form along the corridor should correspond to changes in context and design vocabularies east and west of it.
- 2. Main Street between Custer and Maple.** Consensus was that the proposed zoning, particularly the proposed increase in FAR, was not compatible with the existing built form of this business district, noting the majority of its character is 2-3 stories. This is another location where I think the proposed M1 designation was seen as more appropriate, allowing no more than a four-story building as-of-right in these locations. Due to the significance of the storefronts, the rhythm of fenestration and entrances, alignment of horizontal articulation by way of aligned eaves, cornice lines, belt and string courses etc, it was suggested that this location have more prescriptive design related requirements for as-of-right developments that enable new interventions that respect the character and articulation of existing forms. They also discussed the potential for required setbacks and transitional height planes above the full second-story in this location.
- 3. Dempster Street between Elmwood and the alley west of Hinman.** Same concerns as the Main Street narrative above although there was additional concern with the adjacent M3 zoning designation just south of Dempster adjacent to the landmark at the southwest corner of Chicago and Dempster, as well as the portion of M3 just east of Sherman running south noting that its adjacent to lower-density two-part commercial buildings and lower-density residential to the west side of Sherman, a handful of which are landmarks.
- 4. Downtown Davis Street between the alley west of Hinman and Ridge.** It was noted that the portions of east and west Davis Street should be treated differently as they contain very different built forms and character currently. West of the tracks on Davis, the consensus was that the existing D2 zoning should be maintained or have a modest increase in the existing FAR that is permitted to achieve no more than a three-story building as-of-right in this location. It was noted that this portion of Davis acts more as a neighborhood business district and not as much part of the downtown, being immediately adjacent to residential areas. Although they didn't outright say it, I feel like this portion could follow the same recommendations they made for Main and Dempster, with transitional height planes, design guidelines, and other ways to create more predictive outcomes that have compatible building articulation. The portion of Davis Street east of the tracks didn't find a lot of consensus before they continued the discussion for the next meeting, but it seemed that they felt the current proposal, particularly the increase in FAR for this location was not appropriate and that the proposed 65' height, with a lower FAR could result in built forms that respect the existing scale of buildings at the street

level while stepping back behind that existing streetwall. It was another area where they discussed wanting to guide more prescriptive design outcomes due to the significance of the architecture currently in these locations.

Cade W. Sterling

Planner

Community Development Department

Planning & Zoning Division

City of Evanston

2100 Ridge Ave. | Evanston, IL 60201 | 847-448-8231

csterling@cityofevanston.org | cityofevanston.org

The City of Evanston is committed to promoting a Citywide culture of accessibility and inclusivity. To request an accommodation for a program, service, or activity, please call 847-866-2919 to make an ADA service request or fill out a [request form online](#).

ANDREA LISS

January 21, 2025

Land Use Commission
City of Evanston
2100 Ridge Avenue
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Dear Commissioners,

Please consider my thoughts and ideas about Envision 2045 as outlined below. The entire community needs you to provide leadership and thoughtfulness, professionalism and prudence as we move forward.

I AM AN EVANSTONIAN

I came to Evanston to attend Northwestern as a graduate student at Medill and have been here ever since. I started out living in a rented studio apartment on Grove Street. As a young professional, I took the train to downtown Chicago every day for work. Eventually I moved to the 3rd Ward where I currently live in a condo in one of the denser areas of town. When I was dating my husband, a long-time Lincoln Parker, we decided to build our life here in Evanston. We're still here – loyal Evanstonians through and through.

As time went by, I started a design business here, and eventually after being a 'professional renter' most of my life, I was able to purchase a 1911 building in the 4th Ward for my business. I've put my heart and soul into making it a place where people can be inspired and create. All my employees take the train to get to and from work – one of the wonderful amenities of Evanston.

In addition to living and working here, I have some experience in the zoning aspects of Evanston. My plan of using a portion of my building to create a small special event venue to help me with the property taxes meant that I also went through a zoning process with DAPR and ZBA. I was successful in adding the Special Use of Banquet Facility, and the venue is in the works with plans to open next year.

I am a part of Evanston and Evanston is a part of me. My life is here – personal and professional – through so many stages of life. I love our jewel on the lake for its people, culture, history, architecture, local businesses, restaurants, charm, and local smarts in so many ways.

I am very concerned about much that I read and hear about the new zoning plans being discussed and will outline them below. While looking ahead, and planning for the future, we need to protect and preserve the Evanston we know and love.

ZONING COMMENTS OVERVIEW

I am very supportive of updating the comprehensive plan and the zoning code, addressing affordable housing, transit-oriented development, environmental sustainability, and building a positive future for all of us. I also think that a project this large and with as much built in change throughout the City needs to be more thoroughly reviewed and refined to get it right and avoid errors and unintended consequences.

The Land Use Commission is in a position to be influential and make a big difference. Evanstonians citywide are calling for a more measured process for the best outcome. Many are professionals with years of experience in affordable housing and zoning issues. Many of you have voiced concerns during the public meetings, and I hope you will heed this chorus of opposition and to the plan in its current form and the artificial timeline you are working towards.

Excellence, quality, and solutions that include all Evanston residents should be the standard. The draft plan is not an example of excellence and needs work to bring it up to par. There are too many areas that are either boilerplate, incomplete, or just plain wrong. The plan is missing data to support its conclusions and doesn't seem like it was written by people who know Evanston. It reads more like an aspirational "How Things Should Be" without taking into account where we are, what Evanston is all about, and the best ways to achieve the goals outlined in the plan. To that end, the comprehensive plan is anything but that and should be given the time to be fully complete and agreed upon strategically before layering in the tactics of zoning.

Case in point, the proposed zoning changes for two areas I know best – my condo in the 3rd Ward and my commercial building in the 4th Ward – are ill-suited for their neighborhoods, and if those two places that I know so well have mistakes, I wonder what else is wrong in the plan regarding neighborhoods that I am not as intimately knowledgeable about. The specifics are listed below:

FOURTH WARD ZONING M3 ZONE 800 Greenwood Street

In looking at the new interactive zoning map, I have concerns about my street, both on its own, and as it relates to Elmwood, which we back up to.

C2 to M3

The current C2 zoning of my block on the West side of the tracks has a height limit of 45 feet. The proposed M3 zone puts my street in the same category as the East side of the tracks and Chicago Avenue and more than doubles the height limit to 100 feet.

This change ignores that our street is of moderate height with 1-, 2-, and 3-story buildings, and that it backs up to a residential neighborhood with single family homes.

My street and those that run on the West side of the tracks are "transition" blocks and should be zoned accordingly with appropriate height restrictions. Any new development should be limited in size to provide a balanced transition to the adjacent streets. This is listed in the new code as a value – in describing the downtown area the plan says there "should be a lot of tall buildings in the central downtown area, while the edges should transition to shorter buildings as they approach nearby residential neighborhoods."

I recognize that we are in a Transit-Oriented District, but this needs to be balanced with the surrounding neighborhood and how best to integrate further density with the existing conditions. Tapestry Station and the Custer Avenue development come to mind as the maximum scale that would be appropriate for this area.

In considering how to create standards that make sense for Sherman Avenue and Custer Avenue which run West of the tracks, the Envision 2045 plan has useful language in the University 1 (U1) District zoning description on page 23: "Where this district is located across a street or alley from residential uses, sensitive site design is required to minimize impacts on the surrounding neighborhood." I think this written standard is appropriate here as well.

M3 Transparency Requirement

I am also concerned about the Transparency requirement as written for this new M3 district. While I understand and appreciate the desire for designing buildings that are welcoming from the streetscape, I think the requirement is too directive. Storefronts are not appropriate for all commercial businesses, and there should be other options allowed.

In the case of my 1-story property, there are windows all along the upper third of the building. This is perfect for our design studio, office, workshop, and venue uses. We have an abundance of natural light, along with the privacy to conduct business and special events without a storefront showcase. Under the proposed zoning plan, my building would not be in compliance with the standards, and buildings designed for business uses other than storefronts would not be within standards for development. The directive should be changed to include more options and creative architectural solutions.

THIRD WARD ZONING R4 ZONE 470-498 Sheridan Road

R4 - RESIDENTIAL 4 (currently R5)

I live at Lake Shore Condos near South Boulevard Beach, and the new description for my neighborhood describes "mixed-use residential buildings that may include neighborhood amenities such as small ground floor food and beverage establishments and ground floor retail goods and service uses."

While this description applies to certain nearby neighborhoods in Evanston such on the corner of Hinman at Main Street, it is inappropriate for our neighborhood including Sheridan Square, and neighboring courtyard buildings on Sheridan Road, South Boulevard, and Michigan, Forest, Judson, and Hinman Avenues. It does not make sense to have the zoning code allow business establishments on the ground floor of these buildings. The new streamlined zoning description does not serve the neighborhood well and would dramatically change the character and enjoyment of what is a strictly residential, and dense neighborhood.

Further, In the Residential Category descriptions, the neighborhood is also identified as URBAN LIVING, described as follows: "This category includes large multi-unit buildings, often designed around a central courtyard, located near commercial areas and around downtown. These large properties can support significant buildings that might have small businesses on the ground floor, like coffee shops and convenience stores, to serve the local community."

This description, like much of the plan, reads like an aspirational view with an agenda that does not take into consideration the quality of life and sense of place of those living in those areas. I have heard city staff speak about a directive value that envisions corner stores in residential neighborhoods around the city for walkability reasons. This is not appropriate for all neighborhoods.

There are no commercial establishments in this area, nor do they belong here. Imagine Sheridan Square with a coffee shop or convenience store. The new zoning category would allow it "by right." This would change the character of our quiet residential neighborhood dramatically. We are not Rogers Park and don't want to become another version of that. The new plan has the potential to destroy our peaceful way of life and plummet property values.

The same applies to much of this new district between Sheridan and Chicago Avenue. I suggest that this category be revisited throughout the plan and revised. It concerns me that this recommendation was made at all and raises the question as to if those who came up with it have been to the neighborhood.

Of note, there is an error on the newly released interactive map. They have our building currently in red as if it is Mixed Use, which is incorrect. We are currently R5.

OTHER GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

1. "The map is not the territory" and streamlined zoning ignores certain variations on the ground. I think it is worth looking at the city street by street to be sure the new zones make sense. I understand the desire to simplify, but removing nuance and necessary complexity seems reckless. Details matter and removing them does not serve us well.
2. Questions about quality of life and what the changes proposed will do to existing neighborhoods and the people who live in them should be ranked as high considerations in any proposed changes. Property values, displacement of long time Evanstonians, loss of historical properties to developers and impact on the environment, should all be reviewed as possible consequences and be adjusted accordingly.
3. Staff has mentioned that much of the built environment in Evanston does not match the current zoning code, and there is a desire with the new zoning plan to bring all into compliance by instituting more uniform standards. While this may look good on paper, and feel neat and tidy, it ignores that Evanston was incorporated in 1863 and was built under various zoning codes. Evanston is interesting, quirky, and complex. Streamlining it to simplify may have unintended consequences of adding too much height and density and creating a developer's dream that will change the charm and sense of place that makes Evanston so interesting and unique. Why does everything need to be the same? Maybe we need a plan that is not as complex as the current one, but not as simplified as what is being proposed.
4. Having gone through a robust zoning process with my commercial building to add the Special Use of a Banquet Facility, I have experience with the process and considerations involved, including taking input from neighbors and adjusting plans accordingly. While I appreciate the simplification of less zones, I think it is important to take a more thoughtful approach as needed. Neighbors, quality of life, and property values must be taken into consideration as developments are planned. Evanston is a rich and varied place with intricacies and complexities that should be contemplated in the zoning code.
5. Reuse, remodeling, and repurposing of existing structures is an option that will maintain the character and history of Evanston and should be encouraged. A good example is the project on Dempster and Chicago where the developer is working to maintain the ground level façade and build height and density set back and behind the original structure. I hope some consideration will be provided for such hybrid developments that have less impact on the environment and surrounding neighborhoods than all new construction.

6. I appreciate the move to less dependence on cars, but they are and will continue to be a part of life and need to be planned for. I am concerned about parking and want to be sure that new developments will have sufficient parking to avoid over-crowding the streets. Not all residents are young, able-bodied, and work in Evanston. People need cars to get to work, take kids to sports practices, doctor visits, grocery shop, visit family etc. Destination businesses that attract customers from outside of Evanston need a place for their customers to park. Consideration should also be taken of our winters when bicycles are not a viable option.

7. The new plan and zoning tactics place a high value on increased density. Are Evanstonians asking for more density? One of the reasons my husband and I selected Evanston to live is because it is not as densely populated as Chicago. What will increased density do to our public works and services like fire and police? What will added density do to the open spaces, air quality, and livability of Evanston? Evanston is a part of the larger "Chicagoland" area and can only absorb our portion of density. Careful consideration needs to be taken so that the changes proposed are done in an ecological manner where we don't destroy what we have by chasing a vision for some think we "should" be.

CONCLUSION

Evanston is wonderfully complex place with a rich history and intricate range of homes, businesses, neighborhoods, and architecture. Please work to preserve as much of the character and charm of Evanston as possible while preparing for the future. Please lead the way without destroying what we have.

I strongly request that more time be given to review and assess the entire new comprehensive and zoning plans so that more input and discussion can take place. Something this large and with as much change built in needs to be more thoroughly reviewed by the community to avoid unintended consequences.

I question the prudence of rushing this plan before an election. These proposed changes should be an issue that is debated and discussed among potential candidates running for local government offices. The people of Evanston deserve to vote for elected officials according to their views on the matter, versus a top-down directive approach without voter input.

Sincerely,



Andrea Liss
800 Greenwood Street
Evanston, Illinois 60201



Meagan Jones <mmjones@cityofevanston.org>

Fwd: Envision Evanston 2045; 2 attachments and 1 article for the Land Use Commissioners

Marion Johnson <marionjohnson@cityofevanston.org>

Tue, Jan 21, 2025 at 2:50 PM

To: Meagan Jones <mmjones@cityofevanston.org>, Uri Pachter <upachter@cityofevanston.org>, Elizabeth Williams <ewilliams@cityofevanston.org>

Hi all,
can you respond to this request?

Thanks,

Marion Johnson

Housing and Grants Supervisor

Community Development

City of Evanston

Pronouns: She/Her

2100 Ridge Ave. | Evanston, IL 60201 | 847-448-8679 | marionjohnson@cityofevanston.org | cityofevanston.org

The City of Evanston is committed to promoting a Citywide culture of accessibility and inclusivity. To request an accommodation for a program, service, or activity, please call 847-866-2919 to make an ADA service request or fill out a [request form online](#).

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Alf McConnell** <alfmccconnell@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, Jan 21, 2025 at 2:32 PM

Subject: Envision Evanston 2045; 2 attachments and 1 article for the Land Use Commissioners

To: Marion Johnson <marionjohnson@cityofevanston.org>, Stephanie Mendoza <smendoza@cityofevanston.org>

Cc: Paul Breslin <p-breslin@northwestern.edu>, Holly Greenhagen <hollygreenhagen@gmail.com>, John Alsterda (current) <jalsterda@yahoo.com>, Meg Welch <mwmairead@gmail.com>, David Cherry <stellaleon@comcast.net>

Hello, Marion and Stephanie.

Further to our prior communications and concerning the Land Use Commission meeting tomorrow (Wednesday) evening, attached please find:

- My updated letter concerning affordable housing and Envision Evanston 2045;
- My background information.

Please email these two attachments to the Land Use Commissioners, and please place a hard copy in their respective folders.

Also, please email to the Land Use Commissioners the following link to an article about the affordable housing community that I am developing in Rockford. I could **volunteer** (i.e., no compensation to me) to help the City develop in Evanston develop such a community in Evanston:

https://www.rockrivercurrent.com/2025/01/06/new-affordable-housing-development-for-seniors-planned-for-riverfront-in-south-rockford/?fbclid=IwZXh0bgNhZW0CMTEAAR0R_7GuQHnZADNqTQ6I5nMyLN0qFOKmzEvJfCZ4o4TSVovqviim74omJVA_aem_dehqFbfw4WheP0nMBP2zFQ

Upon receipt of this email, please confirm receipt of this email and the two (2) attachments.

Thank you,

Alf

Alf G. McConnell

AlfMcConnell@gmail.com

My office # : **847-491-9707** (landline)

e-fax # : **847-556-6528**

Time on this email: CST

2 attachments

 **Evanston zoning issue -- Alf McConnell's letter -- an analysis of affordable housing in Evanston -- CLEAN, Last modified by Alf -- 1-20-25--2155.pdf**
233K

 **Background Alf McConnell; gen; 11-pitch; b5d25e23h.pdf**
83K

January 20, 2025
(an updated version of my prior letters)

Re: Envision Evanston 2045

Dear Evanston Residents:

Having been in the real estate industry for 54 years (nine of which were spent as a commercial mortgage banker and 45 years as a real estate developer), having developed affordable housing for the past 30 years (two of my developments have received national recognition for quality), I have a decent understanding of affordable housing. Therefore, I would like to make the following points:

Executive Summary: The proposed revision of R-1 zoning (to allow for the construction of 2-unit, 3-unit, and 4-unit buildings – such a revision of a zoning designation is called “upzoning”) will **not** create affordable housing. Only the development of 3-or-more-story apartment buildings of 50-or-more units per building have a chance of creating affordable housing because of the need to (a) create economies of scale, (b) attract the necessary special financing, and (c) hire experienced, knowledgeable professional property management. Furthermore, these affordable multifamily buildings need to be located near (a) public transportation, (b) retail shopping, and (c) services. Two-, three-, and four-unit buildings that include one or more affordable units do not have these necessary elements. Also, because **there is a financial cost to a municipality of affordable housing**, only affordable housing units sufficient to meet the needs of that municipality’s citizens should be developed – It’s fiscally irresponsible to develop an excessive number of affordable housing units that essentially benefit other municipalities. Also, population growth generally has its problems -- As the population grows in a municipality, the cost of municipal services also grows, as well as the problems of governing a growing population. To revise the R-1 zoning (to allow buildings of 2- to 4-units) would put Evanston on a path that would result in the elimination of most detached single-family homes over time.

Details to Support the Executive Summary:

- I can appreciate that Mayor Biss and some members of the City Council might like to promote more affordable housing, a concept I support, but there is a right way and a wrong way to create affordable housing.
- Most knowledgeable, experienced developers of affordable housing would assert that **revising R-1 zoning (so developers can build 2- to 4-unit buildings) is the wrong way to try to create affordable housing and will not actually create affordable housing.**
- **2- to 4-unit buildings do not have the necessary economies of scale to justify their construction as a means of creating affordable housing.**
- The best way to efficiently create affordable housing in any meaningful numbers is by constructing medium to large apartment buildings (50 units and more – in Evanston, that would be constructing buildings with three or more stories). Such buildings should be constructed in the right locations (explained later in this letter) and would be financed with Section 42 financing (a program under the IRS) along with other financing programs.
- Most affordable housing in the United States is made possible through Section 42 financing, in conjunction with other financing programs.

- It is essentially impossible to efficiently construct affordable housing in any meaningful numbers by revising R-1 zoning to allow for 2- to 4-unit buildings. Units in 2- to 4-unit buildings would be sold or rented as market-rate housing, unless the developer/owner is willing to basically gift his/her money to the project. Such 2- to 4-unit buildings (as a plan to create affordable housing) is economically unfeasible and essentially will not happen.
- A person who is willing to donate his/her money to affordable housing would be better off contributing his/her money to the construction of a 50+ unit apartment building where the economies of scale and the necessary financing have a chance:
 - at making such affordable housing possible.
 - and*
 - at making it economically feasible to hire quality, professional property management. Quality professional property management is only available for buildings much larger than a 2- to 4-unit building.
- Financing methods to make 2- to 4-unit buildings affordable do not exist. Such special financing only exist in meaningful quantities for the development of medium to large apartment buildings because only larger buildings have the economies of scale needed to make affordable housing a reality.
- If the City of Evanston were to hypothetically legislate that the developer of proposed a 2- to 4-unit building must designate at least one of those units as affordable, it would be economically unfeasible for the developer to build that building. Therefore, this whole idea of revising R-1 zoning (to incentivize the construction of 2- to 4-unit buildings) as a way to increase affordable housing is unfeasible and is not going to happen.
- In any event, ideally, affordable housing should be located near public transportation, shopping, and other services, such as in the general downtown Evanston area. Thus, those residents of affordable housing would not need a car, thus saving them money. For the City Council to think that people in need of affordable housing are going to live in 2- to 4-unit buildings in those outlying neighborhoods (formerly detached single-family neighborhoods) runs counter to the needs of the people who need affordable housing. Respectfully, the City Council and the advocates of affordable housing are pursuing an unworkable plan.
- The City has wasted taxpayers' money in the commissioning of a study from a consultant who was essentially hired to write a report that would justify this proposed upzoning plan. The consultant was not correct and was not objective. Any knowledgeable, competent consultant would not write a report to justify upzoning as a method to create affordable housing.
- For various reasons (including the cost to a municipality of affordable housing), a smart municipality is going to build only enough affordable housing to:
 - Meet the needs of residents who already work or are needed to work within that municipality. In other words, if there are 1000 employees who work in Evanston and qualify for affordable housing, then Evanston should promote 1000 units of affordable housing but no more than 1000 units.
 - Meet the needs of its existing residents, including its senior residents, who qualify for affordable housing.
 - A smart municipality is not going to promote the construction of affordable housing that ends up acting as a magnet that attracts people from other municipalities. Such an approach would end up significantly costing Evanston (i.e., the existing taxpayers), thus

causing existing residents to move out of Evanston and causing potential Evanston residents to relocate to other municipalities.

- The bottom line is that because there is a cost of affordable housing to a municipality (in the form of lower real estate taxes per unit, the cost of social services, etc.), Evanston should not promote the development of an excessive number of affordable housing units that essentially benefit other municipalities.
 - Each municipality needs to build its own share of affordable housing that will be occupied by the residents who work or will work in that municipality.
 - Wilmette, Winnetka, etc., are happy to let Evanston pay for affordable housing for those people who work in Wilmette, Winnetka, etc., so that those municipalities don't have to pay for that affordable housing.
- Increasing the population of a municipality is not necessarily good.
 - As the population grows in a municipality, the cost of municipal services also grows, as well as the problems of governing a larger population.
 - Though the International Olympic Committee awarded Denver the Winter Olympics, Colorado voters turned down those Olympics. Colorado voters did not want the growth that would be created by those Olympics.
 - We have all seen how population growth has contributed to problems for our planet.
- Evanston already has a significant number of multifamily buildings abutting neighborhoods of detached single-family homes. For the City Council to pass legislation that results in a path to the elimination of many detached single-family homes in Evanston is not good for the reasons stated in this letter. And once higher-density zoning legislation is passed, history has proven that it is nearly impossible to reverse such zoning.
- Yes, there are people who want to move to Evanston – They want to move to Evanston because of the character, the charm, the ambiance of Evanston, partly created by the neighborhoods of detached single-family homes that have existed in Evanston for more than a century. However, if the City Council radically changes the character of Evanston to be more like Chicago, many of those potential residents will not want to move here to Evanston.
- If the City Council revises R-1 zoning (to incentivize the construction of 2- to 4-unit buildings), it will put Evanston on a path that will result in Evanston having a smaller and smaller percentage of detached single-family homes.
 - Of **Evanston's** 33,783 housing units, only **31.8%** are detached single-family homes (using the Census Bureau's 2018-2022 five-year estimate, which tends to lag).
 - **63.6%** of the housing units **in the U.S.** are detached single-family homes (per Statista Research Dept., Oct. 7, 2024).
 - **75.2%** of the housing units **in Wilmette** are detached single-family homes (per Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning, August 2024).
 - **The conclusion is that the City Council should not pass legislation that will accelerate the reduction of detached single-family homes.**
- Does the City Council really want to deny potential residents and existing Evanston residents who live in apartments the opportunity to live in a detached single-family home neighborhood? Is the Evanston City Council saying, in essence: "We don't want that type of resident to live in Evanston -- Go live elsewhere."
- **The City Council's revision of R-1 zoning is basically denying people the option to move into a detached single-family home.** Potential Evanston residents and existing Evanston apartment

dwellers who want to live in a detached single-family home in the North Shore (for whatever reason) will buy such a home in Wilmette, Kenilworth, Winnetka, Glencoe, etc., municipalities that do not have the diversity that exists in Evanston. The City Council would be creating a concentration of people in those municipalities, people who will not be exposed to the diversity that exists in Evanston.

- After 160+ years, it is unfair that the City Council might suddenly and radically change the character of Evanston forever.
- Upzoning would be unfair to those residents who have chosen to live in a neighborhood of detached single-family homes in Evanston, and upzoning would be especially unfair to those **residents who have invested in the most valuable asset they own -- their detached single-family home.**
- It would be a shame to have detached single-family homes (especially **the many attractive and/or historic and/or architecturally significant detached single-family homes**) **demolished and replaced with unattractive 2-, 3-, and 4-unit buildings.**
- If those multi-unit buildings were designed to be attractive, then those attractive designs and the resulting construction costs would make such buildings even more economically unfeasible as affordable units.
- **Owners and developers of detached single-family homes would tend to not maintain them, knowing that these homes will be demolished.** Simerly, landlords who own buildings that are subject to rent-control are not well maintained.
- As people retire to the sunbelt or move into assisted-living and as people die and their homes are sold by their descendants, **the elimination of neighborhoods of detached single-family homes will accelerate over time.**
- **Ecologically speaking**, tearing down Evanston's detached single-family homes and filling landfills with the remnants of these houses is not good public policy, especially when the replacement buildings have their negative implications.
- At the beginning of this process, there was mention that this proposed zoning plan was being modelled after those plans of San Francisco and Minneapolis. However, Evanston is neither San Francisco nor Minneapolis. Among other things (using 2023 population numbers):
 - Evanston is a small city (of only 75,050) in a large metropolitan area of 8.937 million people.
 - San Francisco and Minneapolis are large cities surround by small cities and towns.
 - San Francisco is 808,988 with a metropolitan area of 4.57 million people.
 - Minneapolis is 425,115 with a metropolitan area of 3.71 million people.
 - Of the roughly 21,000 new units of housing permitted in Minneapolis between 2017 and 2022, 87% of these units were constructed in buildings of 20 or more units, and just 1% were in buildings with only 2- to 4-units (per the Pew Charitable Trust).
 - San Francisco and Minneapolis have their own set of unique problems.
- We all want to improve Evanston, but the upzoning of R-1 zoning is not going to improve Evanston. Instead, it will decrease the quality of Evanston.
- I would be willing to donate my time, effort, and expertise to the City of Evanston to help the City create substantial affordable housing in the quantities needed for Evanston residents, assuming the City Council does not revise the existing R-1 zoning.

- And if I may offer some friendly advice to advocates of affordable housing (the very people who I have spent the last 30 years helping by creating affordable housing), please don't begrudge people for wanting to continue to live in a neighborhood of detached single-family homes.
 - Though there are those who might try to pit certain groups against each other, please keep in mind **that there are neighborhoods of detached single-family homes all around Evanston, occupied by people of various religions, races, sexual orientation, etc.**, who have purchased or rented those homes and want to keep their neighborhoods as they are. They do not want a 2-, 3-, or 4-unit building constructed next to their detached single-family home.
 - Discrimination is not an issue in this matter. The Illinois Human Rights Act forbids discrimination in real estate transactions, including discrimination in housing based upon race, color, ancestry, national origin, religion, sex (including sexual harassment), pregnancy, age (40 and over), marital status, sexual orientation (including gender-related identity), military status, disability, familial status, etc.
 - People are entitled to spend their money however they wish, and for those people who have chosen to live in a detached single-family home (for whatever reason), so be it.
 - We need to keep in mind that most people who have chosen to live in Evanston have done so, appreciating the diversity that exists in Evanston. Therefore, we are all on the same side – We do not want people to create division between groups who feel differently about this zoning issue, especially given that some advocates of affordable housing mistakenly believe that revising R-1 zoning is going to help their cause (i.e., to create more affordable housing).
- Rather than the City Council spending their time on trying to quickly push through unwanted legislation that would essentially result in the death of the unique character of Evanston, a character that is appreciated by most people (including those folks who live in condos and apartments), **the mayor, the City Council, and the City staff should spend their time finding ways to reduce government expenses, making Evanston a better place to live, and reducing the number of vacant retail stores in Evanston.**

Respectfully,



Alf McConnell

- Born in Evanston Hospital 81 years ago (1943)
- Parents and grandparents lived in Evanston
- Attended Willard Elementary School, Haven Middle School, and Evanston Township High School
- Undergraduate and graduate school, University of Wisconsin, Madison
- Winner in a national development competition for the best affordable development in the nation
- Raised more than a million dollars for Evanston Township High School
- Developed a \$60-million, mixed-income senior community owned by a non-profit of affordable housing
- Has developed affordable housing in Milwaukee & Madison, Wisconsin, and Rockford, Illinois

Background Information on Alf G. McConnell

Mission Statement: Quality real estate development, achieved legally, morally, ethically, fairly, and even compassionately

Mr. McConnell was born and raised in Evanston, Illinois. He earned a B.S. degree in Economics in 1967 and an M.B.A., with a concentration in Finance, in 1970, both degree from the University of Wisconsin in Madison. From August 1970 through February 1971, he was employed by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Company (since renamed KPMG Peat Marwick), the largest public accounting firm in the world at that time.

Between 1971 and 1980, Mr. McConnell was associated with two diversified real estate companies, both of which allowed him to develop real estate for his own account. From March 1971 through March 1979, he was associated with McElvain-Reynolds Co., where he was consistently the leading officer in production during his last five years. From April 1979 through May 1980, Mr. McConnell was associated with Draper & Kramer, Inc., where he was again the leading officer in production. In these positions, he consulted with the owners of and was responsible for the structuring/financing of several hundred million dollars' worth of real estate, including apartment properties, shopping centers, condominium projects, office buildings, hotels, industrial properties, special purpose properties, and real-estate-related bond transactions.

In July 1980, Mr. McConnell founded Liberty Mortgage & Development Company in Chicago.

Since 1973, Mr. McConnell has developed, owned, and managed real estate for his personal account. As such, he has been instrumental in the development and redevelopment of numerous residential and commercial properties located in Wisconsin, Massachusetts, New York, Colorado, California, and Illinois. One such development was the winner of the coveted "Pillars of the Industry Awards" competition, which recognized this property as the best project of its kind in the nation. Another of his developments was selected as a finalist in another national development competition. An office property developed by Mr. McConnell is one of the finest multi-tenant office buildings of its kind ever developed as of that time. Additionally, Mr. McConnell owns several parcels of vacant land (ready for development); was an owner of a non-real estate related business with annual revenues of \$18,000,000 (1991 dollars); was the founder and owner of a private cable TV company.

Furthermore, a substantial portion of Mr. McConnell's time, money, and efforts have been utilized in supporting various non-profit causes. Specifically, he organized his 10-year, 25-year, 37½-year, and 50-year high school reunions (a class of 775 students), the McElvain-Reynolds company reunion, and his 40-year college fraternity reunion; is founder, producer, and sponsor of two separate non-profit world-music benefit concert series (fourteen concerts), donating all the net proceeds to local charities; has been an annual sponsor, contributor, and supporter of Milwaukee Irish Fest (considered to be the largest and best Irish festival in the world), the former Chicago Celtic Fest, the Celtic Colours International Festival (Cape Breton Island, Nova Scotia, Canada), and the Old Town School of Folk Music; is the founder of a non-profit world-music record label; donated the Kuebler-Lange Model of the USS Constitution (valued in 1975 at \$1,000,000) to the USS Constitution Museum in Boston; was the first swimmer in history to shave his head for a swimming meet, a practice that later spread throughout competitive swimming world and then to other sports.

Current and past professional associations:

- University of Wisconsin Real Estate Alumni Association
- National Council of State Housing Agencies
- National Association of Industrial and Office Parks
- Illinois Mortgage Bankers Association
- Mortgage Bankers Association of America

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.
Andrew Pierson	2728 Lincolnwood	1/22/2025	Zoning Code - E	In favor	Written comment	<p>To the honorable members of the Evanston Land Use Commission:</p> <p>I live in northwest Evanston (Ward 6) and I wanted to express my support for the recently proposed zoning changes. Evanston is experiencing a housing crisis like much of the country and we need additional housing units now more than any time since WWII. Other cities and towns that have made similar zoning changes have seen rent and housing prices flatten - something that would help our most vulnerable neighbors in addition to those looking for starter homes. Additionally, both our schools and businesses are in need of more students/customers so creating opportunities to meet the unprecedented housing demand while adding to the tax base at the same time makes perfect sense to me.</p> <p>I love living in Evanston and I am frankly concerned that my children will never be able to afford a home and raise their own families here. Home prices are skyrocketing and we simply need more housing units. Many of our R-1 neighborhoods already have 2, 3 and 4-family buildings that completely blend into the community. On recent walks through NW Evanston I couldn't help but notice several multi-family buildings in the same neighborhoods as single family homes. And these are extremely desirable and beautiful streets with very high property values. Seeing streets like that, which work just fine with a mix of building types, make me less concerned about the impacts of the proposed zoning changes. Further, because nearly all of Evanston's lots are fully built out, any changes will be gradual and will happen over years and decades, not weeks or months. Many R-1 lots don't even meet the dimensional requirements for larger buildings so while some new housing will be built, our streets will retain a lower density feel. And for those wishing to live in and maintain a single family home, they can still do that under the proposed code.</p> <p>The housing affordability crisis is decades in the making and will take decades to solve. Decades of building more housing. Research shows that the best ways to increase housing production and affordable housing unit counts are: relaxing zoning codes, mandatory inclusionary zoning for larger buildings and targeting funding for affordable developments. I love my neighbors and respect everyone's right to an opinion but a multi-pronged effort is the only way to solve a housing crisis and I think Evanston is on the right track with the recent proposals.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and work on this issue.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Andrew Pierson</p> <p>P.S. I work professionally in the housing field but not locally (I live in Evanston but work remotely in Rhode Island). I have no connection to, or relationship with, any local real estate developer or project.</p>		
Scott Roberts	320 Dempster St	1/22/2025	Zoning reform	In favor	In person		Self	
Ian Ross	2719 Payne Stre	1/26/2025	Zoning	Opposed	Written comment	<p>I moved to our neighborhood to raise my family in part because I like the feel of the neighborhood. It has character and feels very residential and peaceful which is what I prefer. Allowing multi family housing and not requiring garage parking for the vehicles will increase density and crowding. I am not in support of increased density in housing (including additional cars that would be parked on the streets) in my neighborhood. Please leave the zoning alone and let us live in peace!</p>		
Jeff Wootton	1028 Hinman Av	1/22/2025	Amended Zoning	Opposed	Written comment	<p>I want to state my objection to the proposed zoning changes along Chicago Avenue, specifically the three blocks of Chicago Avenue between Dempster and Lee. The proposal is to change both sides of the street from the current C2, which limits building height to 45', to the new M3 which allows building height up to 100' with no required setbacks. These three blocks border single family homes in the Lakeshore Historic District. This is an extreme transition and would be, I believe, the most extreme in Evanston.</p> <p>The city's Preserve 2040 plan states that Evanston's historic resources are vitally important and define Evanston's built character and identity. Contained within the plan is Initiative 2.5, which acknowledges the redevelopment potential of Transit Oriented Development Corridors - along Chicago Avenue in particular, but it notes that development "represents a threat to integrity of setting". It calls for "sensitive transitions in height, bulk and form as new development approaches a the boundary of an historic district.</p> <p>Under the new M3 zone that is proposed for Chicago Avenue, we could see a 100' tall building a mere 70 feet from historic homes. This does not represent a "sensitive transition."</p> <p>I am not anti-development. Aside from the height restriction, I would welcome the change from a purely commercial zone on Chicago Ave to mixed use. And the current 45' height limit represents a reasonable transition in my opinion.</p>		
Pat Mulhern/Katt	1224 Hinman	1/22/2025	Chicago Ave. Co	Undecided	In person		Group	Hinman 1200 block petition signers
Richard Weiland	1012 Hinman Av	1/22/2025	Zoning adjacent to the Lakeshore		In person		Self	

						<p>My name is Ruth Cordes and I respectfully submit the following comments: At the City Council meeting on 1/13/2025, Matt Rogers indicated that he is hearing a lot from residents in R1 and R2 zones but very little from others. As a member of a condo association comprising 3 buildings in the 900 block of Michigan Avenue, I want to tell you that there is unanimous opposition in my association to the rezoning of our block from R5 to R4 and strong reservations generally about the establishment of the transit/urban living corridor the consultants seem to be proposing along Main Street east of Chicago Avenue.</p> <p>The third ward already has one of the highest densities in the Evanston. When I moved back to the Chicago area 40 years ago, I chose to live in Southeast Evanston rather than a higher density area in the City of Chicago because of its perfect balance of an urban and suburban experience. My block has an attractive, harmonious combination of well-built, century-old rental and condo buildings and single-family homes. Many of the buildings, including mine, have basement apartments. We are in the Evanston Lakeshore Historic District. There are 3 condo/co-op buildings on my block on the National Register of Historic Places and one single-family home is listed as an Evanston landmark. Maintaining Evanston's architectural heritage was one of the pillars of the Zoning Diagnostic Report dated October 2024 but, as currently envisioned, the new plan and zoning map would encourage the sale of the remaining single-family homes and other structures in my neighborhood to developers who might replace them with modern, unadorned, utilitarian structures at odds with the present aesthetic in the neighborhood. Such buildings could also adversely affect the quality of life for current residents by obscuring the sun, interfering with airflow, increasing noise, making parking for guests and residents impossible, and impeding traffic flow along narrow, already-congested residential streets that, even now, are frequently blocked for minutes at a time by standing vehicles. Unasked and unwished for by current property owners, this shift could transform my residential street into some consultant's dream of an "urban living center" promoting significantly taller and larger buildings that might have small business on the ground floor. It could lead to overcrowding, loss of neighborhood character, loss of privacy, and increased noise from residents, pets, cars, delivery and service vehicles.</p> <p>Houston and Minneapolis have been held up as a blueprint for housing reform by Connections for the Homeless. In both cities, neighborhoods along the new transit corridors created there saw the most change after rezoning while zones formerly designated "single-family" saw the least change. Most new housing (in one case 80%) was created in areas that were formerly commercial, industrial or already contained multi-family housing. If Evanston follows the same pattern, my neighborhood is the one most likely to experience rapid change. The remaining single-family homes in my ward are more likely to be developed into multi-family housing, creating even more density, while those in R1-R2 zones are the least likely to be redeveloped. Evidence of the disproportionate burden being placed on R4 neighborhoods is not limited to this. By most measures, the requirements for structures in the R4 zone are experiencing the most change in increased size, height, lot coverage, reduced set backs, etc. while the R1-R3 zones are experiencing little or no change. The impact of having a duplex or triplex replace a single-family home in a R1 zone (but occupying basically the same footprint and measuring, at worst, only a .50 story higher) pales in comparison to having a 6-story (possibly 7-story building, if affordable housing bonus is sought) with a bigger footprint replace a single-family home in a R4 zone. Permitted uses in R4 zones also disproportionately burden our area with the least desirable residences and uses which our area already supports (recovery/shelter, single room occupancy, etc.) while continuing to exempt protected R1 and R2 zones.</p> <p>As I have discussed this issue with neighbors, I realized how few are aware of the proposed changes. (By the way, kudos to the marketing person who came up with the disingenuous name "Envision Evanston 2045". It was perfectly designed to obscure the fact that important votes were being taken in 2025.) Like everyone I have heard speak on this issue, I am proud of Evanston's progressive policies and social, racial and economic diversity but this plan and new zoning map does not contain enough specifics to persuade me that such extensive reform will promote those ideals. The rollout has been fundamentally flawed. It should be stopped now and more thought should be given as to how affordable housing can actually be achieved through incremental change. Even if there is a consensus among a majority of Evanston citizens that the city should take such extreme measures to encourage the development of more affordable housing, it is unfair to push through a scheme that would promote that goal by sacrificing the quality of life and property values of a minority of residents and property owners within the city. Given the disproportionate impact that this measure would have on the subset of residents in the residential neighborhoods along Main Street, WHILE HAVING LITTLE OR NO IMPACT ON OTHERS, the Commission and City Council should follow an approval process especially designed to notify and solicit input from affected residents, especially input on how to mitigate the impact on their quality of life and property values if the proposed scheme is approved.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>		
Ruth Cordes	925 Michigan Ave	1/22/2025	Agenda Item II.B	Opposed	Written comment			
Susan	1201 Judson Ave	1/22/2015	Official Zoning M	Opposed	Written comment	<p>I think decisions about changing the current Evanston zoning should be delayed until the public knows exactly what will replace it. My understanding is that the city will allow developers to build huge storied buildings (30+ feet) which would destroy the character of our city, make corridors of our blocks, and leave even more vacancies in the buildings that we currently have. I don't think the public has been adequately notified of how the proposed changes will alter our city forever. I had difficult time finding information and an even more difficult time finding how I could make a written comment since the notice that was sent out had the incorrect information for a written comment.</p>		

						<p>I applaud the City Council's decision to split off the comprehensive plan and delay the zoning rewrite. I also urge the Land Use Commission to take seriously Mayor Biss' encouragement to councilmembers not to vote for the project "until they feel it is ready," which may mean that the Commission pushes its recommendation beyond the end of February deadline.</p> <p>A plan of this scope deserves time and attention. Five more weeks may not be enough, especially given that the addition of four to seven more chapters was discussed at the last LUC meeting. Minneapolis, which has been cited as a model for Evanston, started a process in 2009 that took effect in 2020—that is, over a period of 11 years.</p> <p>Mostly importantly, the draft plan fails to make a connection between an increase in housing density and an increase in affordable housing. Evanston has already taken steps, similar to those that Minneapolis adopted, to remove institutional and structural barriers to creating more affordable housing. These include increasing the number of affordable units required in new developments, increasing the cost of opting out of these requirements, and allowing developers to provide fewer parking spaces. We have learned that, with or without these requirements, developers are not interested in building the kinds of housing that make a significant impact on affordability, particularly for families.</p> <p>When Mayor Biss announced that the City of Evanston has been awarded a highly competitive \$7 million grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Pathways to Removing Obstacles to Housing (PRO Housing) program, he said, "Let's use this momentum to figure out how to do affordable housing together."</p> <p>Indeed, let's take the time to figure this out. I concur with First Ward council member Clare Kelly who wrote last month, "Envision Evanston would benefit from an extended time frame that is typical of other communities such as Wilmette and Highland Park that engaged in a multi-year process. ... To act responsibly, the city should extend the deadline until Fall 2025 to allow for sufficient time to thoroughly engage with the community and review accurate and comprehensive draft plans and zoning changes with residents. Extending the timeframe would also allow city staff to fully research relevant supporting data and incorporate additional public input."</p>		
Anne Cordes	604 Michigan Av	1/22/2025	Envision Evanston 2045		Written comm			
Nick Vivirito	802 Elmwood av	1/22/2025	new zoning code	In favor	Written comm	<p>I want to voice my support for the upzoning and density increase efforts in this plan.</p> <p>As an Evanston resident with a young family I find it difficult to afford housing in the city and every study I can find shows that allowing more development will reduce housing costs compared to the current zoning policies.</p> <p>I choose to live in Evanston for it's walkability and access to transit. I live in a four story building and I do believe I have just as much a right to live here as any single family home owner.</p> <p>I do not like that there are laws pushing for the only housing to exist be larger without shared walls, which increase energy use at a time of a global climate crisis. I want the ability to choose to live more sustainably in apartments or townhomes.</p> <p>I want to be able to live without a car as much as possible and believe parking should be up to the individual to pay for, not mandated as an expense by the government.</p> <p>Personally the type of housing I find missing in Evanston are 3-4 bedroom condos and townhomes. Many homes are too big for my needs, and many apartments are studios or 1-2 bedrooms. I would like to see that missing middle incentivised.</p> <p>Above all, development takes a long time and I would like the conversation to be about what the residents of 2045 will need, more than what current residents are afraid to lose. They are not hear to speak for themselves.</p>		
Michael Lohr	726 Milburn St, E	1/22/2025	Envision 2045	Opposed	Written comm	I do not understand what the Commission is doing at this point? I thought the Council had decided to split the Comp Plan and zoning discussions, the former preceding the latter. The current agenda for the meeting is unclear relative to the Council's decision. I request much greater clarity and specificity now as to what if any discussions and/or decisions are on the agenda for the Commission meeting tomorrow, January 22nd. Rgds		
Michelle Chlebek	2207 Orrington A	1/22/2025	Upzoning	Opposed	In person		Self	
Michael Lohr	726 Milburn St, E	1/22/2025	Envision 2045	Opposed	Written comm	I am confused by the stated agenda for the meeting on January 22 as I thought the Council had decided zoning discussions would follow a decision on the Comp Plan. If zoning is to be discussed I would like to express my opposition to blanket rezoning of every single R1 parcel in Evanston. Such an action is unfair to homeowners and actually an indication of laziness and indifference by the Council. I think the Commission should be rigorous in requesting, collecting, and analyzing the data to support such a widespread and far-reaching change to the entire fabric and character of every single Evanston street, block, and neighborhood. And all in the name of what? More housing? I walk on Evanston streets every day and I see numerous if not countless "availability" signs in front of homes, small multi-family units and larger apartments. The Commission and Council owe the citizens of Evanston an honest evaluation of housing needs and the reasons for such dramatic zoning changes, literally almost overnight.		
John Kennedy	1119 Hinman	1/22/2025	Envision EV 204	Opposed	In person		Self	

						<p>Although encouraged by the decision to push the Zoning review til later in the year, I believe it's important to continue to provide comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Although I am a believer that increased density could/should be a good thing for the city, it MUST be done carefully and appropriately in locations where available amenities can help it thrive. Blanket increases in density are not a good plan. Increased density should be allowed and encouraged where shopping, food & beverage, public transportation can support increased density. 2. I suggest the City require concessions for developers for increases in density in these locations. They could take the form of increased FAR due to transit (Transit Oriented Development), which Chicago has used successfully, increased FAR for additional affordable unit percentages (in perpetuity), increased FAR for additional public green space, etc 3. Some residents have suggested additional height of buildings will create canyon effects - I would implore the City to requires that, in some locations, and where zero front setbacks are required, an appropriate datum height be maintained along the streetscape, with a "tower" pushed back by a significant setback to prevent this concern. The City may also allow increased FAR for maintaining the existing facade (building the new structure behind). 4. There is no "one size fits all" and although the stated intent of the Zoning Ordinance includes language to remove some of the overlay districts, etc, I would caution that blanket changes should be avoided. 5. Removing the height limit in downtown districts feels irrelevant. Increasing the "by-right" height limit may be acceptable - tho unsure what the right height would be. Removing the limit removes some ability of the City to regulate the heights of towers. Ceding this to developers would not be smart. I do, however, support increased heights in the downtown districts and areas directly adjacent to CTA/Metra - within reason. 6. I am NOT in favor of increasing density for R1 and R2 Zones - these are Evanston's single-family areas and are very likely the reason many families move to Evanston and continue to live in Evanston and raise their families. Many of them left areas in Chicago, NY, etc in search of single-family homes in neighborhoods. To potentially damage those neighborhoods would be a great disservice to Evanston residents. <p>I also suggest that the Comprehensive Plan be stripped of its recommendations for "specific" changes in density. That is the job of Zoning. The Comprehensive Plan should be a conceptual, aspirational document that can inform Zoning. As such, it should be full of data point for reference.</p>		
Lee Greenberg	2207 Orrington A	1/22/2025	Zoning Map and	Opposed	Written comm			
Andrea Liss	800 Greenwood	1/22/2025	Zoning	Opposed	Written comm	Please see the public comment I sent via email to Meagan Jones. Thank you, Andrea Liss		

Gul Agha	1720 Maple Ave.	1/22/2025	Zoning Code	Opposed	<p>Petition Calling for a Ban on Construction of Buildings Over 10 Stories High in Evanston</p> <p>According to the EPA, buildings contribute 31% of Greenhouse Gas emissions (GHGs) in the US (by comparison, passenger cars and light duty trucks accounts for 16%). In the City of Evanston, buildings produce a staggering 80% of the City's total GHGs. Consider this: a building of 20 stories or taller has double the carbon footprint per square foot of floor space than that of a building that is 6 stories or less. Tall buildings have to deal with higher winds, colder temperatures and increased solar gain. They require proportionately more steel and concrete--a huge source of GHGs. A rough estimate of the increased GHGs of a 1500 sq ft unit in a highrise building over GHGs of the unit in a 3 story building: it is equivalent to driving at least 46,000 miles per year (based on 2023 mpg) for the life of the building. Envision Evanston 2045 Draft Plan calls for "lots of tall buildings" in Downtown Evanston and the proposed Zoning changes facilitate tall buildings. Adding tall buildings will not only exacerbate our climate crises, it will also hamper efforts to make downtown Evanston more visitor friendly. A growing city doesn't need streets to be stifled with traffic congestion, wind tunnels, and lack of sunshine in the winter. Rather, it should have a downtown that is a welcoming space with wider sidewalks and pedestrian-only streets.</p> <p>Let's embrace a future that prioritizes sustainable growth and improved quality of life. Increasing density with buildings 6 stories or less along transit corridors is environmentally friendly. We urge Evanston city officials to prohibit the construction of buildings over 10 stories (or over 100ft height). Only through your support can we enact this change and put Evanston on a path to environmental sustainability.</p> <p>References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sources of Greenhouse Gas Emissions US EPA https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/sources-greenhouse-gas-emissions 2. High-rise buildings much more energy-intensive than low-rise news.myScience / news / news 2017 3. Pomponi, Francesco, et al. "Decoupling density from tallness in analysing the life cycle greenhouse gas emissions of cities." Nature Partner Journal Urban Sustainability 1.1 (2021): 33. https://www.nature.com/articles/s42949-021-00034-w 4. Godoy-Shimizu, Daniel, et al. "Energy use and height in office buildings." Building Research & Information 46.8 (2018): 845-863. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09613218.2018.1479927 <p>SIGNATORIES</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gul Agha Evanston IL 60201 2. D Adler Evanston IL 60201 3. Irving Miller Evanston IL 60201 4. Zihang Yan Evanston IL 60201 5. Melodye Buskin Evanston IL 60201-31 6. Marion Verp Evanston IL 60201 7. Molly Levitt Evanston CA 60201 8. Hamon Kim Evanston IL 60202 9. Shane Carlin New York NY 10010 10. Joannell McKenna Wheeling IL 60090 11. Lea N R Rajstein Hellmann EVANSTON IL 12. S. Lilly Zheng Evanston IL 60201 13. Maureen Posner Evanston IL 60201 14. Ann Silberman Mauston WI 53948 15. Michael Broscio Evanston IL 60201 16. Tamara Faintuch Orlando FL 32805 17. Kathleen Oswald Evanston IL 60201 18. Richard Fuhr Evanston IL 60201 19. Jennifer Peters Evanston IL 60201 20. Lance Armor HI 21. Jon Inwood Brooklyn NY 11226 22. Patricia Blumen Evanston IL 60201 23. Karen Appleby Evanston IL 60201 24. Barbara Putta Evanston IL 60201 25. Maureen Conway Evanston IL 60201 26. Lisa Hershenson Evanston IL 60201 27. Judith McGuire Evanston IL 60201 28. Vickie Burke Evanston IL 60201 29. Heidi Meredith Chicago IL 60609 30. Catherine Rocca Chicago IL 60620 31. Anne Jacobson Chicago IL 60640 32. Erika Rikhiram Clermont FL 34711 33. Suzanne Medina Deerfield IL 60015 34. Holly Smith Morton Grove IL 60053 35. Kurt Feuer Evanston IL 60202 36. Jill Cabot Evanston IL 60201 37. Matthew Vitacco Crystal Lake IL 60014 38. Kenneth Fox Evanston IL 60201 39. Linda Balla Evanston IL 60201 40. Whitney Davison Saint Louis MO 63131 41. Faranak Talischi Evanston IL 4 42. Kathleen Rostrom Evanston IL 4 43. Paul Fields Evanston IL 60202 44. Leah Stark Chicago IL 60605 		
----------	-----------------	-----------	-------------	---------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

45.	Robert Marder	Evanston	IL	60201	
46.	Kathryn Gibson	Chicago	IL	60636	
47.	Jamie Charisse Kosova	Evanston	IL	4	
48.	Jack Faintuch	Evanston	IL	60201	
49.	Mary Trouille	Evanston	IL	60202	
50.	Edward Blumen	Chicago	IL	60623	
51.	John urbonas	Plainfield	IL	60586	
52.	Neriah Dei	Glenview	IL	60025	
53.	Ata Tafaghodi	Chicago	IL	60623	
54.	Cody Todd	Lake Zurich	IL	60047	
55.	Betty Ievenfeld	Evanston	IL	60201	
56.	Rick Kolsky	Evanston	IL	60201	
57.	Erica G Granchalek	Evanston	IL	4	
58.	Hope T	Chicago	IL	60202	
59.	Suzanne Courtheoux	Chicago	IL	60614	
60.	A K	Chicago	IL	60639	
61.	Janice Bartell	Sarasota	FL	34232	
62.	Christine Bowman	Evanston	IL	4	
63.	Richard Welland	Kansas City	MO	64184	
64.	Barbara Tait	Shorewood	IL	60404	
65.	Bekki Kaplan	Evanston	IL	60201	
66.	Cynthia Martin	Chicago	IL	60623	
67.	Steve Novotny	Evanston	IL	60201	
68.	Shayne Oster	Homer Glen	IL	60491	
69.	Donna Hooshmand	Chicago	IL	60629	
70.	Darryl Heine	Barrington	IL	60010	
71.	Kelly Edwards	Evanston	IL	60201	
72.	Jui Ryu	Chicago	IL	60626	
73.	Kristin Lohmeier	Winnetka	IL	4	
74.	Marcia Hartigan	Glenview	IL	60025	
75.	Edith Sue Clalidoux	Dillon	CO	80435	
76.	Susan Siokos	Evanston	IL	60204-514	
77.	Vaishali Yajnik	Evanston	IL	60201	
78.	Cara Yajnik	Wilmette	IL	60091	
79.	J Raval	Evanston	IL	60202	
80.	Steve Fish	Chicago	IL	60614	
81.	olena kushyna	Norridge	IL	60634	
82.	Jon Dutcher	Evanston	IL	60201	
83.	Susanne Dutcher	Evanston	IL	60201	
84.	Jordan Spencer	Wilmette	IL	60091	
85.	Margaret Moses	Evanston	IL	60201	
86.	Halle McLean	Evanston	IL	60201	
87.	Justin McLean	Baltimore	MD	21229	
88.	Kara Hu	Chicago	IL	60641	
89.	Anna B	Chicago	IL	60634	
90.	yanjia zhang	Evanston	IL	60201	
91.	Bryant Johnson	Frankfort	IL	60423	
92.	Vincent Kwasniewski	Evanston	IL	4	
93.	jeffrey gomes	East Providence	RI	2914	
94.	Dipankar Dasgupta	Kolkata		700075	
95.	David Johnson	Evanston	IL	60201	
96.	Christopher Davis	Chicago	IL	60628	
97.	Judith Segal	Evanston	IL	60201	
98.	L G	Aurora	IL	60506	
99.	Leana Cottone	Elk Grove Village	IL	4	
100.	Mikey Sanchez	Mcallen	TX	78501	
101.	Emmanuel Birch	Lexington	NC	27295	
102.	Larry Plotzker	Morton Grove	IL	60053	
103.	Patricia Corirossi	Evanston	IL	4	
104.	Andrew Floyd	Dover	OH	44622	
105.	Ayam Hamdan				
106.	Divya Nagendran	Aurora	IL	60505	
107.	stephanie moore	lynwood	IL	60411	
108.	Iarry Siegel	Chicago	IL	60618	
109.	Helene Full	La Valle	WI	53941	
110.	Jade Martin	Evanston	IL	60201	
111.	Kelsey Calico	Chicago	IL	60624	

112.	Jhilmil Jha	EVANSTON	IL	60201-314
113.	Lacy Godbey	West Lafayette	IN	47906
114.	Zihan Wang	Park Ridge	IL	60068
115.	Chris Gibson	London	KY	40741
116.	Nanako Mura	Chicago	IL	60641
117.	Annie Davidson	Evanston	IL	60201
118.	Judy Fayman	Evanston	IL	60201
119.	Camila Tinajero	Chula Vista	CA	91913
120.	Elisa Kohr	Skokie	IL	60076
121.	Kyle Navins	Chicago	IL	60629
122.	Karen Joyce	Evanston	IL	60202
123.	Betsy Karver	Evanston	IL	60201
124.	Victoria Foreman	Chicago	IL	60202
125.	Natasa Paunovic	Evanston	IL	60201
126.	rajesh krishnamurthy	Philadelphia	PA	4
127.	Mary Eellen Channon	Chicago	IL	60640
128.	Elizabeth Station	Arlington Heights		2/16/2024
129.	Cole Phillips	Chicago	IL	60629
130.	Bob Sitman	Kenosha	WI	53142
131.	Nanette Snowden	Skokie	IL	60076
132.	Monica Ptak	Evanston	IL	60202
133.	Mary Parisoe	Evanston	IL	60202
134.	Lynn Gendleman	Evanston	IL	60201
135.	Janice Wojciechowski	Chicago	IL	60644
136.	Marsha Warren	Evanston	IL	60201
137.	Michael Sciortino	Washington	DC	4
138.	Emanuel Johnson	Chicago	IL	60660
139.	Sara Marberry	Evanston	IL	60201
140.	Carol Nielsen	Evanston	IL	60202
141.	Thea Halvorson	Evanston	IL	60201
142.	Zehra Khan	Chicago	IL	
143.	Kimberly Wolfe	Salt Lake City	UT	84115
144.	Mary Beth Kisner-Griffin	Chicago	IL	4
145.	Shaun Waldron	Evanston	IL	60201
146.	Liane Anderson	Evanston	IL	60201
147.	Michael Bernard	Evanston	IL	60201
148.	Mary and Donald Koss	Evanston	IL	
149.	Nhi Huynh	Harwood Heights	IL	60706
150.	MB G	Evanston	IL	60201
151.	Cassie Yun	Skokie	IL	60067
152.	Isadora Tavens	Chicago	IL	60629
153.	Debra Comess	Evanston	IL	60202
154.	Maureen Fogerty	Des Plaines	IL	60016
155.	Josh Standiford	Lake Zurich	IL	60047
156.	Fran Foley	Mount Prospect	IL	60056
157.	John foley	evanston	IL	60201
158.	Bonnie Rodin	Evanston	IL	60201
159.	Joyce Zeiss	Evanston	IL	60201
160.	James Hartman	Chicago	IL	60602
161.	Carmen Quiles	Chicago	IL	60624
162.	Thomas Fogerty	Evanston	IL	60201
163.	Awais Khan	Chicago	IL	60602
164.	Susan Cherry	Evanston	IL	60201
165.	Terry Newton	Wilmette	IL	60091
166.	Amy Matteoni	Evanston	IL	60201
167.	Mary Lou Smith	Evanston	IL	60201
168.	Germaine Newsome	Chicago	IL	60629
169.	Sallie Carrero	Evanston	IL	60202
170.	David Lukens	Evanston	IL	60201
171.	Ticy Varughese	Skokie	IL	60076
172.	Mary Bell	Evanston	IL	60201
173.	Sue Gregor	Evanston	IL	60201
174.	Judy Conner	Winnetka	IL	60093

175.	Debra Hill	Evanston	IL	60202
176.	Shannon Smith	Lackawaxen	PA	18435
177.	Sharon Ward	Evanston	IL	60202
178.	Jaime Hupke	Evanston	IL	60202
179.	Cory Crock	Park Ridge	IL	60068
180.	Mari Leonard	Evanston	IL	60201
181.	Sandra Freda	Evanston	IL	60202
182.	Fay Bomberg	Evanston	IL	60202
183.	Connie Cave	Lake Forest	IL	60045
184.	Eron ogunsanya	Evanston	IL	60202
185.	Elizabeth Mendoza	Evanston	IL	4
186.	Molly Zoltan	Chicago	IL	60651
187.	Frank Zoltan	Evanston	IL	60201
188.	Anne Gonzalez	Chicago	IL	60602
189.	Richard Martin	Evanston	IL	60201
190.	Jennifer Cole	Evanston	IL	60201
191.	Effie fernandez	Evanston	IL	60201
192.	Paul Lehner	Evanston	IL	60201
193.	Kiera Madden	Evanston	IL	60201
194.	Wendy N	Evanston	IL	60201
195.	Joan Muller	Evanston	IL	60201
196.	robinson robinson	Chicago	IL	60610
197.	Kiera Kelly	Evanston	IL	60201
198.	yaneisy mendez	Evanston	IL	60202
199.	Lisa Wright	Evanston	IL	60201
200.	Parisa Chamlou			
201.	Aaron Strug	Munster	IN	46321
202.	Lori Keenan	Evanston	IL	60201
203.	D Rodriguez	Chicago	IL	60642
204.	Jennifer Washburn	Evanston	IL	4
205.	Mary V	Skokie	IL	60077
206.	Jeffrey Cody	Chicago	IL	60626
207.	Mathew David	Evanston	IL	60201
208.	Richard Levenfeld	Chicago	IL	60634
209.	Mary Rosinski	Evanston	IL	60201
210.	Rachel L'evenfeld	Los Angeles	CA	4
211.	Catherine Lau	Evanston	IL	60201
212.	Michael Losoff	Chicago	IL	60623
213.	Melissa Perez	Chicago	IL	60618
214.	Yukari Rozenoff	Evanston	IL	60201
215.	Sheila Spica	Chicago	IL	60625
216.	Larry O'Brien	Glenview	IL	60026
217.	Dean Palumbo	St. Charles	IL	60175
218.	Vincent Duggan	Niles	IL	60714
219.	Sara Woods	Elkhart	IN	60618
220.	Marcus Gottlieb	Highland Park	IL	60035
221.	David Fisher	"Evanston, IL 60201"	IL	4
222.	Iana Morgan-Lopez	Oak Park	IL	4
223.	Marc Breslow	Evanston	IL	60201

224.	Sylvia Corcoran	Evanston	IL	60201	
225.	Janice LacKey	Evanston	IL	60201	
226.	Sophia Shimanska	Chicago	IL	60653	
227.	Nancy Burrage	Santa Rosa	CA	95402	
228.	Nancy Burke	Evanston	IL	60201	
229.	pam cofre	skokie	IL	60076	
230.	Malisa Coleman	Chicago	IL	60651	
231.	Gabby Crosby	Kenosha	WI	53144	
232.	Priscilla Boyar	Chicago	IL	60651	
233.	Brent Boggs	Summersville	WV	26651	
234.	Gwen Napier	Midlothian	IL	60477	
235.	Simone Saltman	Chicago	IL	60625	
236.	Anna Savini	Skokie	IL	60077	
237.	David Plantz	Bradenton	FL	34209	
238.	MONICA LATOSKY	WILLOWICK	OH	44095-374	
239.	Daniel Berry	Gurnee	IL	60031	
240.	Kim Hilton	Skokie	IL	60077	
241.	Tim Paul	Chicago	IL	60605	
242.	Elisa Lindstrom	Evanston	IL	60201	
243.	Cindy Nowak	Chicago	IL	60630	
244.	William Kelly	Northbrook	IL	60062	
245.	Peter Marks	Evanston	IL	60201	
246.	Phil Adams	Wilmette	IL	60091	
247.	Amy Hedstrom	Wilmette	IL	60091	
248.	Sara Chatfield	Evanston	IL	60201	
249.	Maria Beury	Chicago	IL	60605	
250.	Carol Johnson	Wilmette	IL	60091	
251.	Sherry Kraft	Chicago	IL	60659	
252.	Betsy Storm	Evanston	IL	60201	
253.	Mary Duros	Chicago	IL	60626	
254.	Dorothy Marks	Jamaica			
255.	Lauren Louer	Evanston	IL	60202	
256.	Kerry Piest	IL			
257.	Lukas Trawicki	Dousman	WI	53118	
258.	JESUS PACHECO	Chicago	IL	60605	
259.	Kathy Freese	Chicago	IL	60612	
260.	Ay Azym	Skokie	IL	60076	
261.	Thomas Parisi	Evanston	IL	60201	
262.	stephen Yas	Long Beach	CA	90803	
263.	Sumaiya Saeed patel	Chicago	IL	60605	
264.	Courtney Crockett	Evanston	IL		
265.	Susan Kelly	Evanston	IL	60068	
266.	Sarah Kim	Lake Forest	IL	60645	
267.	Shari Werve	Kenosha	WI	53143	
268.	Danish Zaib	New York	NY	10013	
269.	Riley Schuler	Joliet	IL	60447	
270.	Janet Migdow	Evanston	IL	60201	
271.	Sara R	Chicago	IL	60647	
272.	Abdulsallam Nooristani	Chicago	IL	60626	
273.	Brian Acquah	Silver Spring	MD	20901	
274.	Barbro Magnusson Golden	Sag Harbor	NY		

275.	Kimberly Kern	Chicago	IL	60654	
276.	Maria Saldana	Chicago	IL	60632	
277.	Julia Forgash	Evanston	IL	60201	
278.	Jeff Forgash	Evanston	IL	60201	
279.	Kehinde Ajumobi	Chicago	IL	60644	
280.	Anne Berenberg	Evanston	IL	60201	
281.	Rodger Sonneborn	Evanston	IL		
282.	Sabryna-Joi King-Bell				
283.	Linda Wild	Evanston	IL	60201	
284.	Maryl Kavanagh	Chicago	IL	60645	
285.	Ronald Hindin	Evanston	IL	60201	
286.	Carol Hindin	Evanston	IL	60201	
287.	Douglas Haight	Evanston	IL	60201	
288.	Marie Warshauer	Evanston	IL	60201	
289.	Yvette Gideon	Evanston	IL	60201	
290.	Shirley Tumaneng	Evanston	IL		
291.	Joshua Figueroa	Waukegan	IL	60087	
292.	Dale Lubotsky	Evanston	IL	60202	
293.	Chris Johnson	Glenview	IL	60025	
294.	Lauren Shamblyn	Yorkville	IL	60538	
295.	tiffany tot	Evanston	IL	60201	
296.	Michael Schnur	Evanston	IL	60201	
297.	Antony McShane	Chicago	IL	60602	
298.	John LaFramboise	Hoffman Estates	IL		
299.	Maureen Ellis	Chicago	IL	60613	
300.	Ann Waller	Chicago	IL	60631	
301.	Alexa Julio	McHenry	IL	60050	
302.	Janna Nugent	Evanston	IL	60201	
303.	Kendra Beedle	Bloomfield	MI	48302	
304.	Laura Gottardi-Littell	Evanston	IL		
305.	Ann Silberman	Evanston	IL	60201	
306.	Bob Hercules	Evanston	IL	60201	
307.	Mikalyn Maltes	Evanston	IL	60201	
308.	Heather Ross	Evanston	IL	60201	
309.	Timothy Garcia	Chicago	IL	60602	
310.	Laurence Cairo	Chicago	IL	60640	
311.	Kristin Hintermeister	Chicago	IL	60602	
312.	Diane Florsheim	Chicago	IL	60654	
313.	Chitralekha Dasgupta	"1720 Maple Avenue,	1640ates	1/11/2025	
314.	Janice Liten	Barrington	IL	60010	
315.	Tooba S	IL	60659		
316.	Noah Hernandez	Morton grove	IL	60053	
317.	Terri Drews	Evanston	IL	60201	
318.	Jeff Howard	Evanston	IL	60202	
319.	Erfan Safi	Sacramento	CA	95825	
320.	David Stuart	Cicero	IL	60804	
321.	Rowan Kramer-Mann	Evanston	IL		
322.	Doug Macdonald	Des Plaines	IL	60016	
323.	Faiqa Mohiuddin	Naperville	IL	60564	
324.	Nurulnisa Mohamad Omar	Chicago	IL	60659	

						325. Ilana Morgan-Lopez CHICAGO IL 60651		
						326. Ahmad Khan Chicago IL 60602		
						327. Tom Kalogris Chicago IL 60659		
						328. Maureen Johnson St Louis MO 63104		
						329. Lateef Carrere Chicago IL 60628		
						330. lexi Winsky Olathe KS 66062		
						331. Katrina Falkner Chicago IL 60616		
						332. Amy Gramza Fox Lake IL 60020		
						333. Iv C Chicago IL 60656		
						334. Arthut Altman Evanston IL 60201		
						335. Paul Breslin Evanston IL 60202		
						336. Candy Heaphy Evanston IL 60201		
						337. Derek Pooh Berwyn IL 60402		
						338. Roziyah Ibrahim Chicago IL 60645		
						339. Lucille Rosario Bolingbrook IL 60490		
						340. Ahmad Talischi Evanston IL 60201		
						341. Vikki Proctor Chicago IL 60614		
						342. Brooke Sanders Crown Point IN 46307		
						343. Maggie Garris Elgin IL 60123		
						344. Ashley Shide Chicago IL 60647		
						345. Melissa Williams Chicago IL 60605		
						346. Samone Ratliff Chicago 60623		
						347. Jennifer Washburn		
						348. Nicole Zafiratos Plainfield IL		
						349. Daholat Salaudeen Calumet City IL		
						350. Vaughan Nessler Evanston IL 60201		
						351. Frances Gasbarra Evanston IL 60201		

Christopher Beasley	915 Michigan Ave	1/22/2025	Envision Evanston	Opposed	<p>Written comment</p> <p>Dear Land Use Commission, I am writing to express my concerns about the broad zoning changes outlined in the Envision Evanston 2045 comprehensive plan. Specifically, I am concerned about the impact on R4 residential neighborhoods and the broader modifications to residential zoning.</p> <p>Neighborhood Character and Housing Density The proposed rezoning in the comprehensive draft plan would dramatically alter the fabric of our peaceful Evanston neighborhoods. I live in the 900 block of Michigan Avenue. Zoned R4, my street features a balanced mix of century-old apartment buildings, historic landmark condominiums, and single-family homes. The street straddles the Lakeshore Historic District, with a few historic structures within the district. My neighbors have one or more cars, and parking is extremely limited on our narrow street.</p> <p>Urban Living and Architectural Impact With the comprehensive plan, much of the 3rd Ward would be designated as "urban living". Along with the proposed up-zoning of R4, mixed-use buildings would be allowed on our quiet street. Per the comprehensive plan, these large properties can support significant buildings that might have small businesses on the ground floor, like coffee shops and convenience stores. The addition of large-scale, mix-use development would fundamentally threaten the aesthetics and historic character of Michigan Avenue.</p> <p>Existing Development Capacity Evanston has consistently demonstrated its capacity for sustainable population growth and diverse housing expansion through strategic, thoughtful development initiatives like: •Ann Rainey Apartments •Tapestry Station •The Legacy at 1621-1631 Chicago Ave •South Boulevard Affordable Housing</p> <p>At the current pace and with future developments (e.g. 605 Davis and 900 Clark Street), on the horizon, these projects could potentially accommodate 8,000 new residents without requiring wholesale zoning restructuring.</p> <p>In the comprehensive plan, both sides of Chicago Avenue would be zoned, an M3 district, for intense high density development -- allowing for buildings up to 100 feet tall (10-11 stories). This is a substantial increase compared to current regulations, which typically cap heights at around 35 feet in many commercial zones. This up-zoning seems excessive and uncharacteristic of the existing neighborhood make up.</p> <p>Risks of Eliminating Single-Family Zoning The proposed elimination of R1 zoning is especially worrisome: •It may encourage opportunistic developers and institutions, like Northwestern University, to buy up limited single-family homes, further eroding this housing stock. •It risks overwhelming infrastructure with excessive high-density housing developments. •It represents a fundamental shift away from Evanston's quiet, suburban residential neighborhoods toward a more urbanized model, which many of us don't want.</p> <p>Affordability and Community Impact Evanston's proposed zoning framework risks fueling gentrification by relying on "trickle-down" housing and an overabundance of market-rate development. A more balanced, equity-driven approach is needed—one that prioritizes truly affordable housing through innovative, community-focused solutions. This can be accomplished without transforming our peaceful suburban neighborhoods into densely populated urban corridors.</p> <p>I urge city planners and the land use commission to reconsider the comprehensive plan, carefully weighing its potential benefits against the irreparable damage it could cause to our neighborhoods and the qualities that make Evanston feel like home.</p> <p>Sincerely, Christopher Beasley</p>		
Alex Youkhan		1/22/2025	Rezoning		<p>Written comment</p> <p>Regarding rezoning, although it may be a good idea, we all need more information before making a decision on something that will affect the city for years to come and could do irrevocable damage to Evanston's desirability in the future. I am absolutely in favor of affordable housing and diversity, however I do not believe that rezoning a whole city is the way to get to it. Giving property owners and developers the right to increase the number of units located on their land does not guarantee either diversity or affordable housing unless specific requirements are put in place at the same time. Allowing the population of a city to double/triple in a short period of time is a recipe for disaster for the quality of life both for the present and future residents, and for the city services. We, in Evanston, are lucky enough to have a diverse population of caring educated residents. I hope the city will take advantage of that. Please allow the time to do proper due diligence before making a decision.</p>		

Vincent Kwasnie	1720 Maple Ave	1/22/2025	New proposed zoning	Opposed	Written comment	<p>I am opposed to the aspects of the proposed new zoning ordinance that calls for "lots of tall buildings" in the downtown area.</p> <p>First of all, what is a "tall building"? There should be a maximum height specified or developers will be all over this to turn Evanston into a clone of River North or the South Loop. Part of Evanston's appeal is that it is NOT River North. "Lots of tall buildings" is a rat-hole that will degrade Evanston as a place to live. You are killing the golden goose. People come to Evanston from downtown to escape downtown yet retain an urban feel with easy access to downtown. More mid-level height buildings is a much better way to accomplish the laudable objective of densifying Evanston without the huge negative of "lots of tall buildings". I believe that calling for "lots of tall buildings" is a hasty, poorly-conceived, from the gut solution to the call for densification that needs to be reassessed much more critically. It should be scrapped or modified to limit the "tallness" to 12 stories or so.</p> <p>Second, at least with regard to the proposed high rise at Clark & Maple, the "tall buildings" aspect of the proposed new zoning ordinance does NOT address the affordable housing goals of Evanston. These units will not be rented by residents in need of affordable housing. They will be rented by Northwestern students and new young professionals emigrating from Chicago. Look at the proposal... virtually all studios and one-bedrooms. How does that help struggling families in Evanston? To address affordable housing problems, more dispersed low-rise buildings with larger living spaces should be promoted in the "ring" around downtown and in Uptown along with lower mid-rise buildings in downtown. (As to opposition by other neighborhoods to low-rise, multi-family buildings, more affordable housing needs to be shared change; downtown should not bear the full cost of that change.)</p>		
Steve Test	1135 Hinman Ave	1/22/2025	Opposition to proposal	Opposed	In person		Self	
Molly Levitt	1720 Maple Ave.	1/22/2025	New Zoning Ordinance	Opposed	Written comment	<p>I am strongly opposed to building tall buildings in downtown Evanston. I am particularly opposed to the current skyscraper proposal on Maple and Clark St. I believe that buildings in the area should be limited to 10 or 12 stories at most both for the environment and to maintain Evanston's integrity. Thank you for your time and attention. Molly Levitt</p>		
Trisha Connolly	1428 Darrow Ave	1/22/2025	Envision Evanston	Opposed	Written comment	<p>Hello, Commissioners-</p> <p>I am unable to attend the meeting tonight. I would ask that you please push for the following to make more informed decisions around the Comprehensive Plan AND Zoning plan:</p> <p>1) Please request a housing needs study and implementation plan, like Highland Park has done. https://voorheescenter.uic.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/122/2017/10/2001-highland-park-affordable-housing-plan.pdf</p> <p>2) There isn't ANY current information about Evanston's Strategic Housing Plan on the City's website. As I understood from the last council meeting, the staff was delaying that work until the Comprehensive Plan was completed. This is unacceptable.</p> <p>We need to have a clearer path on what our data shows on affordable housing need and be able to set goals concerning those needs. We say we care about affordability in Evanston, let's make sure we are gathering the information we need to make the most impactful decisions for our future.</p> <p>I appreciate the work and dedication you have given to the commission. I hope you will not be sidelined by deadlines, but rather by doing justice for creating housing in Evanston based on our needs, with data to back it up.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Trisha Connolly</p>		
Denise Delahorn	2148 Lincolnwood	1/22/2025	Proposed Zoning	Opposed	Written comment	<p>I urge all of you volunteers on the Land Use Commission to revisit the proposals related to zoning changes outlined in Envision 2045. It seems to me that there is not clarity on the key objective of the overall plan and the proposed remedy of upzoning all R1 property in Evanston is absolutely not the best solution to whatever the challenge is that this plan is supposed to address. Upzoning will be a boon for developers and not the means to provide "affordable" (which has yet to be clearly defined) housing and it poses significant deleterious consequences for the quality and character of our neighborhoods. If we are trying to simply provide more housing units to the projected population increases (a subject which is open to debate -- after all, consider all of the additional units that have been constructed in the past 10 years yet there seems to be no impact on overall population -- can someone explain that please?), that high-density units such as the apartment buildings in downtown Evanston would be the solution. If the problem is housing for a growing homeless population, none of these "affordable" homes will be "affordable" if we don't solve the root causes of homelessness. Why aren't we considering building a permanent shelter that can provide temporary housing for homeless people and concurrent mental health and counseling services to help these individuals establish more sustainable existences? I urge you to consider alternatives to the current proposal, analyze key learning from communities similar to the character and demographics of Evanston and build a new plan, however long that takes, with sufficient time for community involvement and feedback before consequential changes to the city's zoning code are enacted. Thank you for your consideration.</p>		
Fiona McCarthy		1/22/2025	Evanston Rezoning	Opposed	Written comment	<p>I am writing about the planned rezoning. I want to caution the commission in allowing the T1/T2 zones to be reclassified as U1. Since there is a consent decree to have the NU/City meetings it would open up the city to more lawsuits if the zoning were changed.</p>		
Ann Silberman	1720 Maple	1/22/2025	High rise construction	Opposed	Written comment	<p>I will soon be adversely affected by the tearing down of a building that I patronize that is less than 5 stories tall to be replaced by a behemoth that is over 27 stories by measure. This almost 150 unit building will have zero parking spaces included. It will also substantially block the light and the view of my home and increase the carbon footprint and worsen the wind tunnel effect and shear in the area. Lots of high rises downtown is not conducive to quality of life and not what citizens who live in Evanston moved here for.</p>		
Robert Keding	1320 Main St	1/22/2025	Envision Evanston	In favor	In person		Self	
Patricia Blumen	1720 MAPLE AV	1/22/2023	Zoning Ordinance	Opposed	Written comment	<p>We already have multiple tall buildings in downtown Evanston, which contribute to traffic, congestion, danger to pedestrians (especially Seniors and short people). I love Evanston (50 year resident) and want to stay living in downtown, but not if we are becoming the next downtown Chicago with canyons of highrise buildings. The entire character of Evanston is at stake. Evanston's growth must occur throughout the city and include affordable housing in all areas.</p>		
Linda Damashek		1/22/2025			In person		Self	

						<p>My name is Michael Martin, I live in the Third Ward of Evanston with my wife Rose. I'm writing in strong support of the goals and specific changes to the zoning code of Envision Evanston 2045.</p> <p>My wife and I have been acutely affected by the steep rise in housing costs in Evanston. The rent in our building has gone up more than \$200 in the two years we've lived here. We both have bachelors and masters degrees, and despite our careers advancing and our incomes increasing, the cost of housing in Evanston is making owning a home in Evanston less and less likely. My wife was born and raised in Evanston and has spent nearly her entire life living here. Unfortunately, if current trends continue, we will likely not be able to say the same for any children we have.</p> <p>I believe housing affordability should be a top priority of Envision Evanston 2045. Changing the zoning code to make building denser, more affordable housing legal would be a crucial part to addressing what has become a crisis for many communities in Evanston. I have grave concerns about what the future of Evanston looks like without immediate action to curb housing costs. It looks like a less economically, racially, and culturally diverse Evanston; an Evanston with a shrinking tax base and increasing costs; a place where young families with children, middle and working-class households cannot afford to live. This is the reality many vulnerable Evanstonians face today with our current restrictive zoning code, and if building more dense housing throughout Evanston isn't made legal, it all but ensures that this trend will continue.</p> <p>The changes to R1 zones proposed in Envision Evanston would apply to less than 40% of currently-single family lots, and offer reasonable restrictions on setbacks, building heights, square feet to lot size ratios, and others. These rules would make any homes that would be built fit into the neighborhoods they're in, just like the diverse array of single family homes, 2-4 flats and apartment buildings we live with today in my own neighborhood of the Third Ward.</p> <p>Allowing higher-density housing to be built along transit networks and city-owned parking structures in downtown (which are currently often less than half capacity) is another goal of Envision Evanston that I deeply support. More people living in the downtown area will help to support current businesses, create a customer base for new businesses, and take pressure off of the existing aging housing stock (which were once naturally-occurring affordable housing). By utilizing the infrastructure we already have (city owned parking structures, the Metra and CTA) we can increase the housing supply, address our shrinking tax base and school enrollment, and incentivize economic growth.</p> <p>A city's zoning code does not dictate what will be built, only what is possible in the future. A diversity of housing types already makes Evanston unique among its Northshore neighbors and other Chicago suburbs, but our current zoning code does not allow for even the possibility of building the kinds of homes people like me and my wife can afford in the future. I urge the Land Use Commission and my fellow Evanstonians to support these reasonable and measured changes which will keep Evanston thriving for the next twenty years.</p>		
Michael Martin	108 Keeney Stre	1/22/2025	Envision Evanston	In favor	Written comment			
Isaac Hacker	1108 Hinman Ave	1/22/2025	II. B - Zoning Map	Opposed	In person		Self	
Eagly, Alice	324 Davis St	1/22/2024	zoning changes	Opposed	In person		Self	
Alexander Schep	311 Kedzie St Apt	1/22/2025	24PLND-0044 - II	In favor	Written comment	<p>I'm writing to voice my support in favor of the proposed amendment to Evanston's zoning. Housing unaffordability is one of the most critical and impactful issues of our time, not only in Evanston but all around the country. Restrictive zoning only serves to exacerbate the issue by limiting supply, particularly in in-demand regions and cities. As demand has risen and supply continues to struggle to keep up, the price of homes has risen dramatically and the prospect of not only homeownership but also finding an affordable apartment to rent continues to feel further out of reach for middle and lower income citizens. Speaking as someone who has rented my entire life and desires to some day become a homeowner, seeing rents and home prices rise at an accelerating pace year after year is deeply demoralizing. Beyond just housing affordability, though, increasing density has a variety of positive impacts in the community. Higher densities increase the consumer base for local businesses, supporting economic growth and resilience. Attracting more people to our community through more affordable housing can increase our tax base, lessening the burden on each individual citizen. It is precisely because of multi-family housing that I am able to live in Evanston at all; indeed, if there were no multi-family housing, I would never be able to afford a home here. In Evanston we have a plethora of beautiful streets with both multi-family and single-family homes, the mixing of which has caused no negative externalities, but to the contrary, has led to the development of a wonderful community of architecturally rich multi-family and single-family homes complimenting each other, one in which local businesses have thrived and that residents are proud to call home. Zoning reform can bring about a more resilient and prosperous Evanston for all residents, and I am grateful for everyone taking the time to discuss this important issue.</p>		

Name	Comment
Ed Blumen	<p>Keep Evanston Unique Again</p> <p>As I mentioned at the 12/3 meeting "We all love Evanston because it is unique". A city with multi more tall buildings would destroy that. I am in favor of increased population density in the downtown area because of the many benefits it would bring to existing and new residents. My suggestion was to consider a "stack up" presence much like the 1800 Ridge building. In quantity this could add many additional residents, green roofs and an architectural uniqueness. Thank you, Ed Blumen</p>
Sonia Cohen	<p>Hello Sarah,</p> <p>Thank you for your presentation last night on the zoning initiative, and for answering my question why 50-ft. buildings would be permitted on my block (my address is 2707 Prairie). I'm writing to request that my block be designated R2 rather than R3 in the new zoning scheme. This would be consistent with the projected R2 zoning for the next block of Prairie to the north, between Jenks and Isabella.</p> <p>The block of Prairie south of us (Central to Livingston) is designated R3 perhaps because, unlike my block (Livingston to Jenks), it has a mix of residential and commercial properties, and has a two-hour parking restriction. The two blocks to the north, including my block, are strictly residential, and have a mix of small multi-units, townhomes, and single-family homes.</p> <p>Please let me know the steps needed to change our designation from R3 to R2 to better align with the rest of our area.</p> <p>On a related matter, Paul met with neighbors concerning potential tenants for the Office Depot property. Given that the Office Depot parking lot is small, prospective tenants may consider Prairie Ave. for street parking (as it currently does to a limited extent). If we increase density with four-story buildings this possibility will diminish.</p> <p>I'm copying our neighborhood group, so we can all understand the process.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Sonia Cohen 2707 Prairie Avenue</p>

<p>Mark Jones</p>	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I live at 2675 Prairie Avenue, and am very concerned about the new zoning plan.</p> <p>While we are currently zoned R4 for multi-family, the current height limit is 35 feet. Our new proposed R3 zoning with a height limit of 50 feet just seems so out of scale for this block. There is not a developer that would not use the full 50 feet of height, and there are several older smaller houses that would likely be purchased by a developer if they turn over.</p> <p>I ask that we be zoned R2 in the new proposed zoning system to maintain the current height limit of 35 feet.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Mark</p>
<p>Anne Branning</p>	<p>The block of Prairie Avenue between Livingston and Jenks (north of Central) is exclusively residential and continues as residential (R2) to the city limits at Isabella. The block between Livingston and Jenks should be consistent with the remainder of the street and NOT zoned R3 as currently proposed which pushes commercial and bigger construction projects to the north of Central Street.</p> <p>I request that this change be granted for consistency and density in this primarily residential area.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
<p>Eric Hungness and Sarah Hahn</p>	<p>Dear Envision Committee,</p> <p>We are Sarah Hahn and Eric Hungness of 2708 Prairie Ave. We are writing because we are highly concerned about the proposed zoning changes to our street and the surrounding Central Street neighborhood. We believe that this neighborhood is unique because of its residential feel. We previously lived in Wilmette for 16 years and chose to move here 4 months ago because of this classic and historic feel mixed with intimate small business. This expansion would potentially destroy this character. We hope you will seriously consider the opposition voices to the city's proposal.</p> <p>Respectfully yours, Eric Hungness and Sarah Hahn</p>

Dear friends:

I am shocked to see that the Envision Evanston plan would reclassify areas of R1 and R2 designation for single-family homes to a mixed use plan that would evidently allow the classic and historic houses in these districts to be torn down and in favor of small apartment blocks and multiple unit arrangements, totally changing the character of much of central Evanston. The increased density would certainly not be desirable, given the traffic concentration that we already face. The appearance of a district of classic single-family homes dotted with modern small blocks of apartments would be highly undesirable for Evanston and certainly for us, the current homeowners.

I have witnessed this type of transition in other university towns, such as Ann Arbor Michigan. The result is a decline in the livability of the central area for nonstudent adults. The multiple unit residences almost always house students who pack themselves into these apartments, thus forcing the residents of the remaining single-family homes to put up with the noise (and often trash) from lots of student parties at all hours and extremely heavy use of any available parking. The families in the remaining single family homes eventually just give up and move elsewhere, with university faculty no longer enjoying attractive districts close to their university. Gradually these areas become nearly 100% high-density student housing. Many of our central residential areas would eventually become merely an extension of Northwestern University housing, but with student housing built for private profit. Northwestern would be relieved of the burden of providing more student housing because we, the citizens of Evanston, would have very generously given Northwestern some of our most-prized residential districts of single-family houses in favor of student housing built for private profit.

Please visit Ann Arbor Michigan or other university towns with such misguided zoning plans to see how this has worked. Badly, I assure you, for the attractiveness and livability of these towns for anyone but students.

Here are the specifics of your shocking plan: the classification of many R1 and R2 areas into a district with these characteristics:
Moderate Size Residential: This category includes existing multi-unit buildings with a moderate number of units, along with some single-family homes on smaller lots. The smaller lots can have more than one home, while the larger lots can support new multi-unit buildings through expansions, adding multiple homes, or redeveloping the land

Alice Eagly

Dear Mayor Biss;

I know you do not know me. Very briefly, I live on the 1000 block of Judson in the same house my husband [Todd Wiener] and I bought in 1987. We both are lawyers and are involved in Evanston non-profit organizations. Todd was on the board of ECF for 6 years, is on the board of the Evanston Symphony and has been on the board of the Foundation for Beth Emet. I have done literacy tutoring through Dist. 65 at Washington School and through HARP at Oakton school and am now on the board of Y.O.U.

I read your article in the RoundTable and while agree that Evanston needs more affordable housing, not just for humanitarian reasons, but because I do not want Evanston to turn into another homogeneous (ethnically, racially, religiously, economically) like the suburbs to the north. We moved to Evanston from the city because its population was diverse in all ways.

However, your proposed change in residential zoning will have the unintended consequence of making Evanston have even LESS affordable housing.

We know this from the recent development in Evanston where there are duplex/townhomes on single family lots (including 2 on Greenleaf). Single family homes were demolished and in their place were multifamily units each costing \$1.5+M. That is not affordable. I fear that no one understands what affordable really means to families making \$60-100k/yr. It is houses that cost \$250 to maybe \$500k. I do not want Evanston to be only for the financially well-off.

The proposed zoning change, I fear, is just giving a new year gift to developers. That is not what our government should be doing or who our government should be helping.

Another unintended consequence is that the zoning change, in essence, eliminates landmarked historic areas. Yes, that designation will still exist, but part of what makes these areas historic is that they are the single-family properties built in the late 1800s and early 1900s when "L" extended to make Evanston. Without the zoning protection, every landmarks buildings can be torn down.

Another victim of the new zoning (which is designed to make Evanston more dense) is the demolition is our trees. To make property denser with buildings, trees will have to go and, again, the trees of Evanston are a great asset to the city.

Finally, I do not understand the rush to pass Envision Evanston to totally change the character of the city when 95% of its citizens knew nothing about this until about 30 days ago. At a minimum far more input and thought over time needs to be given to a plan that clearly will change the character of our city.

Fran Weichart	<p>As a 26 year resident involved in many organizations in Evanston, I say NO to the proposed zoning changes in Evanston Envision 2045.</p> <p>I want transportation-oriented increased density in our city. I want the population to grow, as I believe this is needed to support our restaurants, businesses, and transportation options, especially in light of online shopping, Wilmette's tremendous success, and remote working. I want the zoning chaos to be simplified so that developers don't propose 50 story buildings which are ultimately negotiated down to 20 story buildings (it's such a game... just have a firm, proper zoning height and let them have it!). The zoning changes need to be reviewed in detail for each and every block to be sure they are appropriate.</p> <p>Example: Does building a 10 story building on the East side of Chicago Avenue between Lee and Greenleaf make sense??? No. On the West side of Chicago Avenue? Sure, that makes sense as it does not abut/shade an historic district. And who would ever build on the West side (where we want to encourage development) if the East side buildings would block their view of the lake? This type of oversight is why this proposal should not pass as is. Don't throw the baby out with the bath water - think through every block and get it right. This will take time, unfortunately.</p> <p>There are so many more specific examples in North and South Evanston, but.... I'm sure you've heard it all today.</p>
---------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Dear Mayor Biss and Alderman Wynne,

I value Envision 2045's focus on sustainable development and equitable land use but I strongly oppose eliminating Single Family Home zoning. As a native Evanstonian, and 30-year Southeast Evanston resident, I believe these neighborhoods are essential to the city's character, diversity, and historic streetscapes.

I support the continued construction of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), like carriage houses and guest houses, within Single Family Home zones. In fact, I wish I could have one of my own. ADUs would potentially increase housing options while preserving neighborhood integrity. Nevertheless, allowing four units or more on properties currently zoned for single-family use is highly disruptive and amounts to the elimination of single-family zoning. I also back adding housing in existing business districts and mixed-use areas but stress the need for height restrictions to maintain streetscape harmony and Evanston's unique inner-ring suburban character.

Evanston already has diverse housing options, including townhomes, duplexes, row homes, and single-family homes. Preserving Single Family R1 zoning and supporting discreet ADUs provides flexibility without disrupting neighborhood character. Claims of a "missing middle" and exaggerated concerns about displacement do not reflect local housing realities. Policies should focus on promoting homeownership and enhancing Evanston's desirability, rather than pushing politically driven density measures.

Inclusionary zoning ordinances beyond state and federal requirements may discourage housing construction. Evanston's small geographic footprint cannot solve national affordability issues but should prioritize livability and community character.

As a resident of the Evanston Lakeshore Historic District, I support the City's commitment to historic preservation. Revisiting the list of non-contributing properties and safeguarding existing zoning in historic districts will maintain their character. Protecting single-family zoning preserves neighborhood stability, property values, and environmental sustainability, ensuring Evanston's continued appeal for families and long-term residents.

Transportation and environmental goals should balance sustainability with practical resident needs. Eliminating off-street parking minimums does not deter car ownership in communities like Evanston and leads to crowded street parking, which can heighten risks of vehicular-related crime and theft. New developments must avoid adding this burden. Efforts to expand EV infrastructure and improve mass transit centers align with sustainability goals and benefit residents.

The Main Street Metra station is a vital transportation hub for Evanston residents. I urge the City to advocate for its preservation and improvement, particularly as it has been vulnerable to cuts in service post-pandemic. My family utilizes the Main Street Metra for commuting three times per week.

Evanston parks face challenges like overcrowding by non-residents and bureaucratic inefficiencies in maintenance. For example, Clark Square Park struggles with issues like weeds overwhelming the lakefront rocks during summer, detracting from its beauty. Events like the Starlight series should involve proper consultation with neighbors, as seen with the 2024 Clark Square concert and Fourth of July celebrations causing significant parking issues. Implementing resident parking restrictions on and near the lakefront could alleviate these problems.

To ensure the sustainability of parks, the City should improve fiscal accountability and explore revenue-generating opportunities, such as reintroducing beach tokens. Environmental policies must balance ambition with practicality, avoiding overly ambitious rules that erode trust, like the poorly executed Gas-Powered Leaf Blower ban. Engaging residents and stakeholders will ensure environmental policies are both impactful and supported.

Downtown Evanston faces challenges from taxes, fees, and regulations, contributing to business turnover. The impact of these challenges is often downplayed in our community's political culture but should be reviewed with an open mind. Strengthening partnerships with Northwestern University can enhance the downtown area's appeal. Addressing issues like homelessness and panhandling will make Downtown Evanston more inviting. The relative success of smaller business districts like Main-Dempster Mile and Central Street should serve as a model while also lending evidence to the uniqueness of Downtown Evanston and its proximity to campus.

Walter S Hallen	I note no mention is made addressing electric bikes and scooters using streets and sidewalks. What about bikes and scooters that ride on streets but do not follow traffic laws.
Drs. Ram and Sara Yogev	We have lived in Evanston since 1975 and at our current home on the third ward since 1989. We are very concerned-upset that the proposed zoning changes will create too much congestion, traffic, parking, and Evanston will stop feel be a suburb but will actually become an extension of Chicago- an urban area. Please take this issues into consideration