Zoning Assessment Steering Committee Meeting

Monday, May 15, 22
3:30 pm – 5:00 pm
Agenda

3:30 Icebreaker and say hello in chat
3:35 Definitions Review – Sustainable Development
3:45 Review of Outcomes and Process Themes
4:40 Zoning Map Review: What's happening on the ground?
4:55 Final Meeting Preview
5:00 Adjourn
Definitions Review
Group Agreements

• Be present

• Listen deeply

• Recognize your privileges

• Embrace ambiguity and change; challenge perfectionism

• Challenge with care

• Preserve the integrity of stories

• Steward our space

• Respect silence

• When things get difficult, turn to wonder
Consensus Building – Decision Making

- **A fist** means, “I vote NO.” or in consensus it means, “I object and will block consensus (usually on moral grounds).”
- **1 finger** means, “I’ll just barely go along.” or, “I don’t like this but it’s not quite a no.” or, “I think there is lots more work to do on this proposal.” In consensus this indicates standing aside, or not being in agreement but not blocking the consensus.
- **2 fingers** means “I don’t much like this but I’ll go along.”
- **3 fingers** means, “I’m in the middle somewhere. Like some of it, but not all.”
- **4 fingers** means, “This is fine.”
- **5 fingers** means, “I like this a lot, I think it’s the best possible decision.”
• We'll start out with consensus voting via Mentimeter. Please let us know if you are having trouble accessing the voting.

• Then depending on the level of consensus, we will have discussion and make edits to the definition.
(Environmentally) Sustainable Development

Development that **acknowledges the importance of ecology and natural systems and works to** address past environmental harms, reduce current negative impacts – especially the overburdening of marginalized communities – mitigate future harms, and ensure the benefits of economic activity are broadly distributed **by taking positive steps towards a sustainable future.**
Review of Outcomes and Process Themes
Steering Committee Meeting #3 Outcomes Activity

- Identified built environment outcomes to be achieved related to definitions of equity, sustainability, and public health

- Shared those outcomes with their table and discussed whether the outcome could be impacted by zoning or a different policy mechanism
Synthesis of Individual Outcomes into Themes

- All worksheet outcomes were recorded in a spreadsheet – approximately 120
- Outcomes were grouped based on content and theme was created to capture general intent of the grouping
Outcomes Review

Outcomes

• Greater access to medical care
• Access to high quality and affordable health care for all
• Healthy people, families, and communities – across all social categories
• Healthcare facility that is accessible
• Ensure access to health care and social services
• Hospitals, health care providers and pharmacies within a half-mile of each neighborhood

Outcome Theme

Affordable health care providers (pharmacies, hospitals, medical clinics, social services) and options are accessible in all neighborhoods (half-mile of each neighborhood)
Outcome Themes
Zoning/Land Use

- Decrease in polluting/harmful industries (heavy industry) in neighborhoods through land use or regulation Community-centered decision making; residents have ways to provide meaningful feedback to be taken seriously
- No engagement [should be needed] on by-right projects
- Planning and incentives for existing and new builds (incentives to retain existing buildings vs new builds)
- Flexibility for non-residential properties to be used to provide services that neighborhood residents need and want
- Accessible outdoor green spaces, parks and trails within neighborhoods for walking and biking (within 30 min walk)
- Beautiful landscaping that promotes health and safety (increase # of trees)
- Transit hubs that promote housing/business/rec/services
- Expanded business and entertainment corridors in Black neighborhoods - more nodes for business, culture and entertainment Neighborhoods should have a mixed-use that support each other
Zoning/Land Use PLUS market

- Address climate change and adaptations needed for it / green infrastructure
- Accessible affordable housing options (cost and types)
- Housing for those that are housing and job insecure and for unhoused population
- Diverse housing options (subsidized, affordable, workforce/middle, market, luxury) are available in every neighborhood Neighborhoods have diverse opportunities for employment
- Affordable grocery options are accessible in all neighborhoods
- Affordable health care provider (pharmacies, hospitals, medical clinics, social services) options are accessible in all neighborhoods Productive use for all land - particularly for vacant land
- Accessible indoor/outdoor "third space" entertainment, health, cultural or educational amenities across age groups
- Strong and vibrant business corridors with diverse (and small) business opportunities in neighborhoods
- Accessible EV charging
- Public transit enhancements (affordable, reliable, speed, more options, equipment maintenance, increased shelter, Better parking)
Zoning/Land Use PLUS other departments/codes

- Pedestrian and bike friendly corridors that connect the city
- Distributed energy generation
- Building stock is energy efficient and less reliant on carbon-based fuels.
- Streetscaping and lightscaping for safety across neighborhoods (infrastructure)
- Revitalization of historical commercial corridors / preservation
- Safe, walkable (accessible to people with disabilities) streets, sidewalks and amenities in every neighborhood to access basic needs
- Reduction in car dependency and congestion: network of walking, microtransit, micromobility and other options
- Safe, affordable and reliable conditions regardless of preferred mode of transportation + low emission modes
Other departments/codes

- High quality public schools that are accessible within neighborhoods
- Learning opportunities for alternative learners, based on individual strengths and interest
  Continuous learning opportunities throughout one's life
- Free public WiFi
- Provide clean safe water supply and water systems (removal of lead pipes)
- Reform property tax assessments
- Organic waste and recycling programs
- Little threat to personal safety or to property
Market/people dependent

- Fair and harmonious property values throughout the city
- Offices that meet the needs of future
- Local entrepreneurship opportunity, particularly for BIPOC residents
Discussion

- Do these outcome themes reflect your individual work and your discussion with your group?
- Are there outcome themes missing?
Focus Group Review

- MPC hosted four focus group meetings attended by 30 organizations
- Focus group participants noted which of the outcome themes resonated with them and which ones they had questions about
Outcomes Themes

Resonated Strongly

- Safe, walkable (accessible to people with disabilities) streets, sidewalks and amenities in every neighborhood to access basic needs including work/school, stores, healthcare, etc.

- Diverse housing options (subsidized, affordable, workforce/middle, market, luxury) are available in every neighborhood

- Accessible affordable housing options (cost and types)

Questions

- Fair and harmonious property values throughout the city

- Productive use for all land - particularly for vacant land

- No engagement on by-right projects
Discussion

• What do the following outcomes mean, more specifically?

  • Fair and harmonious property values throughout the city
  • Productive use for all land - particularly for vacant land
  • No engagement on by-right projects
Outcome Themes

Review of Outcomes for Zoning / Land Use Relationship

• Reviewed the outcome themes to determine how strongly they relate to a change in zoning or land use

• Outcome themes grouped into four categories:
  o Zoning/Land Use
  o Zoning/Land Use PLUS market
  o Zoning/Land Use PLUS other department/codes
  o Other city departments/codes
  o Market/people dependent
Outcome Themes

Discussion

• Do you generally agree with this classification of outcome themes?
Steering Committee Meeting #4 Process Activity

- Identified where challenges and successes were experienced as part of the zoning and land use process

- Shared examples with their table and discussed where the challenge/success occurred, who was impacted and how it did or did not reflect equity
Synthesis of Individual Process Challenges/Successes into Themes

- All Steering Committee challenges and successes were recorded in a spreadsheet.

- Focus group participants also completed an activity recording where they or their organization experienced a challenge and/or success related to land use and zoning. These responses were also recorded in a spreadsheet.

- Overall themes for the individual comments were developed and each individual response was coded.
Process Themes Review

**Major Categories:**

- Process Participation
- Public Review
- Aldermanic
- City and Departmental
- Accountability
- Applicant Process Requirements
Process Themes
Process Participation

CHALLENGES

- Process is difficult to understand.
- Permit review is confusing and challenging.
- Process is not accommodating to non-English speakers.
- Process is not accessible for people with disabilities.
- Zoning and land use terms are difficult to understand.
Public Review

CHALLENGES

- Zoning change notices are not provided broadly to those impacted.
- No engagement with community on by-right projects.
- Public notices of meetings are not provided with enough time for review and comment.
- Public comment/input is for show and does not result in any meaningful change.
- Community meetings are not transparent about outcomes and what the residents can and cannot influence.
- Public input happens late in the process.
- Public hearings do not allow for a fair view of community input/support.
- Public hearing time of day limits participation for those with less means.
- Restrictive public comment process that makes it difficult to participate.

SUCCESSES

- Early community engagement meetings for zoning changes.
- Review process allows for input that can lead to applicant changes, particularly on larger projects.
- Three types of public meeting notices are provided.
Aldermanic

CHALLENGES

- Aldermanic control of downzoning.
- Ward community engagement process limits participation.
- Ward community engagement process allows for resident prejudice.
- No consistent ward level (community engagement) process on land use decisions.

SUCCESES

- Aldermanic support for project.
- Ward level community driven zoning and development processes can provide opportunities for community input.
City and Departmental

CHALLENGES
- DPD Staff are unresponsive and limited.
- City staff can be difficult to work with and non-collaborative, lacking coordination.
- Feedback from the City can be vague or conflicting requiring multiple revisions.
- DPD does not have the staff to support application and intake process.

SUCCESSES
- Intake meetings with departments.
- City staff support when navigating process.
- Knowledgeable zoning administrator with feedback during process.
Accountability

CHALLENGES

- After process concludes, promises given to groups are not kept.
- Unclear communication about how decisions are made, and criteria used.
- Previous applicant behavior with follow-through and compliance is not considered as part of the process when granting a permit.
- Unclear/lack of documentation at public hearing like ZBA, requiring a FOIA for the information.
Applicant Process Requirements

CHALLENGES
- Process is difficult to start and complete.
- Relies on workarounds to avoid application process for zoning code changes that are needed but not advanced.
- Changes required of applicant that are irrelevant to zoning/land use.
- Additional changes required of applicant for what is a minor Planned Development change.
- Minor changes require going through the zoning process.
- Zoning change process requires legal representation, which is expensive.
- Process is slow (length of application time from start to finish can be long).
- Inadequate information provided in application notice letters and very little flexibility to add additional information.
- Unclear application filing requirements with unwritten rules and outdated procedures.
- Strict interpretation of the code from the zoning administrator.
- Process is slow (ZBA delay in signing off when a project turns into a mini-trial due to opposition).

SUCCESSES
- Business Permit Process went smoothly.
Discussion

- Do these themes and categories generally reflect your challenges and successes with land use and zoning?

- Are there challenges and successes that are missing?
Zoning Map Review
Zoning Map Review

DPD Planning Regions
Zoning Map Review

Citywide Zoning Breakdown

- Residential Single-Unit: 41%
- Residential Multi-Unit: 3%
- Parks and Open Space: 8%
- Planned Manufacturing District: 6%
- Manufacturing: 11%
- Downtown: 1%
- Business: 3%
- Commercial: 6%
- Transportation <1%
- Residential Two-Flat: 8%

Citywide Land-Use Breakdown

- Single-Family Residential: 20%
- ‘Non-Parcel Areas’ 24%
- Manufacturing Districts, ROW, Downtown, etc.: 6%
- Institutional: 6%
- Commercial: 5%
- Mixed-Use: 1%
- Multi-Family Residential: 12%
- Industrial: 6%
- Open Space: 7%
- Transportation, Utility, Waste: 9%
- Vacant: 5%
- Trans. ROW: 4%
- Water: 1%
### Zoning Map Review

#### Community Areas by Racial Majority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Majority Asian Community Areas (Armour Square)</th>
<th>Majority Black Community Areas</th>
<th>Majority Latino Community Areas</th>
<th>Majority White Community Areas</th>
<th>No Majority Community Areas</th>
<th>City of Chicago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>6.05%</td>
<td>6.47%</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>6.88%</td>
<td>6.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>14.47%</td>
<td>2.96%</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
<td>2.18%</td>
<td>3.48%</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
<td>1.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>22.38%</td>
<td>16.52%</td>
<td>16.16%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>4.02%</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Manufacturing Districts</td>
<td>4.89%</td>
<td>6.49%</td>
<td>12.46%</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>4.86%</td>
<td>6.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Developments</td>
<td>24.97%</td>
<td>6.59%</td>
<td>7.67%</td>
<td>22.77%</td>
<td>15.90%</td>
<td>12.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Open Space</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>7.26%</td>
<td>4.61%</td>
<td>11.45%</td>
<td>6.27%</td>
<td>7.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (RS)</td>
<td>8.07%</td>
<td>39.02%</td>
<td>45.07%</td>
<td>38.61%</td>
<td>43.57%</td>
<td>40.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (RM)</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>5.14%</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>3.47%</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (RT)</td>
<td>16.58%</td>
<td>9.95%</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>8.42%</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Research and Next Steps

- Affordability and Residential Districts
  - Residential zoning breakdown at community level
  - Community areas, zoning districts, and affordability correlations

- Change in Rezonings and Construction
  - Increased use of PD designation and in what areas of the city
  - Comparison to building permits
  - Number of zoning changes within ward/community area over time

- Industrial Corridors & Jobs

- Mixed Use Nuances - what R or B designations allow other uses?

- Zoning District and Community Area Demographic Regression Analysis

- Conflicts/Differences Between Zoning and Land Use

What other research questions should we be exploring?
Steering Committee Activities and Why

Meeting 1: Zoning Basics Information Review

Meeting 2: Definitions of Equity, Sustainability, Public Health

Meeting 3: Built Environment Outcomes

Meeting 5: Outcomes Impacted by Zoning and Land Use

Meeting 4: People and Process Outcomes

Methodology to Assess how Current Zoning and Land Use Helps/Hinders Outcomes
• Review the methodology
  • Definitions
  • Revised outcomes
  • Indicators to be used to conduct the assessment
  • Key questions to be answered
  • Overall approach

• Pilot Geography
  • Criteria for selection?
  • Who should we engage?
  • Who should participate?
Thank you!

Meeting 5: May 15, 22
3:30 pm – 5:00 pm