

**M<sup>C</sup>Cormick**

Northwestern Engineering

# City of Evanston

Community Gardens Project

Acknowledgements: Professor Mark Werwath, Professor Ohad Perry, Kumar Jensen, Mark Varner  
Team Members: Yin Hua Chen, John Dong, Christina Hua, Sunny Kim, John Qian, Jenny Park

# Table of Contents

I.	<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	2
	Introduction	
	Objective	
	Product Description	
	Deliverables	
II.	<b>Method</b> .....	3
	Prior Research	
	Assumptions	
	Data Collection	
	Analysis	
III.	<b>Conclusion</b> .....	6
	Concerns and Limitations	
	Conclusion and Recommendation	
IV.	<b>Appendix</b> .....	8
	A. Chicago Botanic Garden Interview Notes	
	B. SCOPE Document	
	C. Work Cited	
	D. City of Evanston Ordinance 81-O-14 (Abridged)	

# Executive Summary

---

The City of Evanston recently passed Ordinance 81-O-14 “Amending Portions of the Zoning Ordinance to Create the ‘Urban Farm,’ ‘Urban Farm, Rooftop,’ and ‘Neighborhood Garden’ Uses” which is effective as of August 23rd, 2014. This ordinance explicitly allows for the creation and maintenance of urban farms, rooftop urban farms, and neighborhood gardens. However, the city has no existing database that provides information on viable land and rooftops for the community to use for this purpose. For the final deliverable delivered to our client, we have created a database of potential public spaces within Evanston. We have evaluated each of these spaces based on four criteria: plot area, light exposure, proximity to water lines, and existence of a nearby water access point.

## Introduction

The City of Evanston recently passed Ordinance 81-O-14 “Amending Portions of the Zoning Ordinance to Create the ‘Urban Farm,’ ‘Urban Farm, Rooftop,’ and ‘Neighborhood Garden’ Uses” which is effective as of August 23rd, 2014.

The Ordinance defines each as such:

NEIGHBORHOOD GARDEN:	A principal use that provides space for people to grow plants for non-commercial purposes, such as beautification, education, recreation, or harvest, and is managed by a specific person or group responsible for maintenance and operations.
URBAN FARM:	An indoor or outdoor principal use that includes growing plant products for wholesale or retail sales and may include one (1) or more of the following: washing; packaging; storage. Typical Urban Farms may include growing beds, greenhouses, and orchards.
URBAN FARM, ROOFTOP:	A rooftop operation that includes growing plant products for wholesale or retail sales and may include one (1) or more of the following: washing; packaging; storage. Typical Rooftop Urban Farms may include growing beds, greenhouses, and orchards.

Table 1: Description of gardens

## Objectives

The need for this project arose after the passing of Ordinance 81-O-14 on August 23rd, 2014. Prior to this, the City of Evanston had never done research nor considered creating a database of spaces for the purposes of urban farming. However, without any research or knowledge of available spaces, the ordinance would have no impact. Therefore, our objective is to find the maximum number of available, feasible lot sizes within the limits of the city, so that the City of Evanston can begin implementing the gardens mentioned in the ordinance.

## Product Description (Solution)

The proposed solution to the problem that the City of Evanston faces is to create a database of potential spaces for the three types of Urban Gardens. Within our database, the plots will be evaluated based on certain criteria which we will develop through research. Those who would benefit from our solution include the City of Evanston as a whole, as well as its residents.

## Deliverables

The final deliverables of this project are the following:

- Database detailing potential locations for gardens and urban farms
- Final report summarizing our research and methods
- Poster displaying plot locations and project information

# Method

---

## Prior Research

We conducted extensive research about Urban Farming and Gardening for this project. One of our main sources was the Chicago Botanic Garden, an organization that runs various Neighborhood Gardens around the city of Chicago, as well as the largest Rooftop Farm in the Midwest. We interviewed Laura Erickson, Market Coordinator at Chicago Botanic Garden. Interview notes can be found in Appendix A. Through this interview, we gained extremely valuable insight on the necessary criteria to consider for choosing a plot of land for an Urban Farm or Garden, as well as some of the costs of such projects. The most useful piece of information we gained through this was the information on soil use in Urban Gardening. Originally for our project, we planned to use the US Department of Agriculture Web Soil Survey to gauge the quality of the soil at our plots. However, through our interview we learned that this was not enough information. Laura suggested we either use raised beds (which incur higher costs, but are a very effective long term investment,) or take soil samples for soil testing in a lab, which will give us all the necessary information we need to know for whether a plot is viable to grow plants in.

Another resource we found to be extremely useful was *The Potential for Urban Agriculture in New York City* (Ackerman, 44), a report done by Columbia University. In the *Site Suitability* section, it confirmed our research about soil, and recommended that raised beds are used in Urban areas because of the high likelihood of soil contamination, and the fact that soil remediation processes for contaminated soil is extremely expensive and time consuming. Furthermore, the *Site Availability and Distribution* section gave us an idea of how to use the Geographic Information System (GIS) to find vacant land that the city can use as plots for their proposed gardens. We strongly recommend this report as a reference for our client when they start the process of starting their gardens, as it has very valuable information including the annual yields and capacities of various plants that can be grown in Urban Farms / Gardens, waste and composting information, case studies from previous experience, and general recommendations on the topic.

Finally, *Urban Farming in Boston, a Survey of Opportunities*, a report done by Tufts University (Chin, 37), was another valuable source of information for our project. This project was extremely similar to ours in many ways, as their main goal was using GIS to find and rank plots in Boston for Urban Agricultural purposes. It gave us detailed insight on how to use GIS to assess potential plots for our database, as well as many factors to consider when doing so. Furthermore, they focused on the criteria they used to rank their plots, which we ended up using for our project as well. The most useful piece of information we found in this report was the the scale for the light exposure criteria used in our report, as well as the detailed descriptions of how they used GIS to find and rank their plots for their database.

## Assumption

The data collection that we performed revolved around using several GIS files, which were provided to us by the City of Evanston. As such, we made certain assumptions regarding these files. Firstly, we assumed that the images shown, including those of landmarks and water lines, are accurate, as our criteria are completely based off of them. In addition, while most of the GIS files that we used are continuously updated, the GIS file containing aerials (the base layer of the map) is from 2012. In our data collection, and particularly when we judged light exposure, we assumed that the landscape shown had not changed enough to affect our evaluations.

## Data Collection

In order to find suitable plots of land, we were required to use GIS (Geographic Information System). We were granted permission by the City of Evanston to use their GIS data prepared for us by Mark Varner, GIS Specialist. The GIS data

included different layers that each gave us different information, such as aerial views, city-owned parcels, parcels without buildings, zoning maps, and access to water. We overlaid the different layers on each other to find parcels of land suitable for neighborhood gardens. We used GIS to obtain both descriptive information about the plots as well as factors considered for neighborhood gardens. The descriptive information includes the location (both exact and relative), ward/zoning district, and the property index number (PIN). The factors that we considered for implementing neighborhood gardens include plot area, light exposure, proximity to water (both to water mains and service points), and accessibility/amount of traffic. Using GIS, we also created a map of the potential plots of land which can be layered with the aeriels and other layers.

When we were choosing the plots of land, we also used our judgment to take into account for the surrounding areas. For example, if there was a sports field nearby, we would determine how far away was necessary to place a neighborhood garden so that neither activity would disturb each others' operations. Similarly, if the location was in a park with a wide open space, we decided not to place it in the center as we assume the area may already be in use for other recreational activities. For cases like this, we placed the plots on the edges or corners so that the majority of the area could still be used for other activities.

## Analysis

Upon the compilation of feasible Evanston-owned plots, further analysis was needed to rank the plots that will best fit the purpose of neighborhood gardening and urban farming. Our team decided that the factor weighting method will be the best technique to combine the subjective and objective considerations of the database. This method allows us to assign heavier weight to important factors that will contribute more to a plot's viability for use. A caveat in the way we approach this method is that we assign importance based on our understanding and assumptions for the plot. Different groups may use the land for other purposes, and as such would need to reassign weights and scores for each factor.

The key factors that we considered are light exposure, water proximity, and plot area. Plot area is given a weight of 10 because a large area allows for farming and gardening of a variety of plants and vegetables. A community group would have enough land to expand their crops instead of seeking more viable plots. Scored on a scale of 1 to 4, a score of 1 was given to a plot smaller than 1000 square feet, 2 given to a plot less than 2000 square feet but greater than 1000 square feet, 3 given to plot less than 5000 square feet but less than 2000, and 4 given to plot greater than 5000 square feet.

Plot Area (square feet)	Ranking
<1000	1
1000-2000	2
2001-5000	3
>5001	4

The second and third factor of importance is water proximity and the existence of a water service point. Water is an essential resource for the crops. Thus, closer water source means less expenses are required. If there is an existing, usable water service point that is less than 50 feet from the plot, the group can tap in with less expenses needed than to pay for long pipes. Therefore, the existence of a water service point was given a weight of 8 on a binary scale, with 0 representing no service point and 1 representing the existence of a water service point. The proximity of water line was given a weight of 6 and put on a scale from 1 to 3. If the closest water line was less than 50 feet, it was scored 3. If the

closest water line was less than 100 feet, it was scored a 2. If the closest water line was farther than 100 feet, it was given a score of 1.

Proximity to Water Line (feet)	Ranking
>100	1
51-100	2
<50	3

The fourth factor given a weight was exposure to light. All flowers, plants, and vegetables need sunlight to grow, therefore we assumed that the longer the land can be exposed to light in a day, the better the vegetation. Because Illinois is located in the Northern hemisphere, a land will be longer exposed to sunlight with less obstruction from its Southern side. Light exposure was put on a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 being the most destructive obstruction and 4 being the least obstruction. A weight of 5 is given to this factor. This lower weight accounts for the uncertainty in our scoring for light exposure. We used ArcGIS and Google maps to visually determine the lands' scores, and we have learned from the client that satellite images are taken in the winter, meaning the trees will mostly look scarce and smaller than during other seasons.

Light Exposure	Ranking
Plot has large trees on all borders and buildings on the Southern side	1
Plot has scattered trees or buildings on the Southern side	2
Plot has at least 1 side mostly unobstructed (by trees), and no building obstructing the Southern side	3
Plot is surrounded by scattered/no trees, with no building obstruction	4

By summing the weighted scores of each land, we found 2 plots of land, Plot # 57 and Plot #73 with the highest scores of 81. They both score a 4 in plot area, 3 in proximity to water, 3 in light exposure, and have a close existing service point. These are the best two plots for a community group to first look into if they are interested in neighborhood gardening or urban farming, according to our criteria and scales. The database shows a few other plots with high scores, with a mixture of large plot area, good light exposure, and close water sources.

\* During the poster session on June 1st, we spoke with Professor Ankenman who recommended a more statistical approach to determining the weights of the factors. We made changes to our final database accordingly.

In order to normalize the scaled values, we found the mean and standard deviation of the values for each of the factors. The normalized values mainly gave more weight to the binary factor, which was water service point, if it exists. In addition, standardization accounts for the skewed distribution of values in a factor. With the standardized values, the plots with the highest ranks were still Plot #57 and lot #73. This makes sense because they both had an existing service point and high values in other factors. However, other plot rankings shifted.

# Conclusion

---

## Concerns and Limitation

The ordinance that the City of Evanston passed was intended for public land that was not under prior plans of development. As such, any new developments of such land may cause opposition from some residents who currently use the land for recreational purposes. People may also be dissatisfied if an urban farm or neighborhood garden is located right next to their property; for example, opposition may arise from the smell or wild animals that the garden may attract, or even the aesthetics with which the residents do not agree.

Other concerns include circumstances such as theft and trespassing, because the neighborhood gardens and urban farms will not be on private property. It is currently unclear as to how property rights will be recognized, and how to manage conflict between opposing interests in both the development and cultivation of the land. An idea for mitigating this risk is to create contracts with the users for usage rights of the land. These contracts will protect their interests and are similar to assigning users property rights.

In terms of the map of Evanston shown on GIS, the aerial photos tend to be taken in the Winter season. Therefore, the number and size of trees and other shrubbery that affect criteria of plots such as light exposure may not be accurate, as they lose their leaves during this time. If we were to have these photos taken in a different season, this might affect the ranking that we would give in regards to such criteria to some plots in the database.

Additionally, there are some limitations to our actual database. One is that it does not include specific locations for potential rooftop farms. This is due to a number of reasons: firstly, rooftop farms are much more difficult to work with, and thus people of Evanston are more likely to start up neighborhood gardens. Rooftop farms have difficulty accessing water, and the size and contents of the rooftop farm would face major restrictions as to not exceed the maximum load that the building could hold. Additionally, even with viable spaces for rooftop farms in Evanston, one would have to ensure that the building is not private and could be used at all for a rooftop farm. The feasibility of a rooftop farm depends heavily on civil engineers and other experts' assessment due to the reasons stated above, and the City of Evanston approves each application on a case-by-case basis. Another limitation to our database is that the factor weighting model may not apply to all users. For example, our model gives more weight to plot area and whether or not there is an existing water point near the plot, but other criteria such as shade and light exposure may actually be more important in some cases, depending on the user's needs. Thus, the model is not as intuitive as we would like it to be, but it still does take into account the criteria that generally holds more importance when it comes to neighborhood gardens and urban farms, based on outside research as well as our client's experiences.

## Conclusion and Recommendation

We located 74 plots of city-owned land that can be used for neighborhood gardens. For a community group or Evanston resident seeking to start a neighborhood garden that has ample light exposure, an existing water service point closer than 50 feet, and greater than 5000 square feet in dimensions, we recommend plot #57 in Baker Park and plot #73 in Elks Park. Although there is a softball field in Elks Park, the garden can be located sufficiently far enough away to be viable. It is also important to note that the plots that we have indicated only denote the possible areas for neighborhood gardens. If the area is already used for recreation by residents, they may be opposed to the creation of an activity that severely limit their current uses. Therefore it is important to take into account that disputes may arise, and that both the City of Evanston and its residents should be considerate of others so that multiple activities can be enjoyed concurrently.

The City Ordinance placed strict limitations on the location of urban farms. Out of our plots, only one falls in the permitted Industrial Zone, plot #75 on 2310 Oakton Street. Even this plot does not seem the most viable for Urban Farming because its small size (~650 sq. ft.). It is also in very close proximity to the Evanston Animal Shelter and the former Evanston Recycling Center. Therefore, we conclude that the current limitations of the City Ordinance on urban farming are not permissive enough for us to suggest more viable spaces.

Regarding rooftop urban farms, our research has indicated that additional expertise and information is required for evaluation and implementation. Through our interview with the Chicago Botanic Garden, it is clear that checking individual buildings for the feasibility of rooftop farms requires experienced civil engineering expertise, which falls outside the scope of our project. It is very likely that this is one of the major factors influencing the City of Evanston to review each application for rooftop farms on a case-by-case basis. Therefore, we have not included potential rooftop urban farming spaces in our database.

# Appendix

---

## Appendix A – Chicago Botanic Garden Interview Notes

1. What are the main criteria to consider when looking for a location for an urban farm / rooftop farm?
    - a. land ownership - cheap land
    - b. 8-10 hrs of sunlight
  2. What are some things that could potentially ruin a garden / farm that most people may not know of?

vandalism and theft - biggest issue (chicago botanic has 8ft fences around)

    - i. they're working in southside areas mostly
  3. Do you make money from this? Where did you find the funding to start this garden / farm? How much did it cost to start up, how much does it cost to maintain?

depends on space, start up cost several thousand dollars (5-10k)  
afterwards very cheap (seeds, water, soil)
  4. How do you protect your garden from the weather? (wind, snow, etc.)

pull out the plants for winter, compost them, put straw down on top of the beds to protect from soil erosion (very cheap)

    - a. cover cropping - growing different grasses that survive the winter, roots make the soil better
  5. Who helped you choose the location for your farm/garden? Is there a database of locations for potential new farms / gardens that you know of? (Ask for contact info)

Chicago Botanic are paying people to start a new farm (super expensive, \$250k)

    - a. physically walk out and see them (water, sunlight, soil, same things we're doing) - how visible is it? do we want super public or kind of private?
  6. Where do you get your soil? What do you suggest we do for our soil (physical/chemical/biological remediation vs importing) - what are things to look out for in terms of soil for our gardens  

possible contamination, we should do phase 1 soil test assessment for each individual plot (~100 dollars each) or basic soil analysis (\$20-30)

    - i. but we should just use raised beds (cedar wood beds, but expensive)
      1. don't want treated wood (thyme second best)
    - ii. compost from Midwest Organic (or local landscaping companies)
  7. How did you screen out avoid brownfeld/contaminated soil?
- Urban farms are hard to make a profit - need to pay a farmer / gardener to take care of gardening, sell, etc. Labor cost is super high, not a lucrative thing (social mission instead)
    - Chicago Botanic makes 150k in produce sales (about 15% of their costs) - but they pay people to work at the farms
  - Rooftops - need more experts, much harder to work with
    - are the buildings structurally sound enough to use?
    - Water is much harder to access on a rooftop
    - we need to grow on lightweight material, not soil
    - way more difficult to work with

**SCOPE MANAGEMENT PLAN**  
**<CITY LAND VIABILITY FOR COMMUNITY GARDENS>**  
**SUSTAINABILITY FELLOW**  
**CITY OF EVANSTON**  
**2100 RIDGE AVENUE**  
**EVANSTON, IL 60201**  
**3/11/2015**

**Table of Contents**

- A. Executive Summary
- B. Project Objectives
- C. Project Description
- D. Project Estimates
- E. Project Controls
- F. Authorizations
- G. Scope Statement Approval Form/Signatures

## **A. Executive Summary**

The City of Evanston recently passed Ordinance 81-O-14 'Amending Portions of the Zoning Ordinance to Create the "Urban Farm,' 'Urban Farm, Rooftop,' and 'Neighborhood Garden' Uses" which is effective as of August 23rd, 2014. They have no existing database that provides information on viable land and rooftop for the community to use for this purpose. Our final deliverable for our client is to create a database of private and public spaces that adhere to a set of criteria, such as available water source and lot sizes, for the City of Evanston to utilize in the future.

## **B. Project Objectives**

### **1. Project Need/Opportunity/Objectives**

The need for this project was created through the passage of the Ordinance 81-O-14. Before August 23rd, 2014, the City of Evanston had never created a database of spaces for the purpose of urban farming. There would be no impact in Ordinance without a database to actually implement urban farming. Our objective is to find the maximum number of available, feasible lot sizes within the limits of the city.

### **2. Product Description (Solution)**

The proposed solution to the problem that City of Evanston faced is to create a database for the three types of Urban Gardens. The lots will be chosen and ranked according to a set of criteria defined by the the client and the through additional research. Those who would benefit from our solution includes the City of Evanston and its residents.

### **3. Deliverables**

The final deliverables of this project include an organized database that will allow our client to easily access the available locations, as well as an organized ranking/rating system that can be used for urban farming.

## **C. Project Description**

### **1. Scope**

#### **Includes:**

- Database of rooftop and space
- Ranking system according to criteria for different functions
- Cost of Urban Farming implementation
- Closest water sources

### **2. Completion Criteria**

A functioning database of lands in the City of Evanston that will be accessible for urban farming.

### **3. Risk Assessment**

The creation of the database itself will pose no significant risks, and the only risks of the project come from physically surveying land in the City of Evanston.

### **4. Constraints**

*All projects have constraints, and these need to be defined from the outset. Projects have resource limits in terms of people, money, time, and equipment.*

- Project Time Constraint: March 9th, 2015 - June 7th, 2015

## 5. Measures of Project Success

- User-friendly database
  - Client satisfaction survey

## 6. Assumptions

- Support from City of Evanston
  - Administrative Services
  - Department of Community and Economic Development
  - Utilities
  - Planning and Zoning
- Accessibility to:
  - City of Evanston database
  - Geographic Information System (GIS)

## 7. Roles and Project Stakeholders

<b>Project Sponsor/Client</b>	Kumar Jensen/City of Evanston
<b>Project Manager</b>	Professor Werwath, Professor Diego Klabjan
<b>Stakeholder</b>	City of Evanston and its employees/residents
<b>Team Members</b>	Christina Hua, Lisa Chen, John Dong, Sunny Kim, Jenny Park, John Qian

## ***D. Project Estimates***

### 1. Estimated Schedule

Key Project milestones relative to project start are as follows:

<b>Project Milestones</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
Project Start	03/09/15
Proposal Submission/Approval	04/01/15
Identify and Map All Available Spaces	04/08/15
Identify Necessary Criteria for Space Selection	04/15/15
Identify Space Functionality, Measurements, and Feasibility	04/22/15
First Version of Database	05/01/15
Midpoint Review with Client and Advisor	05/13/15
Database Testing	05/20/15
Review Criteria	05/25/15

Revise Database	06/1/15
Project Completion/Database Submission	06/05/15

## 2. Resource Requirements – Team and Support Resources

The following personnel resources are required to complete this project:

Personnel Resource Types	Quantity
Project Team Members	5
Project Manager and Advisor	2
<b>Total Personnel Resources</b>	<b>7</b>

### Assumed Available Resources

- City of Evanston Administrative Services
- Department of Community and Economic Development
  - Planning and Zoning Division
- City of Evanston Department of Utilities

### 3. Estimated Cost

Budget assumptions will be determined upon meeting with Director of Community and Economic Development.

## **E. Project Controls**

### 1. Steering Committee Meetings

Our team will meet twice a week to allocate responsibilities, as well as update other team members on progress.

### 2. Biweekly Status Reports

Biweekly meetings with client and project manager to track progress and ensure deadlines and expectations are met. Biweekly reports will be presented to client and project managers.

### 3. Issue Management

Project-related issues will be addressed amongst the the project team members and documented accordingly. Issue descriptions, owners, resolution, and status will be documented. Project manager and client will be consulted for unresolved issues or if additional resources are necessary.

### 4. Change Management

In the case that our client's expectations change throughout the duration of our project, we will make sure to communicate with our project managers to ensure mutual understanding of client's needs. Following this, we will update budget and resource charts so that they are an accurate depiction of the project's current status.

### 5. Communication Management

Project team will have weekly update/status meetings to review completed tasks and determine current priorities. Minutes will be documented from all meetings. Project team will meet with Project managers biweekly for updates and concerns. Contact client and project managers through email or phone on urgent issues.

**F. Authorizations**

*This section sets out who has authority to approve scope statement, authorize project changes, approve and accept project deliverables.*

**The Scope Statement will be approved by:**

- The Project Manager
- The Project Owner
- The Project Sponsor

**Project Changes will be approved by:**

- The Project Owner

**Project deliverables will be approved/accepted by:**

- The Project Owner
- The Project Sponsor
- The Key Stakeholders

Specific task responsibilities of project resources will be defined in the Project/work Plan.

**G. Scope Statement Approval Form/Signatures**

**Scope Statement Approval Form**

**Project Name:** City of Evanston Community Gardens

The purpose of this document is to provide a vehicle for documenting the initial planning efforts for the project. It is used to reach a satisfactory level of mutual agreement between the project manager and the project sponsors on the objectives and scope of the project before significant resources are committed and expenses incurred.

I have reviewed the information contained in this Scope Statement and agree.

Name	Signature	Date

*The signatures of the people above relay an understanding in the purpose and content of this document by those signing it. By signing this document you agree to this as the formal Project Scope Statement.*

## Appendix C – Work Cited

Ackerman, Kubi. *The Potential for Urban Agriculture in New York City*. Rep. New York City: Columbia U, 2012. Print.

*Best Practices in Urban Agriculture: A Background Report for the City of Kamloops to Support Development of a Urban Agricultural Strategy*. Kamloops, BC: Kamloops Food Policy Council, 2008. Print.

Chin, Denise, Tida Infahsaeng, Ian Jakus, and Valarie Oorthuys. "Urban Farming in Boston: A Survey of Opportunities." (n.d.): n. pag. Tufts University. Web. 31 May 2015.

Koski, Hannah. "Guide to Urban Farming in New York State." (n.d.): n. pag. Cornell University. Web. 31 May 2015.

Effective Date: August 23, 2014

7/15/2014  
6/3/2014

**81-O-14**

**AN ORDINANCE**

**Amending Portions of the Zoning Ordinance  
to Create the “Urban Farm,” “Urban Farm, Rooftop,” and  
“Neighborhood Garden” Uses**

**WHEREAS**, on June 11, 2014, the Plan Commission held a public hearing, pursuant to proper notice, regarding case no. 14PLND-0059 to consider various amendments to the text of Title 6 of the Evanston City Code of 2012, as amended (the “Zoning Ordinance”), relating to the creation of the Use known as “Urban Farm,” “Urban Farm, Rooftop” and “Neighborhood Garden;” and

**WHEREAS**, the Plan Commission received testimony and made written findings pursuant to Section 6-3-4-5 of the Zoning Ordinance that the proposed amendments met the standards for text amendments, and recommended City Council approval thereof; and

**WHEREAS**, at its meeting of July 28, 2014, the Planning and Development Committee of the City Council considered and adopted the findings and recommendation of the Plan Commission in case no. 14PLND-0059 and recommended City Council approval thereof; and

**WHEREAS**, at its meetings of July 28, 2014 and August 11, 2014, the City Council considered and adopted the records and recommendations of the Plan Commission and the Planning and Development Committee,

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF  
THE CITY OF EVANSTON, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS, THAT:**

**SECTION 1:** The foregoing recitals are hereby found as fact and incorporated herein by reference.

**SECTION 2:** Section 6-18-3 of the Zoning Ordinance, "Definitions," is hereby amended to include the following:

NEIGHBORHOOD GARDEN:	A principal use that provides space for people to grow plants for non-commercial purposes, such as beautification, education, recreation, or harvest, and is managed by a specific person or group responsible for maintenance and operations.
URBAN FARM:	An indoor or outdoor principal use that includes growing plant products for wholesale or retail sales and may include one (1) or more of the following: washing; packaging; storage. Typical Urban Farms may include growing beds, greenhouses, and orchards.
URBAN FARM, ROOFTOP:	A rooftop operation that includes growing plant products for wholesale or retail sales and may include one (1) or more of the following: washing; packaging; storage. Typical Rooftop Urban Farms may include growing beds, greenhouses, and orchards.

**SECTION 3:** Chapter 4 of the Zoning Ordinance is hereby amended by the enactment of a new Section 9 thereof, to read as follows:

#### **6-4-9: NEIGHBORHOOD GARDENS:**

A neighborhood garden is a principal use that provides space for people to grow plants for non-commercial purposes, such as beautification, education, recreation, or harvest, that is managed by a specific person or group responsible for maintenance and operations. The following general requirements shall apply to neighborhood gardens:

- (A)** The person or group responsible for managing the garden shall be identified on each required annual application/registration form.
- (B)** On-site processing and/or storage of plants or plant products are prohibited.
- (C)** Outdoor storage of any kind is prohibited.
- (D)** A fence and one (1) accessory structure for the storage of gardening tools and supplies, no larger than one hundred twenty square feet (120 sq. ft.) in area, shall be allowed on-site, provided the owner or operator first obtains a Certificate of Zoning Compliance or Building Permit for it/them.
- (E)** Composting of plant material that is grown on site shall be permitted, except in the required front yard. All other composting is prohibited.
- (F)** No incidental sales of plants or produce shall take place on site.
- (G)** Neighborhood gardens shall be maintained so as not to encourage the harboring of vermin. Accumulations of weeds and/or rubbish is prohibited.