Memorandum

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Steve Hagerty, Chair of Harley Clarke Citizens’ Committee
       Members of the Harley Clarke Citizens’ Committee

Subject: Harley Clarke Citizens’ Committee Report to City Council

Date: June 5, 2015

Recommended Action:
Staff recommends that City Council receive and file this report.

Summary:
The mission of the Harley Clarke Citizens’ Committee was to identify, develop, and evaluate the viability of options for the property in the context of the criteria developed by the Committee. Committee members have unanimously agreed that it will not consider any option in which the beach or access to the beach does not remain publicly owned.

Over the course of its eight meetings, the Committee solicited public participation in several ways, including: (1) through a City established email address for comments at harleyclarkemansion@cityofevanston.org, (2) public comment at each Committee meeting beginning with the Committee’s second meeting, held on February 26, 2015, (3) a public workshop held on May 18, 2015 and (4) through an online survey available online from May 18 through 31, 2015. This process led to the creation of a report, in which the Committee identified five potential options for the future of the property. The attachments to this memorandum include a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the Committee’s findings and survey results, position statements on how the property should be used from each non-Aldermanic member of the Committee, and other relevant information.

Background:
On January 5, 2015, the City received notice from the Illinois Department of Natural Resources that they no longer intended to continue negotiations to lease or purchase the Harley Clarke Mansion for use by the State of Illinois’ Coastal Management Program. At the January 12, 2015, the City Council requested the creation of a special committee to study the property and report back to the City Council in June 2015. The
Harley Clarke Citizens’ Committee was appointed by the City Council on January 26, 2015 and held its first meeting on February 12, 2015.

Attachments:
- Presentation to City Council
- Position Statements from Committee Members
We love Evanston. We love the vibrancy of the community; the character of the built structures; and the diversity that exists within this town. We even appreciate the impassioned debate that ensues over issues of significant change (although not necessarily the stress and frustration that accompanies it).

In the end there’s a general feeling within this community that we want to “transmit this City not only not less, but greater, better, and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us.”
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Committee sought extensive public input – 8 public meetings, each with public comment; 4-month open public email box; May 18th Public Workshop; and community survey completed by 1,375 individuals

- We have learned **there is no consensus on what to do with the Mansion**.

- The Council must make a values determination. What value or set of values is most important relative to the Mansion and the City at-large?


- The Answer ultimately lies in deciding which Option (or variation of these options) meets the value or set of values most important to the majority of Council Members
**BRIEF HISTORY OF THE HARLEY CLARKE MANSION**

- Built in 1927 by Harley Clarke but sold in 1949 to the Sigma Chi National Fraternity where it served as their headquarters until 1965.

- Property of 4.7 acres acquired by the city in 1965 for $750,000, and leased to the Art Center in June 1965.

- Zoned R1 until 1990’s when it was rezoned to 0S (Open Space).

- City **leased** the mansion to the Evanston Art Center for $1 per year, in agreement that the EAC would maintain interior and the city would be responsible for exterior.
WHERE WE’VE BEEN:  
WHAT TO DO WITH THE HARLEY CLARKE MANSION

- Col. Jennifer Pritzker, an Evanstonian with significant financial means and a record of historic preservation, offered to acquire the property (excluding the beach or access to the beach) and develop a 57-room boutique hotel with parking, a restaurant, and event space.

- The City Council voted 6-3 in July 2013 not to have the City Manager negotiate with Pritzker.

- The IL DNR expressed an interest in renovating the Mansion and converting it into office space and a Lake Michigan center. Ultimately, IDNR did not move forward due to election of a new Governor and no ownership of land/building.

- On January 12, 2015, the City Manager discussed with the Council seeking contracts to demolish the Mansion. The Council moved to create the Harley Clarke Citizens' Advisory Committee.

- On January 26th, the City Council unanimously approved the Appointees to the Committee
THE COMMITTEE’S OBJECTIVE

To identify, develop, and evaluate the viability of options in the context of the criteria developed by the Committee.

The Committee also unanimously agreed upfront that it would consider NO option in which the beach or access to the beach was sold.
OUR OTHER OBJECTIVE...
TO CREATE A PROCESS THAT WAS OPEN, TRANSPARENT, INCLUSIVE & RESPECTFUL

- Accepted public feedback at 1st meeting on process
- Immediately established and promoted one central email address for citizen input: harleyclarkemansion@cityofevanston.org
- Started our 2nd meeting with thirty minutes of Public Comment
- Closed each meeting with Public Comment
- Organized a “Town Hall” meeting on May 18, 2015
- Sought community opinion through a Survey
PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT BY THE NUMBERS:

- **8** Harley Clarke Committee Meetings (1 Public Workshop)
- **75** Unique Public Commenters (100 total)
- **250** Emails sent to the Harley Clarke Mansion Email address
- **200** Public Workshop Attendees
- **1,375** Survey Respondents

Note: Unaudited figures
SURVEY PARTICIPATION – MAY 18-31; N=1375

Survey Response Heat Map

Survey Responses by Ward

HARLEY CLARKE CITIZENS’ ADVISORY COMMITTEE - REPORT TO EVANSTON CITY COUNCIL
### PARTICIPANTS’ OPINION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion Breakdown</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Public Comment</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City retain and renovate the building for public use.</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City demolish the building and redevelop the site as park land.</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City sell (or lease) the building and land and allow it to be renovated for a</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commercial use, such as a hotel or event space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City sell the building and land and allow the site to be redeveloped under</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residential zoning, including senior housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City sell (or lease) or gift the building to an organization that would renovate</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and preserve it for public cultural and/or educational use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Committee developed and agreed upon 20 criteria by which to evaluate each option. The Committee did not weigh the criteria, leaving it to the Council to pass judgement on which criteria hold more value (e.g., Preserving the Mansion vs. having more green space).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution require the expenditure of City funds?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do alternate funding sources exist for this proposed solution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Does the facility remain publicly owned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Does the land remain publicly owned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Does public access to the grounds remain available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Does public access to the facility remain available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution preserve the building?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution preserve the Jens Jensen garden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution generate 1-time revenue for the City?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution generate recurring revenue for the City?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution generate sufficient maintenance revenue?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution require additional parking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution require a change in zoning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution increase the “green space”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution increase traffic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution increase density in the floor area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution meet an existing or anticipated long-term need in the community?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Describe how the proposed solution will be funded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Describe the proposed solutions best attribute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Describe the potential environmental impact(s) this solution would have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Describe how the proposed solution may change the character of the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Describe how the solution is compatible with existing City planning documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Describe the Evanston population served (including size of said population) by the solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Describe how the proposed solution affects beach access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>If applicable, describe sources of revenue to the City from this proposed solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Outstanding Question(s):</strong> What is the cost for the City to repair and renovate this structure?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPTIONS CONSIDERED

1. City retain and renovate for public use.

2. City demolish the building and redevelop the site as park land.

3. City sell the building and land, and allow it to be renovated for a commercial use, such as a hotel or event space.

4. City sell the building and land, and allow the site to be redeveloped under residential zoning.

5. City sell or gift the building to an organization (PNP/Foundation) that would renovate and preserve it for public cultural and/or educational use.

* Note IDNR was not put forth during the public workshop because the majority of the Committee understands this option to be no longer viable. A more comprehensive list of ideas offered by the public and committee can be found in the Appendix.
# SUMMARY OF OPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed solution require the expenditure of City funds?</td>
<td>Retain: Yes, Demo: Yes, Sell, Hotel: No, Sell, Residential: No, Gift: No, IDNR: Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do alternate funding sources exist for this proposed solution?</td>
<td>Uncertain: No, Sell, Hotel: Yes, Sell, Residential: Yes, IDNR: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the facility remain publicly owned?</td>
<td>Yes, N/A: No, No: Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the land remain publicly owned?</td>
<td>Yes, No: No, Maybe: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does public access to the grounds remain available?</td>
<td>Yes, Maybe: Yes, Maybe: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does public access to the facility remain available?</td>
<td>Yes, N/A: Yes, Uncertain: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed solution preserve the building?</td>
<td>Yes, No: Yes, Uncertain: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed solution preserve the Jens Jensen garden?</td>
<td>Yes, Uncertain: Maybe, Uncertain: Yes, Maybe: Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed solution generate 1-time revenue for the City?</td>
<td>No, No: Uncertain, Yes: Yes, Maybe: No (if sale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed solution generate recurring revenue for the City?</td>
<td>Maybe: No, Yes: Yes, Maybe: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed solution generate sufficient maintenance revenue?</td>
<td>No, No: N/A, N/A: N/A, N/A: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed solution require additional parking?</td>
<td>Maybe: No, Yes: Maybe, Maybe: Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed solution require a change in zoning?</td>
<td>Maybe: No, Yes: Yes, Maybe: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed solution increase the &quot;green space&quot;?</td>
<td>No: No, Yes: No, No: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed solution increase traffic?</td>
<td>Maybe: Uncertain, Yes: Maybe, Maybe: Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed solution increase density in the floor area?</td>
<td>No, No: Yes, Maybe: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed solution meet an existing or anticipated long-term need in the community?</td>
<td>N/A, Yes: Yes/No/Maybe, Maybe: Maybe, Maybe: N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY MEMBER PRESENTATIONS

Video:
https://youtu.be/XHTD53Gg_3g

Presentations can be found at:

Presentation 1 (Sheila Sullivan)
Presentation 2 (Peter Greene)
Presentation 3 (Chris Oakley)
Presentation 4 (Patrick Donnelly)

Sheila Sullivan
✓ 30 Year Evanston Resident
✓ President, Southeast Evanston Association
✓ Environmental & Public Health Scientist

Peter Greene
✓ 30 Year Evanston Resident
✓ 1st VP, CBRE Hotels
✓ 50 Years Hotel Experience
✓ $2B in Hotel Activity

Chris Oakley
✓ 20 Year Evanston Resident
✓ Architect, 35 Years Historic Preservation, Adaptive Re-Use
✓ 10 Years, Director of Design

Patrick Donnelly
✓ Evanston Resident
✓ Organizer, www.harleyclarke.com
✓ Commercial Advertising Executive Producer

See Appendix – for entire list of attendees pros/cons
OPTION 1: CITY RETAINS AND RENOVATES MANSION FOR PUBLIC USE

**PROS**
- Remains public
- Provides additional programming space.
- Character of neighborhood remains unchanged
- Reinforces the principle that parkland is for the people and not to be commercialized
- Compatible with Lakefront Plan

*Preserves the building, maintains public ownership, and provides additional programming space.*

**CONS**
- Most likely requires significant city funding.
- Would generate little to no revenue to maintain the building and address other more pressing human needs in the community.
- Could require additional parking and rezoning.
- Continues on similar path to the last 40 years expecting different result
- City lacks financing, knowledge, and capabilities to successfully operate mansion
- Unlikely city would be able to restore mansion to past grandeur
OPTION 2: CITY DEMOLISH MANSION
REDEVELOP SITE AS PARKLAND

PROS
✓ Maintains and increases public use
✓ Eliminates future City expenditures & liability
✓ Increase “green space” for free play
✓ Restores views of lake from Sheridan Rd.
✓ Creates opportunity for contiguous park campus
✓ Creates opportunity for more beach parking and access
✓ Preserves some and possibly all of the Jens Jensen Gardens
✓ Offers Evanston opportunity to re-envision, or develop for public use

CONS
✗ Does not preserve the building
✗ Does not generate any revenue for the City
✗ Loss of a local historic landmark
✗ Does meet an existing or anticipated long-term need in the community
✗ Would require city funds to demolish

Offers City more park land and open programming options
OPTION 3: SELL PROPERTY
FOR BOUTIQUE HOTEL, EVENT SPACE, RESTAURANT

PROS
✓ Generate one time revenue plus annual property, sales, hotel, and liquor taxes
✓ Opportunity to create a one of a kind property near Lake Michigan.
✓ Compatible with City’s Strategic Plan
✓ Eliminates liability to City
✓ Building renovated with private (not City) funds
✓ Public access to the facility can remain available.

CONS
✗ Will alter character of neighborhood
✗ The land & facility may no longer be public/city owned
✗ Will require rezoning (affects lakefront master plan) & additional parking
✗ Requires a parking solution (garage, valet, etc)
✗ May be cost prohibitive “as is” for a b&b, restaurant, or event space
✗ Will primarily only serve affluent; access limited to those that can pay
✗ Sale may set bad precedent for other city assets
✗ May increase traffic and density

Preserves the building at owner’s expense; Offers some public access
OPTION 4: SELL PROPERTY
REDEVELOP SITE UNDER RESIDENTIAL ZONING

PROS

✓ Property Renovated with private (not City) funds
✓ Generate one time revenue plus annual property taxes
✓ Eliminates liability to City
✓ Returns property to R-1, original zoning

Returns the parcel to residential use, similar to rest of neighborhood

CONS

✗ Loss of control of a public asset
✗ Exclusive; no public accessibility; no community benefit
✗ Complete loss of park space and public use
✗ Increased density
✗ Will require rezoning
✗ Lost opportunity to create community benefit
✗ Only serves the affluent
✗ Sets bad precedent for other city assets
OPTION 5: SELL OR GIFT BUILDING TO A PNP/FOUNDATION FOR RESTORATION & PUBLIC USE

PROS

✓ Preserves building with donor funds (no public money)
✓ Eliminates liability and City Operations & Maintenance
✓ Building and property remain in use for public
✓ Provides additional programming space
✓ Character of neighborhood remains relatively unchanged
✓ Reinforces principle that parkland is for the people and not to be commercialized

CONS

✗ Large foundations did not previously express interest (e.g., Botanic Garden, Driehaus, Mitchell Museum)
✗ City loses control
✗ Uncertain whether community organization could raise $3M+
✗ No revenue generated if building is “gifted”
✗ Risk of endangering the character of neighborhood depending on use
✗ Concern that option may have an air of exclusivity
✗ Increased risk because community organization may have limited to no track record
✗ Issue been around for 3+ years and activists to publicly save mansion have not coalesced to fundraise

Preserves the building and creates a community cultural/education center
SURVEY RESPONDENTS’ OPINION

- Some participants expressed concern about survey – personal information, technical errors, methodology
- Survey results indicate there is no community consensus.
- Two-thirds of respondents preferred the City either retaining the building or gifting it to a non-profit/Foundation
- Find survey results and public comments at: CityofEvanston.org/mansion
### HARLEY CLARKE CITIZENS’ ADVISORY COMMITTEE
#### CITIZEN MEMBERS PREFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Damashek</th>
<th>DiMarco</th>
<th>Hagerty</th>
<th>Shumaker</th>
<th>Zeinemann</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City retain and renovate mansion for public use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City demolish the building and redevelop the site as park land</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>City sell the building and land, and allow it to be renovated for a commercial use, such as a hotel or event space</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>City sell the building and land, and allow the site to be redeveloped under residential zoning, including senior housing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>City sell or gift the building to an organization (PNP/Foundation) that would renovate and preserve it for public cultural and/or educational use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Consensus

✓ Unanimous Committee agreement: never sell the beach, nor access to it

✓ Generally, Option 4 – Selling Building/Land for Residential Development – is Committee’s least preferred option.

✓ Generally, the Committee feels that building’s financial operation should be self sustaining.
FINAL THOUGHTS & CONSIDERATIONS

1. **Consensus:** After three years it is clear there will not be a general community agreement on what to do with the Harley Clarke Mansion. There are passionate advocates with legitimate rationale for all sides of this issue.

2. **Cost Estimates:** There was much discussion about cost estimates. The City’s, IDNR, and Pritzker’s. The majority of the committee ultimately decided the estimates discussed are not viable because the Scope of Work is unclear and there was no industry standard design and cost estimate approach followed.

3. **Expertise:** The Committee did not have the time, nor technical expertise to fully develop each option or develop cost estimates.

4. **Lease Option:** A land-lease option could be considered under Options 3, 4, and 5.

5. **Letters from CSNA and SEA advocating public ownership.** Link to Letters

6. **Evanston Chamber of Commerce:** Completed a survey of members and submitted to Committee. Link to survey.

7. **Values Decision:** Everyone’s intentions are good. Everyone wants what they think is best for Evanston. Ultimately the City Council needs to decide what value or set of values related to the Mansion and the Community at-large are most important.
OTHER IDEAS MENTIONED DURING PROCESS

1. **Parking**: Consider converting public parcel on SE corner of Sheridan and Milburn Park 8-12 to parking for Mansion

2. **Consolidate Park District**: Use opportunity to create a consolidated park district

3. **Northwestern**: Gift the building to NU via a land-lease but seek agreement from NU to pay property tax.

4. **Vivian Meier**: Convert into a Vivian Meier museum

5. **Temporary Uses**: Laser tag; haunted house
APPENDIX SUMMARY

1. Position Statements from Citizen Committee Members
   - Steve Hagerty
   - Garry Shumaker
   - Dawn Davis-Zeinemann
   - Amina DiMarco
   - Linda Damashek

2. Summary of Survey Data
3. Evanston Chamber Survey Summary
4. Workshop Flip Charts (summary)
5. Central Street Neighbors Ass’n Letter
6. Southeast Evanston Ass’n Letter
7. Pritzker Proposal Summary

8. Presentations by Community Members
   - Presentation 1 (Sheila Sullivan)
   - Presentation 2 (Peter Greene)
   - Presentation 3 (Chris Oakley)
   - Presentation 4 (Patrick Donnelly)
Harley Clarke Citizen Committee -Position Statement- Linda Damashek- June 2015

CITY COUNCIL SHOULD TAKE DIRECTION FROM THE SURVEY RESULTS FAVORING PUBLIC, NON-COMMERCIAL USES-

It is very clear from the results of the Harley Clarke Citizen’s Committee (HCCC) survey ranking of the five options, that a majority of the citizens (67%) want the future use of the mansion and grounds to be used for public, non-commercial purposes. This data alone should be enough to rule out commercial and residential development of the property. Of the 67%, 38.5% of the respondents preferred Option 1 (“City retain and renovate the building for public use”) and 28.3% chose Option 5 (“City sell or gift the building to an organization that would renovate and preserve it for public cultural and/or educational use”). An additional option, which has been referred to as Option 6, was discussed at the HCCC’s last meeting of June 1. Option 6 would allow the City to “lease the building to an organization that would renovate and preserve it for public cultural and/or educational use”.

The results of this survey corroborated my personal experiences of talking with Evanston residents of all ages, races, socioeconomic and geographical distribution. The majority of citizens want this prime community asset-- the Harley Clarke mansion, coach house, and parkland-- to remain available to citizens for community, public use. They support future uses that are compatible with the existing Open Space zoning. They do NOT want it to be privatized for commercial use (as evidenced by the low vote numbers for the hotel (19%) and residential development options (2%)). Public sentiment does not support changing the zoning to allow for- profit, commercial uses in the middle of public parkland or adjacent to, and impinging on a public resource such as the Lighthouse Beach. The City Council should honor the results of the survey conducted by its appointed HCCC and city staff and figure out how to implement the will of the citizens—their constituents.

OPTION 6—A LEGAL VARIATION OF OPTION 5-

After participating in this process, my view is that the best option to implement is Option 6-- “City lease the building to an organization that would renovate and preserve it for public cultural and/or educational use”. This option is essentially Option 5 with the change that the City would lease the building, rather than selling or gifting it, to an organization that would renovate and preserve it for public cultural and/or educational use. Per the survey chart, the two highest weighted choices were also for public use. Option 5 had the highest weighted score of 3.83, with Option 1 as second choice with a weighted score of 3.74. The HCCC Chair indicated that this proposed lease under Option 6 had merit and could be given further consideration.

RENOVATION COSTS-

In the process of the HCCC meetings, we learned from construction experts that the mansion is structurally sound with the foundation, walls, and roof in good condition. In addition, we had city staff share important information with us to assist in getting a clear understanding of the renovation costs involved. According to the Evanston Department of Public Works at the April 15, 2015 meeting:

Code Compliance items- Construction Costs- $ 170,000  
“Leasable Space” items- Construction Costs- $ 420,000  
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS $590,000

This is a very modest cost compared to the multi- million costs about which some have speculated. This number refers to the costs required to have the interior space made “leasable”. Any other construction costs would relate to changes made by the end user for their programming needs or potential future exterior renovation costs.

FOUNDATION ESTABLISHMENT AND RENOVATION TIMING-

Option 5, combined with the leasing provision (i.e., Option 6), would best be accomplished through the establishment of a legal entity (Non-Profit Foundation) to determine programming goals and begin subleasing and fundraising efforts. The focus of this option would be on ecological and historical education as well as community wide seasonal and cultural programming. It may take a year for the fundraising efforts to be completed before use specific renovation can begin, but code compliance work can and should begin sooner.
FINANCIALLY SELF-SUSTAINING OPERATIONS-

My research indicates that the building can be financially self-sustaining with revenues from programming, events, and subleasing. I have visited four successful financially self-sustaining public mansions in the Chicago area and three of them have shared details of their financial operations. All have indicated that they break even in operation and maintenance costs.

PUBLIC USE- OPTION 1-

While my preferred public use option is Option 5 (6), I could also support Option 1 with the City continuing to own and renovating the building for public, non-profit, community use. This option received the greatest number of survey votes- 38.5% of the total votes.

I suggest that this project would be a very good use for the first year $1,000,000 installment payment of the “Good Neighbor Fund” from Northwestern University that Evanston will receive annually for five years. The Mayor and the President of Northwestern can meet to discuss pledging the FY 2016 funds toward the reasonable renovation needs of Harley Clarke. Additional funds could come from grants that are only available to municipalities and the public sector.

Another potential source of funds for the renovation of Harley Clarke is to reallocate the $900,000 earmarked in the Capital Improvement Plan for the renovation of the two fog houses located next to the Lighthouse and used for Ecology Center programming. The Ecology Center programming could then operate from the larger and more desirable space in the mansion. Further, many more types of public uses throughout the entire year could also be programmed for the mansion.

I also suggest the creation of an Enterprise Fund to segregate the operating funds for the mansion from the City’s General Fund to provide transparency and accountability to the taxpayers and Northwestern University.

DEMOLITION COSTS - OPTION 2-

The City of Evanston Department of Buildings and Inspection provided a cost estimate for demolition of $185,000. This was documented by several correspondences. One memo dated March 20, 2105 listed $60,000 for soft costs and services, and another estimate on May 11, 2015 quoted $100,000-$125,000 for labor costs. The costs for deconstruction (where reusable materials are separated out and the property owner is paid for them) might vary somewhat but would be in the same general ballpark. This is a modest cost to preserve the Harley Clarke property for parkland and public use.

I would choose the demolition option over any option that involves for-profit commercialization of lakefront land and building. All private, for-profit, commercial use options including a hotel, senior assisted living, or luxury residential development are totally unacceptable options as evidenced by community opposition, workshop and survey comments, and survey results.

FURTHERING PUBLIC POLICY-

The City of Evanston’s Comprehensive Plan identifies our community priority to maintain existing public open space and to expand parkland wherever possible. In addition, the City of Evanston’s Lakefront Master Plan establishes the community’s priority to keep the lakefront free from commercialization.

PREVENT A PRECIOUS PUBLIC ASSET-

This property was initially bought by the City of Evanston for the citizens of Evanston for the parkland and the beachfront. The mansion was not purchased for the benefit of a private developer or business or any such use that invariably will negatively impact the experience of the property’s public uses. The public lakefront is Evanston’s most valuable asset for the benefit of its citizens and it should never be privatized for the commercial profit of the few. The public value of the many and varied potential uses and public enjoyment of the mansion, its ancillary structures and the grounds far outweigh the cost figures for renovation and operation. The truth of this statement was demonstrated by the results of the citizen survey. The survey indicated that: 1) the citizens do not want the Harley Clarke property sold or leased to a commercial developer for residential or commercial uses; and 2) citizens want the city to maintain ownership of the property and/or lease it to a non-profit organization for public use in perpetuity. The Harley Clarke Citizen’s Committee focused on an opinion seeking process. Therefore, recommending the citizen’s choice for public use is the obvious and best recommendation that we can make to City Council.
To the Council, Committee and Evanston Public:

It has been a great pleasure to serve on the Harley Clarke Citizen’s Committee for a cause I am very passionate about.

The past 4 months have enlightened me as to how important this landmark is to the Evanston Community. I’ve learned the concerns as well as desires of our people and have tried to take all into consideration when selecting my decision.

It is very difficult to hear all possibilities in a 10 minute presentation. I felt it advantageous to explore options of interest a bit further. Research has caused me to choose Option 4 utilizing Convexity Properties.

Convexity’s goal is to create a win-win scenario that will please Evanston residents and be financially feasible at no cost to the city. Their quote, “Tell us what Evanston wants… and we will do our best to make it happen”.

Listed are pros for decision:

- **Restore the building and keep its history at no cost to the city.**
- **City owns land**
- **Minimal green space utilized**
  - The existing analysis conducted assumed an “L” shaped building addition. This hypothetical plan was chosen because it did not require additional parking; allowed the addition to stay below the height of the mansion; and allowed unchanged pedestrian access to beachfront.
  - Please note: Underground parking, if desired, would increase costs. The offset would be more senior housing units (building upward) to keep green space. If Evanston approves, this action can be taken as well.
- **Public Use**
  - Configuration could allot for Concerts (NU music students), public boutique dining (coffee shop/cafeteria, restaurant), educational seminars, workshops, game nights, etc.
  - Public events would take place on 1st floor and the grounds
- **More consistent occupancy** vs. “how many occupants can we house” for a hotel structure. Allows a senior living community to be smaller, less dense, and a significantly lower impact on traffic and parking than a hotel.
- **Job creation**
  - Dependant on size and housing unit number; the minimum of 20 full-time employees plus engagement of 3rd party local services (food, real estate, housing services, etc.) typically coming from the local community would assist in running the establishment.
- **Income to city**
- **Limited traffic**
- **Long Term Management**
  - Convexity would own the building and enter into a management agreement with a best-in-class senior living management company to operate it. These management agreements are very stable and customarily structured for terms of 10 years or more. The management company would operate under its brand, not Convexity’s.
- Convexity has already made contact with Mather Lifeways to determine interest in management. When timing is appropriate, Convexity would contact additional companies to find the best fit.

- **ADA Compliance**
  - For the use of Senior Development, Convexity has factored into their feasibility analysis for an ADA compliant plan. Adding elevators, widening stairwells, renovating restrooms and improving wheelchair accessibility will bring the building to where it needs to be for such a plan.

- **Convexity is Ready to Go!**
  - Convexity could close on the purchase of the building in as little as 30 days from City design and plan approval.

Listed *cons* for decision

- **Establishment would be a For-Profit business** possibly under the Cook County Class-L Tax Incentive. This reduction would return to regular assessment level in the 13th year of operation.
  - This is not a total con, however, it is known that the city would receive limited taxes early on. Any private use, including hotel, would likely apply for this tax incentive, which is revenue generating vs. the alternative of a public use creating expense and not generating any revenue.

If there were a choice Option 3, Commercial/Hotel use would be a selection as well. However, inconsistency leads me to wonder if the building would be utilized enough for it’s worth… even with no cost to the city. A Senior residential plan seems to bring a bit more promise; as long as it entails a portion for public use. Understand, this is the only option I would chose for residential use.

Thank you all for your time and appreciated interest in our “Mansion on the Lake”.

Dawn Davis-Zeinemann  
Harley Clarke Citizen’s Committee Member
I appreciate having the opportunity to serve on this committee, and to submit my recommendation for your consideration.

Based on the public input and committee evaluation, I recommend that the City demolish the mansion and convert the property to open parkland, sell all architecturally significant materials and chattel, and lease or gift the exterior Jens Jensen Gardens, coach houses and adjoining greenhouse to an entity dedicated to their preservation and renovation for economically sustainable public use.

The following priorities emerged as a result of our process:

No Sale of Parkland
Retention of Property for Public Use
Preservation of the Mansion and Gardens
Minimal or No Cost to City

My recommendation addresses these priorities. It minimizes City/public expense and liability, avoids the sale of parkland and retains public domain. Limiting the lease/gift to the coach houses, greenhouse and gardens achieves several purposes. The burden of the entire estate proved to be too large for the previous lessee and the City, leading to the neglect of the gardens, coach houses and greenhouse. The coach houses and greenhouse are manageable in size. They can be operated to provide suitable programing space for public or commercial use. Additionally, the cultural relevance of the Jens Jensen Gardens exceeds that of the Harley Clarke Mansion itself.

Thank you for your time and consideration. If the City Council chooses to take the recommended approach, I am committed to volunteering my time and energy to the process and project. It was a pleasure serving on this committee, engaging with our citizenry, working with my fellow members and Alderman Rainey and Grover.

Harley Clarke Committee Member Ranking of Options
1 - City demolish mansion, redevelop as parkland
2 - City retains and renovates mansion for public use
3 - Sell or gift building to a PNP/Foundation for restoration & public use
4 - Sell property for boutique hotel, event space, & restaurant
5 - Sell property; redevelop site under residential zoning
Dear Mayor and Members of the Evanston City Council,

After careful consideration, I have reached the conclusion that the most viable option for the Harley Clarke Mansion is for the City to sell the building and land and allow it to be renovated at the owner’s expense for a publicly accessible commercial use, such as a boutique hotel, event space, and restaurant.

During the last 4 months I have witnessed firsthand how genuinely passionate people are about Evanston, the lakefront, our history, our values, and our future. I have also seen how receptive people are to having their voices heard and to being able to share their opinions and perspectives.

In the end it has become clear to me that the fate of the Mansion depends on what value or set of values one holds most important. Is it maintaining the mansion in the public trust in perpetuity? Is it preserving an old but once beautiful building? Is it creating more green space? Is it generating ongoing revenue? Is it creating jobs? These and other value-based questions must be answered in the context of the Mansion and the City at-large.

The Key Question: Funding the Renovation / Re-Purposing of the Building

Assuming the building is to be saved and not demolished, the question arises where the financial resources should come from to renovate this structure to meet an acceptable, publicly accessible function. The City? The Private Sector? Generous donors? A foundation? A new community-based organization? Equally important, does the money even exist from any of these sectors/entities to create a function of public value?

General Funding Suggestions

Those advocating for the City to retain and renovate the Mansion for public use (Option 1) believe one or more of the following statements. (1) The building can be repaired/renovated for significantly less than the figures cited in the IDNR and Pritzker proposals. (2) Revenue exists within the City’s budget to renovate and maintain the building. (3) The City can find another tenant who would renovate the property and pay a market rate for its use. (4) The City can raise funds from donors for the repairs/renovation. (5) The City can raise taxes or issue a bond to generate the revenue necessary to keep this a public asset. (6) Residents can volunteer their time and talent free of charge or at significantly discounted rates to repair/renovate the mansion. (7) The renovation of the mansion can occur in phases over many years, and use apprentices from ETHS and elsewhere.

Generally, advocates for Option 1 believe that if it’s not financially feasible for the City to repair/renovate under Option 1, then the City should gift (but maintain ownership through a long-term lease) the building to a non-profit or foundation, such as a community group like the Harley Clarke Revitalization Project (HCRP). If the City Council selected this Option (#5), the HCRP believes it could raise at least $3M to repair, renovate, and repurpose the building to serve as a community cultural center, and that the building could then be self-sufficient through user and other fees.

For advocates of Options 1 and 5, the value that is most important to them is that the Harley Clarke Mansion remains forever in the public domain. In fact, many of the advocates of Option 1 and 5 would rather the building be demolished and converted into parkland than sold and converted into a publicly accessible function such as a hotel, event space, and/or restaurant. On an emotional level I think it’s an appealing idea that the building
remain publicly owned and operated. However, I cannot reconcile that with the financial burden this will place on taxpayers, particularly in light of other more pressing City needs, and why we should expect a different outcome from what’s occurred over the last 40 years relative to the maintenance and upkeep of the building.

My Position

At some point during the debate over Harley Clarke – perhaps when the yard signs went up that said, “Parks are for People, Not for Profit” – a pervasive, yet I believe false, premise solidified in the minds of many: private development and public good cannot co-exist. As one of the participants in this process noted, “Private development and public good are not binary choices. Open minds can find reasonable compromise.” For this reason I believe the City selling the mansion and land and allowing it to be renovated for a commercial use, such as a hotel, restaurant, and event space, is just such a compromise between private enterprise and public benefits. (Note, any such sale must exclude the beach, dunes, and access to the beach; restore the Mansion and Jen Jensen gardens; contain covenants to ensure that the use of the property must be maintained even upon subsequent sale of the property; retain or expand parking for beachgoers; and limit noise and congestion for nearby neighbors. Additionally, the City Council ought to investigate a land-lease. However, a land-lease should not be non-negotiable condition.)

Assuming a reputable acquirer were to step forward, I support Option 3 because it restores the building at the expense of the owner (and not the City); the quality of restoration will likely exceed that which can be done by the City or community-based non-profit; the building’s function would be publicly accessible, meaning it would be available to the public to dine, lodge, or hold an event; and it would eliminate the City’s financial and legal risk associated with owning this asset. Furthermore, this solution would generate one-time revenue, plus property, sales, hotel, and liquor taxes, valuable revenue streams that could be directed to other more pressing needs in town related to education, social services, affordable housing, parks and recreation, etc. This solution is also aligned with the City’s Strategic Plan agreed upon by the City Council and would create good jobs. Lastly, this solution would create a one-of-a-kind amenity on the lake, something that doesn’t exist anywhere in Evanston or up the shore.

I also favor this option because the Mansion and grounds remain publicly accessible (something that would not likely occur under Option 4), and does not siphon community fundraising efforts from other worthy causes. While gifting the building to an established foundation with a track record of preservation, such as the Chicago Botanic Gardens or Driehaus, is appealing from a preservation perspective, it’s unclear how likely this is given that neither entity nor similar ones responded to the City’s Request for Information (RFI) in 2012.

In closing, as a participant in this process said, “We need to live in the world as it is, not as we would like it to be.” This does not mean that we shouldn’t be idealistic and aspire for better, but it does mean that we can’t roll back the passage of time and unburden ourselves of all the other problems, budget constraints, and prior commitments that need to be addressed in our community. Selling the mansion for a publicly accessible use, such as a boutique hotel, event space, and restaurant/café, generates many public benefits with modest sacrifice. To me, this solution seems like the realistic, sensible middle ground in this debate.

Sincerely,

Stephen H. Hagerty
Chair, Harley Clarke Citizens’ Advisory Committee
June 8, 2015

Madam Mayor and Members of City Council,

I would first like to thank you for giving me the opportunity to contribute to this process regarding the future of the Harley Clarke site and structures. I recognize and respect the many variables in this conversation, and have throughout this process taken care to keep an open mind and tried to maintain a holistic view of the impacts not just to the property but to the fabric of our community.

I appreciate the time and attention to the work you do as Aldermen and Alderwomen and I thank you for your dedication to that responsibility. I would ask that you also approach your evaluation of this body of work and the assembly of public comment included in this commissions report with the same open mind that this commission has been asked to approach the evaluation and discussion of the options for solutions.

Our charge was to evaluate and recommend viable options for the use, development or rehabilitation of this property to City Council. For the past 4 months we have collected public comment as well as captured detailed discussion as a committee as it related to the viability of most if not all of these in the context of “the options” which are described in the report before you. It is my hope that from this body of work the council and staff may craft an informed RFP for the property in the very near future. I urge the council to take the momentum of this discussion and the attention it may have gathered to solicit viable proposals from qualified parties regardless of the option council elects to pursue.

In the end I am pleased with the work done by this committee and honored to have been a part of it. It has both given voice and platform to established positions on this matter but also to many others who fall between the extremes and has now collected and recognized to many more variables for consideration.

After much reflection and many conversations with community members from many angles of this issue I come to the conclusion that the core issues at hand here are similar between the groups. We all wish to see the building and gardens preserved, we all insist that it remain an accessible part of our community and most importantly we all seek to protect its valuable and prominent role on our lakefront and in our community.

As a 2-term member of the preservation commission, I cannot place enough emphasis on the value of the historic fabric along our lakefront, Sheridan Road and throughout our community. We are surrounded by outstanding examples of architectural history and its evolution in every ward of our community. The Sheridan road corridor and lakefront represent only a snapshot of that richness. As I say that, I will also caution that this is not to say that all that is old is sacred as some might believe of broader preservation goals. I am a strong believer in preservation as an economic engine and that the continued evolution and stability of our historic fabric clearly reflects that growth and change over time. Both remain vital to local property values as well as to the identity of our community. The structures and gardens of the Harley Clarke site are valuable for many reasons. They are clearly valuable both for the physical impression they make but also for the social history they carry. When the historic district nomination was crafted...
many years ago these structures and gardens are cited for their importance to the district and Evanston's broader community context. For that reason I urge council to pursue a path that respects the grandeur of the site, its significance as a local resource, and the economic benefits that may come with preservation and adaptive reuse of this property.

After much consideration I urge you to pursue option 3 in which the building, gardens and site are most likely to be preserved and renovated with the greatest care and intent. I believe that this option affords our community the greatest opportunity to mutually benefit from the value added to that property through investments, added jobs, revenue and amenities available to the general public. This option would maintain access to the site by our community for events, dining and leisure all of which remain consistent and common threads through all of our discussion with so many of our neighbors who have participated in this process.

While I remain concerned about the future of the property should any proposed endeavor fail, I urge the council to consider within the RFP for the sale of the buildings but maintain an option for a transferable long term leasehold for the land which may be more acceptable to some potential investors and in keeping with many of our community voices rather than an outright transfer of ownership for the land. I believe that many of the requirements for access and parking included in the initial RFP should be again included and perhaps refined to reflect more accurately the desire and input of the community for public use of the land and gardens surrounding the buildings. The opportunity herein to develop a public/private solution for this project and property which allows commercial development fulfilling a desired use and continued access to this property is not only a way to boost the economic growth in Evanston but also to signal to others that our community is willing to participate in the continued growth of our city.

While the record will show that my interest in option 5 was noted early in this process and I continue to see great benefit in this option I find that the funding and operational stability of such a future for the building and property is not as certain as the benefits it my offer as a conceptual solution. I would encourage council to develop an RFP for this option as a secondary solution. This RFP should incorporate strict and considered parameters for not only business plans and financing but also for alternative strategies for future stability should the initial endeavors for fundraising and project path falter. Should such an option succeed in the near term I would argue that we as a citizenry are owed as much confidence in the longevity of the plan in 5 years and beyond as we are assured at its introduction.

Respectfully,

Garry Shumaker
Harley Clark Citizens’ Advisory Committee
Q1 On a scale of 1-5 where 1 is your most preferred option, please rank each of the options identified by the committee:

Answered: 1,375 Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City retain and renovate the building for public use</td>
<td>38.47%</td>
<td>27.93%</td>
<td>13.45%</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
<td>10.55%</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Demolish the building and redevelop the site as park land</td>
<td>12.29%</td>
<td>16.15%</td>
<td>29.89%</td>
<td>15.71%</td>
<td>25.96%</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City sell the building and land, and allow it to be renovated for a commercial use, such as a hotel or event space</td>
<td>18.62%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>16.22%</td>
<td>24.29%</td>
<td>32.87%</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City sell the building and land, and allow the site to be redeveloped under residential zoning, including senior housing</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
<td>10.18%</td>
<td>15.93%</td>
<td>43.05%</td>
<td>28.51%</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City sell or gift the building to an organization that would renovate and preserve it for public cultural and/or educational use</td>
<td>28.29%</td>
<td>37.75%</td>
<td>24.51%</td>
<td>7.35%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2 Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?

Answered: 702   Skipped: 673
## Q3 Who are you?
Answered: 1,375  Skipped: 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>99.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address 2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>99.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province</td>
<td>99.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>99.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>