A quorum being present, Ms. Leonard called the meeting to order at 2:32 pm.

Approval of minutes

September 20, 2017 and October 4, 2017 DAPR Committee meetings.

Mr. Gerdes moved to approve the minutes from September 20, 2017 and October 4, 2017, seconded by Mr. Zalmezak.

The Committee voted 10-0 to approve the minutes of September 20, 2017 with 2 abstentions and voted 8-0 to approve the minutes of October 4, 2017 with 4 abstentions.

New Business

1. 601 Davis Street Planned Development

Dave Cocagne, developer, submits for a planned development to construct a 33-story, 318 dwelling unit mixed use building with 176 parking spaces and approximately 7,400 square feet of ground floor commercial space in the D3 Downtown Core Development District. The applicant seeks site development allowances for: number of dwelling units (318), building height (313 feet), floor area ratio (12.25), number of parking spaces (176), number of loading docks (3), curb cut for drive-through between building and street right-of-way, and a ziggurat setback that is less than 40 feet at a height of 42 feet along Davis St. and along the north property line.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Kerry Dickson, Developer
Devon Patterson, Architect

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Patterson provided an overview of the proposed project. 33-story building (358 feet tall). The project has a total of 176 parking spaces, 118 bike parking spaces.
University Building to remain. No work proposed on the building at this time and no overhang from new construction. Have met with Design Evanston and gone before the Preservation Commission and continued to adjust the building design.

Ground floor layout includes retail space, a Chase Bank drive through with an entrance on Davis Street and exits onto two-way alley, as well as a drop off inset in front of the lobby entrance.

Access easement just north of University Building to remain.

Three different tiers (layouts) of apartment floors within the building.

Shadow study shows less impact on buildings to the north due to presence of an existing parking lot adjacent to the site.

Podium of building to have a height of 58 feet and brick façade throughout with glass windows on the south façade that wrap around to the sides of the buildings and “window” openings on the remaining facades. Façade broken up into three different sections.

No public benefits were provided for the proposed project. Mr. Treto explained that public benefits are items which go above and beyond base requirements for a project. Examples of possible public benefits were provided. Ms. Leonard read the code section related to planned developments and public benefits and Mr. Mangum recommended that recent planned developments be looked at for additional examples of benefits that can be provided.

Thomas Klein stated that the zoning analysis completed deemed the project non-compliant and that the City may make itself vulnerable if it does not follow the code.

Carl Klein stated that there should be significant public benefits given the number and extent of the public benefits. Inquired about a code section which spoke to the development needing to be no taller than 220 feet if it was within 50 feet of another development (applies to buildings on the same lot). He also inquired about the access to the bike room and inclusion of parking heights within the height calculation.

Mr. Mangum inquired about the brick size being used (Norman brick) and stated that brick should be used on all 4 sides of the podium façade. He also stated that the parking within these levels should be fully enclosed and mechanically ventilated, not open. Ms. Leonard emphasized the need to not see an open garage and to have active uses on the podium levels.

Ms. Leonard inquired about signage for the site which Mr. Dickson stated would only be for retail at the site but has not been developed yet. Ms. Leonard suggested that blade signs be used and Mr. Gerdes stated that a Unified Business Center Plan should be done all of which would be a separate permit.

Mr. Patterson stated that there will be entry lighting, street lighting on the street and amenity spaces will have more sensitive lighting. There will be no uplighting of the building and garage lighting will be shielded.

Bird Friendly measures include semi-reflective glass (<30% reflective) and a pattern will exist on the primary facades which will mitigate fly-through at the site. Ms. Leonard suggested that LEED 55 standards be used.

Mr. Zalmezak stated that the idea of engaging with Fountain Square is good for the site and general area.
Ms. Knapp inquired about drop-off site maintenance, its interaction with the existing bike lane and access. Mr. Dickson stated that the goal was to avoid blocking the bike lane and the lobby concierge would monitor the space. The space itself can have markings on the street to indicate it is not a regular parking space and can be designed to be accessible.

Ms. Velan stated that loading zones are typically towards the end of a block and that shared loading zones are common. Ms. Knapp stated that people will need to be alerted that there may be additional pedestrians after the existing intersection.

Mr. Mangum stated that the Chase Bank drive through is not appropriate for the site as it breaks up with pedestrian vitality of the block and interrupts the protected bike lane. Ms. Leonard emphasized that point stating that though there is an existing drive-through, having it in new construction is not desirable. Mr. Dickson stated that if in the future it is not needed it would be incorporated into the retail space. Ms. Eckersberg mentioned that the drive through is a deal breaker for Public Works Agency.

A study was requested showing how many vehicles utilize the alley and the existing Chase ATM as well as a possible meeting.

Ms. Knapp inquired about the bike room access, emphasizing that bicyclists are not allowed to use the alley and would have to walk their bicycles in the alley.

Ms. Leonard brought up concerns regarding the short loading berths and the use of larger moving trucks causing alley blockages. Mr. Patterson stated that move-ins would be scheduled to avoid overlap of moving truck usage. Mr. Dickson stated that a management plan could be drafted regarding acceptable moving truck size and managing the loading area. Prohibition of inappropriate truck sizes could be included within the ordinance if project is approved. A construction management plan would be required including plans for alley access.

Mr. Jensen inquired about how trash disposal is handled with multiple locations for refuse. Mr. Patterson stated that a trash chute will be provided for the residential portion of the building for both refuse and recycling. Mr. Jensen then stated that a small scrap program may be adopted by the City which the building may qualify for and commented on the need to have larger trash rooms to accommodate different refuse options.

Ms. Eckersberg stated that downspouts along Chicago Avenue drain onto the street and if that could be fixed.

Mr. Nelson stated that the water meter must be located within 5 feet of where the service comes into the building.

Mr. Jensen asked if there has been any thought to climate change effects on or by the building. Mr. Patterson stated that there will be an emergency generator room at grade may service emergency needs and that more climate hazards can be studied. Mr. Jensen recommended that the development look at possibly elevating the emergency mechanicals. Ms. Eckersberg mentioned ASCE has a program being developed that addresses climate resiliency of development.

With regards to public benefits Mr. Mangum shared that the FAR and height are well over allowed maximums, the taller height pushes for a taller out of scale podium and that the allowances should yield greater public benefits with
preservation/restoration of the University Building being an example. He also pointed out that parking provided is well below the recently approved .55 parking spaces per bedroom requirement.

- Ms. Velan stated that nearby garages are well utilized and that the most open garage is farther away from the site. Additionally the new Target coming in will likely change availability at the Sherman Avenue garage. Mr. Dickson stated there is possibility for using the garage at Park Evanston.

- Mr. Jensen inquired about the availability of EVC stations within the garage and if there is ability to increase that amount. Mr. Dickson stated that they could have the ability to increase numbers and intend to provide those within the garage.

- Ms. Leonard stated that there has been discussion around being in the spirit of the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance and not the letter of the law as well as consideration of the application being withdrawn. As of now the project proposes 4 on-site affordable units (two 1 bedrooms and two 2 bedrooms) at 50% AMI in perpetuity. As well as $1.5 million donation to an Evanston based nonprofit centered on student homelessness.

- Ms. Flax stated that there is more emphasis on on-site affordable units from both the public and the alderman so 4 units out of 318 is not a large amount. Also the developer working directly with a nonprofit may not set a good precedent.

- Mr. Zalmezak that the developer needs to balance development allowances with public benefits and should listen to staff and community feedback regarding affordable housing and the curb cut for Chase Bank.

- Mr. Dickson stated that the development team needs to determine the best way to fund inclusion of on-site units and will need to have a financial model that works.

The Committee voted to continue this item to the October 25, 2017 DAPR Committee meeting.

Adjournment:
Mr. Nelson moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Jensen. The committee voted unanimously 12-0, to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 4:19 pm.

The next DAPR meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 18 2017 at 2:30 pm in Room 2404 of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.

Respectfully submitted,
Meagan Jones
## DESIGN AND PROJECT REVIEW (DAPR) – MTG DATE: October 11, 2017

**Address:** 601 Davis Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTING MEMBERS</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director of Community Development</td>
<td>Johanna Leonard Chair</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Zoning Administrator</td>
<td>Scott Mangum Vice Chair</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMO/Economic Development</td>
<td>Paul Zalmezak</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. for the Director of Parks, Recreation and Community Services</td>
<td>Ray Doerner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Engineer</td>
<td>Lara Biggs</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. from the Fire Department</td>
<td>Mario Tristan</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. from the Police Dept.</td>
<td>Lloyce Spells</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. for the Director of Public Works</td>
<td>Jim Nelson</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Planner</td>
<td>Melissa Klotz</td>
<td>No Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Building & Inspection Services Division Manager | Gary Gerdes | -Construction Management Plan required.  
-Unified Business Center Plan (signage) required.  
-Seeking Bird-friendly LEED credit.  
-Further Study on Alley Impact with consideration to current uses by adjacent properties. Line of sight issues leaving ATM or alley at Church St.  
-Need list of public benefits.  
-Discussion item responses in response letter |
| Assistant Director of Public Works/Forestry | Paul D’Agostino | |
| Neighborhood and Land Use Planner | Meagan Jones Secretary | No Comment |
| Rep. from the Utilities Dept. | Ingrid Eckersberg | No Comment |

**Quorum:** A quorum shall consist of the Director of Community Development or his/her designee, one other representative from the Department of Community Development, a representative from the Department of Public Works, and two additional Voting Members, and shall be required in order to conduct any official committee business.