PLAN COMMISSION
Wednesday, March 14, 2018
7:00 P.M.
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, James C. Lytle City Council Chambers

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM
2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: February 21, 2018
3. NEW BUSINESS
   A. Planned Development
      1727 Oak Avenue 18PLND-0005
      Trammell Crow Company, developer, proposes to construct a 17-story active adult, age-
      restricted, multi-family rental development with 169 units and 139 parking spaces in the D3
      Downtown Core Development District. The applicant seeks site development allowances for: 1) 
      number of dwelling units (169 where 117 allowed); 2) building height (155 feet where 170 feet
      allowed as a site development allowance); 3) front yard setback (1 foot where a minimum of 3
      feet required); and 4) loading (1 short berth where 2 short berths required).
   B. Text Amendment
      Coach House Definition 18PLND-0013
      A Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment pursuant to City Code Title 6, Zoning, to revise the
      definition of a coach house.
4. OTHER BUSINESS
5. PUBLIC COMMENT
6. ADJOURNMENT

The next regular meeting of the Plan Commission is scheduled for WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 2018 at
7:00 P.M. in JAMES C. LYTLE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.

Order of agenda items is subject to change. Information about the Plan Commission is available online at:
http://www.cityofevanston.org/plancommission. Questions can be directed to Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use
Planner, at 847-448-8170 or via e-mail at mmjones@cityofevanston.org.

The City of Evanston is committed to making all public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. Any citizen needing
mobility or communications access assistance should contact the Community Development Department 48 hours in advance
of the scheduled meeting so that accommodations can be made at 847-448-8683 (Voice) or 847-448-8064 (TTY).

La ciudad de Evanston está obligada a hacer accesibles todas las reuniones públicas a las personas minusválidas o las
quienes no hablan inglés. Si usted necesita ayuda, favor de ponerse en contacto con la Oficina de Administración del Centro a 
847/866-2916 (voz) o 847/448-8052 (TDD).
MEETING MINUTES
PLAN COMMISSION
Wednesday, February 21, 2018
7:00 P.M.
Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, James C. Lytle Council Chambers

Members Present: Colby Lewis (Chair), Simon Belisle, Patrick Brown, Terri Dubin, Carol Goddard, George Halik, Peter Isaac, Andrew Pigozzi, Jolene Saul

Members Absent:

Staff Present: Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Administrator
Erika Storlie, Assistant City Manager/Acting Director of Community Development

Presiding Member: Colby Lewis, Chairman

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chairman Ford called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: November 29, 2017 and December 6, 2017

Commissioner Goddard made a motion to approve the minutes from December 6, 2017. Commissioner Belisle seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken and the minutes were unanimously approved, 9-0.

Commissioner Dubin made a motion to approve the minutes from November 29, 2017. Commissioner Goddard seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken and the minutes were unanimously approved, 9-0.

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. TEXT AMENDMENT 18PLND-0004

College/University Parking Requirements
A Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment pursuant to City Code Title 6, Zoning to amend Chapter 16 of the Zoning Ordinance to modify parking requirements for College/University Institutions.

Ms. Jones provided a brief background on the current parking regulations for
College/University Institutions noting that two Institutions which were open at the time of the adoption of the regulations, Kendall College and National Louis University, no longer had campuses in Evanston. She provided information on the current amount of parking provided by Northwestern and the number of parking permits issued to students living in dormitories and fraternity/sorority houses. She also stated that the City and Northwestern University are co-applicants for the proposed text amendment.

Questions from the Commission:

- Whether or not the parking requirement takes event space parking into consideration. Mr. Mangum stated that the amendment specifically addresses the dormitory and fraternity/sorority house uses but that the overall parking requirements take event spaces into consideration. There is parking available on campus for public use that does not require a permit during certain times of day.

- Why file the application jointly? Mr. Mangum stated that the reason for the amendment is the work being done on the City reservoir requires the removal of parking spaces above the new reservoir and that instead of having Northwestern University come in for variance requests for that and future projects on campus, the text amendment was suggested.

- How many parking spaces would be required after the text amendment should it be approved and could the University reduce parking in other locations on campus? Mr. Mangum stated that 3,493 would be the number of required parking spaces and that it is possible that parking is reduced in other parts of campus.

- Clarification on the timing of the 2015 study provided and the opening of new garages on campus. Mr. John D’Angelo clarified that at the time of the 2015 study the two newest parking garages on the north and south ends of the campus were open and taken into account.

- Whether or not the “projected” amount of parking needed includes faculty and students within the building as part of new construction. Mr. D’Angelo confirmed that faculty and students are included in the projected amount of required parking.

- Double counting of students is still not fully reduced for residents of dormitories, fraternities and sororities. What will prevent Northwestern from coming back for further reduction? Ms. Storlie stated that the impetus for the text amendment is the work the City must complete on the City Reservoir and the loss of parking spaces. Northwestern University did not approach the City for the proposed amendment. She also stated that there is no evidence that the double counting is a problem and does not anticipate Northwestern University coming in for further required parking reductions.

Commissioner Goddard made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed text amendment. Commissioner Belisle seconded the motion.
A roll call vote was taken and the motion was approved, 9-0.

Nays: None

B. TEXT AMENDMENT 18PLND-0011

Porch Regulations
A Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment pursuant to City Code Title 6, Zoning to amend City Code Section 6-4-1-9, Yards, and City Code Section 6-18-3, Definitions, to modify regulations pertaining to porches.

Mr. Mangum provided background and reasons for the proposed text amendment including a large number of requested variances due to the lack of usable porch space permitted by the current regulations. Two options were provided: the first to permit a front porch depth that extends a maximum of 25% into the required front yard setback, and the second to permit a porch depth of 6 feet, provided that a minimum 10 foot front yard setback is provided.

Questions from the Commission:
- Whether or not the proposed amendment would apply to new construction or additions. The proposed amendment would apply to any new construction affecting front yard setbacks.
- How is porch use regulated? If a porch space is enclosed and is used as interior living space then these regulations would not apply to that space.
- 6 feet, while reasonable for a front porch, may be limiting in a large front yard. Discussion followed starting with a suggestion of combining the two amendment options to fully address functionality of porches in yards of varying sizes.
- Clarification on how setbacks are managed when there are varying existing front yard setbacks, or a zig-zag effect, within a block. Mr. Mangum stated that an average of existing front yard setbacks is taken to determine required setbacks for new construction or additions. Discussion followed with comments regarding the desired outcome.
- Clarification on depth needed for ADA accessibility and suggestion that the porch be at least that depth. If a ramp were needed that would be a similar regulation to allowing steps projecting into a setback.

Discussion continued regarding preferences for the text amendment and emphasis that the required setback is a minimum, allowing the property owner to still have some flexibility. Clarification on whether or not nonconforming porches would be affected was provided, specifically, if a porch is damaged or destroyed outside of the
property owner’s control, it could be replaced within a year.

Commissioner Isaac made a motion to recommend that the amendment be revised so that front porches must maintain a minimum ten foot front yard setback and may be the greater of six feet in depth or 25% of the depth of the required front yard. Commissioner Belisle seconded the motion.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion was approved, 9-0.


4. OTHER BUSINESS

A. MODIFICATIONS TO ADMINISTRATIVE RULES AND PROCEDURES OF THE PLAN COMMISSION

Ms. Jones provided a brief summary of the edits being proposed by staff for the Administrative Rules and Procedures. These consisted of: minor grammatical edits, changes to the attendance requirements, changes to language regarding review of the City’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP), elimination of Associated Members, and the elimination of leaseholders being able to request a continuance at public hearings (consistent with City code) among other items.

Discussion followed with Commission questions and comments as follows:

● Concern that deleting the CIP review would remove an opportunity for public comment. Mr. Mangum responded that there are other opportunities for the public to provide feedback on the CIP, specifically at City Council or Administration and Public Works Committee. It was suggested to take out reference to the CIP but keep the remaining language as it refers to other City plans.

● Displeasure with the language attendance requirement vote. Suggestion to remove that portion of the revised language but keep the reduction in missed meetings triggering action at the Chair’s discretion.

● Confirmation that there are currently no Associate Members.

● Confirmation regarding the necessity of holding a position on a subcommittee or being a liaison.

Commissioner Isaac made a motion to revise the proposed amendment to Article IV(E) to read “The chair shall notify the Mayor when a member of the Commission has failed to attend meetings during a consecutive three (3) months, or six (6) times during a consecutive twelve (12) months, unless the chair shall determine that the failure to attend was for a good cause.” Commissioner Saul seconded the motion. The Commission voted, 9-0, to adopt the revised amendment regarding
Commissioner attendance.

Commissioner Isaac made a motion to revise the proposed amendment to Article III to remove reference to CIP review and read “To study, review and prepare recommendations on plans and proposals of other departments of the City government which relate to the implementation of the Comprehensive General Plan.” Commissioner Goddard seconded the motion. The Commission voted, 8-1, to approve the revised amendment regarding CIP and plan review.

Commissioner Belisle made a motion to approve the remaining suggested amendments as presented by staff. Commissioner Isaac seconded the motion. The Commission voted, 9-0, to approve the remaining suggested amendments as presented by staff.

B. APPOINTMENTS OF LIAISONS AND ZONING COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chair Lewis listed the Commissioners who acted as liaisons for various Boards and Committees and asked if there were any proposed changes. A brief discussion followed.

The following appointments were made:
Zoning Committee- Dubin, Saul (Chair), Goddard, Belisle, Isaac;
Comprehensive Plan Committee- Dubin (Chair), Lewis, Piggozi, Brown, Halik;
Rules Committee- Lewis, Isaac, Goddard (Chair);
Economic Development Committee – Piggozi;
Planning & Development Committee – Lewis;
Housing & Community Development Act Committee – Goddard;
Transportation and Parking Committee – Dubin;
(Public Place Names Committee and ADA Advisory Committee have been eliminated).

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Goddard made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Piggozi seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken and the motion was approved by voice call 9-0. The meeting was adjourned at 8:34 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Meagan Jones
Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Community Development Department
Plan Commission

Planned Development

1727 Oak Avenue
18PLND-0005
To: Chair and Members of the Plan Commission

From: Erika Storlie, Assistant City Manager/Acting Community Development Director
Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Administrator
Melissa Klotz, Zoning Planner

Subject: Planned Development
1727 Oak Ave., 18PLND-0005

Date: March 9, 2018

Request
The applicant requests approval of a 17-story active adult, age-restricted, multi-family rental development with 169 units and 139 parking spaces in the D3 Downtown Core Development District, with Site Development Allowances for the number of dwelling units, building height, front yard setback, and number of loading berths. The site plan and proposed Site Development Allowances were modified after the newspaper legal publication and mailed notices were sent to the public. A site development allowance is no longer being requested for the fence and pergola location, however, an allowance is now requested for the number of loading berths.

Notice
The application was filed in conformance with applicable procedural and public notice requirements, and was published in the Evanston Review on February 22, 2018 as:

Trammell Crow Company, developer, proposes to construct a 17-story active adult, age-restricted, multi-family rental development with 169 units and 139 parking spaces in the D3 Downtown Core Development District. The applicant seeks Site Development Allowances for: 1) number of dwelling units (169 where 117 allowed); 2) building height (155 feet where 170 feet allowed as a site development allowance); 3) front yard setback (1 foot where a minimum of 3 feet required); and 4) a fence and pergola in the front and north interior side yard for a dog park. In addition, the applicant may seek and the Plan Commission may consider additional Site Development Allowances as may be necessary or desirable for the proposed development. Please provide comments at: http://1727oak.civicomment.org/
General Information

Applicant: Johnny Carlson
Trammell Crow Chicago Development, Inc.
700 Commerce Drive, Ste 455
Oak Brook, IL 60523

Owner(s): FDS 1007 Evanston, LLC
11601 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 2460
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Existing Zoning: D3 Downtown Core Development District

Existing Land Use: Surface parking lot for 1007 Church building
Property Size: 35,240 sq. ft. (0.81 acres) as proposed by subdivision
PIN: 11-18-123-012-0000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surrounding Zoning and Land Uses</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>C2 Commercial District</td>
<td>Religious Institution, Metra tracks, Maple Ave. parking garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RP Research Park District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>D3 Downtown Core Development District</td>
<td>Office/Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RP Research Park District</td>
<td>Optima Views multifamily residential, Commercial (ground-floor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>O1 Office District</td>
<td>1717 Apartments &amp; Sienna Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R6 General Residential District</td>
<td>multifamily residential, Religious Institution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

Project Description
The applicant proposes subdivide the existing property and construct a 17-story, 169 unit active adult, age restricted building for residents 55 and older, with ground floor amenity space, 129 enclosed parking spaces, 7 roofed parking spaces and 3 open parking spaces. Upon subdivision, the new development parcel will total 35,240 sq. ft. (0.81 acres).

Uses surrounding the property include the 8-story office/medical building at 1007 Church St. commonly known as Shand Morahan Plaza and designed by renowned architect Helmut Jahn, the 8-story apartment complex at 1717 Ridge Ave./8-story condo complex at 1720-1740 Oak Ave., and multiple moderate sized religious institutions. The
east property line abuts the Metra tracks, with the 28-story Optima Views condo/mixed use complex on the other side of the tracks. A 10-story independent living/assisted living/memory care facility was approved to the northwest at 1815 Oak/Ridge Ave. as a Planned Development in 2016, and is anticipated to begin construction in late 2018.

1727 Oak Ave. Proposed Planned Development

Site Layout:
The current property, comprised of 1007 Church St. and 1727 Oak Ave., is triangular in shape with approximately 311 feet of frontage along Church St. and 488 feet of frontage along Oak Ave. and a total lot size of 75,993.5 sq. ft. The applicant proposes to subdivide the property just north of the 1007 Church building to separate the existing building from the proposed development. The resulting lot that the development is proposed at is also triangular in shape with approximately 317 feet of frontage along Oak Ave and a lot size of 35,240 sq. ft.
Proposed Subdivision Indicating New Property for Proposed Planned Development (with current conditions/surface parking lot shown):

The property currently features a surface parking lot comprised of 45 parking spaces for the office/medical building immediately to the south at 1007 Church St. The applicant proposes to subdivide the property just north of the 1007 Church building and construct the proposed development on the newly created triangular parcel. With the loss of 45 parking spaces, 1007 Church still complies with the required parking since it features a total of 300 parking spaces where 294 spaces are required. The 300 parking spaces for 1007 Church St. are located on the west side of Oak Ave. at the existing Sienna Court condo development.

The proposed structure consists of a parking podium base that is set back 3.5 feet from the front (Oak Ave.) property line to align with the 1007 Church building. The second
and third floors comprise the remainder of the enclosed parking and cantilevers over the first floor to a distance 1 foot from the front property line. Floors 4-16 comprise the bulk of the tower structure and features ziggurat step backs from all sides of the podium base. The tower is approximately 14.5 feet back from the podium in the front and the south side that abuts 1007 Church, and approximately 24.5 feet back from the rear of the podium. The tower does not extend all the way to the north of the property due to the triangular convergence of the property lines. The tower features protruding balconies on all facades that are minimally sized and do not extend out to the depth of the podium.

The ground floor features amenity space including a lobby/lounge, leasing area, dining area, dog wash station, package room, salon and spa, and an outdoor dog park, as well as the entrance to the loading berth and parking garage. The ground floor features 13 fully enclosed parking spaces, 7 roofed parking spaces that are accessed from the outside but are not enclosed, as well as 3 unenclosed/not roofed parking spaces. The exterior parking will be available to guests of the facility. One enclosed short loading berth is located off of the private drive entrance next to the entry to the parking garage, which thereby achieves only one curb cut for the entire development. There is no alley on the block.

The second and third floors comprise the remainder of the parking podium, with 57 parking spaces on the second floor and 59 parking spaces on the third floor. Of the total 139 parking spaces, 9 spaces are compact size and 4 spaces are tandem access. Tandem spaces will be allocated to residents who own two vehicles and request two parking spaces.

Floors 4-16 feature a combination of 26 studios (alcove), 91 one-bedroom units, and 52 two-bedroom units, all ranging in size from 569-1245 sq. ft. The top floor features additional amenity space including a fitness room, movie room, and game room, as well as an outdoor rooftop pool and the enclosed mechanical penthouse.

The building reaches a total height of 176 feet. However, the D3 District discounts floors that are at least 75% parking from the height calculation. With floors 2-3 entirely devoted to parking, 21 feet of building height is excluded from the height calculation, for a requested building height of 155 feet. Although the first floor features parking, it is not excluded from building height due to the amount of habitable amenity/lobby space.

The applicant will modify the on-street parking along Oak Ave. There are currently 45 on-street metered parking spaces on Oak Ave. between Church St. and the curve to Clark St. The applicant proposes to relocate an existing fire hydrant to the north end of the property and remove one existing curb cut, which then allows for additional on-street parking. The applicant proposes a total of 49 on-street metered parking spaces, two of which are ADA-compliant spaces in front of 1007 Church to serve the medical building. The ADA spaces will be connected to an ADA-compliant path to the sidewalk. Since
the proposed on-street parking adds a net increase of 4 spaces (2 of which are the ADA spaces), the applicant proposes to utilize 2 spaces in front of the proposed building as short-term 15 minute metered spaces for drop offs, Uber pick-ups, etc. Metering the short-term spaces will help ensure proper utilization and turnover of the spaces.

The streetscape will be improved with brick banding adjacent to the curb along the sidewalk and increase the number of street trees adjacent to the development from 13 existing trees to 18 (due to the removal of one existing curb cut and the relocation of the fire hydrant). The existing crosswalk located towards the southern portion of the development will be re-striped and a curb-extension constructed to shorten the crossing distance. Five public bicycle racks will be provided at the north end of the development in the right-of-way.

The applicant also proposes landscaping on top of the parking podium to establish a green roof. A dog park is proposed at the far north end of the property that will be accessible to the general public. The dog park is surrounded by a 5 foot tall metal, wrought-iron style steel fence and features a gate to the public sidewalk for public access. A steel and wood pergola is proposed over a portion of the dog park with a maximum height of 12 feet.
Compliance with the Zoning Ordinance
The intent of the D3 Downtown Core Development district is to encourage large scale development of a variety of commercial and residential uses, specifically:

The purpose of the D3 downtown core development district is to provide for the highest density of business infill development and large scale redevelopment within downtown Evanston. The district is also intended to encourage and sustain mix of office, retail, and residential uses. Planned developments are encouraged as a special use in the D3 district. Where D3 zoned lots or areas are overlaid with the oRD redevelopment overlay district designation, a planned development is required in order to ensure that proposed development in these areas is consistent with the objectives and policies of the adopted "plan for downtown Evanston."

Subdivision
The applicant requests approval of a subdivision to establish a new property line between the existing 1007 Church building and the proposed development site. As subdivided, each property will stand on its own. The 1007 Church property will maintain compliance with the Zoning Ordinance since it was not previously approved as a Planned Development, maintains a compliant side yard setback to the new property line, complies with the parking requirement for an office/medical office use, and is below the maximum allowed FAR with the smaller lot size. The newly created parcel complies with the lot requirements of the D3 District.

Planned Development
The applicant requests Special Use approval for a Planned Development, which is required due to a lot size in excess of 30,000 sq. ft., construction of more than 20,000 sq. ft., and development of more than 24 residential dwelling units. The applicant requests four Site Development Allowances to exceed the base D3 zoning regulations.

The applicant requests the following Site Development Allowances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Development Allowances Requested</th>
<th>D3 District Requirement</th>
<th>Site Development Allowance</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dwelling Units/ Lot Size</td>
<td>117 (300 sq. ft. /DU)</td>
<td>No maximum</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>85 feet (plus up to 4 floors of parking)</td>
<td>220 feet (plus up to 4 floors of parking)</td>
<td>155 feet (plus 21 feet or 2 stories of parking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Loading Berths</td>
<td>2 short berths</td>
<td>No minimum</td>
<td>1 short loading berth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setback</td>
<td>3 foot block average</td>
<td>No minimum</td>
<td>1 foot (floors 2-3 only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The applicant believes the requested Site Development Allowances are appropriate for the following reasons:

Number of Dwelling Units: The D3 District encourages high density development and the site is proximate to public transportation. The number of dwelling units proposed is appropriate for the site, as is demonstrated by surrounding developments with similar or greater density such as Sienna Court (111 DUs), 1717 Apartments (175 DUs), Church Street Station (105 DUs), and Optima Views (205 DUs).

Building Height: The D3 District encourages large-scale development that is appropriate for an urban downtown environment. The building height proposed is appropriate for the site, as is demonstrated by surrounding developments with similar or greater height such as Optima Views (28 stories), Church Street Station (17 stories), and the recently approved 1815 Oak/Ridge development (10 stories), as well as other recently approved developments in the downtown such as 1571 Maple St. (12 stories) and 1450 Sherman Ave (15 stories). The development does not request to exceed any of the maximum Site Development Allowances as the recently denied 601 Davis St. Planned Development proposed for FAR and building height.

Number of Loading Berths: Two short loading berths are required due to the square footage of the residential portion of the development (parking and amenities are excluded). Due to the use of the property as an age-restricted active adult building, residents are able to age in place with less residential turnover. With less residential turnover, moving trucks or vans will not be on-site as frequently as they are at typical residential developments. Additionally, the dwelling units are small to moderate in size and will feature no more than two residents per unit (typically one), so moving trucks or vans will not stay in the loading berth for long. This Site Development Allowance is due to City staff’s requirement that trucks not back out of any loading berth onto Oak Ave., which would be a significant vehicular and pedestrian hazard. As proposed, trucks utilizing the loading berth will back up via a three-point turn entirely within the property to reverse and then exit to Oak Ave in a forward motion. Also, with only one loading berth proposed, the loading berth is able to utilize the curb cut that serves the parking garage rather than creating a second curb cut just for loading.

Front Yard Setback: The D3 District permits a zero foot front yard setback when adjacent buildings on the same side of the street within the block feature a zero foot front yard setback. In this case, the only building on the same side of the street is 1007 Church, which features a 3 foot front yard setback. In such case, the average setback of the block is the required front yard setback (which is 3 feet). The first floor of the proposed development complies with a 3.5 foot setback to maintain streetscape continuity for pedestrians. However, the second and third floors that comprise the parking podium cantilever into the front yard with a proposed 1 foot front yard setback. This is necessary to accommodate a compliant number of parking spaces and drive aisles within the parking garage. Since the first floor complies with the required front
yard setback, and the Site Development requested is for a minimal 2.5 foot differential, the intent of the requirement is met. All floors above the parking podium comply with a 14.5 foot ziggurat setback.

The applicant was responsive to City staff's comments and recommendations to reduce the number of Site Development Allowances requested from an initial eight requests down to the four current requests. The proposed development complies with the D3 District requirements for all other zoning requirements, including a proposed FAR of 4.24 where up to 4.5 is permitted, side and rear setbacks of 5 feet or more where zero feet is permitted, and 139 parking spaces (126 that meet code requirements for stall size and drive aisle access) where a minimum of 122 parking spaces are required.

Parking and Traffic
The property is located within the City’s TOD (Transit Oriented Development) area and is located less than 1,000 feet from both the Davis St. Metra Station and CTA Station. Based on the City’s TOD parking requirement, .55 parking spaces are required per bedroom, for a total parking requirement of 122 parking spaces (based on 221 total bedrooms proposed). The development proposes a total of 139 parking spaces, including 9 compact spaces and 4 tandem spaces. When excluding the compact and tandem spaces, which do not meet zoning requirements for the parking stall size or the drive aisle access, 126 fully-compliant parking spaces are provided and in compliance with the parking requirement. The applicant believes additional parking is not needed for the facility due to the nature of an age-restricted building that encourages residents to age in place, utilize the surrounding highly walkable downtown area, and take advantage of amenities such group transportation for special events/trips.

The applicant submitted a Traffic Impact Study (prepared by Kenig, Lindgren, O’Hara & Aboona, Inc., or KLOA) that analyzes the anticipated traffic impact the development will have on the area. The traffic study takes into account recently approved large developments including 1815 Oak/Ridge and the recently denied 601 Davis St. Planned Development. The traffic study notes active-adult developments typically feature a resident demographic with a reduced need to travel outside the development, especially during peak commuter periods.

The property is located less than 1,000 feet from the Davis Street Metra and CTA Stations, which are also bus stops for multiple CTA and Pace bus routes. The traffic study finds the existing conditions of the signalized intersection at Ridge Ave. and Church St. will maintain the same vehicular delay level for both morning and evening peak hours except for the morning northbound approach, which will decrease from level C to D, and the evening southbound approach, which will also decrease from level C to D. The signalized intersection at Church St. and Oak Ave. will maintain all current B levels at all times. The non-signalized access points on Oak Ave. (for parking lot/alley access) will maintain all current levels with one exception; the outbound parking lot access with a westbound approach (current surface parking lot that will be replaced by
the development) currently operates at an A level for both morning and evening peak hours, while the proposed development’s outbound parking garage access with a westbound approach will operate at a B level for both morning and evening peak hours.

The traffic study concludes the street network will be able to accommodate the increased traffic volumes and no capacity improvements or modifications for vehicular movement are needed or suggested. However, the study does note pedestrian countdown timers should be installed at the intersection of Ridge Ave. and Church St. similar to the pedestrian timer that will be provided by the nearby 1815 Ridge/Oak development at the Oak Ave. and Church St. intersection when that development is constructed. The study also recommends the proposed development provide one on-site car-sharing vehicle, electric vehicle charging stations within the parking garage, and a DIVVY Bike Share station near the site. The applicant agrees to install the pedestrian countdown timer at the intersection of Ridge Ave. and Church St., a transit-tracker screen within the lobby of the proposed development to alert residents to Metra and CTA train times, and will construct the parking garage as electric-vehicle ready with infrastructure in place for future electric vehicle stations as needed.

Public Benefits
The applicant has committed to provide the following public benefits as part of the Planned Development proposal:

1. Provide and maintain a dog park that will be accessible by the public at north end of the development site.
2. Provide wayfinding signage on the property for the City walking fitness route (3 signs)
3. Provide 5 bicycle stalls for public use adjacent to the dog park.
4. Repaint Church St. bicycle lane between Oak Ave. and Maple Ave.
5. Relocate fire hydrant to increase on-street metered parking on Oak Ave. by two additional spaces.
6. Provide Transit Tracker within the development.
7. Provide 4 additional street trees on Oak Ave.
8. Provide pedestrian countdown timers at the intersection of Church St. and Ridge Ave.

The proposed public benefits are moderate compared to other recently approved Planned Developments. However, the applicant has agreed to provide all required inclusionary housing units on-site rather than paying the fee-in-lieu, which is a substantial cost increase to the developer.

Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan
The guiding principle of the 2000 Comprehensive General Plan is to encourage new development that improves the economy, convenience and attractiveness of Evanston while simultaneously working to maintain a high quality of life within the community
where new developments should be integrated with existing neighborhoods to promote walking and the use of mass transit.

The proposed development is consistent with the Plan objective to maintain the appealing character of Evanston’s neighborhoods while guiding change. The proposed development will provide the first large-scale active adult age-restricted building in Evanston that is not specifically an independent or assisted living facility, which will benefit Evanston’s aging population by providing a new housing option that encourages aging in place for residents.

The proposal is largely consistent with the Plan’s objective to maintain and enhance property values in Evanston. The development site is currently underutilized as a surface parking lot in the downtown, which is not the highest and best use for the property. The creation of 169 new dwelling units will contribute to the City’s economy and the downtown.

As a high-density residential development located in a highly walkable area with multiple public transit modes nearby including Metra, CTA, and Pace, this TOD proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s vision to provide higher density housing near transit stations.

Compliance with the 2009 Downtown Plan
This site is located within the West Core subarea of the 2009 Downtown Plan, which plans for 50,000-100,000 sq. ft. of new office space, 100,000-120,000 sq. ft. of new retail space, and 2,000 new dwelling units at a rate of 200 new dwelling units per year for 10 years. The West Core subarea calls for buildings with a base height of 15 stories or 165 feet, with bonuses available for a maximum height of 18 stories or 198 feet. The proposed development fits well with the Downtown Plan as it falls between the base and maximum Downtown Plan height and adds new dwelling units in target with the plan.

Compliance with the Design Guidelines for Planned Developments
The proposed building is consistent with the Design Guidelines for Planned Developments. The proposal was reviewed by the Design and Project Review (DAPR) Committee on February 21, 2018 and March 7, 2018 (meeting minutes attached) and received a unanimous recommendation for approval.

The proposed development will reduce the number of existing curb cuts on the property from two to one, which will improve the walkability of the block and establish a cohesive sidewalk that connects the downtown area that is west of the Metra tracks (all the way to 1815 Ridge/Oak) with the rest of the downtown with minimal vehicular conflicts. The loading berth is specifically designed to utilize the parking garage curb cut as well as a turn-around area on the private property to ensure trucks do not back out into pedestrian areas or the street. The applicant worked extensively with staff to design an appropriate loading berth/turn-around area with only one curb cut at the property.
streetscape will be improved with additional street trees, brick banding on the sidewalk, additional on-street parking, restriping the crosswalk and adding a curb extension on Oak Ave., and pedestrian countdown timers at the Church St. and Ridge Ave. intersection.

The ground floor of the building features active uses and a large amount of fenestration that encourages pedestrian activity. The parking podium is comprised of corrugated, perforated, metal panels with a matte finish that vary in color to break up the massing of the parking garage while providing adequate ventilation. The vehicular doors that lead to the parking garage and loading berth are designed with frosted glass since they are visible from the right-of-way. Floors 4-16 are set back from the parking podium to further reduce the massing of the building. These residential floors feature mostly glass facades with intermittent metal panels and aluminum window details, as well as protruding balconies with glass railings. The top floor features metal panels that cover the mechanical penthouse, glass, and intermittent wood-grain panels for architectural detail. Bird-friendly measures are proposed for the first 48 feet of building height (ground floor, parking podium, and extending above the green roof on the parking podium), which is the most impactful zone to bird flight. Bird-friendly measures include matte finishes, additional metal interruptions within the glass balcony railings and corner building windows, and fritted patterns on the balcony railing glass.

The proposed development utilizes a sleek, modern style that is complementary to surrounding buildings including the adjacent 1007 Church building that was designed by architect Helmut Jahn.

Compliance with Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (IHO)
The IHO requires 10% of the total dwelling units proposed as on-site affordable housing units (17 units for this development), or a $100,000 fee-in-lieu for each required affordable housing unit ($1.7 million for this development). The applicant agrees to provide all required affordable housing units on-site, which is a higher development cost to the applicant. Therefore, the applicant proposes slight modification to the unit breakdown and affordable rates (based on area median income or AMI) from what the IHO requires. The modification does not meet all requirements of the IHO, but may be approved by City Council as an equivalent alternative. The applicant proposes the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Units in Development</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Market Rate Rent</th>
<th>50% AMI Rent</th>
<th>60% AMI Rent</th>
<th>80% AMI Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$2,050</td>
<td>2 units $691</td>
<td>2 units $829</td>
<td>4 units $1,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 BR</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>3 units</td>
<td>4 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The applicant proposes zero affordable 2-bedroom units since most units in the building will only be occupied by one individual given the age-restricted building. Additionally, the affordable rent rate for 2-bedroom units would be a significant loss to the applicant compared to the market rate, which would make it economically infeasible to provide all 17 on-site affordable units.

In order to achieve all 17 affordable units on site and with appropriate AMI rent levels to help individuals in the most need for affordable housing, the applicant proposes 8 affordable studios and 9 affordable one-bedroom units, with half of the units rented at 50% and 60% AMI and the other half of the units at 80% AMI.

Although the proposed inclusionary housing proposal does not meet the IHO requirement, the proposed equivalent alternative is more beneficial to the community than if the applicant paid the fee-in-lieu. All affordable units are the same size as the market rate units, and feature similar fixtures and finishes.

Design and Project Review (DAPR) Committee Review
The DAPR Committee reviewed the proposed development on February 21, 2018 and provided comments and suggestions to the applicant. Most significantly, the Community Development Department and the Public Works Agency strongly recommended relocation of the loading berth area, which was originally at the north end of the site near where the dog park is now proposed, and required trucks to back out onto Oak Ave. The DAPR Committee reviewed a revised plan that included relocation of the loading berth area and a reduction of the number of loading berths from 2 to 1 on March 7, 2018. With the revision to the loading berth that created a turn-around area for trucks entirely within the private property, as well as other minor modifications, the DAPR Committee recommended unanimous approval of the Planned Development.

Standards of Approval
The proposed development must satisfy the Standards for Special Use in Section 6-3-5-10, the Standard for Planned Development in Section 6-3-6-9 and Standards and Guidelines Established for Planned Developments in the D3 Downtown Core Development District. (Section 6-11-1-10)

Staff finds that the proposed development meets all Standards for approval:

Standards for Special Use (Section 6-3-5-10):
A Planned Development is listed as a special use in the D3 Downtown Core
Development district. The proposed development follows the purposes and policies outlined in the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance.

The proposed development will not cause a negative cumulative effect when considered in conjunction with other special uses in the area. Surrounding uses include high-density residential and office/medical office. Although the property is located in the D3 District, the site is not central to the retail core of the downtown area and is not suitable for a mixed-use building with substantial ground floor retail.

The proposal can be adequately served by public facility infrastructure already available. The street and sidewalk network and extensive public transportation, as well as water, sewer, electricity, and gas infrastructure already exist in the area. Any necessary modifications to infrastructure, including the relocation of a fire hydrant, shall be approved through the permit process as appropriate.

The applicant submitted a Traffic Impact Study that finds there will be minimal effect to the level of service on existing surrounding roadways. The access to the parking garage and loading berth are combined into one to reduce the number of curb cuts on the property and increase the walkability of the area. Additionally, the applicant agrees to multiple public benefits that increase the walkability and pedestrian safety in the area, thereby encouraging less vehicular usage.

Finally, the proposal meets all zoning requirements other than the four Site Development Allowances requested.

Standards and Guidelines for Planned Developments in D3 District (Sections 6-3-6-9 and 6-11-1-10):
The proposed Planned Development complies with the purpose and the intent of the Comprehensive General Plan, the 2009 Downtown Plan, and the Zoning Ordinance. The proposal is a high density residential development that is a compatible land use with surrounding properties. The proposed development preserves surrounding character-giving buildings such as the Helmut Jahn designed Shand Morahan building at 1007 Church St. Additionally, the proposal enhances the existing streetscape and strengthens the pedestrian orientation and scale of the entire block.

The proposal is consistent with the vision and goals of the Comprehensive Plan for redevelopment of underutilized properties and the 2009 Downtown Plan, with appropriate building height, bulk, and density.

Recommendation
City staff and the DAPR Committee recommend approval of the development proposal, including the subdivision, proposed Site Development Allowances, and Inclusionary Housing equivalent alternative that provides 17 on-site affordable units. Given the on-site affordable units, staff does not recommend any additional Public Benefits for the
proposed development.

City staff recommends the following conditions:

1. The proposed Planned Development shall substantially conform to the plans and documents presented.
2. The applicant shall agree to a Construction Management Plan (CMP) prior to building permit issuance.
3. Any change in use of the building must be approved as an amendment to the Planned Development.
4. The applicant shall pay for the installation of additional on-street parking meters, as well as the cost of lost meter revenue directly related to the construction of the building as determined by the Parking Division.
5. The applicant shall submit a traffic and pedestrian study within one year after issuance of the final Certificate of Occupancy for the building, analyzing any traffic incidents adjacent to the Subject Property, intersection of Church St. and Oak Ave., and curve from Oak Ave. to Clark St. Upon review of the applicant’s submitted traffic study, the City reserves the right to restrict movement in or out of the site or require additional traffic calming measures and pedestrian safety measures.
6. The applicant shall remove and remedy any contaminations located on the Subject Property in accordance with the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency.
7. 17 on-site affordable housing units shall be maintained in accordance with the approved equivalent alternative inclusionary housing proposal for a minimum period of 25 years.
8. On-site building management shall be responsible for ensuring delivery/moving trucks utilize the one provided on-site loading berth in a timely manner so that at no time is one truck waiting on the street for the loading berth to become available.
9. The dog park shall be open to the public and maintained by on-site building management. Dog refuse pickup bags and refuse containers shall be available for public use within the dog park at all times.
10. The Applicant shall install a Transit Tracker Display Board or like system as information/technology changes within the building’s lobby area in perpetuity.
11. The Applicant shall make streetscape improvements, per site plan including bike racks, wayfinding signage, curb extension, and street trees.
12. The Applicant shall be responsible for repainting the bike like on Church Street between Oak Ave. and Maple Ave.
13. The Applicant agrees to contribute fifteen thousand dollars ($15,000.00) to the City of Evanston to be utilized for the installation of pedestrian countdown timers when the City conducts its traffic light update.
Attachments

Proposed Development Plans - updated February 28, 2018
Proposed Subdivision - submitted February 14, 2018
Public Benefits Summary - updated March 7, 2018
Affordable Housing Proposal - updated March 7, 2018
Zoning Analysis - updated March 2, 2018
Bird Safety Plan
Signage Proposal for Northshore Medical parking (at 1720 Oak Ave.)

Planned Development Application Documents - submitted January 29, 2018
   Including Market Study and Traffic Impact Study
Comments received as of March 9, 2018
DAPR Meeting Minutes - February 21, 2018
DAPR Draft Meeting Minutes - March 7, 2018
Link to Project Site, including comments: http://1727oak.civicomment.org/
Architectural Metal Panel (Parking Ramp Screening):
Preferred material includes vertical placement,
perforation, corrugated shape, color gradation
Architectural Metal Panel (Parking Ramp Screening):
Preferred material includes vertical placement, perforation, corrugated shape, color gradation
Dog Park:
- Pergola — steel and treated wood
- Fence — steel
BIRD COLLISION DETERRENCE

INCLUDES 12’ OF HEIGHT ABOVE GREEN ROOF

PORTION OF LEVEL 5

TOP OF LEVEL 4

INCLUDES 12’ OF HEIGHT ABOVE GREEN ROOF

FAÇADE ZONE 1

BIRD SAFETY

(to be most visible to birds)

BOTTOM OF LEVEL 1

FACADE ZONE 1
Balconies will incorporate interruptions between glass sheets (to be metal framed)

5th-level balconies: glass will include fritting pattern similar to above image

Glazing at building corners will incorporate metal mullions

Metal screening at parking levels will not have shiny finish (to be matte finish)
Frosted Glass Garage Door (at Parking & Loading entries):

- PREFINISHED COMPOSITE METAL PANEL
- EXTERIOR HIGH PRESSURE LAMINATED PANEL - WOOD GRAIN
- PREFINISHED COMPOSITE METAL PANEL
- PREFINISHED PERFORATED METAL PANEL IN CORRUGATED SHAPE (VARIES IN COLOR)
- FROSTED GLASS GARAGE DOOR
- FACE BRICK

March 7, 2018
PRE-FINISHED ALUMINUM WINDOW WALL SYSTEM
PRE-FINISHED COMPOSITE METAL PANEL
GLASS RAILING
PRE-FINISHED COMPOSITE METAL PANEL
PREFINISHED PERFORATED METAL PANEL IN CORRUGATED SHAPE (VARIES IN COLOR)
HIGH PRESSURE LAMINATED PANEL - WOOD GRAIN
PRE-FINISHED ALUMINUM WINDOW WALL SYSTEM
TRANSPARENT GLASS
TRANSPARENT GLASS
TRANSPARENT GLASS

March 7, 2018
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• Provide IHP units on-site vs. fee in lieu – When including the IHP units on-site, as proposed, vs. fee in lieu, there is a negative impact on the proforma, equating to less profit ($3,500,000).
  
  Approximate cost to public benefit: $3,500,000

• The subject property is currently used for surface parking. The Applicant’s consultants estimate a net fiscal benefit to the City ranging from $46,156 to $71,615 per year, which yields a Net Present Value of between $700,790 and $1,100,990 to the City of Evanston over 20 years (average of the range over 20 years).
  
  Approximate cost to public benefit: $900,890

• Provide public dog park at the north end of the property.
  
  Approximate cost to public benefit $25,000 (initial improvements – stone surface, perimeter fence, miscellaneous landscaping, trash receptacle and security camera) + $50,000 (on-going maintenance over 20 years - $2,500/year) = $75,000

• Provide wayfinding signage on the property for the City walking fitness route (3 sign locations at $500/sign)
  
  Approximate cost to public benefit: $1,500

• Provide public bike stalls (5 bike stalls at $500/stall) on north end of the site adjacent to the public dog park at the north end of the property.
  
  Approximate cost to public benefit: $2,500

• Repaint the bicycle lanes on Church Street (Oak to Maple: 300 ft. at $16/ft.)
  
  Approximate cost to public benefit: $5,000

• Increasing Oak Avenue parking stall count by 2 (cost to move fire hydrant)
  
  Approximate cost to public benefit: $10,000

• Transit Tracker in the building (TV and software)
  
  Approximate cost to public benefit: $5,000

• Provide 6 additional canopy trees along Oak Avenue (6 trees at $500/tree)
  
  Approximate cost to public benefit: $3,000

• Covering the cost for a pedestrian countdown ticker at the intersection of Ridge Avenue and Church Street.
  
  Approximate cost to public benefit: $15,000

Approximate Cost of Public Benefit: $4,500,000
INCLUSIONARY HOUSING PROPOSAL

Submission Date: 03/07/18

Applicant Name: Johnny Carlson Phone: 630-368-0253

Applicant Address: Trammell Crow Chicago Development, Inc./700 Commerce Dr., Suite 455/Oak Brook, IL 60523

Applicant Phone: 630-368-0253 Cell Phone: 

E-Mail: Jcarlson@trammellcrow.com Website: www.trammellcrow.com

Property Owner Name: FDS 1007 Evanston, LLC Phone: 

Property Owner Address: 11601 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 2460 / Los Angeles, CA 90025

Property Owner Phone: 213-600-4326 Cell Phone: 

E-Mail: Cwilliams@FDStonewater.com Website: www.fdstonewater.com

Project Name: Evanston Active Adult Apartments

Project Address: 1727 Oak Ave, Evanston IL 60201

Parcel Identification Number (PIN): 11-18-123-012-0000

Project Type: ☒ New Construction

☐ Conversion/Addition of Residential Units

Project Located in: ☒ TOD Area Please list: Downtown

☐ Non-TOD Area

Project Description: The proposed development is a luxury residential community with approximately 169 age-restricted, 55+, Active Adult rental apartment units, including approximately 139 parking stalls. The proposed development will offer a housing option that makes economic sense by offering affordable monthly payments, unlocking home equity, and providing a rich social experience for empty-nesters in the Chicago North Shore submarket that desire to live in an urban environment. This residential community will offer various unit types for its diverse tenant profile, tailored to the active adult demographic in search of flexible luxury living. Unit types will range from Studio units to large 2-bedroom units. This variety in housing types will help to accommodate a variety of household formations, sizes and incomes. The average unit size ranges approximately 569 – 1,245 RSF.

Inclusionary Housing Compliance: ☒ On-site Units

☐ Fee in Lieu
Project Funding Type: ☒ Private

☐ Public

If publicly funded (Federal, State, Local), list all sources of governmental assistance, including TIF, low income housing tax credits, bond financing, public grants, land disposition programs and other:

N/A

Affordable Units: ☒ Rental  Market Rate Units: ☒ Rental

☐ For Sale  ☐ For Sale

Residential Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total # of Units</th>
<th>Affordable Units *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Studio and 1-Bedroom units are interchangeable by Owner -- see Exhibit A.

Unit Square Footage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Market Rate Units</th>
<th>Affordable Units *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>569 SF</td>
<td>569 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>614-778 SF (range)</td>
<td>614-778 SF (range)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Studio and 1-Bedroom units are interchangeable by Owner -- see Exhibit A.

Describe general location of each affordable unit within the development (attach plans including floor plans, specify size and location of affordable units)

Affordable units will be located on various floors throughout the building and will include similar unit finishes compared to the market-rate units.

Pricing Schedule – Market Rate Units (Estimated Sale Price or Rent Amount)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sale Price</th>
<th>Rent Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$2,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**For Development in TOD Areas**

### On-site Affordable Rental Units – Number at each Income Level and Estimated Rents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Units at 50% AMI*</th>
<th>Units at 60% AMI*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Units</td>
<td>Rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### On-site Affordable Rental Units – Number at each Income Level and Estimated Sale Price

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Units at 80% AMI</th>
<th>Units at 100% AMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Units</td>
<td>Sale Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fee in Lieu of On-site Units: $100,000 x _______ (number of units) = $ _______

*At least 50% of the affordable units rent will be set at or below 60% AMI -- see Exhibit A.

**Studio and 1-Bedroom units are interchangeable by Owner -- see Exhibit A.

### For Development in Non-TOD Areas

#### On-site Affordable Rental Units – Number at each Income Level and Estimated Rents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Units at 60% AMI</th>
<th>Units at 80% AMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Units</td>
<td>Rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### On-site Affordable For-Sale Units – Number at each Income Level and Estimated Sale Price

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Units at 80% AMI</th>
<th>Units at 120% AMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Units</td>
<td>Sale Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fee in Lieu of On-site Units: $75,000 x _______ (number of units) = $ _______

If the project construction will be done in phases, provide a construction schedule for market rate and affordable units.

This project will not be completed in phases.
☐ The developer proposes to meet the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance requirements through the attached alternative equivalent action. (*The proposal must show that the alternative proposed will increase affordable housing opportunities in the City to an equal or greater extent than compliance with the express requirements of Inclusionary Housing Ordinance.*)

For further information visit: [www.cityofevanston.org/IHO](http://www.cityofevanston.org/IHO)

I certify that the above information is true and correct:

Print Name: Johnny Carlson  Position/Title: Principal

Signature: [Signature] Date: 03/07/18
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMI</th>
<th>Rent Type</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Average (1)</th>
<th>Studio</th>
<th>1-Bed</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Gross Affordable Rents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Gross Affordable Rents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Gross Affordable Rents</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross Average Affordable Rents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Utility Allowance (2) $135
Average Net of Utilities Affordable Rents $825
Average Market Rate Rents $2,425

Market Rate Premium Over Affordable (%) 194%
Market Rate Premium Over Affordable ($) $1,600

Note (1) Average Gross Affordable Rent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMI</th>
<th>Studio</th>
<th>1-Bed</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$891</td>
<td>$740</td>
<td>$716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$829</td>
<td>$888</td>
<td>$859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$1,106</td>
<td>$1,165</td>
<td>$1,146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note (2) Average Utility Allowance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility Allowance Per City Standard</th>
<th>Studio</th>
<th>1-Bed</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heat</td>
<td>$23</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$46</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Heat</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerator</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>$146</td>
<td>$135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* at least 50% of the affordable units rent will be set at or below 60% AMI (4 units at 50% and 5 units at 60%) and the remainder at 80% AMI (8 units)

** Studio and 1-bed affordable units are interchangeable by Owner (requirement allows for a mix of studio units and 1-bed units, all studio units, or all 1-bed units) - this will vary at any given time
Zoning Analysis
Summary

Case Number: 17ZONA - 0280
Case Status/Determination: Non-Compliant

Proposal:
Subdivide property, construct 17 story active adult multifamily residence

Zoning Section: Comments:

Subdivision required to split property in two with new property line
Planned Development required

6-11-4-4
117 dwelling units allowed (300 sq ft lot size per dwelling unit = 117 DUs)
Propose 169 dwelling units
Eligible Site Development Allowance (no maximum)

6-11-4-8
85' building height allowed
Propose 155' building height (21' of parking floors excluded)
Eligible Site Development Allowance (maximum 170')

6-11-4-7-A
0' front yard setback allowed if +50% of block at 0' (block is at 3')
Propose 3.5' front yard setback for first floor (compliant) and then 1' front yard setback for floors above (non-compliant)
Eligible Site Development Allowance

6-16-5
2 short loading berths required
1 short loading berth proposed
Eligible Site Development Allowance

For Existing 1007 Church Property:
Lot size decreases from 75,993.5 to 40,753.5 — Compliant
FAR increases from 1.93 to 3.61 — Compliant
New north interior side yard setback — Compliant
Proposed wrought-iron fence near north interior side yard property line shall be at least 3' back from the front façade of the 1007 Church building
294 parking spaces required (includes 1998 request to add 49 required parking spaces for medical office use for a total of 345 spaces where 294 are required) — Loss of 45 surface parking spaces on 1727 Oak property leaves 1007 Church with 300 spaces where 294 are required (a portion of the required parking is located off-site) — Compliant

1007 Church property was constructed as-of-right and will continue in compliance following the subdivision; therefore no additional process/approval is needed for the 1007 Church property.
City of Evanston
ZONING ANALYSIS REVIEW SHEET

APPLICATION STATUS: Pending Review  November 16, 2017
RESULTS OF ANALYSIS: Non-Compliant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z.A. Number:</th>
<th>17ZONA-0280</th>
<th>Purpose: Zoning Analysis without Bid Permit App</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>1727 Oak</td>
<td>District: D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Johnny Carlson</td>
<td>Overlay: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Preservation District:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIS APPLICATION PROPOSES (select all that apply):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Principal Structure</th>
<th>Change of Use</th>
<th>Sidewalk Cafe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Accessory Structure</td>
<td>Retention of Use</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition to Structure</td>
<td>Plat of Resubdiv/Consol.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration to Structure</td>
<td>Business License</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention of Structure</td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS BASED ON:**

| Plans Dated: | 11.01.17 |
| Prepared By: |        |
| Survey Dated: |        |

**Existing Improvements:**

**Proposed Description:**
Subdivide property, construct 17 story active adult multifamily residence

## ZONING ANALYSIS

### PLANNED DEVELOPMENT THRESHOLDS

- Does not apply to 1t, 12, 13, 15, U2, or Excluded T1 & T2 Properties. See Section 6-8-1-10(D) for R's; Section 6-9-1-9(D) for B's; Section 6-10-1-8(D) for C's; Section 6-11-1-10(D) for D's; Section 6-12-1-7(D) for RP; Section 6-13-1-10(D) for MU & MUE; Section 6-15-1-8 for O1, T's, U's, or, orRE, & orRD.

1. Is the request for construction of substantially new structures or a substantial rehabilitation or substantial addition as defined by increasing floor area of principal structure by 35% or more? If not, skip to 2 & 4 below.
   - Yes

2. Does the zoning lot area exceed 30,000 sqft?
   - Yes

3. Does the proposal entail more that 24 new residential, commercial, business, retail or office units in any combination?
   - Yes

4. Does the proposal entail the new construction of more than 20,000 sqft of true gross floor area at or above grade including areas otherwise excluded from defined gross floor area?
   - Yes

### FRONT YARDS

Section 6-4-1-9(A)1 - For R, T, or U District proposals, does 50% or more of the block frontage have a setback of more than 27 feet?
- Section 6-4-1-9(A)3a - Does an abutting lot have less than the required front yard setback of the zoning district?
- Section 6-4-1-9(A)3b - Is the subject property located between an improved lot and a vacant lot? Or is the subject property a corner lot?

### PRINCIPAL USE AND STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Use</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USE:</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Dwelling - MF</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

Minimum Lot Width (LF)
- No Requirement

**USE:**
- Multi Family

**Comments:**

Minimum Lot Area (SF)
- 1/300 DU
- 75993.5
- 25240

**USE:**

**Comments:**

Minimum Dwelling Units:
- 117 DUs
- 0
- 169

**Comments:**

LF: Linear Feet  SF: Square Feet  FT: Feet
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### Rooming Units:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Building Lot Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(SF) (defined, including subtractions &amp; additions)</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Impervious Surface Coverage (SF, %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Accessory Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rear Yard Coverage:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40% of rear yard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Gross Floor Area (SF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use:</th>
<th>4.5 or 158580 sqft</th>
<th>149571</th>
<th>Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Height (FT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>85 + 85 = 170 (PD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>176 - 21 (parking) = 155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Frent Yard(1) (FT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction: W</th>
<th>3' (1007 Church)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street: Oak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Frent Yard(2) (FT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Street Side Yard (FT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Interior Side Yard(1) (FT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction: N</th>
<th>62</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Interior Side Yard(2) (FT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction: S</th>
<th>29; 6'4' open parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Rear Yard (FT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction: E</th>
<th>5 building, 5.1 open parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## ACCESSORY USE AND STRUCTURE

### Use (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permitted Districts:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balcony</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permitted Required Yard:</th>
<th>10% into required setback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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**Additional Standards:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height (FT)</strong></td>
<td>Flat or mansard roof 14.5', ot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance from Principal Building:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>within building envelope</th>
<th>Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front Yard(1A) (FT)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street:</strong></td>
<td>Oak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within building envelope</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interior Side Yard(1A) (FT)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within building envelope</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interior Side Yard(1B) (FT)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within building envelope</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rear Yard (FT)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction:</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACCESSORY USE AND STRUCTURE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use(2):</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permitted Districts:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permitted Required Yard:</strong></td>
<td>3' back from front facade</td>
<td>Building Envelope</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Standards:</strong></td>
<td>Pergola</td>
<td>attached/building footprint</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height (FT)</strong></td>
<td>Flat or mansard roof 14.5', ot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance from Principal Building:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

|                                |          |          |          |               |

**LF:** Linear Feet  **SF:** Square Feet  **FT:** Feet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard (2A) (FT)</td>
<td>3' back from front facade</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5'</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direction: W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street: Oak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard (2B) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Side Yard (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard (2A) (FT)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direction: N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard (2B) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direction: S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard (FT)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direction: E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PARKING REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use(1): Multi-family (Nonres District)</td>
<td>.55 x 221 bedrooms=121.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use(2): Retail Goods Establishment</td>
<td>3k exempt = 0 required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use(3):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REQUIRED:</td>
<td>121.6</td>
<td>1007 Church=294 required</td>
<td>139 (including 9 compact &amp; 4 tandem)</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>139 (including 9 compact &amp; 4 tandem)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap Parking Spaces:</td>
<td>Sec. 6-16-2-6 = 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Clearance (LF)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 assumed</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfacing:</td>
<td>Sec. 6-16-2-6 (E)</td>
<td></td>
<td>enclosed/paved</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5' interior side setback</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**Angle(1): 90 Degree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Width(W) (FT)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth(D) (FT)</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aisle(A) (FT)</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module (FT)</td>
<td>SL 42.0, DL 60.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Angle(2):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Width(W) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth(D) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aisle(A) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Garage Setback from Alley Access (FT):**

**Comments:**

**LOADING REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loading Use:</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>1 short 30K to 100K, 1 short each addl. 200K.</td>
<td>1 short</td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**TOTAL (long):**

**TOTAL (short):** 2

**Long Berth Size (FT):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**Short Berth Size (FT):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10' wide x 35' deep</td>
<td>10 x 35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**Vertical Clearance (FT):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14'</td>
<td>14' assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**Location:** Sec. 6-16-4-1

**Comments:**

**MISCELLANEOUS REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement (1): 1007 Church parking</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>294 total spaces required</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>eliminate 45 spaces=300</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement (2): 1007 Church FAR</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 D3 max</td>
<td>1.93 (147,000 sq ft)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement(3):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1007 Church new side yard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 building; 5 parking</td>
<td>5' building; no parking</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**Analysis Comments:**

**RESULTS OF ANALYSIS**

Results of Analysis: This Application is Non-Compliant

Site Plan & Appearance Review Committee approval is: Required

See attached comments and/or notes.

![Signature](image)

**Signature**

**Date**

3/2/18
BIRD COLLISION DETERRENCE

INCLUDES 12’ OF HEIGHT ABOVE GREEN ROOF

PORTION OF LEVEL 5

TOP OF LEVEL 4

36’

BOTTOM OF LEVEL 1

FACADE ZONE 1

FACADE ZONE 1

FACADE ZONE 1

FACADE ZONE 1

(to be most visible to birds)
Balconies will incorporate interruptions between glass sheets (to be metal framed)

5th-level balconies: glass will include fritting pattern similar to above image

Glazing at building corners will incorporate metal mullions

Metal screening at parking levels will not have shiny finish (to be matte finish)
Signage - New Parking Field Across the Street

1 message

Carlson, John @ Oak Brook <JCarlson@trammellcrow.com> Sat, Feb 24, 2018 at 9:56 AM
To: Melissa Klotz <mklotz@cityofevanston.org>, Scott Mangum <smangum@cityofevanston.org>
Cc: "Jahnke Dale, Katie (katie.dale@dlapiper.com)" <katie.dale@dlapiper.com>, "Hamilton, Grady @ Oak Brook" <GHamilton@trammellcrow.com>

Melissa,

Below is the signage that will be located across the street for NorthShore wayfinding. This was requested by a DAPR committee member.

The only tenant who is currently allowed to park in the parking field at the office building is NorthShore and they will now park across the street.

Entrance Wall

Medical Group

NorthShore University Health System

1007 Church Patient Parking

Parking space
Garage ceiling

Johnny Carlson | Principal
Trammell Crow Company
700 Commerce Drive, Suite 455 | Oak Brook, IL 60523
T 630.368.0253 | F 630.990.1503 | C 312.502.4547
Jcarlson@trammellcrow.com
http://www.trammellcrow.com

Follow TCC: Facebook | LinkedIn
BIRD FRIENDLY EVANSTON

March 7, 2018

Design and Project Review Committee
Lorraine Morton Civic Center
2100 Ridge Avenue
Evanston, IL 60201

Re: Assessment of 1727 Oak Proposal with regard to Bird Safety

Dear Design and Project Review Committee,

Bird Friendly Evanston very much appreciates the assistance of staff in referring developers to us in advance of public meetings. Our comments below reflect those provided in a private Fall 2017 meeting with the developer and in the February 21, 2018 DAPR meeting.

We appreciate that the developer is exploring implementing LEED Pilot Credit 55, and we strongly recommend that the developer follow through and apply those standards. This is important for several reasons.

Evanston is in a highly sensitive location at the lakefront; birds migrating to and from their wilderness homes to the north are caught over the lake at night, concentrate on the shore at dawn, and then move inland. The bright lights of downtown attract these birds. At Northwestern University’s Evanston campus alone, 300 dead and injured birds of more than 50 different species were collected this fall. Many of these bird species such as the Illinois-threatened Black-billed Cuckoo are rare and declining. Window collisions are indiscriminate.

Birds killed by window collisions can include young and healthy individuals and endangered or threatened species. It is unusual that an urban center can contribute significantly to wildlife conservation. Evanston has an important opportunity to safeguard our nation’s bird life.

Finally, the 1727 Oak location within Evanston is highly sensitive. CTA and Metra rail lines, with trees, shrubs and ground cover along the rails, are crucial green space in an urban landscape. Birds are attracted to greenery along the rail lines, and susceptible to collisions with glass structures adjacent to the lines. We know this is a concern at this location because 1007 Church, which is next to 1727 Oak, reported that it has regularly collected birds that collide with its reflective glass.

Many bird-safe residential buildings have been constructed applying LEED 55 principles. LEED 55 is practical and achievable. See the many examples featured in the American Bird Conservatory brochure here https://abcbirds.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Bird-friendly_Building_Guide_WEB.pdf
If LEED 55 cannot be achieved, we welcome meeting with the developer to discuss areas of particular concern. Bird friendly treatments include adding fritting, window films or other steps and adjusting landscaping and lighting. Possible steps that would help at this building:

- Treating glass the first 60’ above the podium or green roof, where birds may land and collide on takeoff. This includes not only windows, but also glass balcony walls.
- Treating glass railings.
- Treating areas where glass reflects trees or other greenery.
- Treating glass corners.
- Requiring that external lighting be minimized from 12 am until after dawn during Spring and Fall migration, and educating tenants about the need. (http://chicagoaudubon.org/content/lights-out-0)
- Avoiding guy wires and roof lighting that pose a bird hazard.

As an aside, you may not be aware of three major bird-protective actions the Northwestern University Evanston campus has taken just this fall:

1) The new Ryan Fieldhouse and Walter Athletics Center is being constructed of glass with a dot pattern to increase visibility to the birds.
2) The windows on the Frances Searle Building were covered with a film to break up the reflections with a line pattern, putting an end to 45 years of bird mortality easily numbering in the thousands at those mirrored windows.
3) The University has covered a small test area of the new mirrored Kellogg building with a dot patterned film and is considering expanding this over broader expanses of the building.

Evanston is moving toward becoming a more welcoming place for the rare wildlife that uses our city.

Thanks for your time and your support for reducing Evanston bird mortality.

Libby Hill, Beth Lange, Judy Pollock, Leslie Shad, and Allison Sloan,
Coordinating Group
Bird Friendly Evanston

Cc: Johnny Carlson, Trammel Crow
Aaron Roseth, esg
**Question:** The project is located near Metra and CTA stations. How can the project improve the transportation experience? The project includes 158 parking spaces. How else can it minimize parking impacts in the surrounding area? As a residence for 55+ year olds what other amenities could be provided for its residents and the broader senior community? How can the building design blend in with the neighborhood and improve the pedestrian experience? The City of Evanston would like to hear from you. Any other questions or suggestions for the proposal?

**Response 1**
I think this site and development proposal make better use of the Metra and CTA service than a parking lot for the adjacent building. Residents will have convenient transit access without having to drive. I would suspect that the building would also help shield train noise from the residential buildings just west of the site on Oak and to a lesser degree on Ridge. The plan looks to include angle parking along the east side of Oak Avenue next to the property. While I believe some parallel spaces are being eliminated, the angle spaces should compensate for any displacement. This site covers its parking needs and I don't think it necessarily needs more amenities than what other standard residential buildings would want. The biggest amenity is being in downtown Evanston with easy walking access to shops, restaurants, the lakefront, and culture. The proximate transit access to other neighborhood nodes in Evanston or to Chicago is an attraction (not that many residents would be driving during rush hours anyways). This site, as I understand it, is including affordable housing on-site rather than paying the in-lieu fee, so that is a benefit in this area and for other active seniors. Other than that, I think it's use of high quality materials will be an improvement over the current site and treat the area well in terms of I think it has good scale and size. I don't think it has to necessarily "blend" as variety is a good thing, but I think it generally in line with other projects we are seeing downtown. I think the pedestrian route/experience walking along the east side of Oak, linking Clark with Church, will be an improvement (and needs to be so that residents can comfortably walk to/from the east side of the tracks).

Just that I'm in favor of the project. It improve last the tax base as a higher use for the property vs the surface lot. It has good overall scale. These types of uses have little traffic study impact. They are a benefit to schools without creating additional burden on them. It provides an opportunity for older residents to stay in or move to Evanston when downsizing while allowing them to take advantage of all that downtown offers. Overall, I think this is a good project for the community.

**Response 2**
I live in 1720 Oak. If the 17-stories building was built, my condo will be totally blocked from any sunshine. So I hope the building would be no higher than 5 stories.

**Response 3**
By locating somewhere else. The revised plan only has 137 units which will strain parking even further. This is not an acceptable development for this site. By being located somewhere else. It is too large, will cause over-congestion is a small area, and be a safety concern for current residents in the area. By being located somewhere else. It is too large, will cause over-congestion is a small area, and be a safety concern for current residents in the area.

estimated property tax income of $750,000 (according to John Carlson of Trammel Crow) is not a significant and amount and does not warrant numerous negative effects it will have current residents!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! DO NOT APPROVE THIS PROJECT despite the pro-development position of the 2nd ward alderman, Peter Braithwaite.
Regarding 1727 Oak
1 message

You Li <you.li@u.northwestern.edu>  Tue, Mar 6, 2018 at 11:54 PM
To: mklotz@cityofevanston.org

Hi Melissa,

I am an owner of a condo in 1720 Oak. I am writing to express my objective to 1727 Oak, because it would block all sunlight of my unit. Does the developer has any way to resolve this issue? Thanks.

Regards,

You Li

You Li
PhD Student
Electrical Engineering and Computer Science
Northwestern University
Tech L580, 2145 Sheridan Road
Evanston, IL 60208, USA
A quorum being present, Ms. Storlie called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm.

New Business

2. 1727 Oak Ave. Planned Development

Trammell Crow Company, developer, proposes to construct a 17-story active adult, age-restricted, multi-family rental development with 169 units and 139 parking spaces in the D3 Downtown Core Development District. The applicant seeks site development allowances for: 1) number of dwelling units (169 where 117 allowed); 2) building height (155 feet where 170 feet allowed as a site development allowance); 3) front yard setback (1 foot where a minimum of 3 feet required); and 4) a fence and pergola in the front and north interior side yard for a dog park. Recommendation to Plan Commission.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Johnny Carlson
                      Aaron Roseth

DISCUSSION:

- Age restricted building.
- Site development allowances:
  - Number of dwelling units
  - Building height
  - Parking setback
  - Accessory structure for dog park pergola
- Public benefits:
  - 17 affordable dwelling units, studio and 1-bedroom, with ¼ at each of 50%, 60%, 80% and 100% AMI.
  - Dog park, public
  - $100k benefit to the City
  - Public wayfinding signage
  - Bike parking
  - Repainting bike lanes on Church Street
  - Transit tracker
- Reviewed ground floor layout - main entry, dog park, salon.
- Two levels of parking above the ground floor.
- Reviewed typical floor plan.
- Reviewed amenity deck, 14th floor, discussed programing.
• Building materials discussed: 1st floor masonry facade, perforated corrugated metal on parking levels, upper floors glazing and metal panel.
• Migratory birds, no pure glass exterior, architecture patterns break up upper level facade.
• Translucent garage door material.
• Proposed building height is mid-range of adjacent uses.
• Dwelling unit sizes, average is 818 sq. ft.
• Reviewed loading dock turning radius with vehicles backing into the dock from Oak Ave.
• Podium has a green roof, would consider white roof as suggested by Mr. Jensen. Pavers on the roof typically a buff color but not confirmed. Green roof typically done with trays, no resident access.
• Loading dock concern, not allowed to back in due to lack of visibility. Building management will control traffic and time loading accordingly.
• Luay Aboona, KLOA, stated northbound lane typical for deliveries, does not interfere with southbound traffic.
• Mr. Mangum asked if it is possible to locate loading dock adjacent to the garage entrance utilizing the driveway and curb cut to the south?
• Mr. Mangum stated existing northern location could cause too many conflicts. Asked if it is possible to connect to the loading area to the building loading to the south?
• Mr. Carlson stated it would be costly, footings and mechanicals would make it difficult.
• Mr. Gerdes noted office building parking to be accommodated by garage across the street.
• Ms. Velan asked where employees will park.
• Mr. Carlson noted 6-8 within the building.
• Developer will work with building across the street to have parking in the building after hours, when office is closed.
• Ms. Velan noted applicant proposing drop-off spaces in front of building entrance, 1007 Church St. is also requesting on-street loading spaces.
• Ms. Storlie noted ADA spaces for 1007 Church St. are now in the garage, should work with them to provide that parking on-site.
• Mr. Nelson noted dual water services, meters must be within 5’. Trees must be at least 10’ from utilities.
• Discussion of rents, breakdown of unit affordability. Request to have more units at 50% and 60% AMI.
• Dog park to be relatively flat, short retaining wall included at rear. If loading moved, then could add access to park from the building and increase size.
• Parking podium screening, partial natural ventilation, some fans and exhaust still needed. Matte finish of perforated metal, appearance to vary based on lighting conditions.
• Goal to meet LEED 55.
• Will signage be added to encourage crosswalk use? Yes, can be added.
• Parking to be keycard accessible.
• Joining Voices Interfaith Action, asked how affordable units compare to offering.
• Affordable unit sizes (17 total units):
  o one size for studios
  o 1-bedrooms vary with what is available, 618-778 sq. ft.
  o Mixed throughout the building
• Judy Dollowe, Bird Friendly Evanston, building is in dangerous location for birds. Balcony railings and windows/glass at various levels can be hazardous to birds.
• Leslie Schad, Bird Friendly Evanston, emphasis on need to achieve LEED 55.
Ms. Biggs made a motion to continue this to the March 7, 2018, meeting, seconded by Mr. Gerdes.

The Committee voted, 11-0, to continue this case to the March 7, 2018, meeting.

---

**Adjournment**

Ms. Biggs made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Mangum. The Committee voted, 12-0, to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 3:45.

The next DAPR meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 28, 2018, at 2:30 pm in Room 2404 of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Griffith
DESIGN AND PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DAPR) MINUTES
March 7, 2018


Staff Present: J. Velan

Others Present: J. Velan

Presiding Member: E. Storlie

A quorum being present, Ms. Storlie called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm.

Approval of minutes

February 21, 2018, and February 28, 2018, DAPR Committee meetings.

Mr. Gerdes made a motion to approve the minutes from February 21 and 28, 2018, seconded by Ms. Eckersberg.

The Committee voted, 9-0, with one abstention, to approve the minutes of February 21 and 28, 2018.

New Business

1. 1727 Oak Ave. Planned Development

Trammell Crow Company, developer, proposes to construct a 17-story active adult, age-restricted, multi-family rental development with 169 units and 139 parking spaces in the D3 Downtown Core Development District. The applicant seeks site development allowances for: 1) number of dwelling units (169 where 117 allowed); 2) building height (155 feet where 170 feet allowed as a site development allowance); 3) front yard setback (1 foot where a minimum of 3 feet required); and 4) loading (1 short berth where 2 short berths required).

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Johnny Carlson, developer
                        Gretchen Camp, architect

DISCUSSION:
- Public benefits updated: 9 affordable units at 50%/60% AMI, on-site
  8 affordable units at 80% AMI, on-site
  Added more on-street parking and trees
  Approximately $1 million additional in public benefits
- Loading relocated, all vehicle access at one location. Loading trucks can reverse on-site so there is no backing out onto the street.
- Ground floor reconfigured.
- Dog park under concrete building canopy, pergola or open air. Revised to eliminate need for site development allowances.
• Bird zone is the lower base up to 48’, using bird friendly glass, added window framing at corners of building, so it isn’t entirely clear across the corners, and added framing in balcony railings to break up balconies.
• Signage indicating where 1007 Church Street parking is located.
• 2 short term parking stalls on the street for Uber drop offs, etc, not metered.
• Previously had 45 on-street metered spaces; now propose 49: 2 are short term and 2 are ADA for 1007 Church; net is the same 45. 1007 Church ADA spaces are right in front of that building.
• Staff suggests using short term 15 minute meters to encourage vehicles to move. Agreed to by developer.
• Will modify walk for ADA accessibility at 1007 Church ADA spaces.
• Only need 1 loading berth because there is very low turnover in age restricted buildings. Will have 8 on-site staff (similar sized buildings typically have 4) so deliveries will go quicker. Smaller units that are typically single occupancy means most often move in is done by a van or small moving truck
• Landscaping with pea gravel for the dog park.
• LEED 55 upper bird zone - not committing to comply but will apply best practices as are economically feasible. Cannot afford fritting all the way up the building.
• Mr. Gerdes, note specifically what bird friendly measures will be taken, encourage residents to turn out certain lights at certain times, etc.
• Ms. Eckersberg asked about balcony drainage, stating they should slope away from building, taking into account the force of drainage on the green roof.
• Relocating a fire hydrant to maximize on street parking, and making pedestrian environment friendlier. Staff is concerned about distance between fire hydrants if one is moved. Will confirm location is appropriate.
• Construction - hope to break ground in August 2018.

Public Comments:
• Sue Luellbach, Coalition for the Homeless, encouraged seeing IHO discussions this early in the process. City has a subcommittee looking at inclusionary housing, where IHO will be looked at as the minimum requirement, with only more above as a public benefit. This proposal is still not in compliance with the IHO, want all units at 50%/60% AMI.
• Kiera Kelly, studies are incomplete and don’t look at the traffic issues. Between this new building and 1815 Ridge, 811 Emerson, the study is incomplete. Church and Ridge will now be rated D which is very concerning. Now 12th luxury high rise, City needs a downtown development plan given how much development is occurring. Consider the totality of the recently approved very tall buildings as well as this one. Luxury rentals increase gentrification and acceleration of real estate values. Want common sense and moderation. If this one is approved, future ones in less desirable locations should be scrutinized more.

Mr. Gerdes made a motion to recommend approval of the project to the Plan Commission, seconded by Mr. Mangum.

The Committee voted, 9-0, to recommend approval of the project to the Plan Commission. Ms. Biggs abstained.
Adjournment

Ms. Biggs moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Nelson. The Committee voted to unanimously, 10-0, to adjourn.

The next DAPR meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 14, 2018, at 2:30 pm in Room 2404 of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.
Plan Commission

Text Amendment

Coach House Definition
18PLND-0013
To: Chair and Members of the Plan Commission

From: Erika Storlie, Assistant City Manager/Acting Director of Community Development
Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Administrator
Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner

Subject: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment
Revision of the definition of a coach house
18PLND-0013

Date: March 8, 2018

Request
Staff recommends amending the Zoning Ordinance to modify the definition of a Coach House.

Notice
The Application has been filed in conformance with applicable procedural and public notice requirements including publication in the Evanston Review on February 22, 2018.

Analysis
Background
At the January 29, 2018 City Council meeting, the Council made a referral to the Plan Commission to change current zoning regulations to allow the rental of existing accessory dwelling units to individuals who are not members of the family living in the primary dwelling unit. This came about from an October 2017 Planning & Development Committee discussion regarding ways to address the shortage of housing affordable to low, moderate and middle income households.

Accessory dwelling units can be either detached (coach houses or backyard cottages for example) or attached to the primary structure. Recent and current staff interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance is that Coach Houses, commonly found in Evanston, are allowed as Accessory Dwelling Units to Single-Family Residences per 6-4-6-3 (Allowable Accessory Uses and Structures). However, as these units are accessory to the Primary Use (Single-Family House) they are limited to being occupied by a family member, household worker, or similar relationship and are therefore not allowed to be rented out to the general public.
Proposal Overview
Staff is proposing to amend the definition of a coach house with regards to unrelated tenants. Specifically staff will amend the zoning ordinance as described below:

Section 6-18-3 Definitions.

| COACH HOUSE: | A secondary or accessory dwelling located on the same zoning lot as the principal dwelling unit. Tenants of coach houses may be unrelated to the owners of the principal residential structure. |

This proposed text amendment would apply to all coach houses. In the future additional regulations could be considered, including parking requirements and limits on short-term/vacation rentals of those units.

Standards of Approval
The proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to modify the definition of a Coach House meets the standards for approval of amendments per Section 6-3-4-5 of the City Code. The proposal is consistent with the goal of the Comprehensive Plan to recognize the effect of housing on the quality of neighborhoods by supporting efforts aimed at improving Evanston’s housing stock as well as maintain and enhance property values and positive perception of housing in Evanston. The proposed amendment would help to increase the variety of housing available to residents and will also begin to address concerns about cost and affordability.

The proposed text amendment will not have any adverse effects on the values of the properties in the area as it will enable property owners of existing coach houses to rent those units. Adequate utilities and compliance with other property standards would be required in order to rent the coach houses.

Recommendation
Staff believes the proposed text amendment to revise the definition of a coach house meets the standards of approval as outlined above. Staff recommends the Plan Commission make a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposed text amendment.

Attachments
- Referral memo dated January 24, 2018
Memorandum

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Johanna Leonard, Community development Director
       Sarah Flax, Housing and Grants Administrator
       Savannah Clement, Housing Policy and Planning Analyst

Subject: Zoning Change to Allow Rental of Accessory Dwelling Units to Non-Family Members

Date: January 24, 2018

Recommended Action:
To address the need for affordable housing and to expand the availability of rental housing choices in R1 and R2 districts, staff recommends that City Council make a referral to the Plan Commission to change zoning to allow rental of existing accessory dwelling units (ADUs) to individual(s) who are not members of the family living in the primary dwelling unit.

Funding Source: NA

Livability Benefits:
Built Environment: Support housing affordability; provide compact and complete streets and neighborhoods; and

Equity & Empowerment: Ensure equitable access to community benefits, and support poverty prevention and alleviation.

Discussion:
At the October 30, 2017 Planning and Development meeting to discuss ways to address the shortage of housing affordable to low, moderate, and middle income households, council members agreed that allowing rental of existing ADUs to persons who are not related to the owners of the primary dwelling unit on the property as an immediate action that could expand the number of available rental units in Evanston, particularly in R1 and R2 districts that are primarily owner-occupied single-family homes. This change would apply to all existing ADUs, which can be standalone structures, sometimes called coach houses, backyard cottages, laneway houses or Detached Accessory Dwelling Units (DADUs), or units within the primary structure that have separate kitchens and baths, sometimes called in-law suites, or Attached Accessory Dwelling Units (AADUs).

Staff recommends that City Council make a referral to the Plan Commission to develop a zoning text to permit the rental of existing ADUs to individual(s) who are not members
of the family living in the primary dwelling unit at the February 21, 2018 meeting of the Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission. Occupancy of ADUs should be determined based on square footage and room configuration, with no familial relationship requirement. Considerations include:

- Requiring that either the primary dwelling unit or the ADU have income and rent restrictions to maximize effectiveness to address the need for affordable units. This would not affect properties with ADUs that are occupied by members of the same family as the primary structure, as currently allowed.
- Putting limits on short-term/vacation rentals of ADUs

Future actions for consideration by City Council that would be needed following zoning amendments to allow rental of existing ADUs to non-family members include:

- Developing a process to identify, register and inspect existing ADUs, including those that are already being rented to non-family members. “Amnesty” from fines or penalties for a limited time for ADUs constructed without building permits to encourage registration and inspection.
- Establishing any fee structure for registration and inspections, as well as any fines/penalties for unregistered ADUs that are being rented to non-family members.
- Requiring that ADUs are inspected by City Property Standards before rent-up to non-family members to ensure that units meet City property and occupancy standards. An inspection/certification could be provided and posted in the unit so potential renters. Offering “amnesty” to property owners already renting to non-family members for a limited time.
- Determining how addresses for ADUs will be assigned. A system that differentiates between AADUs and DADUs, such as by assigning letters to the former and numbers to the latter, is recommended to facilitate response to calls for emergency services, postal delivery, etc. Evanston currently uses a variety of ways to assign addresses when two units are on a single PIN, including A and B, street numbers between primary structures when available, adding ½ or Rear to the primary structure address, depending on the individual situation. A recommendation would be developed by staff in Public Works/Engineering, Police, Fire and Community Development. Based on research to date, other communities follow similar processes based on their existing address assignment process and accounting for historical practices.