PLAN COMMISSION
Wednesday, December 12, 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: November 14, 2018

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. Planned Development
1714-1720 Chicago Avenue 18PLND-0053
Paul Janicki, architect, proposes to construct a 13-story office building with 112 on-site parking spaces. The applicant requests a Map Amendment to rezone the property from the R6 General Residential to the D3 Downtown Core Development District. The applicant seeks site development allowances for: 1) An FAR of 5.0, where the maximum permitted FAR in the D3 district is 4.5; 2) A building height of 127 feet to roof (excluding eligible parking levels), where the maximum permitted height of a building in D3 is 85 feet to roof; 3) 112 parking spaces with 22 compact stalls where the minimum required number of parking spaces is 213, in addition to a purchase-sale agreement to replace the 74 library parking spaces onsite, and where compact stalls are not allowed; 4) A front yard setback of 25-feet, where 31.4 feet is required; 5) A north side yard setback of 5-feet proposed, where 15-feet is required; 6) A south side yard setback of 5-feet proposed, where 15-feet is required.; and 7) A canopy yard obstruction of 9.7 feet into the required front yard, where a maximum obstruction of 3.1 feet (10%) is allowed. 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.

B. Text Amendment
oRD Redevelopment Overlay District 18PLND-0102
A Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment pursuant to City Code Title 6, Zoning, to Section 6-15-13 of the Zoning Ordinance, to revise the regulations of the oRD Redevelopment Overlay District, including language regarding permitted and special uses.

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 (TYY).

La ciudad de Evanston está obligada a hacer accesibles todas las reuniones públicas a las personas minusválidas o las que 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).
C. Text Amendment
Public Benefits for Planned Developments 18PLND-0103
A Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment pursuant to City Code Title 6, Zoning, to Section 6-3-6 of the Zoning Ordinance, to revise the regulations relating to Public Benefits of Planned Developments.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

A. 2019 Plan Commission Meeting Schedule

B. Election of Officers and Assignment of Liaisons and Committee Members

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

6. ADJOURNMENT

The next regular meeting of the Plan Commission is scheduled for WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 2018 at 7:00 P.M. in JAMES C. LYTLE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.
MEETING MINUTES
PLAN COMMISSION
Wednesday, November 14, 2018
7:00 P.M.
Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, James C. Lytle Council Chambers

Members Present: Colby Lewis (Chair), Terri Dubin, Carol Goddard, Andrew Pigozzi,
Peter Isaac

Members Absent: Jennifer Draper, George Halik

Staff Present: Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Administrator

Presiding Member: Colby Lewis, Chairman

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

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

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: October 10, 2018

Commissioner Goddard made a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by
Commissioner Isaac. The Commission voted unanimously, 5-0, to approve the minutes
of October 10, 2018.

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. Text Amendment 18PLND-0094
Residential Care Homes
A Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment pursuant to City Code Title 6, Zoning
to modify regulations regarding Residential Care Home uses (Section 6-4-4)
including potential related amendments within the Residential, Business,
Commercial, Downtown, Transitional Manufacturing, Special Purpose and
Overlay Zoning Districts (Sections 6-8 through 6-15).

Ms. Jones provided a brief presentation of the proposed text amendment which was an
aldermanic referral.

Chair Lewis opened up the hearing to questions from the public and invited Alderman
Fiske to speak.
Alderman Fiske explained that the reason for her referral was concern that Springfield had not adequately defined why they had a distance requirement in place and she wanted Evanston to more clearly define its reasoning before there are any issues. She also wished to extend regulation to include residential care homes with fewer than 4 residents.

Sue Loellbach stated she has no issues looking at the distance requirements but she does have concerns about exacerbating issues by making a Special Use where they currently are not. It would discourage affordable housing options.

Chair Lewis then opened up the hearing to questions from the Commission. There were several, including:

- Commissioner Pigozzi asked for further clarification on the goal of the text amendment. The goal is to more successfully defend distance requirement justification for group home uses as well as extend regulations to include residential care homes with fewer than 4 people.

- Commissioner Goddard asked if what is discussed is a different text amendment. Ms. Jones responded that with clarification, the text amendment could be decided upon as is or altered to include more details for distance requirements and extending regulations.

- Commissioner Isaac inquired about the reference to Transitional Treatment Facilities. Ms. Jones responded that those are not within the purview of the proposed text amendment. Commissioner Isaac then asked if the use of residential care homes is a newer phenomenon and if there was an update to the Springfield case. Alderman Fiske stated that the use is not new and many exist within the 5th Ward with some newer ones within the 1st Ward. She believes care homes with fewer than 4 residents should be included within the text amendment. She added that the City of Springfield did not appeal the Circuit Court’s ruling.

Jackie Eddy stated that rules for how close the residential care home use can be are made at the state level if state funding is accepted.

Chair Lewis reviewed the different options the Commission could take for the proposed text amendment. Commissioner Isaac stated that the Commission has not fully gone over the appropriateness of the text amendment and that it should go to committee.

Keralyn Keele of Rimland Services explained that Rimland Services has 13 homes used for adults with autism and she came to the meeting to hear more about what is proposed. She was hoping that there are no hurdles to the work being done. She clarified that the state has a 800 foot distance requirement. She added that their smallest homes consist of only 2 residents and the largest consist of 8 residents.

Commissioner Pigozzi stated that he does not like the idea of making all Residential Care Homes a special use but he would like clarity within the zoning ordinance. He
inquired if the goal could be to redefine the ordinance to not get hung up on the distance requirement.

Chair Lewis expressed that he does not believe this to be an issue and that the proposed amendment seems exclusionary.

Commissioner Goddard made a motion to recommend that the item be brought before the Zoning Committee for further research and discussion. Commissioner Goddard seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion was approved, 5-0.

Ayes: Dubin, Goddard, Isaac, Pigozzi, Lewis.
Nays:

4. Discussion

   A. Text Amendment
      Public Benefits for Planned Developments
      Discussion of existing public benefits required of Planned Developments and direction for a possible text amendment to update those requirements.

Mr. Mangum provided an overview of the discussion item which is a referral from City Council. He explained current regulations and reviewed public benefits from more recently approved planned developments.

Chair Lewis asked if there are issues with the current regulations and if the preference would be to redraft an incentives section on a whole or just the sections addressing public benefits. Mr. Mangum responded that there are questions that have been raised regarding what is appropriate for different projects and that there is a disconnect between the code and past practices. He then provided details on the City Council’s discussions and stated that both revising certain sections and the whole incentives section are options.

Commissioner Isaac asked if staff had reached out to other municipalities. Mr. Mangum responded that this has not happened but is a good suggestion. Commissioner Dubin stated that Evanston is a unique area for development. Oak Park and Arlington Heights were suggested as possible comparable cities to review.

Chair Lewis stated that this is an opportunity to provide regulations that will be better able to be enforced. Commissioner Isaac stated that he would like to see broadness and specificity at the same time. This would enable flexibility for any changes that occur with regards to community or site needs.

Commissioner Pigozzi stated that the list within the staff report is good and
suggested that streetlight replacement be added as a possible benefit to be more inline with new lighting standards. Chair Lewis responded that lighting could be added to a broader list of improvements or possible benefits so as not to get too specific with regards to a public benefit list. Ms. Goddard suggested that staff do some research and return with a list that generalizes the list included in the report.

Ms. Jones confirmed what the Commission would like staff to do. Chair Lewis replied that clumping the detailed list together into different categories would be a start. He stated that it would be good to list overall goals then provide examples on how to reach them through specific public benefits. Commissioner Pigozzi added that it will be good for developers to have a list that shows what Evanston values.

The Commission requested that staff draft possible amendments based on the points brought up during the discussion. The amendment will be brought back to the Plan Commission at a date to be determined.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was one comment to make sure that public benefits of a planned development benefit the public and not just the development’s tenants.

6. ADJOURNMENT

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

A voice vote was taken and the motion was approved by voice call 5-0. The meeting was adjourned at 8:14 pm.

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

Planned Development and Map Amendment

1714-1720 Chicago Avenue
18PLND-0053
To: Chair and Members of the Plan Commission

From: Johanna Leonard, Community Development Director
Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Administrator
Carlos Ruiz, Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator

Subject: Planned Development
1714-1720 Chicago Avenue, 18PLND-0053

Date: November 21, 2018

Request

Paul Janicki, architect, proposes to construct a 13-story office building with 112 on-site parking spaces. The applicant requests a Map Amendment to rezone the property from the R6 General Residential to the D3 Downtown Core Development District. The applicant seeks site development allowances for: 1) An FAR of 5.0, where the maximum permitted FAR in the D3 district is 4.5; 2) A building height of 127 feet to roof (excluding eligible parking levels), where the maximum permitted height of a building in D3 is 85 feet to roof; 3) 112 parking spaces with 22 compact stalls where the minimum required number of parking spaces is 213, in addition to a purchase-sale agreement to replace the 74 library parking spaces onsite, and where compact stalls are not allowed; 4) A front yard setback of 25-feet, where 31.4 feet is required; 5) A north side yard setback of 5-feet proposed, where 15-feet is required; 6) A south side yard setback of 5-feet proposed, where 15-feet is required.; and 7) A canopy yard obstruction of 9.7 feet into the required front yard, where a maximum obstruction of 3.1 feet (10%) is allowed. 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.

Notice
The Application has been filed in conformance with applicable procedural and public notice requirements. Newspaper notice was published in the Evanston Review on November 22, 2018.
General Information

Applicant: Paul Janicki
Paul Janicki Architects
1718 Sherman Avenue
Evanston, IL 60201

Owner(s): The City of Evanston
2100 Ridge Avenue
Evanston, IL 60201

Existing Zoning: R6, General Residential Zoning District

Proposed Zoning: D3, Downtown Core Development Zoning District

Existing Land Use: Parking Lot

Property Size: 26,750 sq. ft. (0.61 acres), 27,071 sq. ft. (0.62 acres) including proposed alley vacation

PINs: 11-18-208-014-0000, 11-18-208-015-0000

Surrounding Zoning and Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surrounding</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>R6, General Residential</td>
<td>Museum (Frances Willard House Museum/WCTU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>R6, General Residential</td>
<td>Membership Organization (The Woman's Club)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>R6, General Residential</td>
<td>Residential, Public Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Evanston Place Apartments, Church Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking Garage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>D2, Downtown Retail Core,</td>
<td>Residence Hall, Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3, Downtown Core Development</td>
<td>(McManus Center, Evanston Public Library)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

Project Description
The applicant is proposing to construct a 13-story, office building with a gross floor area of approximately 136,000 square feet of gross floor area and 112 parking spaces.
The 26,750 sq. ft. site consists of two parcels with a total of 143 feet of frontage on the west side of Chicago Avenue between Church and Clark Streets. The current use of the City owned property is as metered public Parking Lot Number 3.

The uses immediately surrounding the site include the three story Woman’s Club to the south at 1702 Chicago Avenue (built in 1912) a Colonial Revival Evanston landmark, also listed in the National Register of Historic Places, and the Frances Willard Museum Campus to the north. In 2010 the Campus was designated as a local historic district. The district includes the following buildings: 1724 Chicago Avenue (built in 1865) a Gable-Front Side-Hall Vernacular Greek Revival; 1728-1730 Chicago Avenue (built in 1865) a Gothic Revival – the Frances Willard’s house at 1728 Chicago Avenue (addition built in 1882) an Evanston landmark, also listed in National Register of Historic Places as a National Historic Landmark; The Administration Building (built in 1910, additions 1922 and 1940); and 1732 Chicago Avenue, a Stick Style (the shed-roof, wraparound porch is a 1909 addition).

To the east is the nine-story Evanston Place Apartment Building with the City’s Church Street Parking Garage. To the immediate west is the four-story Evanston Public Library, and the McManus Center, a seven-story residential building owned by Northwestern University.

**Site Layout:**
The site is irregularly shaped with approximately 143 feet of frontage along Chicago Avenue; however, the northern portion of the site is deeper than the southern portion, with the alley bending around the property line. The applicant proposes to vacate a portion of the alley to extend the property line and proposed building further south which would further constrict vehicular movements around the bend in the alley. To
compensate, the applicant also proposes to reconfigure the curbing in the alley, removing a mature tree and a portion of sidewalk leading from the alley parking to library entrances, in order to make vehicular movements to alley loading areas of the proposed building, the library, and the McManus Center more feasible.

The massing of the proposed building is in 2 sections: a four-story brick and modular stone veneer building housing the office lobby and parking on the ground floor and upper 3 levels, and a 9-story glass and cast stone veneer office portion above that is pulled back from the base. The top two stories are also pulled back from the seven stories below, reducing the massing of the building. The nine stories above the base are primarily a curtain wall with aluminum or steel windows and spandrels between floors. The curtain walls are flanked by four nine-story sections, in cast stone and glass aluminum/steel windows.

The lower podium portion of the building is proposed with 5-foot setbacks to the north and south property lines and is set back 25-feet from the east property line. The front entrance to the building is through a curtain wall in glass with aluminum or steel windows with a metal canopy over the main entrance leading to the lobby. The main entrance is flanked by two four-story sections in cast stone, modular brick and aluminum or steel windows with powder coat finish to block the view of the parking
levels within the four-story base of the building.

A total of 112 parking spaces are proposed, with 22 of the spaces as compact, lacking either the minimum code required width or depth of an 8.5’ by 18’ parking space. The parking levels are proposed to be sloped, as opposed to the flat levels requested by staff which would allow for greater flexibility of future use of these spaces. A loading bay is located at the rear of the building with access from the alley. The applicant has stated that the 21 ground level spaces would be open to the public at all hours, with the remaining parking available to the public after office hours and on the weekends. The purchase agreement calls for the purchaser to provide 75 parking spaces to replace the existing surface parking spaces for public use at no cost to the City. A bike room with 50 bike parking spaces for office employees will be located on the ground floor of the building.

Vehicular access will be from the alley just west of the property. The garage entrance is toward the southern portion of the building with cars entering facing east, while the loading and refuse area will be located at the northern end of the building with vehicles entering from the south.

The building does not meet required setbacks for the proposed D3 Zoning District with the exception of the rear setback along the west property line. A front yard setback of 25-feet is proposed, where the block average of 31.4 feet is required, and side setbacks of 5 feet are proposed where 15 feet is required adjacent to the residentially zoned properties to the north and south. Additionally, a 9.7 foot canopy would project more than the allowed 10 percent into the required front yard setback.

The actual building height is 167 feet to the roof with four stories of parking. The height of the floors dedicated to parking may be deducted from the maximum height allowed, up to 40 feet, per Section 6-11-4-8. With this reduction the portion of the building that counts toward the maximum height requirement is 127 feet tall.
Compliance with the Zoning Ordinance
The intent 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."

Map Amendment
The site currently lies in the R6 General Residential District, as does the entirety of the east and west facing block faces on Chicago Avenue.

The applicant is requesting a map amendment to reclassify the zoning of the property to the D3, Downtown Core Development District, which allows the most intense development within the City. A new office building would not be allowed within the R6
District. While the maximum height permitted is 85’ in both districts, the maximum site development allowance in the R6 District would only permit an additional 12’ of building height. More restrictive setback, lot coverage, and impervious surface coverage requirements would also apply in the R6 District.

Zoning map of the area surrounding the site, development site marked with harsh marks:

![Zoning Map](image)

_**Planned Development**_

The applicant is requesting Special Use approval for a Planned Development to construct the 13-story (127-foot high) office building with 112 parking spaces.

The applicant is requesting approval of seven site development allowances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Development Allowances Requested</th>
<th>Required / Max. Permitted in the D3 District</th>
<th>Site Development Allowance</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Exceeds Max Site Development Allowance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>85 feet (not including up to 4 floors of parking)</td>
<td>+85 feet= 170 feet (not including up to 4 parking levels)</td>
<td>127 feet (167 feet including 4 parking levels)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>floors of parking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+3.5 = 8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of parking spaces</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112 (22 compact)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front setback (east property line)</td>
<td>31.4 feet (block face average)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side setbacks (north and south property lines)</td>
<td>15 feet (abutting side property line of residential district)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 feet (north and south)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canopy Yard Obstruction (north property line)</td>
<td>3.1 feet (10% obstruction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.7 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking and Traffic
The office use requires 2 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet, however, by code the first 3,000 square feet are excluded and the total is reduced by 20% in downtown. Based on the gross floor area, which excludes parking and mechanical areas, 213 parking spaces are required. The applicant is proposing a total of 112 parking spaces, with 22 of those of a smaller size than the minimum allowed, and an additional 21 reserved for public use. In sum, on-site parking would be provided at a ratio of 0.67 spaces per 1,000 square feet of office space. The applicant has also proposed to lease 122 parking spaces, the difference between the zoning code required 213 spaces and the proposed 91 spaces that would be available to office tenants in the building, within City-owned parking garages for the first year, with the parking needs to be revaluated at that point.

The applicant submitted both a Parking Study and Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Eriksson Engineering Associated, Ltd. The traffic study looked at the additional traffic generated by the office building, along with nearby developments and other area traffic growth, and developed the following conclusions and recommendations:
1. The street network can accommodate the additional traffic from the proposed project, nearby developments, and other traffic growth.
2. The location of the site and the availability of public transportation, walking and biking will minimize the volume of vehicular traffic generated by the site.
3. Indoor bike storage is proposed as part of the building plan.
4. All intersections within the study area work at acceptable levels of service and delay. There in a small increase in delays from the projected traffic growth.
5. The proposed loading dock can serve semi-trailer deliveries and refuse trucks.
The parking study looked at the proposed parking supply compared with usage within existing lots and garages and concluded:

1. The proposed office parking garage will provide both public and private parking spaces with 21 public spaces until 5:00 PM on weekdays and 112 public spaces after 5:00 PM and on weekends. The remaining spaces will be for office tenants (91 spaces during the day and shared at other times).

2. Parking surveys indicate the existing usage of the combined surface lot/library garage (53 vehicles) can be accommodated by the new office garage public area and the library garage (55 daytime spaces). During the evenings and weekends, 112 public spaces will increase the parking supply from 74 spaces for library patrons.

3. Office parking will be provided by a combination of on-site parking (91 spaces) and off-site public parking garages (70-80 spaces in the Chicago Avenue and 40-50 spaces in the Sherman or Maple garages). The off-site leased spaces will be leased for a duration of 12 months. After a period of 12 months the city will revisit and assess the need for said leased spaces with an option to reduce the number of spaces if not utilized. The proposed parking plan will still accommodate the existing needs of the area during the day and provide additional public parking in the evening and during the weekends.

4. The developer will fund the initial cost for installation of a parking signage and detection system for availability of off-site parking in the Church Street and Library Parking garages. The on-going cost and maintenance will be the responsibility of the city.

Public Benefits

The applicant has committed to provide the following public benefits, aside from developing the property and paying property taxes, as part of the Planned Development proposal:

1. Establish the first ever “Evanston High School Student Pilot Internship” for students pursuing an interest in Land Development and Construction Management at the proposed development.

2. Create a Public/Private Bike Room to serve the immediate public/501C3 employees while also promoting bike usage when possible.

3. Agree to add additional conduit devoted for a future pair of Electrical Vehicles parking spots in the Public Spaces.

4. Replace Public Parking Spaces with Covered Public Spaces while providing off-site parking as well.

5. Allow the City of Evanston to have full parking access for public use after 5:00 PM on weekdays and full access all hours Saturday and Sunday.

6. Attended to the Evanston Bird Club President’s concerns with Bird Strikes at the building with placement of trees and landscaping at the site.

7. Agreed to hire a local arborist to evaluate the condition of existing trees.
and explore options with regards to those certain trees.

8. $4M purchase price to the City of Evanston at the closing to Balance the Budget or provide subsidy for much needed programs within the City.

During Design and Project Review Committee (DAPR) meetings, staff shared concerns regarding the extent of public benefits presented for the proposed development. Many items listed in the applicant’s summary of public benefits are items that are required by ordinance or would be standard occurrences with development of the land (payment of taxes, creation of jobs, etc.). The number of site development allowances in association with the need for a map amendment, would lend itself to an increase in the proposed public benefits to mitigate the effects of the proposed development. However, the developer expressed that the project may not be financially viable with any significant changes.

Should changes be made, the complete list of public benefits would be finalized prior to the consideration by the City Council and will be explicitly required within the Planned Development Ordinance.

Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan
The guiding principal 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. As an office development located within walking distance of the Davis Street transit stations, this Transit Oriented Development (TOD) will promote walking and the use of mass transit.

An office building in downtown also works toward the goal to promote a mixed-use Central Business District that is attractive, convenient, and economically vibrant. However, the scale and mass of the proposed building in context with the adjacent landmark structures may not satisfy the objective to identify and protect Downtown’s historic landmarks.

Compliance with the 2009 Downtown Plan
This site is designated as open space in the Downtown Plan, which is not consistent with the proposed development. The site is surrounded by the East Edge, University Link, and East Core subareas, which range between a maximum of 6 to 18 stories in height with bonuses. The Downtown Plan also highlighted the need to maintain a compact, walkable mixed-use transit oriented character while promoting sustainable development that can be an economic engine. The project would contribute to a number of these goals.

Compliance with the Design Guidelines for Planned Developments
The proposed building is consistent with some elements of the Design Guidelines for
Planned Developments. The proposal was reviewed by the DAPR on July 11, 2018 and November 14, 2018 (approved minutes are attached) and received a recommendation for denial of the project due to concerns with vehicular turning movements in the alley, scale of the development adjacent to landmark buildings, the number of site development allowances, and the lack of public benefits provided among other items. The total building height is significantly taller than that of the adjacent landmark structures to the north and south, although the four-story parking podium base is closer in height and uses brick similar to the adjacent Woman’s Club. However, the building’s base lacks active uses on and above the ground level.

Parking access is provided on the west side of the building, off of the adjacent alley, with parking spaces on the ground, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th levels of the development. The loading area and trash enclosure located on the western portion of the property will be accessed off of the alley.

The proposed brick, stone and glass materials are appropriate given the materials of surrounding buildings. The massing is broken up as the upper portion of the building is pulled in from the base. The location of the front façade requires setback variations because it would project into the average setback. Staff will continue to work with the applicant on the overall building design, materials and colors throughout the formal review process.

DAPR Committee Review
The Design and Project Review Committee reviewed the proposed Planned Development on July 11, 2018 and on November 14, 2018. The Committee recommended denial of the proposed development at the November 14, 2018 meeting citing concerns with vehicular turning movements in the alley, scale of the development adjacent to landmark buildings, the number of site development allowances, and the lack of public benefits provided among other items.

Standards of Approval
The proposed development must satisfy the Zoning Ordinance standards for a Map Amendment in Section 6-3-4-5, 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 some of the standards for approval; however, there are several points of concern.

Standards for Map Amendment (Section 6-3-4-5)

The proposed Map Amendment is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan goals, objectives, and policies as a TOD contributing to the vibrant downtown area, however, the scale and mass of the proposed building in context with the adjacent landmark structures may not satisfy the objective to identify and protect Downtown’s historic
landmarks. The adequacy of the public facilities following the proposed alley vacation is also questionable given that vehicular turning movements to access loading at the proposed and adjacent buildings would be compromised.

*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 proposal is in keeping with some of the purposes and policies outlined in the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance if a Map Amendment from the R6 Zoning District is granted.

The proposed office building will not cause a negative cumulative effect when considered in conjunction with other special uses in the area. An office development is appropriate within downtown; however, the height, mass, and scale of the proposed development may not be compatible with the adjacent landmarked institutional uses. As such, the proposal may diminish the value of these institutions, but would likely not diminish the value of other properties in the downtown.

As indicated above, the proposal can be adequately served by most public facility infrastructure already available. The street and sidewalk network, as well as water, sewer, electricity and gas infrastructure already exist and service the existing building and structures on the site, however, the vehicular movements in the adjacent alley would be compromised and off-site parking within City parking garages is proposed to serve the building.

Staff has concerns regarding the public parking loss from existing conditions and vehicular movements in the alley. The applicant has submitted a parking and traffic study that explains that there will be minimal effect to the level of service on existing surrounding roadways. The access to the parking garage and loading dock will be provided via the alley, which is currently utilized by vehicular traffic in addition to pedestrians accessing the library.

While there are no significant historical or architectural resources on the site to preserve, the development may not have a positive impact on the adjacent significant historical resources.

Finally, with a Map Amendment from the R6 to the D3 Zoning District, the proposal would meet all zoning requirements except for the seven site development allowances requested and outlined above.

*Standards and Guidelines for Planned Developments in D3 District (Sections 6-3-6-9 and 6-11-1-10)*

If the Map Amendment to the D3 Zoning District is granted, the proposed Planned Development generally complies with purposes and the intent of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposal is an office development that is a compatible land use within the larger
downtown area, however, the height, bulk, and scale of the proposed project is significantly greater than that of the adjacent landmarked properties within the R6 Zoning District. As previously described, the proposal is in keeping with some of the purposes and policies outlined in the Comprehensive Plan.

The site layout causes concern with regards to both safety and continuity of a pedestrian and walkable experience. There is a lack of active uses on the ground floor and in the base of the building and the proposed location of the building within the existing public alley creates potential conflicts for loading operations at the proposed and adjacent buildings.

**Recommendation**

Based on the analysis above, and the DAPR Committee recommendation, staff recommends the Plan Commission make a recommendation for the denial of the Map Amendment and Special Use for the proposed Planned Development at 1714-1720 Chicago Avenue to the City Council. Should the Commission vote to recommend approval of the project, staff believes the following conditions should be included:

1. Prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant shall record a Plat of Vacation for the requested alley vacation with Cook County Recorder of Deeds.
2. Within one year of the issuance of the final Certificate of Occupancy for the building, the applicant must submit a traffic study analyzing the turning movements and parking utilization within the garage accessed off of the alley immediately west of the site including analysis of any traffic incidents adjacent to the site. Based on the analysis of the traffic study, the City reserves the right to require additional traffic calming measures or operational restrictions.
3. Deliveries for the office building must be performed from the alley and are prohibited during the hours of 7 AM – 9 AM and 4 PM – 6 PM Monday through Friday.
4. The applicant shall pay a one-time contribution of $20,000 to the City’s Public Art Fund for the Installation of a piece of public art in the immediate neighborhood.
5. The development shall include a minimum of two publicly accessible Electric Vehicle charging stations.
6. The building shall incorporate bird friendly measures, including non-reflective glass windows, doors and balconies, minimize any external lighting from 12:00 am until after dawn during Spring and Fall migration, and avoid guy wires and roof lighting that pose a bird hazard.
7. The applicant shall provide for the installation of parking signage and detection systems indicating availability of off-site parking in the Church Street and Library Parking garages from signage located at the office building parking garage.
8. The applicant shall provide for the purchase and installation of two pay stations as replacement for parking meters on Chicago Avenue.
9. The applicant shall enter a lease agreement for 122 parking spaces within City parking garages.
10. The proposed planned development shall substantially conform to the plans and documents attached to this report.
11. The applicant must agree to a Construction Management Plan (CMP) before issuance of the building permit.
12. Any change in use must be approved as an amendment to the Planned Development.

Attachments
1714-1720 Chicago Avenue Proposed Development Plans
Public Benefits Summary
Revised Planned Development Application Materials submitted October 29, 2018, including Traffic and Parking Studies
Approved Minutes from July 11, 2018 and November 14, 2018 DAPR Meetings
Comments received as of December 6, 2018
Link to civic comment site, including comments: http://1714-1720chicagoave.civicomment.org
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PAUL JANICKI
ARCHITECTS

HOLABIRD & ROOT
EXISTING TREE SCHEDULE

TREE PROTECTION NOTES

1. ALL TREES TO BE INSPECTED BY CERTIFIED ARBOREST PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION TO VERIFY AND VALIDATE CONDITION.
2. ARBOREST WILL CREATE A CARE PLAN FOR ALL TREES TO REMAIN, INCLUDING ACTIVITIES SUCH AS ROOT PRUNING AND FERTILIZATION.
3. ALL TREES ON NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES WILL BE PROTECTED PER TREE PROTECTION DETAIL.
Evanston Office Building
1714-1720 Chicago Ave
Evanston, IL 60201
AVERAGE EXISTING FRONT PORCH SETBACK: 25'-11 3/4"
PROPOSED BUILDING FRONT PORCH SETBACK: 25'-0"
AVERAGE EXISTING FRONT PORCH SETBACK: 25'-11 3/4"
PROPOSED BUILDING FRONT PORCH SETBACK: 25'-0"
GROUND LEVEL PLAN - PARKING LEVEL 1

SCALE: 1" = 16'-0"

TOTAL FOOTPRINT: 20,759 SF
TOTAL PARKING THIS LEVEL: 21
ACCESSIBLE: 2

PAUL JANICKI ARCHITECTS

HOLABIRD & ROOT

1714 - 1720 CHICAGO AVENUE
TOTAL FOOTPRINT:
20,759 SF

TOTAL PARKING
THIS LEVEL: 25
ACCESSIBLE: 1
TODAY FOOTPRINT: 20,759 SF
TOTAL PARKING
THIS LEVEL: 33
ACCESSIBLE: 1
TOTAL PARKING:
112 SPACES

SCALE: 1" = 16'-0"
OFFICE LEVEL 1

1714 - 1720 CHICAGO AVENUE

TOTAL FOOTPRINT: 17,006 SF
GROSS LEASABLE: 15,108 SF

SCALE: 1" = 16'-0"
OFFICE LEVELS 8-9

1714 - 1720 CHICAGO AVENUE

TOTAL FOOTPRINT: 16,306 SF
GROSS LEASABLE: 14,408 SF

SCALE: 1" = 16'-0"
PROJECT SUMMARY

GROSS SF - PARKING: 83,036 SF

GROSS SF - OFFICE: 151,654 SF

TOTAL GROSS: 234,690 SF

GROSS LEASABLE: 134,572 SF

SCALE: 1" = 16'-0"
Public Benefits outside of City of Evanston Requirements

- Establish the first ever “Evanston High School Student Pilot Internship” for students pursuing an interest in Land Development and Construction Management at the proposed development.
- Create a Public/Private Bike Room to serve the immediate public/501C3 employees while also promoting bike usage when possible.
- Agree to add additional conduit devoted for a future pair of Electrical Vehicles parking spots in the Public Spaces.
- Replace Public Parking Spaces with Covered Public Spaces while providing off-site parking as well.
- Allow the City of Evanston to have full parking access for public use after 5:00 PM on weekdays and full access all hours Saturday and Sunday.
- Attended to the Evanston Bird Club President’s concerns with Bird Strikes at the building with placement of trees and landscaping at the site.
- Agreed to have Registered Architect Paul Janicki hire a local arborist to evaluate the condition of existing trees and explore options with regards to those certain trees.
- Create 544 Permanent Jobs in the Area, while also create 350 Construction Jobs.
- Based on 544 new employees, local spending of over $3,000,000 per year will be infused into the local economy.
- This “Catalytic Site” will trigger new development and support the City’s Master Plan of spurring new retail developments and business in the Downtown Evanston Area.
- In the Development Agreement, Developer agrees to deed restrict the property that it cannot be sold to a charitable 501C3, thus always paying taxes for the next 100 years.
- 4 MM to the City of Evanston at the closing to Balance the Budget or provide subsidy for much needed programs within the City.

Staff Present: J. Velan,

Others Present:

Presiding Member: J. Leonard

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

New Business

1. **3318 Grant Street**

   Recommendation to ZBA

   Phil and Marcia Vickman, property owners, submit for major zoning relief to enlarge an existing attached 1-car garage into an attached 2-car garage with 32.1% building lot coverage where 30% is permitted, a 0.8’ interior side yard setback where 5’ is required, and a 26.5’ rear yard setback where 30’ is required, in the R1 Single-Family Residential District.

   APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Marcia Vickman, applicant, Nancy Schlosberg, architect Bernie Citron, attorney

   DISCUSSION:
   - Applicant claims would need to remove trees in rear yard to put garage back there
   - Garbage trucks cut the alley corner so detached garage would be in the way according to applicant
   - Applicant will be removing walk & driveway
   - Decrease amount of impermeable surface to property applicant claims
   - They are working to keep as much of the existing garage as possible.
   - Mr. Mangum cited the issue of not conforming due being an attached garage
   - Variation granted in 1999 to connect (garage was already there)

   Ms. Biggs made a motion to recommend approval of project to ZBA, seconded by Mr. Gerdes.

   The Committee voted, 7-3, to recommend approval of project to ZBA.

2. 2118-2120 Ashland Ave., 1625 Payne and 2147-2149 Dewey Ave. Recommendation to ZBA

   Kathy Lichtenstein, lessee, applies for special use permits for Daycare Center - Domestic Animal, and a Kennel, Rex’s Place, in the MXE Mixed Use Employment District.

   APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Kathy Lichtenstein, applicant
DISCUSSION:
- Applicant says the residential houses are staying exactly the same and will be providing sound proofing of the walls at 2118 Ashland Ave.
- Only interior change will be the kennel being added and they want to make a loading zone at 2118-2120 Ashland Ave.
- Mr. Gerdes asked if they have direct access already to rear yard at the properties at Dewey.
- Applicant is buying the Dewey houses in order to keep the yards.
- Mr. Mangum asked the existing capacity for animals.
- Applicant says they could take in 100 but splits them into groups.
- Applicant says they could have 41 dogs in the kennel.
- Applicant says they will be open until 6:30 pm at night and opening at 6:30 am Monday-Friday.
- Mr. Mangum asked if the dog daycare number would expand. Applicant says no.
- Mr. Mangum requests a table summary from client regarding the project.
- Ms. Leonard asked for summary of what each property of this project will be used for.
- Mr. Nelson asked how the clean-up process will occur. Client will be using cleaning service.
- Mr. Nelson asked to do a building survey on the properties of where dogs will be housed.
- Mr. Tristan requested to review the fire plans for the building.
- Proper backflow preventers and water services and equipment requested by Mr. Nelson.

Ms. Biggs made a motion to recommend approval of project to ZBA, seconded Mr. Mangum.

The Committee voted, 10-0, to recommend approval to ZBA.

3. **1925 Green Bay Rd.**

Evanston CITGO, applicant, submits for sign variation to install one 2’ high x 5’ wide internally illuminated, double-faced commercial variable message sign (CVMS) where a CVMS displaying messages other than time and temperature are not permitted.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Syed Saqib, applicant

DISCUSSION:
- Applicant says where sign is currently located at his gas station it makes it difficult to showcase messages as well as prices to the public.
- Applicant also explained canopy sits too close to other structure on property, and cited another gas station with a CVMS sign.
- Mr. Gerdes said it does not have aldermanic support.
- Apprehension of electronic messaging signs is of concern.

Mr. Gerdes made a motion to deny the approval of the variation, seconded by Mr. Mangum.

The Committee voted, 10-0, to deny the approval of the sign variation.

4. **1901-1903 Church St. and 1700-1708 Dodge Ave.**

Preliminary and Final Review
Thomas Ahleman, architect, submits for exterior modifications and facade improvements to an existing commercial building in the B2 Business District and the oWE West Evanston Overlay District.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Joe Curios, applicant

DISCUSSION:
- Applicant stated the only change was to use one awning instead of two at north end of building
- Ms. Leonard asked if additional door to north will remain as door or window. Applicant says they will keep it as a door
- Mr. Gerdes requested two separate permits regarding work being done and signage portion

Mr. Gerdes made a motion to approve preliminary and final review, seconded by Mr. Nelson

The Committee voted, 10-0, to approve for preliminary and final review.

5. 1623 Simpson Street

Preliminary and Final Review

Thomas Ahleman, architect, submits for exterior modifications and facade improvements to an existing mixed-use building in the B1 Business District.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Joe Curios, applicant

DISCUSSION:
- No Discussion (no changes from concept review)

Mr. Gerdes made a motion to approve preliminary and final review, seconded by Mr. Nelson.

The Committee voted, 10-0, to approve for preliminary and final review.

6. 1714 Chicago Avenue

Planned Development

Recommendation to Plan Commission

Paul Janicki, architect, proposes to construct a 13-story office building with 120 on-site parking spaces. The applicant requests a Map Amendment to rezone the property from the R6 General Residential to the D3 Downtown Core Development District. The applicant seeks site development allowances for: 1) An FAR of 5.0, where the maximum permitted FAR in the D3 district is 4.5; 2) A building height of 127 feet to roof (excluding eligible parking levels), where the maximum permitted height of a building in D3 is 85 feet to roof; 3) 120 parking spaces with 72 compact stalls where the minimum required number of parking spaces is 210, in addition to a purchase sale agreement to replace the 74 library parking spaces onsite, and where compact stalls are not allowed; 4) A front yard setback of 25-feet, where 32.83 feet is required; 5) A north side yard setback of 5-feet proposed, where 15-feet is required; 6) A south side yard setback of 5-feet proposed, where 15-feet is required.; and 7) A canopy yard obstruction of 9.67 feet into the required front yard, where a maximum obstruction of 3.28 feet (10%) is allowed.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Paul Janicki, architect, Jenni Troutman & Greg Stec
DISCUSSION:

- 85 public parking spaces that will be covered due to having building according to applicant
- Public benefits include creating 350 construction jobs during construction of the project according to applicant
- Estimated 3 million dollars fused into the city due to having building according to applicant
- Applicant mentioned it’s a TOD development and would make sense to have this project in this area
- Applicant claims it will be paying around 1.5 million dollars in property taxes and deed restriction will be on property thus they cannot sell to Northwestern [the implication here was that the developer could not sell the building to a tax exempt entity, i.e. NU]
- Ms. Leonard stated the recommendations given in the staff review letter were not reflected in the updated revisions which will have potential to delay the process and suggested that staff reiterate those comments
- Mr. Mangum stated active uses would be warranted for the ground floor of this building
- Applicant said neighbors of the area do not want active or commercial uses
- Mr. Mangum asked how mechanical ventilation of the parking will work due to its possible effects on the building design
- Mr. Gerdes asked if building will be utilizing regular size brick or pre-fabricated on a panel. Applicant does not know yet.
- Mr. Mangum asked about the thickness of the precast panels and for design details within precast panels
- Ms. Biggs asked how glass will address bird safety issue. Applicant open to applying standards on how to apply the LEED pilot credit
- Mr. Mangum asked about utilization of express ramps and flat parking levels to allow for future adaption of use. Applicant doesn’t find it economically or sustainably feasible unless they are allowed to have the parking count go down
- Mr. Ruiz states that adequate size of parking spaces is crucial.
- Mr. Mangum states that building is significantly higher than adjacent landmark buildings and that is of concern
- Ms. Hyink asked about indoor bike parking being available to public. Applicant said yes.
- Ms. Leonard says shared shower room for bikers will be key component
- Ms. Hyink requested that building have electric vehicle parking stations. Applicant is open to that
- Ms. Velan requests Divvy stations and essentially more public amenity parking options
- Karen Danczak Lyons, Library Director asked how many public spaces will be available in evening. Applicant said entire ground floor (20 compact parking spaces). Ms. Danczak Lyons concerned that that may not be enough for 1500 daily visitors
- Ms. Leonard asked how traffic study for parking was conducted
- Ms. Leonard that certain patrons of library are not having their needs met based on current proposal in regards to the type of parking they need.
- Ms. Danczak Lyons concerned about trucks maneuvering through the alley near building
- Ms. Biggs has major concern regarding the alleyway and its pedestrian traffic. Ms. Biggs claims building will lead to line of sight issues
- Ms. Biggs has concerns how trucks will actually get into the loading dock for the library
- Ms. Biggs asked for renderings of trees near and around the building
- Ms. Leonard says property tax dollars derived from project is not considered a public benefit nor the additional dweller moving into the building leading to economic usage
• Ms. Leonard says they would like shadow and wind studies and a 3D model for the building in preparation for Plan Commission
• Mr. Tristan would like to see designs on turn radius due to current design causing difficult for fire trucks
• Karl Klein, expressed concerns about project, noting concurrence with many of staff comments
• Executive Director of WCTU during public comment cited concerns about rental revenue from their properties due to construction, and water run off on their property without protection, based from past experiences of flooding due to construction of the building north of their property. Desires a better tree protection plan.
• A longtime resident during public comment worried about the trees not surviving since setback will not be a 15 foot setback on north side. Also, was concerned on changing the zoning for a large size building and the precedent it could set
• Following an inquiry from Ms. Leonard, the applicant requested to come back to DAPR at a future date with revisions prior to receiving a recommendation from DAPR, acknowledging that the planned development would not be considered by the Plan Commission on July 25, 2018

Ms. Biggs made a motion to continue discussion to a date uncertain, seconded by Mr. Mangum.

The Committee voted, 9-0, to continue discussion to a date uncertain.

---

**Adjournment**

Ms. Biggs moved to adjourn, seconded by Ms. Leonard. The Committee voted unanimously, 9-0, to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 4:55 pm.

The next DAPR meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 18th, 2018, at 2:30 pm in Room 2404 of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.

Respectfully submitted,
Torrence Gardner

Staff Present: J. Velan, C. Ruiz, E. Golden, K. Danczak Lyons, P. Zalmezak

Others Present: Ald. Rainey

Presiding Member: J. Leonard

A quorum being present, Ms. Leonard called the meeting to order at 2:31pm.

Approval of Minutes

October 24, 2018, DAPR Committee meeting minutes.

G. Gerdes made a motion to approve the October 24, 2018, meeting minutes, seconded by S. Mangum. The Committee voted, 8-0, to approve the October 24, 2018, meeting minutes. There was one abstention.

New Business

1. 1724 Sherman Avenue Preliminary/Final Review
Julio Rufo, architect, submits for permit for facade renovation, in the D2 Downtown Retail Core District.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Julio Rufo, architect

DISCUSSION:
- J. Rufo stated the plan is to remove the existing steel frame canopy and replace it with a cornice with a smaller profile, exterior material to be dryvit. He stated the plan also includes repairing the exterior masonry and painting the whole facade.
- G. Gerdes noted the facade at the 1st floor is not consistent between the tenant spaces, suggesting the facade should be consistent.
- J. Rufo stated one business sign will be replaced and a new sign installed for Kilwins.
- J. Rufo stated the client is considering slightly different color palette, lighter shades.
- S. Mangum suggested exploring the natural color of the painted brick and considering an alternate the proposed EIFS.
J. Leonard stated the facade at the 1st floor should be consistent between tenant spaces, stated the project should come back to DAPR. She stated different replacement materials should be considered.

S. Mangum made a motion to hold item in Committee to allow the applicant to consider facade and material details, seconded by L. Biggs.

The Committee voted, 9-0, to hold item in Committee.

2. 3233-3249 Central Street Preliminary/Final Review
William Schermerhorn, property owner, submits for permit to construct a 2-story 12-unit multiple-family residence with a 16-car detached garage, in the R4 General Residential District and oCSC Central Street Corridor Overlay District.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: William Schermerhorn, property owner
Eileen M. Schoeb, architect

DISCUSSION:
- E. Schoeb stated there have been no exterior changes to the plan since the last time they were before DAPR, she reviewed the public benefits incorporated into the plan, including paving the alley, installing bus stop, signaled crosswalk.
- E. Schoeb stated about 5 trees need to be removed. She noted the landscape plan has not changed.
- E. Schoeb stated the garage has been shifted 5’ to the west to allow 10’ separation between their garage and the garage on the adjacent property to the east.
- E. Schoeb stated the 1st floor dwellings are fully accessible.
- W. Schermerhorn stated de-construction work continues, materials to be sorted then removed from the site, then the foundations removed.
- L. Biggs stated the City is hoping to install the crosswalk signal soon and asked if the City could purchase the signal now and bill the applicant the amount per the public benefits.
- W. Schermerhorn stated that would be acceptable.
- K. Jensen asked if EV chargers are being installed and if solar panels have been considered.
- E. Schoeb stated empty conduit and banked meters are included in the construction drawings. She stated the solar panels would provide limited benefit due to building height and trees.

G. Gerdes made a motion to approve the project, seconded by S. Mangum.

The Committee voted, 9-0, to approve the project.
3. **100 Chicago Avenue**  
Amelia Tabeling, architect, submits for permit to construct a new 5-story mixed-use building with 4,999 square feet of indoor ground floor retail, 7,000 square feet of outdoor garden/open sales lot, 26 dwellings, and 30 parking spaces, 128-132 Chicago Avenue PD, approved by City Council on May 29, 2018, Ordinance 61-O-128, in the B3 Business District.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Michael Wilkinson, architect

DISCUSSION:

- M. Wilkinson presented the exterior building materials and colors, green and white aluminum panels, synthetic wood at balconies, metal railings at balconies, vinyl door and window frames.
- M. Wilkinson stated the cafe will occupy the south end while the garden shop will occupy the north end of the ground floor retail space.
- M. Wilkinson reviewed the landscape plan. He stated discussion are still on-going with Metra concerning landscaping their property along the railroad tracks. He stated they still want to landscape this area.
- S. Mangum noted the fence will be black, asked if it should be green to coordinate with the green panels on building.
- M. Wilkinson stated the black fence is intended to coordinate with the colors at the retail level rather than the green on the upper floors.
- J. Leonard asked about bike parking.
- M. Wilkinson stated there is an indoor bike parking room and bike racks along Chicago Avenue.
- G. Gerdes stated a construction management plan is required prior to permit issuance.

G. Gerdes made a motion to approve the project, seconded by S. Mangum.

The Committee voted, 9-0, to approve the project.

4. **1227 Dodge Avenue**  
Sherilynn Asuoha, potential lessee, submits for a special use permit for a Daycare Center - Child, Destiny Track Children’s Engagement Center, in the C1 Commercial District.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Sherilynn Asuoha, potential lessee

DISCUSSION:

- S. Asuoha stated the daycare center provides services to families that have dealt with tragedies. She stated children will be picked up and dropped off at several off-site locations and brought to the daycare center via vans leased from Pace. She stated the property has 8 parking spaces, they plan to lease 2 Pace vans.
- J. Leonard asked if the Pace vans can accommodate car seats.
● S. Asuoha stated yes.
● S. Mangum asked if parents will be required to use the Pace vans.
● S. Asuoha stated she prefers child arrive and leave via the Pace vans rather than parents dropping off and picking up, but needs the flexibility for both options.
● G. Gerdes stated this is a change in use, there are potential building, fire and health codes that kick in, suggested meeting with staff to review code issues to see if they are financially feasible.
● S. Mangum asked about the status of their State license.
● S. Asuoha stated that is still in process. She stated the State wants the local approval process to occur first before they issue a license. She stated she prefers a full-time center, but could operate part-time if that is the license the State issues. She stated the Pace vans will be used for transport regardless.
● J. Leonard stated a concern with street traffic and bike lane and the possible need for a on-street loading zone, creating traffic conflicts. She stated any approval should be conditioned upon prohibiting an on-street loading zone.
● Discussed were hours of Monday-Friday, 6:30am to 6:00pm, and the types of services provided, such as daycare and afterschool programs.
● S. Mangum stated hours and drop-off details need to be pinned down.
● J. Leonard stated better details need to be provided.
● G. Gerdes stated the parking lot is tight, had to back out at a recent visit. He stated one ADA parking space is needed.

J. Leonard made a motion to hold item in Committee in order for the applicant to address the following concerns, motion seconded by L. Biggs:

1. Employee parking
2. Pace van parking
3. How vehicles will exit from the property onto Dodge Avenue
4. ADA parking space
5. Meet with staff to review building, fire and health code requirements
6. Operational details including hours and State licensing

The Committee voted, 9-0, to hold item in Committee in order for the applicant to address concerns.

5. **1714-1720 Chicago Avenue** Planned Development

Paul Janicki, architect, proposes to construct a 13-story office building with 112 on-site parking spaces. The applicant requests a Map Amendment to rezone the property from the R6 General Residential to the D3 Downtown Core Development District and a special use for a Planned Development. The applicant seeks site development allowances for: 1) An FAR of 5.0, where the maximum permitted FAR in the D3 district is 4.5; 2) A building height of 127 feet to roof (excluding eligible parking levels), where the maximum permitted height of a building in D3 is 85 feet to roof; 3) 112 parking spaces with 22 compact stalls where the minimum required number of parking spaces is 213, in addition to a purchase-sale agreement to replace the 74 library parking spaces.
onsite, and where compact stalls are not allowed; 4) A front yard setback of 25-feet, where 31.75 feet is required; 5) A north side yard setback of 50-feet proposed, where 15-feet is required; 6) A south side yard setback of 50-feet proposed, where 15-feet is required.; and 7) A canopy yard obstruction of 9.67 feet into the required front yard, where a maximum obstruction of 3.18 feet (10%) is allowed. Recommendation to Plan Commission.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Paul Janicki, architect
Gary Stoltz, developer

DISCUSSION:

- P. Janicki stated they have addressed the alley issue from before. He stated the building depth has been reduced by 5’ to provide more room at the alley. He stated the plan includes a pedestrian crosswalk across the alley to provide access to the library, the existing landscape island on the library property will need to be modified to provide adequate alley space and a portion of the alley vacated. He stated the Fire Department is satisfied concerning fire truck access.
- P. Janicki stated the number of parking spaces proposed is reduced due to the building depth change. He stated the plan includes 21 spaces for the library, with a total 112 spaces available to the public during evenings and weekends.
- P. Janicki stated there will be bike storage, showers can be provided by individual tenants.
- J. Leonard stated showers should be provided to encourage biking.
- S. Mangum stated reduced parking may encourage more biking.
- P. Janicki stated translucent glass will be used for the first 40’ of the building height, at the parking levels. He described architectural details.
- L. Biggs stated her concern with the alley being tight, concerned with semi-trailers getting to and maneuvering through the alley, noting the plan encourages pedestrian traffic in the alley. She noted there is a utility pole at the McManus building. She stated the alley becomes tighter with the proposed vacation. She stated the RFP did not include alley vacation.
- L. Biggs stated operational restrictions in the alley will be required if the project moves forward.
- Parking was discussed. K. Danczak Lyons, Library Director, provided parking data, how patrons arrive and if by vehicle where they park.
- J. Leonard stated the parking concern is more an issue of a type and location of parking preferred by women in particular vs. the availability of parking. She stated an individual’s parking preferences which may not be available even though there is parking available.
- J. Velan asked how spaces allocated to the library will operate. She stated the operation should be similar to the City’s parking facilities.
- G. Stoltz stated the office spaces would be accessed through a key fob, after 5pm and on weekends those spaces would be available to the public.
- K. Jensen asked if EV parking stations will be provided.
- P. Janicki stated empty conduit will be in place.
G. Stoltz stated increased construction costs due to tariffs and interests rates make providing EV parking stations cost prohibitive.
L. Biggs asked about snow removal from the alley. She stated once the City’s parking lot is gone, the City will no longer plow the alley.
J. Leonard stated a snow management plan is needed.
Landscaping was discussed. P. Janicki stated trees will need to be removed; suggested trees could be planted on adjacent properties. He noted the plan includes rooftop trees. Planting additional parkway trees was discussed, either replacing trees in poor health or in locations that need a parkway tree.
K. Jensen asked if renewable energy is being considered.
G. Stoltz stated it is cost prohibitive, stated tax credits for renewable energy are expiring.
Public benefits were discussed. G. Stoltz stated construction training for ETHS students will be provided.
J. Leonard stated aside from the construction training program, most of the listed public benefits are inherent to building an office building, rather than providing benefits to the community in exchange for development allowances.
S. Mangum noted additional zoning related comments remain from review letter.

Public Comment:
Austin Sherer stated his opposition to the development. He stated the alley is tight, it will cause traffic problems, a tall office building at that location does not make sense.
Glen Madeja, Frances Willard House Museum, stated the museum will lose rental income from parking spaces and apartment during construction. Stated his concern with stormwater runoff, site security, health of trees on museum property due to shade from the building.
Sara Schastok, stated project lacks public benefits, concerned with a blank wall at pedestrian level.
Janet Steidl, stated application information is not accurate, plan details are inconsistent, the Fire Department comments not provided directly.
Joan Safford, stated her concern with the zoning change, office use at that location.
Vickie Burke, stated her concern with construction impacts on the Frances Willard House Museum buildings.
Bonnie Wilson, stated her concern with construction impacts on the Frances Willard House Museum buildings.

The Committee discussed that there are still concerns which have not been addressed.
G. Stoltz requested a recommendation from the Committee instead of a continuance.

G. Gerdes made a motion to recommend denial, seconded by L. Biggs.

The Committee voted, 9-0, to recommend denial of the project to the Plan Commission.
Adjournment

K. Jensen made a motion to adjourn, seconded by L. Biggs. The Committee voted, 9-0, to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 5:04pm.

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

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Griffith
5/13/2018

Mayor Hagerty and the Evanston Aldermen
City Manager Bobkiewicz
Northwestern President Schapiro

I’m writing to reiterate my strong opposition to the construction of a 13 story office building on the library parking lot, 714-720 Chicago Ave. (West side of the street). This lot was designated to be a park in the Evanston plan. It is uniquely situated adjacent to the main public library and 1 and 1/2 blocks from Northwestern, and between a three story colonial building and three historic Victorian houses, one a national landmark. An office building wedged into this tight space will create a serious safety hazard and ruin the visual aesthetic of the historic adjacent museum and houses. To narrow the street significantly and subsequently bring 1300 additional cars into it twice a day is completely irresponsible.

1. Safety hazard

Last year Chicago Avenue between Church and Sheridan was significantly narrowed with the addition of a double lane bike path. The path is well utilized by Northwestern students and others. The office building would add 1300 cars a weekday to the single worst bottle neck in the city. Cars will either have to turn into the building from Chicago Ave. or from the library alleyway; both are hazardous. Cars will have to brake before turning, slowing traffic. Cars from the south will have to wait till the west side lane clears, (to turn across it) which, in the morning, happens only rarely and at very long intervals. It doesn’t really matter where the specific building enter and egress lanes are placed; the additional traffic alone into the narrowed street creates the hazard.

At the first serious car/bicycle accident a plaintiff’s lawyer will argue “defective design - strict liability for the city” (as with an inherently defective product) and the project may turn into a liability nightmare for the city as the accidents pile up.

To add substantial traffic to a two block stretch significantly narrowed by a DOUBLE bike lane is quite simply against all conceivable logic. The block would forever look as though it was planned by a drunk. What would the Mayor and Aldermen be prepared to say to the parents of a Northwestern student maimed or killed...
by one of those 1300 additional daily cars?

1. Ignoring history as well as visual common sense

Wedging a tall office building between the historic Colonial Building and the three Victorian houses will not only make them all look ridiculous, it may well effectively destroy the national landmark Frances Willard Museum and house by placing it in a permanent Winter shadow. No one or very few will want to visit the museum in a large shadow during the cold months of Winter, and the architecturally significant structures will deteriorate more quickly.

The City of Boston received $3,000,000 from the developer Boston Properties for construction that places Trinity and the Old South Church in shadow (see attached article from the 11/17/2017 Boston Globe.)

The single most telling fact with respect to this proposal is that two of the three developers invited to bid on the project took one quick look at the space and declined to submit a bid, saying the location was inappropriate for a high office building to be wedged into this small lot with the adjacent small buildings.

Furthermore, the building will set a terrible precedent. If allowed, all future developers along Chicago Ave. will aspire to construct more 13 story/11 story buildings and request variances to do so. A spine of 13/11 story buildings along Chicago Ave. will cut off visually Lake Michigan from downtown Evanston, and the whole area will resemble Sheridan Road in North Chicago, bland and undistinguished. The Hyatt Corporation, which has built many huge hotels, was able to limit their new hotel on Chicago Ave. in Evanston to seven stories, and the new hotel looks entirely congruent with the neighborhood, and is a fine addition to it.

If the Mayor and Aldermen can hold Chicago Ave. to seven stories, allowing 45 to 15 stories West of the railroad tracks, and around 15 stories adjacent to the tracks, Evanston will still feel residential and that is a crucial component of its attractiveness.

Please consider with some measure of deliberation this point of view and preserve safety and historic visual continuity at this location by rejecting the 13 story building. If not that, you might look toward the purchase of huge new liability insurance policies and endless expensive bicycle and traffic accident litigation.

Respectfully submitted,
Austin R. Sherer
Evanston resident
Scott Mangum <smangum@cityofevanston.org>

Fwd: 1714-1720 Chicago Av Case#18PLND-0053
1 message

Carlos Ruiz <cruiz@cityofevanston.org>
To: "Mangum, Scott" <smangum@cityofevanston.org>

Scott,

This is the second of two emails recently opposing 1714-1720 Chicago Avenue PD.

I will forward to you the first email.

Carlos D. Ruiz
Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator
Community Development Department/Planning and Zoning Division
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center
City of Evanston

2100 Ridge Avenue | Evanston, IL 60201
847-448-8687
cruiz@cityofevanston.org | cityofevanston.org

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: <david@stumpf.org>
Date: Wed, Nov 28, 2018 at 11:34 PM
Subject: 1714-1720 Chicago Av Case#18PLND-0053
To: <cruiz@cityofevanston.org>

Dear Carlos,

I own and occupy a residence at 807 Davis. I reviewed the notice of the meeting concerning this project. The proposal should NOT be approved.

The planned parking is inadequate for the number of persons who may populate the building and it will remove existing parking currently serving other entities. The neighborhood is already challenged for parking and this is a proposal to aggravate that problem. I can understand and potentially accept a rezoning from R6 to D3 given the proposed site at a boundary between such zoned locations. But deviating from D3 height, canopy and setback requirements is not desirable, particularly adjacent to residential areas; exceptions should NOT be made.

Thank you for considering my feedback.

Dave

David A Stumpf, MD, PhD
https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0?ik=21627ab1a6&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1618956580373168319&simple=msg-f%3A16189565803...
Professor Emeritus, Northwestern University

807 Davis Unit 313
Evanston, IL 60202

M: 847 494 7589
E: david@stumpf.org
W: http://stumpf.org
Scott Mangum <smangum@cityofevanston.org>

Fwd: 1720 Chicago
1 message

Carlos Ruiz <cruiz@cityofevanston.org>  
To: "Mangum, Scott" <smangum@cityofevanston.org>  

Scott, this is the first of recent emails opposing 1714-1720 Chicago Ave. PD

Carlos

Carlos D. Ruiz
Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator
Community Development Department/Planning and Zoning Division
Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center
City of Evanston

2100 Ridge Avenue | Evanston, IL 60201
847-448-8687
cruiz@cityofevanston.org | cityofevanston.org

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Rita L Mendelsohn <rmendel@northwestern.edu>  
Date: Sun, Nov 25, 2018 at 8:47 PM  
Subject: 1720 Chicago  
To: cruiz@cityofevanston.org <cruiz@cityofevanston.org>

Thank you for making it easy to state my objections to the possible existence of this building by outlining all of the exceptions that are being requested. None of their requests for exception have merit enough to warrant the rezoning of our R6 to a D3. Doing so would be destructive to what makes this area livable and charming and very desirable.

Please register my objection to this proposal as an owner at 522 Church AND as a resident of Evanston for the past 50 years, 30 of those years as a home owner (1210 Lake Street)

Rita Mendelsohn

Sent from my iPad
July 11, 2018

To the members of DAPR and the City of Evanston,

This document represents the concerns of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU), owners of the property immediately north of the proposed Library Parking Lot Building, regarding its design and the potential impacts on the property. This document was created by Glen Madeja, Executive Director of the Center for Women’s History and Leadership, which operates the Frances Willard House Museum and the Frances Willard Memorial Library and Archives on behalf of the WCTU. Mr. Madeja is also the WCTU Site Manager for their properties in Evanston. He holds an MBA degree and a Master’s Degree in Plant Biology and Conservation, both from Northwestern University.

The pages referenced in this document refer to the sequential pages in DAPR Packet 2 dated 07/11/18 comprised of 220 total pages.

Protection of WCTU Historic District Buildings during Construction of the Library Parking Lot Building

- We are concerned with the effects of neighboring construction on our properties. The most worrisome is physical damage to our buildings, their foundations, and their contents. Notably,
  - The Frances Willard House Museum, itself irreplaceable, has many irreplaceable objects in its collections; and
  - During construction in 1979 of the Lakeview Terrace residential building immediately to the north of the WCTU Historic District, the foundation of the house at 1732 Chicago Avenue was damaged with 8 inches of its north elevation crushed. The WCTU was never compensated for this damage and had to undertake the necessary repairs themselves.
- The Historic District buildings will also invariably experience more dust and dirt during the construction period.
- Finally, it is likely that the 2-flat apartment building at 1724 Chicago Avenue, and probably the one at 1732 Chicago Avenue as well, will not be rentable during construction causing substantial loss of revenue – upwards of $7,000.00 per month.
- **If the proposed building goes forward, we propose that, during construction the developer should:**
  - at its cost install seismic equipment throughout the Willard property to monitor seismic impacts resulting from testing and all construction activities on the property;
  - pay for any repairs of any of the buildings or their contents that are damaged by construction activities;
  - pay for monthly interior cleaning of Willard House and WCTU Administration Building;
  - pay for quarterly window cleaning for all structures;
  - pay for twice yearly gutter cleaning for all structures;
  - pay for twice yearly power washing for all structures; and
  - reimburse the WCTU for lost rental revenue.

Water Run-off Protection of WCTU Historic District Site

- As it exists today, our land directly north of the Library Parking Lot (LPL) experiences flooding at times due to overflow from the lot. The LPL is built at a higher elevation than the adjoining property at 1724 Chicago Avenue and the pavement is not always correctly sloped toward the LPL’s drains. With the proposed building, the City and developers need to ensure that run-off from the property does not adversely affect the WCTU Historic District drainage.
- **If the proposed building goes forward, we propose that the developer should:**
  - construct the ground area within the north setback so that it is graded to minimize run-off onto the adjacent area of the Willard property;
  - route as much run-off away from the north side of the building as possible; and
- work with the WCTU Site Manager to investigate ways in which the landscaping could help ameliorate the effects of run-off, such as using moisture loving plantings, creating rain gardens, installing a French drain system, and/or using earth sculpting techniques (swales and berms) to direct the water to a suitable area for eventual absorption into the soil.

There is also an area of open land approximately 9 feet wide by 100 feet long between the WCTU parking adjacent to the alley and 10 feet away from the WCTU Administration Building that could potentially be landscaped for use as runoff space for the Library Parking Lot building. This would provide an environmental benefit as well as an economic benefit for the developers and for the City who would not have to invest in upgrading sewer systems.

Transition zone between proposed building and WCTU Historic District

- Irrespective of its design, we are naturally very concerned about the impact of a 13-story building set 5 feet from our south lot line. It will directly and indirectly alter characteristics that will diminish the integrity of the property’s location and setting. The loss of site integrity can lead to loss of capacity building for historic sites, loss of funding streams, grant eligibility, and finally the inability to maintain the property leading to its physical loss. The LPL building will directly and negatively affect the WCTU property’s “value.” This is why it is so important to us that the physical appearance of the
WCTU Historic District remains as true as possible to its original temporal context of the late 19th century, which we can only hope will mitigate the effects of a neighboring modern high-rise office building.

- We received a grant from the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 2015 to create a historic landscaping plan. This plan has been completed, but we have done only a few small things to implement it because we have been unsure of what was going to happen with the LPL property.
- Our largest concern has always been about property security. Our historic landscaping plan includes a “green fence” along the south property line to prevent people from trespassing on our property, a routine occurrence today with the parking lot.
- In early conversations with the developers of the time, we requested that they create barriers between the alley and Chicago Avenue so that people would not be able to use the area north of their building as a thoroughfare. The developers agreed to that. I proposed extending a planned wooden fence that is part of the historic landscaping plan across the 5 foot setback to meet the new building near the alley. The developers had also agreed to that. The architect said he would review our landscaping plan and consider how it would be implemented along the property line. The developers also said in an early meeting that they would consider funding the implementation of the entire historic landscaping plan, as well as the repaving the WCTU’s parking spaces on the alleyway. There is no indication of these remedies in the application packet. No written agreement was ever produced nor has there been any follow through discussion on any of these items.
- Regarding the proposed Tree Protection Plan on the north side of the LPL property (page 50), it should be noted that two historic bur oak trees near the property line toward Chicago Avenue, dating from at least 1865, are missing from that document.
- I would also like to point out that the trees on the parkway in the Concept Landscape Plan (page 49) are depicted with their crowns, while none of the trees on the north side of the building in the Tree Protection Plan are (page 50). This is important – the crowns of the trees are what enables them to feed themselves through photosynthesis. They also demarcate where the root mass extends so they can absorb water. With a proposed 5 foot set-back (noted in the images at the end of this document), most of the trees will lose a portion, close to half, of their crowns and roots. The trees would survive for a short while but that loss, in conjunction with being in deep shade most of the day, will weaken them and they will die within a few years – it is not clear why the Tree Protection Plan notes that every single tree will be “protected” when they are mostly being sentenced to die. Also, 4 of the trees have been correctly identified as Ulmus americana or American Elms. These trees require a minimum of 6 hours of direct sunlight daily, usually grow from 60 to 80 feet tall (up to 130) and have crowns 40 to 70 feet across according to the USDA, Missouri Botanic Garden, and Morton Arboretum web sites. Being almost on the property line, I am not sure why it is suggested these trees will be “protected” when a +/- 167’ foot tall building is proposed to be built only 5 feet away. I envision a slow death for most, if not all, of these trees. We, the property owner to the north, will then have to bear the sizeable financial expense and work entailed in removing the existing trees and replacing them with appropriate plantings. If this was your property, would you find this acceptable or equitable?
- The south looking view on page 39 shows trees planted on the north side terrace above the 4 story parking garage pedestal which is approximately 42’ high and taller than the houses to the north. The question is if this makes any sense in the context of the Tree Protection Plan. Viewed from the north, one would see lot level trees (if they survive) and then trees planted at over 40’ high, above the tops of the houses to the north. Additionally, one wonders if the efficacy of sustaining the high terrace trees on the north side of the building and shaded by the two flanking towers is supported by horticultural science.
- We will lose the western-most of the two historic bur oak trees near the property line with certainty. Also, the probable impacts on the landscaping of the site having a building +/- 167 feet tall casting much of the property in shadow for most of the day is disturbing.
If the proposed building goes forward, we request that the developers agree to the promises made previously:
  o that people would not be able to use the north side of the building as a thoroughfare between the alley and Chicago Avenue;
  o that they will extend and pay for the planned wooden fence that is part of the historic landscaping plan across the 5 foot (or greater) setback to meet the building near the alley;
  o that the architect or other qualified consultant will review our historic landscaping plan and consider how it would be implemented along the property line; and
  o that the current Tree Protection Plan be revised in light of an agreed upon landscaping plan for the north side of the building.

We would, of course, welcome the developers agreeing to pay for the entire historic landscaping plan and repaving of the parking spaces as was previously discussed.

Finally, we request an irrevocable written agreement in perpetuity from the developers for the payment of any and all costs incurred by the WCTU for removal of any and all existing trees throughout the WCTU property and any and all subsequent re-landscaping.

Thank you.
View of trees along north lot line between LPL building site (on the left hand side) and WCTU Historic District site (on the right) from across Chicago Avenue. Setbacks from the lot line are shown in orange to illustrate how far the trees would have to be cut back. (R6 zoning requires 15’; developers are requesting 5’.)
View of trees along north lot line between LPL building site (on the right hand side) and WCTU Historic District site (on the left) from across the alley. Setbacks from the lot line are shown in orange to illustrate how far the trees would have to be cut back. (R6 zoning requires 15'; developers are requesting 5'.)
November 14, 2018

To the members of DAPR and the City of Evanston,

This document represents the concerns of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU), owners of the property immediately north of the proposed Library Parking Lot Building, regarding its design and the potential impacts on the property. This document was created by Glen Madeja, Executive Director of the Center for Women’s History and Leadership, which operates the Frances Willard House Museum and the Frances Willard Memorial Library and Archives on behalf of the WCTU. Mr. Madeja is also the WCTU Site Manager for their properties in Evanston. He holds an MBA degree and a Master’s Degree in Plant Biology and Conservation, both from Northwestern University.

The following are the concerns we have based on the original document submitted by us to DAPR on July 11, 2018 and which do not appear to be addressed by the developer in their most recent submission. I have removed the supplemental images and information in this document.

Protection of WCTU Rental Revenues during Construction of the Library Parking Lot Building

- It is likely that the 2-flat apartment building at 1724 Chicago Avenue, and probably the one at 1732 Chicago Avenue as well, will not be rentable during construction causing substantial loss of revenue – upwards of $7,000.00 per month. Rental of parking spaces represents another $1,000.00+ per month.
- The Historic District buildings will also invariably experience more dust and dirt during the construction period.
- If the proposed building goes forward, we propose that, during construction the developer should:
  - pay for monthly interior cleaning of Willard House and WCTU Administration Building;
  - pay for quarterly window cleaning for all structures;
  - pay for twice yearly gutter cleaning for all structures;
  - pay for twice yearly power washing for all structures; and
  - reimburse the WCTU for lost rental revenue.

Water Run-off Protection of WCTU Historic District Site

- As it exists today, our land directly north of the Library Parking Lot (LPL) experiences flooding at times due to overflow from the lot. The LPL is built at a higher elevation than the adjoining property at 1724 Chicago Avenue and the pavement is not always correctly sloped toward the LPL’s drains. With the proposed building, the City and developers need to ensure that run-off from the property does not adversely affect the WCTU Historic District drainage.
- If the proposed building goes forward, we propose that the developer should:
  - construct the ground area within the north setback so that it is graded to minimize run-off onto the adjacent area of the Willard property;
  - route as much run-off away from the north side of the building as possible; and
  - work with the WCTU Site Manager to investigate ways in which the landscaping could help ameliorate the effects of run-off, such as using moisture loving plantings, creating rain gardens, installing a French drain system, and/or using earth sculpting techniques (swales and berms) to direct the water to a suitable area for eventual absorption into the soil.

Transition zone between proposed building and WCTU Historic District

- Our largest concern has always been about property security. Our historic landscaping plan includes a “green fence” along the south property line to prevent people from trespassing on our property, a routine occurrence today with the parking lot.
- In early conversations with the developers of the time, we requested that they create barriers between the alley and Chicago Avenue so that people would not be able to use the area north of their building as a thoroughfare. The developers agreed to that. I proposed extending a planned wooden fence that is part of the historic landscaping plan across the five foot setback to meet the new building near the
alley. The developers had also agreed to that. The architect said he would review our landscaping plan and consider how it would be implemented along the property line. The developers also said in an early meeting that they would consider funding the implementation of the entire historic landscaping plan, as well as the repaving the WCTU’s parking spaces on the alleyway. There is no indication of these remedies in the application packet. No written agreement was ever produced nor has there been any follow through discussion on any of these items.

- While the two historic bur oak trees near the property line toward Chicago Avenue are now represented on this version of the Tree Protection Plan, dating from at least 1865, there is still be no consideration for how trees will be “protected” when many are going to lose as much as a third of their crowns and root systems in the new proposal. Root pruning mature trees is not necessarily a good way to protect them. From the University of Florida web site:
  - Factors affecting response of trees to root pruning
    - root size: larger roots may generate few new roots
    - number of cut roots: more roots cut means more tree stress
    - proximity of cuts to the trunk: the closer cuts are to the trunk the bigger the impact
    - species: some species tolerate it better than others
    - tree age: old trees are more likely to stress and die
- The tree protection plan is indecipherable to a lay person. There is a column headed “Protected Tree?” with some being listed as Yes, some No, and others blank. In the “Notes” column, all say “Protect” and only one says Demolish”. None on our property are listed as “Replace”.
- We will lose the western-most of the two historic bur oak trees near the property line with certainty. Also, the probable impacts on the landscaping of the site having a building +/- 175 feet tall casting much of the property in shadow for most of the day is disturbing. The shadow plan provided (pp. 63-66) shows the transition zone will be in complete shade year-round after 9:00 AM and that certain areas extending to about halfway into the Historic District will be in complete shade the entire afternoon in winter, spring, and fall.
  - It is difficult to envision what trees would grow in the transition zone – I found one possible deciduous tree genus and one possible needled evergreen genus for part-shade to full-shade; none for full-shade.
  - For those areas that will be shaded most of the day during the three seasons, there are two Aesculus hippocastanum (Common Horsechestnut) that will be shaded, one of them planted by Frances Willard ca. 1890. The other is an Acer platanoides (Norway Maple). Both require a minimum of part shade (4-6 hours of direct sunlight daily). I do not know the effect the building’s shadow will have on these trees, but it will certainly not be positive.
- If the proposed building goes forward, we request that the developers agree to the promises made previously:
  - that people would not be able to use the north side of the building as a thoroughfare between the alley and Chicago Avenue;
  - that the developer will extend and pay for the planned wooden fence that is part of the historic landscaping plan across the five-foot setback to meet the building near the alley;
  - that a qualified landscaping consultant will review our historic landscaping plan and consider how it would be implemented along the property line; and
  - that the current Tree Protection Plan be revised in light of an agreed upon landscaping plan for the north side of the building.
- We would, of course, welcome the developers agreeing to pay for the entire historic landscaping plan and repaving of the parking spaces as was previously discussed.

I leave you with this question: If this was your property, would you find the developers responses to these concerns acceptable or equitable?

Thank you.
December 7, 2018

To the members of the Planning Commission:

This document represents the concerns of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU), owners of the property immediately north of the proposed Library Parking Lot Building, regarding its design and the potential impacts on the property. This document was created by Glen Madeja, Executive Director of the Center for Women’s History and Leadership, which operates the Frances Willard House Museum and the Frances Willard Memorial Library and Archives on behalf of the WCTU. Mr. Madeja is also the WCTU Site Manager for their properties in Evanston. He holds an MBA degree and a Master’s Degree in Plant Biology and Conservation, both from Northwestern University.

WCTU Historic District Site Security
Our largest concern has always been about property security. Our historic landscaping plan (discussed later in the document) includes a “green fence” along our south property line to prevent people from trespassing on our property, a routine occurrence today with the parking lot. The picture below is from an area near the northeast corner of the parking lot. You can see the gap in the City’s shrubbery and the path that has been worn in the ground on our property from people passing to and from the parking lot.

- In early conversations with the developers of the time, we requested that they create barriers between the alley and Chicago Avenue so that people would not be able to use the area north of their building as a thoroughfare. The developers agreed to that. I proposed extending a planned wooden fence that is
part of the historic landscaping plan across the proposed five-foot setback to meet the new building near the alley. The developers had also agreed to that.

- In a meeting convened by Ald. Fiske at Evanston Civic Center August 14, 2017, the alderman, City of Evanston planning staff, members of the Center for Women’s History and Leadership and our attorney, and Chicago Avenue Partners, LLC (their name at the time), several issues were discussed regarding our concerns about the building and its impact.
  - In a letter from our attorney after the meeting, he documented “The only input received by the Willard/WCTU organization which the developers have acknowledged is that there will be no access between the front sidewalk and back alley on the north side and that they are willing to work with us on appropriate landscaping on the north side.”

- Also in previous meetings, the architect said he would review our landscaping plan and consider how it would be implemented along the property line. The developers also said in an early meeting that they would consider funding the implementation of the entire historic landscaping plan, as well as the repaving the WCTU’s parking spaces on the alleyway. There is no indication of these remedies in the application packet. No written agreement was ever produced nor has there been any follow through discussion on any of these items.

If the proposed building goes forward, we request that the developers agree to the promises made previously:

- that people would not be able to use the north side of the building as a thoroughfare between the alley and Chicago Avenue;
- that they will extend and pay for the planned wooden fence that is part of the historic landscaping plan across the proposed five-foot setback to meet the building near the alley;
- that the architect or other qualified consultant will review our historic landscaping plan and consider how it would be implemented along the property line; and
- that the current Tree Protection Plan (discussed later in the document) be revised in light of an agreed upon landscaping plan for the north side of the building.

Water Run-off Protection of WCTU Historic District Site
As it exists today, our land directly north of the Library Parking Lot (LPL) experiences flooding at times due to overflow from the lot. The LPL is built at a higher elevation than the adjoining property at 1724 Chicago Avenue and the pavement is not always correctly sloped toward the LPL’s drains. With the proposed building, the City and developers need to ensure that run-off from the property does not adversely affect the WCTU Historic District drainage.
If the proposed building goes forward, we propose that the developer should:

- construct the ground area within the north setback so that it is graded to minimize run-off onto the adjacent area of the Willard property;
- route as much run-off away from the north side of the building as possible; and
- work with the WCTU Site Manager to investigate ways in which the landscaping could help ameliorate the effects of run-off, such as using moisture loving plantings, creating rain gardens, installing a French drain system, and/or using earth sculpting techniques (swales and berms) to direct the water to a suitable area for eventual absorption into the soil.

**Transition zone between proposed building and WCTU Historic District**

Irrespective of its design, we are naturally very concerned about the impact of a 13-story building set 5 feet from our south lot line. It will directly and indirectly alter characteristics that will diminish the integrity of the property’s location and setting. The loss of site integrity can lead to loss of capacity building for historic sites, loss of funding streams, grant ineligibility, and finally the inability to maintain the property leading to its physical loss. The LPL building will directly and negatively affect the WCTU property’s “value.” This is why it is so important to us that the physical appearance of the WCTU Historic District remains as true as possible to its original temporal context of the late 19th century, which we can only hope will mitigate the effects of a neighboring modern high-rise office building.

We received a grant from the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 2015 to create a historic landscaping plan. This plan has been completed, but we have done only a few small things to implement it because we have been unsure of what was going to happen with the LPL property.

- None of the LPL building plans or renderings show anything other than an open swath of turf grass to the north of the building on the property. Plans and renderings regarding the area of our property north of the building are inconsistent – sometimes they show a line of trees, other times they show no trees or landscaping of any kind.
- The tree protection plan is indecipherable to a lay person. There is a column headed “Protected Tree?” with some being listed as Yes, some No, and others blank. In the “Notes” column, all say “Protect” and only one says “Demolish”. None on our property are listed as “Replace”.
- There is no consideration for how trees will be “protected” when many are going to lose as much as a third of their crowns and root systems in the proposal. Root pruning mature trees, as proposed, is not necessarily a good way to protect them. From the Environmental Horticulture section of the University of Florida web site:
  - Factors affecting response of trees to root pruning
    - root size: larger roots may generate few new roots
    - number of cut roots: more roots cut means more tree stress
    - proximity of cuts to the trunk: the closer cuts are to the trunk the bigger the impact
    - species: some species tolerate it better than others
    - tree age: old trees are more likely to stress and die
- Being almost on the property line, I am not sure why it is suggested these trees will be “protected” when a +/- 175’ foot tall building is proposed to be built only five feet away. I envision a slow death for most, if not all, of these trees. We, the property owner to the north, will then have to bear the sizeable financial expense and work entailed in removing the existing trees and replacing them with appropriate plantings.
- The trees on the east parkway in the Concept Landscape Plan are depicted with their crowns, while none of the trees on the north side of the building in the Tree Protection Plan are. This is important – the crowns of the trees are what enables them to feed themselves through photosynthesis. They also demarcate where the root mass extends so they can absorb water. With a proposed five-foot set-back (noted in the images at the end of this document), most of the trees will lose a portion, often close to half, of their crowns and roots. The trees would likely survive for a short while but that loss, in
conjunction with being in deep shade most of the day, will weaken them and they will die within a few years – it is not clear why the Tree Protection Plan notes that every single tree will be “protected” when they are mostly being sentenced to die. Also, four of the trees have been correctly identified as Ulmus americana or American Elms. These trees require a minimum of 6 hours of direct sunlight daily, usually grow from 60 to 80 feet tall (up to 130) and have crowns 40 to 70 feet across according to the USDA, Missouri Botanic Garden, and Morton Arboretum web sites.

- We will lose the western-most of the two historic bur oak trees (likely dating from the 1860s) near the property line with certainty. Also, the probable impacts on the landscaping of the site having a building +/- 175 feet tall casting much of the property in shadow for most of the day is disturbing. The shadow plan provided shows the transition zone will be in complete shade year-round after 9:00 AM and that certain areas extending to about halfway into the Historic District will be in complete shade the entire afternoon in winter, spring, and fall.
  - It is difficult to envision what trees would grow in the transition zone – I found one possible deciduous tree genus and one possible needled evergreen genus for part-shade to full-shade; none for full-shade.
  - For those areas that will be shaded most of the day during the three seasons, there are two Aesculus hippocastanum (Common Horsechestnut) that will be shaded, one of them planted by Frances Willard ca. 1890. The other is an Acer platanoides (Norway Maple). Both require a minimum of part shade (4-6 hours of direct sunlight daily). I do not know the effect the building’s shadow will have on these trees, but it will certainly not be positive.

If the proposed building goes forward, we request an irrevocable written agreement in perpetuity from the developers for the payment of any and all costs incurred by us for removal of any and all existing trees throughout the WCTU Local Historic District and any and all subsequent re-landscaping.

Respectfully,

Glen Madeja
Executive Director, Center for Women’s History and Leadership
1730 Chicago Avenue
Evanston, IL 60201
execdir@franceswillardhouse.org
847-721-6191
View of trees along north lot line between LPL building site (on the left-hand side) and WCTU Historic District site (on the right) from across Chicago Avenue. Setbacks from the lot line are shown in orange to illustrate how far the trees would have to be cut back. (R6 zoning requires fifteen feet; developers are requesting five feet.)
View of trees along north lot line between LPL building site (on the right hand side) and WCTU Historic District site (on the left) from across the alley. Setbacks from the lot line are shown in orange to illustrate how far the trees would have to be cut back. (R6 zoning requires fifteen feet; developers are requesting five feet.)
December 7, 2018

Colby Lewis  
Chair  
Plan Commission  
City of Evanston  
2100 Ridge Avenue  
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Re: 1714-20 Chicago Avenue  
Surface Lot East of the Main Library (North of the Woman’s Club of Evanston)

Dear Chairman Lewis:

Reyes Kurson represents the Woman’s Club of Evanston (WCE). As you know, WCE is a critical cultural institution in the community. Since 1889 the WCE has been a transformative force that provides thousands of hours of volunteer time and makes hundreds of philanthropic grants. WCE members collectively donate approximately 15,000 hours of volunteer time every year to organizations in and around Evanston. Members also give and raise money for charity. Over the last decade, WCE has contributed nearly $2 million to worthy causes. The organization is consistent and steadfast in its commitment to making a positive difference.

In addition to the group’s volunteerism and giving, the WCE maintains its historic Clubhouse, a 107-year-old structure, which is included in the National Register of Historic Places. WCE has not asked the City of Evanston to contribute money to preserve the building. To date, the organization has been self-sufficient while keeping up with the substantial cost of maintaining a landmark building.

As proposed, the captioned development creates clear, present, and substantial risk to the Clubhouse and, therefore, to the WCE. Members are concerned about damage to the historic building and loss of private event income during construction.

Structural Damage:  WCE has asked the developer to provide a plan for how it will prevent damage to the Clubhouse and to provide an indemnification in the event of harm to the structure.

Private Event Income:  WCE’s contributions to the community are above and beyond the upkeep of the Clubhouse. Private events fund the expenses associated with building maintenance. If the developer’s project diminishes private events at the Clubhouse during the period of construction, the WCE will be put into vulnerable financial position. WCE has asked the developer to indemnify WCE for loss of income during construction. Inasmuch as the City of Evanston, as the property owner and seller, will profit from development at the parking lot, the City should facilitate and expedite the developer’s provision of this indemnification.
The Plan Commission should support the WCE’s efforts to protect the Clubhouse by refusing to advance the proposed development unless the developer agrees to the following conditions of approval:

1) Developer will provide a written plan for preventing structural damage to the WCE Clubhouse that may result from development-related construction at the subject property;  
2) Developer will indemnify WCE for any physical damage to the WCE Clubhouse resulting from development-related construction at the subject property; 
3) Developer will indemnify WCE for any diminution of bookings in private events during the period of development-related construction at the subject property.

On behalf of the WCE, I respectfully request that the Plan Commission adopts the requested conditions of approval. Without the conditions, the captioned project will put WCE’s volunteerism, monetary contributions to charity, and its Clubhouse at risk, and the WCE must oppose it.

Sincerely,

Amy Kurson  
Reyes Kurson, Ltd.
Plan Commission

Text Amendment

oRD Redevelopment Overlay District
18PLND-0102
Memorandum

To: Chair and Members of the Plan Commission

From: Johanna Leonard, Director of Community Development
      Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Administrator
      Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner

Subject: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment
         Permitted and Special Uses in the oRD Redevelopment Overlay District
         18PLND-0102

Date: December 7, 2018

Request
Staff recommends amending the Zoning Ordinance to clarify the permitted and special uses in the oRD Redevelopment Overlay District and update the list of underlying zoning districts that may carry the designation.

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

Analysis
Background
Per the City’s Zoning Ordinance, the oRD Redevelopment Overlay District “is intended to allow for flexibility in land use layout and design in redevelopment areas where there is an opportunity for mixed use development or development projects in which one (1) or more of the uses are different from, but compatible with, the principal permitted uses in the district. Determination of appropriateness shall be considered on a case-by-case basis to ensure that a particular proposal meets basic standards of public health, safety, and welfare, and supports the economic development objectives of the City. Planned development is required for all developments located within the oRD districts.”

All of the parcels where the oRD Overlay District is currently applied are located in the southwestern portion of the City, both north and south of Oakton Street between Hartrey...
Avenue and the City limits.


Permitted Uses:

The permitted uses for the oRD district shall be as follows:

(A) Any use listed as permitted or special in the underlying base zoning district.
(B) Dwellings - multiple-family (when not more than thirty percent (30%) of a planned development site, excluding affordable housing, as determined by the Plan Commission. In no case, however, shall the total housing area, including affordable housing and other housing, exceed sixty percent (60%) of the site).
(C) Mixed use development.
(D) Retail goods/services establishment, when located on the ground floor.

Several projects have been reviewed under the interpretation that the underlying zoning of a property still dictates what uses are permitted versus special uses. This includes the planned development located at 2494 Oakton Street which required a Special Use for both the planned development and the current auto service station and its accessory uses in addition to special use approval for the Steak 'n Shake Type 2 Restaurant at 2209 Oakton Street.

Additionally, there are a number of uses within the underlying zoning districts that may warrant the additional review included in the special use process, such as: drive-through facilities, automobile repair service establishments, firearm ranges, and heavy manufacturing.

Proposal Overview
Staff is proposing to add language to the Zoning Code which would clearly define which uses are permitted uses and special uses within the oRD Redevelopment Overlay District in addition to language to include the C1 Zoning District as an area that may carry the oRD designation. Specifically staff will amend the zoning ordinance as described below:

6-15-13-2. - PROCEDURE FOR DISTRICT DESIGNATION.

(A) The City Council may, upon the recommendation of the Plan Commission and in accordance with the procedures for amending the Zoning Map set forth in Chapter 3 of this Title, designate any area carrying the following zoning district designations as an oRD district: O1, I1, I2, C1, C2, B2, B3, D2, D3, and D4.
(B) Any oRD district designated by the City Council shall be known as an overlay to the underlying zoning district with the designation oRD on the Zoning Map.
6-15-13-7. - PERMITTED USES.
The permitted uses for the oRD district shall be as follows:

(A) Any use listed as permitted or special in the underlying base zoning district.
(B) Dwellings - multiple-family (when not more than thirty percent (30%) of a planned development site, excluding affordable housing, as determined by the Plan Commission. In no case, however, shall the total housing area, including affordable housing and other housing, exceed sixty percent (60%) of the site).
(C) Mixed use development.
(D) Retail goods/services establishment, when located on the ground floor.

6-15-3-8. - SPECIAL USES.
The Special Uses for the oRD district shall be any use listed as special in the underlying base zoning district.

The added Special Use section would necessitate renumbering subsequent sections within Chapter 15.

Standards of Approval
The proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to clarify the permitted and special uses in the oRD Redevelopment Overlay District and to add the C1 District 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 maintain the appealing character of Evanston’s neighborhoods while guiding their change. It will assist in maintaining consistency of the permitted uses within various zoning districts in the event that future development occurs.

The proposed text amendment will not have any adverse effects on the values of the properties in the area and ensure that the Zoning Code regulations and staff interpretations align.

Recommendation
Staff believes the proposed text amendment to clarify the permitted and special uses in the oRD Redevelopment Overlay District and to add the C1 District 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.
Plan Commission

Text Amendment

Public Benefits for Planned Developments
18PLND-0103
Memorandum

To: Chair and Members of the Plan Commission

From: Johanna Leonard, Director of Community Development
Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Administrator
Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner

Subject: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment
Public Benefits for Planned Developments
18PLND-0103

Date: December 7, 2018

Request
Staff recommends amending the Zoning Ordinance to Section 6-3-6 of the Zoning Ordinance, to revise the regulations relating to Public Benefits of Planned Developments.

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

Analysis

Background
At the October 29, 2018 Special City Council meeting, a referral was made to Plan Commission to formulate a possible text amendment regarding revisions to required public benefits for Planned Developments. At its November 14, 2018 meeting, the Plan Commission began discussion on possible revisions to the Zoning Code, sharing preliminary thoughts on which public benefits should be included and how those benefits could be listed.

The City of Evanston Zoning Ordinance (City Code Section 6-3-6-3) lists the nine public benefits to the surrounding neighborhood and the City as a whole that are intended to be derived from the approval of planned developments, which include, but are not limited to:

(A) Preservation and enhancement of desirable site characteristics and open space.
(B) A pattern of development which preserves natural vegetation, topographic and geologic features.
(C) Preservation and enhancement of historic and natural resources that significantly contribute to the character of the City.
(D) Use of design, landscape, or architectural features to create a pleasing environment or other special development features.

(E) Provision of a variety of housing types in accordance with the City's housing goals.

(F) Elimination of blighted structures or incompatible uses through redevelopment or rehabilitation.

(G) Business, commercial, and manufacturing development to enhance the local economy and strengthen the tax base.

(H) The efficient use of the land resulting in more economic networks of utilities, streets, schools, public grounds, buildings, and other facilities.

(I) The substantial incorporation of generally recognized sustainable design practices and/or building materials to promote energy conservation and improve environmental quality, such as level silver or higher LEED (leadership in energy and environmental design) certification.

Recent planned developments have conditions of approval placed on them which include a wide variety of public benefits that are much more specific than those listed above. These benefits have consisted of infrastructure improvements or payments towards those improvements, public art, dedication of open space, and apprenticeship programs among other items. With fairly recent ordinances setting minimum affordable housing and green building standards, these items are no longer seen as public benefits unless what is provided goes above stated minimum requirements.

Proposal Overview
Staff is proposing to add language to the Zoning Code which would more precisely outline goals and possible public benefits that could assist in reaching them. Specifically, staff is proposing the following changes to Section 6-3-6-3. - Public Benefits relating to planned developments:

6-3-6-3.- PUBLIC BENEFITS.
The public benefits to the surrounding neighborhood and the City as a whole that are intended to be derived from the approval of planned developments include but are not limited to: and are measured based on the quantity and scale of requested site development allowances. Public benefits are not considered to be the proposed principal use(s) on the zoning lot, but rather an accessory feature or use complementary to the proposed principal use(s). These benefits should not be limited solely to the proposed development’s residents or tenants, but should also be accessible to the public and/or mitigate impact of the development on surrounding residents, infrastructure and utilities.

(A) Goals: Planned Developments should incorporate the following goals into public benefits:

1. Preservation and enhancement of desirable site characteristics and open space
2. A pattern of development which preserves natural vegetation, topographic and geologic features.
3. Preservation and enhancement of historic and natural resources that significantly contribute to the character of the City.
4. Use of design, landscape, or architectural features to create a pleasing environment or other special development features.
5. Provision of a variety of housing types in accordance with the City's housing goals.
6. Elimination of blighted structures or incompatible uses through redevelopment or rehabilitation.
7. Business, commercial, and manufacturing development to enhance the local economy and strengthen the tax base.
8. The efficient use of the land resulting in more economic networks of utilities, streets, schools, public grounds, buildings, and other facilities.
9. The substantial incorporation of generally recognized sustainable design practices and/or building materials to promote energy conservation and improve environmental quality, such as level silver or higher LEED (leadership in energy and environmental design) certification.

(B) Public Benefit Categories: The public benefits provided can include, but are not limited to, the following categorized items:

1. Affordable Housing. Provide in excess of the minimum requirements per Title 5, Chapter 7 – Inclusionary Housing.
2. Encouragement of Alternative Modes of Transportation. This includes but is not limited to: incorporation of publicly accessible car-share spaces and memberships to building residents, bike share station sponsorships and/or memberships, and CTA/Metra passes. Additional bike parking and amenities are also encouraged.
3. Streetscape Improvements. Provide elements that create a safe, inviting environment at the street level such as street trees, benches, wayfinding signage and wider sidewalks.
4. Infrastructure Improvements. Provide funding for traffic signal upgrades, crosswalk improvements and traffic calming measures. Where possible, work with transit organizations to improve viaducts and areas near rail facilities and stations.
5. Public Art. Creation of or provide funding for a public art display within the vicinity of the planned development.
6. Sustainability Measures. Achieve LEED Gold or higher. Pursue LEED 55 certification to mitigate harm to migratory birds. Incorporate electric vehicle charging stations into designated parking areas.
7. Education/Employment. Creation of apprenticeship or training programs for residents or students related to construction or
proposed use of the property.
8. Preservation. Preserve and restore historic landmarks on the property; provide funding for improvements to nearby landmarks.
9. Open Space/Parks. Dedication of park space to the City or publically accessible park or garden as part of the development, provide funding towards maintenance and/or upgrades to existing nearby parks.

(C) Standards for Evaluation of Public Benefits: The City Council shall, upon recommendation from the Plan Commission, decide whether the proposed planned development feature(s) have sufficient merit to justify granting of requested site development allowances. The Plan Commission and City Council shall consider the degree to which the following standards are met by the proposed public benefit(s) within the overall context of the principal use(s) in which the proposed public benefit(s) are offered:

1. The size or capacity of the development, public benefit, or provision.
2. The degree to which the location of the development or public benefit within the structure, or on the site of which it is part, enhances the environment of the zoning district of which it is part, the street frontage where it is to be located and the zoning lot itself.
3. The degree of public accessibility to the development or public benefit given its location and the specific nature and function of the public benefit feature.
4. The quality of design of the development or public benefit in the context of the principal use of the zoning lot, the location of said zoning lot in the zoning district, adjacent properties and uses, the use and street frontage character of the zoning lot, said zoning lot within, and the policies, designs and plans of the City.
5. The degree to which the development or public benefit enhances and protects the environment of the zoning district including such elements as air quality, noise reduction, wind effect, temperature moderation, views, pedestrian environment, landscaping and areas for relaxation, and the enjoyment of the City's historic resources.
6. The degree to which the development or public benefit lessens automobile traffic congestion and supports car-sharing, public transit, pedestrian and bicycle usage.
7. The degree to which the development or public benefit increases the availability of quality employment opportunities to residents of the City.
8. The degree to which the development or public benefit enhances the economy of the City.
9. The degree to which the development or public benefit provides for or incorporates social services for the residents of the City.
10. The degree to which the development or public benefit provides for
and protects the public health, welfare, and safety of residents, and employees, and the visitors to the City.

The City Council may find that the degree to which any of the above standards are met are not sufficient to mitigate or offset the requested site development allowance and/or impacts of the proposed development on the surrounding community and may request that additional public benefits be provided.

Other Local Municipalities
As mentioned in the memo to City Council, research has indicated that municipalities vary in how each addresses public benefits. In Oak Park, for example, the Zoning Ordinance states that developers are required to provide public benefits which include: Village improvements, such as infrastructure or business retention efforts; compensating benefits, such as adaptive reuse of existing buildings, provision of public car and/or bike share facilities and open space recreational amenities; and public art. Arlington Heights, however, does not have a specific ordinance addressing public benefits but its Zoning Code makes general statements related to them, and its Plan Commission makes findings related to the physical and economic benefits a proposed development brings to the community.

A number of other municipalities either do not have ordinances that require public benefits for planned developments or have requirements for impact fees relating to all residential development. Impact fees are more common in jurisdictions where considerable open land exists that requires new infrastructure in order to be developed.

Standards of Approval
The proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to revise the regulations relating to Public Benefits of Planned Developments meets the standards for approval of amendments per Section 6-3-4-5 of the City Code. The proposal will affect each of the 15 broader goals of the Comprehensive Plan, as it seeks to ensure that new development will be compatible with adjacent uses and mitigate impacts to utilities and infrastructure. It will create more defined community benefits across a variety of categories while allowing some flexibility for change as community needs change. It will also ensure that the Zoning Code regulations and staff interpretations align.

The proposed text amendment will not have any adverse effects on the values of the properties in the area as it is actually intended to maintain or improve their value. It will ensure that any physical impacts to the immediate area surrounding the development are mitigated and/or have benefits to the public which will counter those impacts.

Recommendation
Staff believes the proposed text amendment to revise the regulations relating to Public Benefits of Planned Developments 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

- Memo to City Council dated October 29, 2018
- Public Benefits approved per 9 recent Planned Development Ordinances
Memorandum

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

From: Johanna Leonard, Director of Community Development
Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Administrator

Subject: Public Benefits for Planned Developments

Date: August 6, 2018

Recommended Action
Staff requests City Council direction, which could come in the form of a referral to the Plan Commission if a Text Amendment is recommended or a recommendation for no further action.

Livability Benefits
Built Environment: Provide compact and complete streets and neighborhoods.

Summary
An exaction, commonly known as a public benefit, is a legal concept in which a condition for development is imposed on a piece of property that requires the developer to mitigate negative impacts of the development.

The City of Evanston Zoning Ordinance (City Code Section 6-3-6-3) lists the nine public benefits to the surrounding neighborhood and the City as a whole that are intended to be derived from the approval of planned developments, which include, but are not limited to:

(A) Preservation and enhancement of desirable site characteristics and open space.
(B) A pattern of development which preserves natural vegetation, topographic and geologic features.
(C) Preservation and enhancement of historic and natural resources that significantly contribute to the character of the City.
(D) Use of design, landscape, or architectural features to create a pleasing environment or other special development features.
(E) Provision of a variety of housing types in accordance with the City’s housing goals.
(F) Elimination of blighted structures or incompatible uses through redevelopment or rehabilitation.
(G) Business, commercial, and manufacturing development to enhance the local economy and strengthen the tax base.

(H) The efficient use of the land resulting in more economic networks of utilities, streets, schools, public grounds, buildings, and other facilities.

(I) The substantial incorporation of generally recognized sustainable design practices and/or building materials to promote energy conservation and improve environmental quality, such as level silver or higher LEED (leadership in energy and environmental design) certification.

Recent planned development ordinances have contained a range of conditions of approval relating to public benefits. An updated catalogue of recently approved planned developments and their associated benefits is attached. Many of the benefits relate to supporting transportation systems, streetscape infrastructure, public art components, sustainability elements, and affordable housing.

While a definitive list of all appropriate public benefits does not exist, the following exactions can be utilized by the City for a development (loosely ordered by relative cost):

- Dedications for Streets, Sidewalks, and Other Public Ways
- Dedication of Public Open Space
- Public Right-of-Way Infrastructure Improvements
- Historic Preservation
- Payment into a Public Fund in excess of code requirement (e.g. Inclusionary Housing Ordinance)
- Improvements to public infrastructure such as parks, transit stations or viaducts
- Public Art
- Provision of Cultural Facilities
- Facilities for Non-Profit Organizations
- Recreational Facilities open to the Public (e.g. Parks or Gardens)
- Landscaping/Creation of Open Space for the Public
- Free or Discounted Transit Passes for Employees and Renters
- Operation of a Shuttle Service
- Apprentice Program for Students
- Local hiring of a minimum number of Evanston residents
- Bird Friendly building measures
- Green Building certification exceeding LEED Silver
- Public Access to Private Facilities
- Public Access to Electric Vehicle Charging Stations
- Public Access to Car Share Programs
- Pedestrian Countdown Timers
- Crosswalk Improvements
- Public Safety Enhancements (such as blue lights)
- Divvy Station Sponsorship
- Public Bike Parking
Other Local Municipalities
Preliminary research indicates that other municipalities have enacted ordinances which vary in whether or how they address public benefits. For example, the Village of Skokie provides for the imposition of reasonable contributions, including dedications of land for public purposes, installation of streetscape infrastructure, and/or preservation of areas containing significant natural, environmental, or historic resources. The Village of Wilmette requires benefits to grant exceptions to district regulations for Planned Developments including community amenities, preservation of historic structures, adaptive reuse, preservation of environmental features, public open space, public infrastructure, affordable or accessible dwelling units, and/or sustainable design. The City of Highland Park requires public benefits, which include sustainable building and site design, streetscape improvements, and/or downtown improvements.

A number of other municipalities either do not have ordinances that require public benefits for planned developments or have requirements for impact fees relating to all residential development. Impact fees are more common in jurisdictions where considerable open land exists that requires new infrastructure in order to be developed.

Incentive Zoning
Some municipalities have implemented incentive based zoning regulations, where developers are granted development bonuses (i.e. increased height, floor area ratio, etc.) as a result of certain development criteria (i.e. green roofs, preservation, increased building setbacks, and other urban design features). This approach was included in the Form Based Zoning component of the 2009 Downtown Plan that was proposed in the plan, but never codified.

City of Chicago – Neighborhood Opportunity Fund
The City of Chicago moved away from an incentive based downtown zoning strategy in 2016 with the establishment of the Neighborhood Opportunity Bonus. The Neighborhood Opportunity Bonus essentially allows developments to voluntarily purchase additional FAR in specified areas adjacent to downtown where a map amendment is requested in the form of a planned development. Cash contributions for additional FAR are allocated toward the Neighborhood Opportunity Fund (80%) used for economic development in underserved areas of the City, Local Impact Fund (10%) to support improvements near the site, and Adopt-a-Landmark Fund (10%) to restore structures designated as official landmarks.

Attachments
Public Benefits approved per 9 recent Planned Development Ordinances
City of Chicago, Neighborhood Opportunity Bonus system
Applicant shall provide one free public benefit membership for each unit who is not on record as having paid the Evanston water tax for any vehicles registered out of state.

Applicant shall provide one free Divvy or similar car-share membership for each unit who is not on record as having paid the Evanston water tax for any vehicles registered out of state.

Applicant must provide one free transit pass for each unit, based on each unit lessee’s annual gross income at 50% AMI, 60% AMI, and 80% AMI.

Must provide one free transit pass for each unit, based on each unit lessee’s annual gross income at 50% AMI, 60% AMI, and 80% AMI.

Applicant must provide two on-site affordable housing one-bedroom units to household earning at or below 150% AMI. The applicant must submit a compliance report by Jan 31 of each year to the Housing Division of the Com. Div. Department showing the unit number, number of bedrooms, tenant name, number of persons in each affordable household unit, annual gross income of each affordable housing unit, date of income certification and monthly rental. The report must include the list of any utilities included in the rent.

Applicant agrees to provide two on-site affordable housing one-bedroom units to household earning at or below 150% AMI. The applicant must submit a compliance report by Jan 31 of each year to the Housing Division of the Com. Div. Department showing the unit number, number of bedrooms, tenant name, number of persons in each affordable household unit, annual gross income of each affordable housing unit, date of income certification and monthly rental. The report must include the list of any utilities included in the rent.

Applicant must provide one free car-share membership for each unit registered out of state. Must arrange for two car-share spaces to be provided along Central St with a arrangement with a common third party commercial car-share company.

Applicant must provide a $2,400,000 sponsorship to the Divvy bike share program prior to issuance of building permit.

Applicant shall provide one free Enterprise car-share membership for each unit registered out of state. Must arrange for two car-share spaces to be provided along Central St with a arrangement with a common third party commercial car-share company.

Applicant must arrange for two car-share spaces to be provided along Central St with a arrangement with a common third party commercial car-share company. Must make a one-time $10,000 sponsorship for the Divvy bike share program prior to issuance of building permit.

Applicant must provide a $10,000 sponsorship to the Divvy bike share program prior to issuance of building permit.

Applicant must provide a $10,000 sponsorship to the Divvy bike share program prior to issuance of building permit.

Applicant shall provide one free CTA Transit Tracker display board in the building lobby area.

Applicant must provide one free transit pass for each unit, based on each unit lessee’s annual gross income at 50% AMI, 60% AMI, and 80% AMI.

Applicant must provide one free transit pass for each unit, based on each unit lessee’s annual gross income at 50% AMI, 60% AMI, and 80% AMI.

Applicant must provide one free transit pass for each unit, based on each unit lessee’s annual gross income at 50% AMI, 60% AMI, and 80% AMI.

Applicant shall provide one free public benefit membership for each unit who is not on record as having paid the Evanston water tax for any vehicles registered out of state.

Applicant shall provide one free Divvy or similar car-share membership for each unit who is not on record as having paid the Evanston water tax for any vehicles registered out of state.

Applicant shall provide one free CTA Transit Tracker display board or like system as information/technology changes within building lobby not visible from adjacent sidewalk in perpetuity.

Applicant shall provide one free Divvy or similar car-share membership for each unit who is not on record as having paid the Evanston water tax for any vehicles registered out of state.

Must provide two on-site car-share spaces through a third party commercial car-share company.

Must provide one free transit pass for each unit, based on each unit lessee’s annual gross income at 50% AMI, 60% AMI, and 80% AMI.

Must provide one free transit pass for each unit, based on each unit lessee’s annual gross income at 50% AMI, 60% AMI, and 80% AMI.

Must provide one free transit pass for each unit, based on each unit lessee’s annual gross income at 50% AMI, 60% AMI, and 80% AMI.

Applicant shall provide one free Divvy or similar car-share membership for each unit who is not on record as having paid the Evanston water tax for any vehicles registered out of state.

Applicant shall provide one free Divvy or similar car-share membership for each unit who is not on record as having paid the Evanston water tax for any vehicles registered out of state.

Applicant shall provide one free Divvy or similar car-share membership for each unit who is not on record as having paid the Evanston water tax for any vehicles registered out of state.

Applicant shall provide one free Divvy or similar car-share membership for each unit who is not on record as having paid the Evanston water tax for any vehicles registered out of state.

Applicant shall provide one free Divvy or similar car-share membership for each unit who is not on record as having paid the Evanston water tax for any vehicles registered out of state.

Applicant shall provide one free Divvy or similar car-share membership for each unit who is not on record as having paid the Evanston water tax for any vehicles registered out of state.

Applicant shall provide one free Divvy or similar car-share membership for each unit who is not on record as having paid the Evanston water tax for any vehicles registered out of state.

Applicant shall provide one free Divvy or similar car-share membership for each unit who is not on record as having paid the Evanston water tax for any vehicles registered out of state.

Applicant shall provide one free Divvy or similar car-share membership for each unit who is not on record as having paid the Evanston water tax for any vehicles registered out of state.

Applicant shall provide one free Divvy or similar car-share membership for each unit who is not on record as having paid the Evanston water tax for any vehicles registered out of state.

Applicant shall provide one free Divvy or similar car-share membership for each unit who is not on record as having paid the Evanston water tax for any vehicles registered out of state.

Applicant shall provide one free Divvy or similar car-share membership for each unit who is not on record as having paid the Evanston water tax for any vehicles registered out of state.

Applicant shall provide one free Divvy or similar car-share membership for each unit who is not on record as having paid the Evanston water tax for any vehicles registered out of state.

Applicant shall provide one free Divvy or similar car-share membership for each unit who is not on record as having paid the Evanston water tax for any vehicles registered out of state.
**Public Benefit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>128-130 Chicago Ave.</th>
<th>1727 Oak Ave.</th>
<th>1450 Sherman Ave.</th>
<th>831 Emerson St.</th>
<th>824 Noyes St.</th>
<th>1815 Ridge/Oak Ave.</th>
<th>1620 Central St.</th>
<th>1571 Maple Ave.</th>
<th>835 Chicago Ave.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Must install all improvements to the streets, including grading of existing pavement parkings, restriping, and asphalt patching at new water/sewer services within the Howard St and Chicago Ave roadway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Must install crosswalks at east side of Ridge Ave and Clark St intersection, east side of Clark St and Oak Ave intersection, all sides of Church St and Oak Ave intersection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install and maintain landscaping improvements as depicted in Exhibit E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Install and maintain stormwater improvements along Ridge Ave including curb extensions, restriping, and additional signage as depicted in Exhibit E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must install all improvements to the midblock crosswalk on Oak Avenue including curb extensions, restriping, and additional signage as depicted in Exhibit E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Must install and maintain stormwater improvements along Lake Street and Sherman Avenue as depicted in Exhibit E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must install visibility signage pointing to transit service at the Davis Street Metra, Chicago Transit Authority, Pace and Divvy stations. Will also be installed to direct safe pedestrian route to Dempster Street and CTA station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Must install 18 bicycle parking spaces near Evanston rail line.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must contribute $15,000 to the City towards the installation of pedestrian countdown timers when the City conducts traffic light updates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Must install multiple green roofs as approved in Exhibit C of the ordinance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must install landscaping as approved in Exhibit C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>applicant agrees to work with the waste management company to assure the alley is passable during waste collection/or pick-up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant agrees to sign a lease for 101 parking spaces at Maple Ave garage for 7 years initially. After the first 7 years, the parking lease agreement can be modified every five years. The applicant must hold valid parking lease with the City of Evanston for the lifetime of the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant will implement following strategies to improve and incorporate bird friendly measures: install low reflective glass windows, install metal balcony railing rather than glass doors and balconies, minimize external lighting from 12:30 am to dawn during spring and fall migration; and avoid guy wires and roof lighting that pose a bird hazard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Building</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant agrees to be in full compliance with LEED 55 standards for Zone 1 of the building (36 feet above grade) and 12 feet above any green roof.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant will create a publicly accessible pocket park on the South end of the subject property as depicted in Exhibit B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Must provide one on-site electric vehicle charging station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant agrees to sign a lease for 101 parking spaces at Maple Ave garage for 7 years initially. After the first 7 years, the parking lease agreement can be modified every five years. The applicant must hold valid parking lease with the City of Evanston for the lifetime of the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant agrees to prepare and record an access easement for the benefit of two properties to the west for trash pick-up along north side of parking lot. A copy of the recorded document must be submitted prior to building permit issuance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant agrees to work with the waste management company to assure the alley is passable during waste collection/or pick-up.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Benefit</td>
<td>128-130 Chicago Ave.</td>
<td>1727 Oak Ave.</td>
<td>1450 Sherman Ave.</td>
<td>831 Emerson St.</td>
<td>824 Noyes St.</td>
<td>1815 Ridge/Oak Ave.</td>
<td>1620 Central St.</td>
<td>1571 Maple Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant will contribute $50,000 to ETHS Entrepreneurship/Apprentice Program for on-site teaching of students. Will create 18-month training workshop.</td>
<td>Must replace existing wood fence along the west property line belonging to the townhouse association adjacent to the west.</td>
<td>Must install two landscape seating areas on private property along Maple Ave.</td>
<td>Must pay $72,281 for permanent loss of 4 on-street metered parking spaces to the City's Parking Fund prior to issuance of temp CO.</td>
<td>Must waive any tenant leasing application, move-in, or similar rental fees to be paid in advance of leasing space for employees of Evanston's 10 largest employers.</td>
<td>Must include commercial space along Davis St.</td>
<td>Applicant agrees to hire a minimum of 5 Evanston residents, with a primary goal of 10, during construction.</td>
<td>Must provide on-site parking for public with two-hour limits between 11am and 5 pm. Management company must manage and arrange for violators to be towed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan Commission

2019 Meeting Schedule &
Election of Officers and Assignment of Committee Members and Liaisons
Memorandum

To: Members of the Plan Commission
From: Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Subject: Proposed 2019 meeting dates for the Plan Commission
Date: December 7, 2018

Evanston Plan Commission Meeting Schedule 2018

Below are the proposed meeting times of the Evanston Plan Commission. The meetings are scheduled on the second Wednesday of each month. All meetings start at 7PM and are located in City Council Chambers unless otherwise noted.

Wednesday, January 9, 2019
Wednesday, February 13, 2019
Wednesday, March 13, 2019
Wednesday, April 10, 2019
Wednesday, May 8, 2019
Wednesday, June 12, 2019
Wednesday, July 10, 2019
Wednesday, August 14, 2019
Wednesday, September 11, 2019
Wednesday, October 9, 2019
Wednesday, November 13, 2019
Wednesday, December 11, 2019

Note: Additional meetings may be scheduled as needed on the fourth Wednesday of each month.

The Zoning Committee of the Plan Commission meetings will be scheduled on per need basis on the third Wednesday of the month.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2018 Appointments</strong></th>
<th><strong>Meets:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Members:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Isaac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning Committee</strong></td>
<td>On a Per Need Basis - 3rd Wednesday of each Month; 7 pm</td>
<td>Dubin, Goddard, Isaac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Committee Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comp Plan Committee</strong></td>
<td>On a Per Need Basis - 2nd Tuesday of each Month; 7:30 am</td>
<td>Dubin (Chair), Lewis, Pigozzi, Brown, Halik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp Plan Committee Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dubin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rules Committee</strong></td>
<td>On a Per Need Basis Fridays: 7:30 am</td>
<td>Lewis, Isaac, Goddard (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules Committee Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goddard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liaisons (Click Committee Name for Description):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Committee</td>
<td>4th Wednesday of each Month; 7:30 pm</td>
<td>Andrew Pigozzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Development Committee</td>
<td>Before Regular City Council Monday Meetings; 7:00 pm</td>
<td>Colby Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Community Development Act Committee</td>
<td>3rd Tuesday of each Month; 7:00 pm</td>
<td>Carol Goddard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Parking Committee</td>
<td>4th Wednesday of each Month; 6 pm</td>
<td>Terri Dubin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>