PLAN COMMISSION
Wednesday, February 26, 2020
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: Minutes will be available at the next Plan Commission meeting

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. Planned Development
1555 Ridge Avenue 19PLND-0108
Thomas Meador, applicant, submits for Special Use for a Planned Development to construct a 5-story, 68 dwelling unit multi-family residence with 57 off-street parking spaces in the R6 General Residential District. The applicant seeks site development allowances for: 1) A 3 ft. setback along the north property line where 15 ft. is required for dwelling units, 2) No landscaping where a 10 ft. transition landscaped strip is required along the north property line, 3) A 10 ft. X 25 ft. loading space with 1 ft. rear yard setback where a 10 ft. X 35 ft. loading space with a 3 ft. rear yard setback is required. 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. Subdivision & Major Adjustment to a Planned Development
1619 Chicago Avenue 19PLND-0059
The applicant, Horizon Realty Group, submits for a subdivision and Major Adjustment to a Planned Development in the D4 Downtown Transition District. The requested adjustment will increase FAR from 3.15 to 4.2, increase parking spaces from 32 (23 on-site, 9 leased) to 38 (all leased off-site), and a decrease in total number of units from 205 to 186 (includes 65 dwelling units). No new site development allowance will be needed.

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

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

La ciudad de Evanston está obligada a hacer accesibles todas las reuniones públicas a las personas minusválidas o las 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. Planned Development
   1621 Chicago Avenue 18PLND-0112
   The applicant, Horizon Realty Group, submits a planned development application to construct a 19-story apartment building with 240 units, 85 subterranean parking spaces, and approximately 3,540 sq. ft. of ground floor retail space in the D4 Downtown Transition District. Site development allowances are being requested for: 1) a building height of 211 ft. 8 in. where 105 ft. is allowed, 2) an FAR of 11.62 where a maximum of 5.4 is allowed, 3) 240 dwelling units where 54 is maximum is allowed, 4) 85 parking spaces where a minimum 185 is required, and 5) 1 short loading berth where 2 short loading berths are required. 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.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

5. ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the Plan Commission is scheduled for WEDNESDAY, March 11, 2020 at 7:00 P.M. in JAMES C. LYTLE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.
Planned Development
1555 Ridge Avenue
19PLND-0108

Plan Commission
Recommending Body
Memorandum

To: Chair and Members of the Plan Commission

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

Subject: Planned Development
1555 Ridge, 19PLND-0108

Date: February 21, 2020

Request

Thomas Meador, applicant, submits for Special Use for a Planned Development to construct a 5-story, 68 dwelling unit multi-family residence with 57 off-street parking spaces in the R6 General Residential District. The applicant seeks site development allowances for: 1) A 3’ setback along the north property line where 15’ is required for dwelling units, 2) No landscaping where a 10’ transition landscaped strip is required along the north property line, and 3) A 10’ X 25’ loading space with 1.5’ rear yard setback where a 10’ X 35’ loading space with a 3’ rear yard setback is required.

Notice
The Application has been filed in conformance with applicable procedural and public notice requirements.

General Information

Applicant: Thomas Meador
GLPE, LLC
1259 W. Madison St.
Chicago, IL 60607

Owner(s): Ridge Grove, LLC
832 Custer Ave.
Evanston, IL 60202

Existing Zoning: R6 General Residential District
Existing Land Use: Surface Parking Lot

Property Size: 32,518 sq. ft. (.75 acres)

PINs: 11-18-308-016-0000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surrounding Zoning and Land Uses</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>R6 General Residential District</td>
<td>Multi-Family Residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>R1 Single Family Residential District &amp; R5 General Residential District</td>
<td>St. Mark’s Church, Single Family Residences &amp; Multi-family Residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>R6 General Residential District</td>
<td>Single Family Residences, Multi-Family Residences, Time and Glass Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>OS Open Space District &amp; R4 General Residential District</td>
<td>Alexander Park and Roycemore School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

Project Description
The applicant proposes to construct a 5-story residential building with 68 dwelling units having a mix of 7 studio, 20 one-bedroom (including a ground floor unit) and 41 two-bedroom units. There are 57 ground level parking spaces (14 exterior, 43 interior). There will be

The site consists of a single parcel at the northeast corner of Ridge Ave. and Grove St. that is currently a surface parking lot. A Major Variation was approved by Council on December 9, 2019 allowing 1570 Oak Ave., a major user of the lot, to lease 57 required off-street parking spaces in a lot more than 1,000 feet from the subject property in the City’s Maple Avenue garage. Additional parking spaces are utilized by others in the neighborhood (Margarita Inn, postal service employees, etc.) but is not required parking for those uses. Surrounding uses include multi-family buildings to the north, Roycemore School and Alexander Park to the west, St. Mark’s Church and multi-family residences to the south, and single-family residences, multi-family residences and the Time & Glass Museum to the east.
Proposed Planned Development Site Plan

Site Layout:
The site is an irregularly shaped square lot with 180.1 ft. of frontage along Grove St. and 175.6 ft. of frontage along Ridge Ave. The building is set back 15 ft. from Grove St. and 21 ft. 10.5 in. from Ridge Ave. (the average setback along this block of Ridge Ave is 21 ft.). The 30 ft. rear building setback also exceeds the minimum of 25 feet that is required. There is a 3 ft. building setback along the north property line which the applicant is requesting a site development allowance for.

Parking and a loading berth for the building will be accessed off of the alley just east of the property. 14 parking spaces will be located on the exterior of the building and two entryways will provide access to the 43 interior parking spaces (including 3 ADA accessible parking spaces. Two exterior parking spaces are proposed to be set aside as visitor parking spaces. Some landscaping will be added along Grove St. to partially shield the surface parking area from the street. Exterior bike parking will be placed adjacent to the alley off of Grove Street and an interior bike room will be accessible from the lobby area and the garage for a total of 41 parking spaces. A single one-bedroom unit with a small patio will have its own entry off of Ridge Ave. The 4 upper level floors will be solely dedicated to residential units, each with its own inset balcony.
Building materials for the proposed development include a beige precast stone base, coping and banding with a dark modular face brick and accented with limestone headers and sills at the windows. Balconies will be steel with decorative aluminum railings. The portions of the building facade with a larger balcony area will be cast stone cladding. The ground floor parking areas will have frosted glass windows to shield from vehicle lighting. The east and north facades will include HVAC louvres on the smaller windows provided on those elevations. The applicant will also utilize roof-mounted solar panels for hot water heating throughout the building. The DAPR Committee and staff feel design improvements should continue to be made to improve the aesthetics of the building for it to better fit into the context of the of the surrounding neighborhood, some of which is within the Ridge Historic District.

Compliance with the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (IHO)
The Applicant is proposing to provide three on-site affordable units (1 one-bedroom and 2 two-bedroom units) and provide a $525,000 fee-in-lieu payment. This proposal complies with the IHO requirement of 5% on-site affordable units and payment of a fee-in-lieu for the remaining 5% of the required 10% compliance and enables the applicant to obtain development incentives for parking, building lot coverage and impervious surface coverage.
Compliance with the Zoning Ordinance

The intent of the R6 General Residential District is “provide for high density residential development of primarily multiple-family dwellings particularly in and around the downtown area.”

The applicant requests three Site Development Allowances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Development Allowance Requested</th>
<th>Required / Max. Permitted in the R6 District</th>
<th>Site Development Allowance Max.</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling unit setback from the north property line</td>
<td>15 ft.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition landscape strip</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3 ft. w/ no landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unenclosed Loading Berth</td>
<td>10 ft. X 35 ft. w/ 3 ft. setback</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10 ft. X 25 ft. w/ 1.5 ft. setback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed building height is 66 ft. which is significantly shorter than the maximum height of 85 ft. permitted in the R6 District.

**Setback and Landscaping:**
The applicant is proposing a 3 ft. building setback along the north property line. For planned developments, a 15 ft. setback from all property lines is required for dwelling units (items such as amenity spaces, interior parking or lobby space must meet the underlying zoning district’s setback requirements). The ground floor dwelling unit and upper level units do not meet this setback. Similarly, a 10 ft. landscaped transition strip is required along the north property line which is not proposed to be provided by the
applicant. The applicant has noted that the multi-family residential building to the north is setback from the shared property line with its driveway providing separation between the building and the property line.

**Parking and Loading:**
The applicant proposes to provide a shortened loading berth (10 ft. X 25 ft.) in the rear yard of the lot with a 1.5 ft. setback from the rear property line (adjacent to the alley). The requirement is for a 10 ft. X 35 ft. loading berth with a 3 ft. setback from the rear property line. In the applicant’s experience, in their other developments, the size of trucks utilized is between 15-25 ft. and would not need a full loading berth size. Staff does have some concern regarding the configuration of the loading berth being parallel to the alley and whether a truck would be able to maneuver without difficulty or possibly clipping other vehicles in the parking area.

**Parking and Traffic**
Based on the number and type of dwelling units proposed (7 studio units, 20 one-bedroom units, and 41 two-bedroom units) and the incentives obtained for providing on-site affordable units, the proposed building is required to have a total of 57 parking spaces. The applicant is proposing a total of 57 parking spaces, 43 interior and 14 exterior (0.84 per dwelling unit and .52 per bedroom), for the proposed development.

The Applicant provided a multi-modal transportation study conducted by KLOA which looked at the possible effects the proposed development may have on traffic in the area. The study noted that the site is considered a Transit Oriented Development that served by several nearby CTA bus lines and is within walking distance of the Davis Street CTA and Metra transit stations. It also noted that, at the Ridge Ave. and Grove St. intersection turns are prohibited between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, specifically: westbound and eastbound through movements, westbound left turns, eastbound left turns and northbound and southbound left turns.

At peak travel times, 24 additional trips are estimated to be generated from the development in the morning and 30 additional trips are estimated to be generated from the development in the evening. A full breakdown of the transportation modes generating these trips is in the chart generated by KLOA below:
Table taken from KLOA Multi-Modal Study

The study concludes that, given the proposed development’s proximity to transit that the building will be a low traffic generator and have minimal effect on nearby roadways and intersections in the area. It noted that providing access to parking from the adjacent north-south alley would minimize the possible conflicts with vehicles and pedestrians and that the parking provided meets City requirements and should be adequate for the development. Staff expressed some concern regarding pick-ups and drop-offs as well as visitor parking. The applicant has since proposed a “bump-out” curb to discourage cars from standing at the intersection (near the building entrance) and encourage slower turns onto Grove St. The applicant is also proposing high visibility crosswalks, crossing Grove St.

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

1) Significant, high quality, landscaping along Ridge Avenue and Grove Street to be installed and maintained in adherence with the Mayor’s Monarch Pledge, at a projected additional installation cost of $20,000, and annual maintenance costs of $2,500;

2) Seven exterior bicycle parking spaces on Grove open to the public or visitors to the site, at which the applicant will explore locating dock-less Lyft/DIVVY bikes;

3) Contribution of $20,000 either to improve Alexander Park, or to support recreational programming at Evanston’s public parks in general. The applicant will work with the parks/public works department to identify the best way to invest
4) Addition of a “bumped-out” curb on Grove street at the corner of Ridge Avenue and Grove Street to discourage vehicles from standing at that corner and to encourage slower turns onto Ridge Avenue;
5) Reconstruction of the full length of the alley between Grove Street and Davis Street next east of Ridge Avenue (cost estimated between $17,000 and $21,000);
6) Addition of high visibility striping on Grove Street at the intersection of Grove Street and Ridge Avenue.

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

The proposed development is also largely consistent with the Plan objectives to maintain the appealing character of Evanston’s neighborhoods while guiding their change and maintain and enhance property values and positive perceptions of housing in Evanston. It will be taking an under-utilized property and replacing it with a 68 unit residential building that is below the maximum height requirement in the district. As a higher density development located within walking distance of the Davis Street transit station, this Transit Oriented Development (TOD) will be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s vision to provide higher density housing near transit stations and along major corridors. The façade attempts to be contextual with the surrounding existing multi-family residences in the area. Staff has expressed a desire to see improvements to the façade which the Applicant has been working to achieve.

Compliance with the Design Guidelines for Planned Developments
The proposed building is consistent with the Design Guidelines for Planned Developments. The building massing is appropriate in scale and context to the site, and provides a transition in massing and height from the larger office and multiple family residential buildings east down to the smaller scale single family residences to the south and west. The use of building materials breaks up the mass of the façade into smaller portions and the ground floor unit and windows around the enclosed parking help to make a more inviting experience for pedestrians. The proposed bump out at the northeast corner of Grove St. and Ridge Ave. (crossing Grove St.) also adds to the safety of that crosswalk and discourages vehicles from sitting at the intersection.

The proposal has been reviewed by the Design and Project Review committee over several meetings. Comments were made regarding the loading configuration, refuse pick-up, ground level exterior design and the overall design of the façade and material use. Revisions have been made to the building addressing most of these concerns,
including revisions following the latest DAPR meeting.

DAPR Committee Review
The Design and Project Review Committee reviewed the proposed Planned Development at its January 8th, January 22nd and February 12, 2020 meetings. The Committee expressed concern regarding the rear loading configurations and trash pick-up in addition to requesting changes to the façade to create a more active ground floor and contextual façade. The Applicant made changes to the building design, creating a ground floor unit, increasing the size of ground floor windows and altering the location of the loading berth. The Committee voted to move the proposed development forward without a recommendation as the Applicant continues to work on the concerns raised, the loading area and balcony design still being of concern. Additional updates to the façade have been received addressing some of these concerns. Staff will continue to work with the applicant on the overall building design, materials and colors throughout the formal review process.

Standards of Approval
The proposed development must satisfy the Standards for Special Use in Section 6-3-5-10, the Standard for Planned Development in Section 6-3-6-9, and the standards and guidelines established for Planned Developments in the R6 General Residential District. Staff finds that, with additional improvement to the aesthetic design and continued look at the loading area the proposed Planned Development meets the Standards for approval.

*Standards for Special Use (Section 6-3-5-10)*
A Planned Development is an eligible special use in the R6 General Residential District. The proposal also follows the purposes and policies outlined in the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance.

Staff does not believe the proposed development will cause a negative cumulative effect when considered in conjunction with other special uses in the area. Surrounding uses include single family (attached and detached) residences, higher density multi-family residences, and a school. This development is of a medium scale and provides several affordable units on-site.

The proposal can be adequately served by public facility infrastructure already available. As there are multiple utility infrastructure lines on the existing poles besides ComEd, the Applicant prefers pole relocation to burying all utilities. The City would prefer that utilities be buried wherever possible.

The applicant submitted a traffic study that found that there will be a minimal increase in the amount of trips generated by the proposed development. There remains some concern regarding the loading area off of the alley, which although revised, may still pose maneuvering issues for trucks.
There are no significant historical and architectural resources or environmental features present on the site. Finally, the proposal meets all zoning requirements except for the three site development allowances requested and outlined above.

Standards and Guidelines for Planned Developments in R6 General Residential District (Sections 6-3-6-9 and 6-8-1-10)
The proposed Planned Development complies with the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposal is compatible in bulk, scale and land use with surrounding properties. The proposal is consistent with the vision and goals of the Comprehensive Plan for redevelopment of underutilized properties with uses compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

The proposed site development allowances are necessary for a desirable redevelopment of the site with public benefits. The proposed development is compatible with other similar developments in the area and is not of such nature in height, bulk and scale to exercise any influence contrary to the purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance.

Recommendation
Given the upgrades that the applicant has made to the proposed development following the DAPR recommendation, Planning & Zoning staff recommends the Plan Commission provide a favorable recommendation for the approval of a Planned Development for 1555 Ridge Ave. subject to the following conditions:

1) The applicant shall continue to work on the aesthetic design of the building additions.
2) The applicant must agree to a Construction Management Plan (CMP) before issuance of the building permit.
3) The proposed planned development shall substantially conform to the documents and testimony on record.
4) Significant, high quality, landscaping along Ridge Avenue and Grove Street to be installed and maintained in adherence with the Mayor’s Monarch Pledge, at a projected additional installation cost of $20,000, and annual maintenance costs of $2,500;
5) Seven exterior bicycle parking spaces on Grove open to the public or visitors to the site, at which the applicant will explore locating dock-less Lyft/DIVVY bikes;
6) Contribution of $20,000 either to improve Alexander Park, or to support recreational programming at Evanston's public parks in general. The applicant will work with the parks/public works department to identify the best way to invest these funds;
7) Addition of a “bumped-out” curb on Grove street at the corner of Ridge Avenue and Grove Street to discourage vehicles from standing at that corner and to encourage slower turns onto Ridge Avenue;
8) Reconstruction of the full length of the alley between Grove Street and Davis Street next east of Ridge Avenue (cost estimated between $17,000 and $21,000);
9) Addition of high visibility crosswalk striping on Grove Street at the intersection of Grove Street and Ridge Avenue.

Attachments

Proposed Development Plans
Zoning Analysis – updated February 5, 2020
Multi-Modal Transportation Study
Comments received as of February 20, 2020
Meeting Minutes -January 8, 2020 DAPR Meeting
Meeting Minutes – January 22, 2020 DAPR Meeting
Draft Meeting Minutes Excerpt – February 12, 2020 DAPR Meeting

[Link to full Planned Development Application]
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OR CA-6 STONE) AND 2" CLASS
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EXISTING

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
THE SOUTH 25 FEET OF LOT 10 AND ALL OF LOTS 11 AND 12 IN BLOCK 41 IN EVANSTON IN THE SOUTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 18,
TOWNSHIP 41 NORTH, RANGE 14, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

COMMONLY KNOWN AS:
205 ROSE AVENUE EVANSTON ILLINOIS

GROUND PREPARED SUBGRADE
EXISTING PAVEMENT
EXISTING SOIL:
10' MIN
5:1 SLOPE

TURF GRASS SEED MIX:
TIMOTHY-33.3% / ORCHARDGRASS-33.3% / KENTUCKY BLUEGRASS-33.3%, SEEDING RATE=70 LBS./ACRE AND COMMON OATS=30 LBS./ACRE FOR A TOTAL 100 LBS./ACRE. OVERSEED WITH 10 LBS./ACRE ANNUAL RYE. SEEDING.

SOD:
16) Sod all unpaved areas of parkways, right-of-ways and front yards to rear wall of the building.
15) Water courses and drainage swales adjacent to construction activities shall be monitored as
necessary for evidence of silt intrusion and other adverse environmental impacts.
14) Any gate in the perimeter fence shall be adequately hinged to prevent entry, except to allow ingress
and egress to and from site, such gate must be looked at all times, other than permitted hours of
use.
13) "No trespassing" signs shall be mounted on the fencing in conspicuous locations until construction
is completed and approved.
12) Erosion controls shall be kept within practical limits as directed by the Village Engineer.
11) Dust produced from the site shall be kept to a minimum during dry periods by spraying water as
required to the Village Engineer's satisfaction and is to be considered incidental.
10) Sedimentation shall be retained on site. Sediment fence shall be installed along the
perimeter of all regraded areas or as required to prevent sediment from entering and/or leaving
the site.
9) All temporary fences shall be designed and installed to form a complete enclosure around the
construction area. Fencing shall be free of deficiencies which may impede safe egress of emergency
personnel.
8) The contractor shall take precautionary measures to minimize earthwork in areas where trees are to
be saved as shown on the plans or determined in the field.
7) The contractor shall maintain the approved drawings, mitigation and permit requirements.
6) The contractor shall be responsible for all site work including grading, earthwork, water courses,
drainage, erosion and sedimentation control.
5) Within the limits of proposed grading the soil shall be compacted to not less than the following
percentages of modified proctor dry density in accordance with ASTM D 1557-78:
Under structures. Building slabs, steps and pavements. Compact six (6") inch maximum lifts of dry subgrade, backfill,
subgrade
Under walkways. Compact six (6") inch maximum lifts of dry subgrade, backfill,
subgrade
All other. Compact six (6") inch maximum lifts of dry subgrade, backfill,
subgrade
4. Contractor shall verify the exact elevation and location of all existing utilities and appurtenances
before the end of each day.
3. In order to protect and ensure against flooding the contractor shall:
a) Submittal of a Notice of Intent (NOI) to IEPA.
b) Under walkways. Compact six (6") inch maximum lifts of dry subgrade, backfill,
subgrade
Under structures. Building slabs, steps and pavements. Compact six (6") inch maximum lifts of dry subgrade, backfill,
subgrade
c) Weekly reports after ½" rainfall or 5" snowfall.
d) Submittal of an Incidence of Noncompliance (ION) if an event occurs.
e) Documentation of changes to ESC plan
f) Documentation of changes to water management plan.
1. Contractor to take all OSHA safety.
### Table: Proposed Imperial Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Type</th>
<th>Area (sq ft)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Slab Area</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Gravel &amp; Landscaping</td>
<td>26,250</td>
<td>45.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diagram: Proposed Residential Building

- **11-20-2019**
- **Project Number:** 19452
- **Start Date:** Nov. 05, 2019
- **Scale:** 1"=20'-0"
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NOTE:
- REFER TO L1.02 FOR PLANTING SCHEDULE
- SEE SHEET #3 OF CIVIL PLANS FOR TOPOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION.
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PROPOSED TREES TO BE REMOVED DURING CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACED 1@ 10" CAL AND 2@ 8" CAL.

BIKE RACK
**PLANTING NOTES**

1. **LANDSCAPING CONTRACTOR** (Contractor) shall visit the site, inspect existing conditions and review proposed planting and related work. In case of discrepancy between plan and plant list, plan shall govern quantities.

2. Contractor shall verify location of all on-site utilities prior to beginning construction on his phase of work. Electric, gas, telephone, and cable television may be located by calling J.U.L.I.E. at (1-800-892-0123), and Badger pipeline may be located by calling Digger’s Hotline at (1-800-242-8511). Any damage or interruption of services shall be the responsibility of the Contractor. Contractor shall coordinate all related activities with other trades on the job and shall report any unacceptable job conditions to Owners Representative prior to commencing work.

3. Contractor responsible for application and cost of all necessary building permits and code verifications. Submit copies of all documents to Owner and the Architect.

4. All shrub bed and trees shall be mulched with a 3” continuous layer of shredded bark. All ground cover and perennial beds shall be mulched with a 1” layer of shredded bark. All deciduous trees shall be mulched with a 3 ft. diameter circle mulch. All evergreen trees shall be mulched to the drip line.

5. Perennial and ground cover beds shall be amended with a 2” layer of mushroom compost, tilled to a depth of 6”, raked smooth, fertilized with commercial 10-6-4 fertilizer at a rate of 25 lbs. per 1000 S.F. planted, covered with 1” layer of shredded bark mulch and watered.

6. Edging to be EDG-KING brand plastic edging or approved equal. EDG-KING to be installed with horizontal steel stakes at 36” spacing. Install per manufacturer’s specifications in all areas indicated on plan. Provide manufactured joints and 90º degree fittings at all corners.

7. The topsoil condition for this project site is as follows:
   - Contractor will be required to place and finish grade topsoil supplied by others at specified depths in planting and lawn areas. (Planting areas [12 inches], Lawn areas [6 inches]).

8. Guarantee of plants for one (1) year shall begin after acceptance by the Architect and/or Owner. The Owner shall assume maintenance responsibilities of all plant material, including watering, cultivating, weeding, mulching, and spraying as necessary to keep plants free of insects and in a healthy, vigorous condition. The Contractor shall guarantee all plants to be in a healthy, vigorous condition for a period of one (1) year following acceptance. Contractor shall replace without cost to the Owner, any dead or unacceptable plants, as determined by the Architect during and at the end of the Guaranteed Period. Subsequent replacement of plant material shall be borne jointly by Contractor and Owner. Owner will pay wholesale cost of plant material, plus reasonable charge for delivery, and Contractor will bear cost of labor for installation per specifications.

9. Seeded lawn to be a combination of bluegrass, perennial rye and fescue with following analysis by weight: 30% Rugby Kentucky Bluegrass, 20% Park Kentucky Bluegrass, 20% Creeping Red Fescue, 20% Scaldis Hard Fescue, 10% perennial Ryegrass. Seed to be applied at a rate of 4 lbs per 1,000 S.F.. All seeded lawn areas shall be fertilized at installation with 0-26-26 analysis, at a rate of 6 lbs per 1,000 S.F.. Second application of 15-40-5 to be applied at a rate of 6 lbs per 1,000 S.F. after first cutting. Acceptance and guarantee notes shall apply to all seeded areas.

10. Acceptance of grading and seeding shall be by the Architect and Owner. The Contractor shall assume maintenance responsibilities for a minimum of sixty (60) days or until second cutting, whichever is longer. Maintenance shall include watering, weeding, reseeding and other operations necessary to keep lawn in thriving condition. Upon final acceptance by the Architect and/or Owner, Owner shall assume all maintenance responsibilities. After lawn areas have germinated, areas which fail to show uniform stand of grass for any reason whatsoever shall be reseeded repeatedly until all areas are covered with a satisfactory stand of grass. Minimum acceptance of seeded lawn areas may include scattered bare spots, one of which are larger than 1 square foot and when combined do not exceed 2% of total seeded lawn area.
Zoning Analysis
Summary

1555 Ridge Ave.

Case Number:                Case Status/Determination:
19ZONA-0157                Non-Compliant

Proposal:
Planned Development: New 5-story, multi-family residence with 68 dwelling units and 57 parking spaces.

Zoning Section:   Comments:
6-8-1-10       Planned Development required.
6-8-8-3        Planned Developments are a Special Use in the R6 District. Special Uses require City Council approval after a recommendation from Plan Commission. For Planned Developments, site development allowances may be approved if the modification is essential to achieve at least one defined public benefit.
6-8-1-10-C-3   A 15 ft. setback for all dwelling units from all development boundary lines is required, 3 ft. is proposed.
6-8-1-10-B-3   10 ft. transition landscaped strip consisting of vegetative screening, fencing, or decorative walls is required along the north property line, none is proposed.
6-16-4-4 & 6-8-8-7 A 10 ft. X 25 ft. loading space with 1.5 ft. rear yard setback where a 10 ft. X 35 ft. loading space with a 3 ft. rear yard setback is required.
**City of Evanston**

**ZONING ANALYSIS REVIEW SHEET**

**APPLICATION STATUS:** September 24, 2019

**RESULTS OF ANALYSIS:** Non-Compliant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z.A. Number</th>
<th>19ZONA-0157</th>
<th>Purpose: Zoning Analysis without Bld Permit App</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address:</strong></td>
<td>1555 Ridge AVE</td>
<td><strong>District:</strong> R6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>Jay Keller</td>
<td><strong>Overlay:</strong> Preservation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone:</strong></td>
<td>3128296666</td>
<td><strong>Preservation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reviewer:</strong> Meagan Jones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X New Principal Structure</td>
<td>Change of Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Accessory Structure</td>
<td>Sidewalk Cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition to Structure</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration to Structure</td>
<td>Plot of Resubd/Cong Alternative Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention of Structure</td>
<td>Business License</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home Occupation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANALYSIS BASED ON:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plans Dated:</td>
<td>1.30.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared By:</td>
<td>Space Architects + Planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Dated:</td>
<td>6.3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Improvements:</td>
<td>Surface parking lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ZONING ANALYSIS**

---

**PLANNED DEVELOPMENT THRESHOLDS**

Does not apply to 11, 12, 13, OS, U3, or Excluded T1 & T2 Properties. See Section 6-8-1-10(D) for RS's; Section 6-8-1-9(D) for B's; Section 6-10-1-9(D) for C's; Section 6-11-1-10(D) for O's; Section 6-12-1-10(D) for RP; Section 6-13-1-10(D) for MU & MUE; Section 6-15-1-6 for D1, T4, U4, U5, ORE, & ORE.

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

   **Yes**

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

   **Yes**

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

   **Yes**

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

   **Yes**

---

**RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT CALCULATIONS**

The following three sections apply to building lot coverage and impervious surface calculations in Residential Districts.

- **Front Porch Exception (Subtract 50%)**
- **Pavers/Pervious Paver Exception (Subtract)**
- **Open Parking Debit (Add 200 sqft/open space)**

---

**PRINCIPAL USE AND STRUCTURE**

### Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARKING LOT</td>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>Dwelling - MF</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**Minimum Lot Width (LF):** 50

**USE:** Multi Family

**Minimum Lot Area (SF):** 5,000 sqft plus 400 sqft per dwelling unit therein

**USE:** Multi Family

**Comments:**

**Dwelling Units:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LF: Linear Feet</th>
<th>SF: Square Feet</th>
<th>FT: Foot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooming Units:</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Lot Coverage</td>
<td>21137 (with IHO bonus)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SF) (defined, including</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtractions&amp; additions):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: With IHO being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compliant (5% onsite units), a 15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bonus is applied for lot coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impervious Surface Coverage</td>
<td>25014 (with IHO bonus)</td>
<td>30700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SF, %)</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: With IHO being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compliant (5% onsite units), a 15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bonus is applied for impervious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surface coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Structure Rear Yard</td>
<td>40% of rear yard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Floor Area (SF) Use:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (FT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard(1) (FT) Direction: W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street: Ridge Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: Average setback on the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>block is 21 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard(2) (FT) Direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Side Yard (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction: S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street: Grove St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard(1) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction: N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: 15 ft minimum required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for planned developments with a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 ft landscaped buffer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard(2) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard (FT) Direction: E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACCESSORY USE AND STRUCTURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use (1)</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Districts: Open Off-street Parking</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Required Yard: Rear Yard</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LF: Linear Feet   SF: Square Feet   FT: Feet
### Additional Standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height (FT)</strong></td>
<td>Flat or mansard roof 14.5', ct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance from Principal Building</strong></td>
<td>10.00'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front Yard (1A) (FT)</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street</strong></td>
<td>Ridge Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front Yard (1B) (FT)</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Side Yard (FT)</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interior Side Yard (1A) (FT)</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interior Side Yard (1B) (FT)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rear Yard (FT)</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direction</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parking Requirements

| Use(1): Mulit-family (Res District)   | < 1 bdrm → 1 1/2/DU 2 bdrm → | 57       | Compliant     |
|                                       | 1 1/2/DU > 3 bdrm → 2 /DU     |          |               |

Comments:

### TOTAL REQUIRED:

\[(27\times 55)+(38\times 1.1)=56.7 = 57\]

Comments: includes HOA bonus which allows no parking requirement for on-site affordable units. one 1-bed, two 2-bed units
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Handicap Parking Spaces</td>
<td>Sec. 6-16-2-6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access:</td>
<td>Sec. 6-16-2-2</td>
<td>enclosed/open, alley access</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Clearance (LF)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&gt; 7'</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfacing:</td>
<td>Sec. 6-16-3-8 (E)</td>
<td>paved</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Sec. 6-4-6-2 and 6-8-8-7</td>
<td>enclosed/open, rear alley access</td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Loading space is located 1.5' from rear property line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Angle(1): 90 Degree</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Width(W) (FT)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth(D) (FT)</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aisle(A) (FT)</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module (FT)</td>
<td>SL 42.0, DL 60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Angle(2):</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Width(W) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth(D) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aisle(A) (FT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module (FT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Garage Setback from Alley Access (FT)

Comments:

### LOADING REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loading Use:</td>
<td>1 short 30K to 100K, 1 short each addtl. 200K.</td>
<td>1 short</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (long):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (short):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Berth Size (FT)</td>
<td>12' wide x 50' deep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Berth Size (FT)</td>
<td>10' wide x 35' deep</td>
<td>10' x 25'</td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Clearance (FT)</td>
<td>14'</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Open air loading berth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Sec. 6-16-4-1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis Comments:

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS

Results of Analysis: This Application is **Non-Compliant**

Site Plan & Appearance Review Committee approval is:

See attached comments and/or notes.

[Signature]

DATE: 2/5/20
MEMORANDUM TO: Katriina McGuire  
Thompson Coburn LLP

FROM: Elise Purguette  
Consultant  
Luay R. Aboona, PE, PTOE  
Principal

DATE: January 20, 2020

SUBJECT: Multi-Modal Transportation Study  
Proposed Multi-Family Residential Building  
Evanston, Illinois

This memorandum summarizes the findings of a multi-modal transportation study prepared by Kenig, Lindgren, O’Hara, Aboona, Inc. (KLOA, Inc.) for the proposed multi-family residential building to be located at 1555 Ridge Avenue in Evanston, Illinois. The site, which is currently occupied by a surface parking lot containing approximately 100 parking spaces, is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Ridge Avenue with Grove Street. As proposed, the site will be redeveloped with a five-story building that will contain 68 residential units (eight efficiency units, 20 one-bedroom units, and 40 two-bedroom units), a parking garage with 45 parking spaces, and 14 exterior parking spaces. Additionally, the proposed building will provide 40 bicycle parking spaces. Access to the parking garage will be provided off the north-south public alley located mid-block between Ridge Avenue and Oak Avenue. **Figure 1** shows an aerial view of the site.

The purpose of this memorandum is to summarize the traffic characteristics of the proposed multi-family residential building and determine the traffic estimated to be generated by the proposed multi-family residential building.
Aerial View of Site

Figure 1
Traffic Characteristics of the Proposed Multi-Family Residential Building

Site Location

As indicated earlier, the site, which is currently occupied by a parking lot containing approximately 100 parking spaces, is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Ridge Avenue with Grove Street. Land uses in the area include St Mark's Episcopal Church south of the site, Alexander Park west of the site, Roycemore School northwest of the site, and Halim Time & Glass Museum west of the site. The site is bounded by a seven-story residential building to the north, Ridge Avenue to the west, the north-south public alley to the east, and Grove Street to the south. Ridge Avenue is a north-south local street which provides two lanes in each direction within the vicinity of the site and carries an Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) volume of 20,600 vehicles (IDOT 2018). Additionally, Grove Street is an east-west local street which provides one lane in each direction in the vicinity of the site and is under stop sign control at its unsignalized intersection with Ridge Avenue. It is also important to note that at this intersection the following movements are prohibited via signage between 7:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M.:

- Westbound and eastbound through movements
- Westbound right turns
- Eastbound left turns
- Northbound and southbound left turns

Public Transportation

The site is served by the Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) rapid transit Purple Line via the Davis station located approximately 1,290 feet (0.24 miles) northeast of the site, by the Union Pacific North (UP-N) Line via the Davis Street/Evanston station located approximately 1,040 feet northeast of the site, and by numerous bus routes located in close proximity to the site (Routes 93, 201, 206, 208, 213, 213, 250, and 422). Given the proximity of the proposed multi-family building to public transportation, the City of Evanston city core, residential and retail land uses, the development meets the characteristics of a Transit Oriented Development (TOD). Figure 2 shows a map of the public transportation serving the area.

Proposed Development Plan

As indicated earlier, the site will be redeveloped with a five-story building containing approximately 68 residential units, a 45-space parking garage and 14 exterior parking spaces that will replace the existing surface parking lot on site. Additionally, the proposed building will provide 40 bicycle parking spaces. Two ingress/egress access drives to the parking garage will be provided off the north-south, 20-foot wide public alley located mid-block between Ridge Avenue and Oak Avenue. Visual warning devices should be provided at the garage exit. Additionally, loading for trucks will be provided in the southeast corner of the site. A copy of the site plan is included in the Appendix.
Public Transportation Available

Figure 2
Alternative Modes of Transportation

Accessibility to and from the area is enhanced by the various alternative modes of transportation serving the area, including the CTA Davis Purple Line station located approximately 1,290 feet northeast of the site, the Davis Street/Evanston Metra Union Pacific – North station located approximately 1,040 feet northeast of the site, and CTA Bus Routes 93, 201, 206, 208, 213, 213, 250, and 422.

Pedestrian Facilities

Sidewalks are provided within the entire surrounding street network. Standard style crosswalks are provided on the east and west legs of the intersection of Ridge Avenue with Grove Street, on the all legs of Oak Avenue with Grove Street and on the all legs of Oak Avenue with Davis Street. Additionally, high-visibility crosswalks are provided on all legs of the intersection of Davis Street and Ridge Avenue. It should also be noted that the intersection of Ridge Avenue and Grove Street should be improved to provide high-visibility crosswalks on all legs of this intersection.

Bike Facilities

Within the vicinity of the study area, Davis Street (one block to the north of the site) provides a westbound protected bike lane between Hinman Avenue and Ridge Avenue. Furthermore, Asbury Avenue (one block to the west of the site), Lake Street (one block to the south of the site) and Maple Avenue (two blocks to the east of the site) provide a signed bike route. It should also be noted that bicycles are prohibited on Ridge Avenue.

Mode-Sharing Transportation Availability

The closest Divvy-bike-sharing station is located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Benson Avenue with Church Street (15 docks) approximately 1,365 feet from the site (at a walking distance of 0.4 mile). In addition, there are Zipcar cars for carsharing within the parking lot located at 1571 Maple Street, located approximately 860 feet from the site.

Modal Trip Generation

The estimates of traffic to be generated by the proposed multi-family residential building was estimated using data published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition* for Land-Use Code 221 (Multifamily Housing Mid-Rise). Based on the Center for Transit-Oriented Development data, approximately 23 percent and 38 percent of residents take public transportation and use alternative modes of transportation (walk, rideshare, work from home or bicycle), respectively, within a quarter mile of the Davis station. Table 1 shows the peak hour multi-modal trips to be generated by the proposed multi-family residential building.
As can be seen in Table 1, the proposed multi-family residential building will be a low traffic generator, generating approximately one trip every four to five minutes during the peak hours. When compared to the traffic Ridge Avenue carries on a daily basis (20,600 vehicles), the proposed development will result in a minimal increase of less than one percent and will not have a significant impact on area roadways and intersections.
Parking Evaluation

As seen from the previous discussion, the availability of alternative modes of transportation will adequately serve future residents of the proposed multi-family residential building. As indicated earlier, this site is located within walking distance of the CTA Davis Purple Line station (approximately 1,290 feet or 0.24 miles) and to the Metra Union Pacific/North Line (UP-N) Davis Street station (approximately 1,040 feet or 0.2 miles), the City of Evanston city core, and residential and retail land uses. Based on a review of ridership statistics provided by Regional Transportation Asset Management System (RTAMS), the Davis Street station has experienced a seven to eight percent increase in ridership over the past 10 years even though the employment and population within half a mile to one mile of the transit center have remained mostly unchanged. Therefore, this confirms that public transportation continues to be an attractive and convenient alternative for the residential uses within the City of Evanston city core.

The proposed development qualifies as a TOD. As such, the development is proposing a reduced parking ratio to conform with the trend of lower parking supply for TODs. A review of the City of Evanston TOD parking requirements for residential buildings indicates that it resulted in a reduction of 56 percent in the number of parking spaces required for a studio/one-bedroom unit in a TOD location as compared to a non-TOD location.

As previously indicated, the proposed multi-family residential building will contain 68 residential units including eight efficiency units, 20 one-bedroom units, and 40 two-bedroom units and will provide a parking garage with 45 parking spaces and 14 exterior parking spaces, resulting in a total of 59 parking spaces. It should be noted that no visitor parking will be provided on-site.

Based on the City of Evanston Zoning Code, multi-family units (within a TOD zone) should provide parking at a ratio of 0.55 parking spaces per one-bedroom unit or less and 1.10 parking spaces per two-bedroom unit resulting in a parking requirement of 59 parking spaces.

However, the City of Evanston also provides bonuses for complying with the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (IHO) requirements, which when applied to this development resulted in a parking requirement of 57 parking spaces.

Conclusion

Based on the preceding evaluation and given the proximity of the site to public transportation, the proposed multi-family residential building will be a low traffic generator and will not have a significant impact on area roadways and intersections. Providing access off the north-south alley will ensure that conflicts with vehicular and pedestrian movements along Ridge Avenue and Grove Street are minimized. The proposed parking supply will exceed the City’s requirements and will be sufficient in accommodating the parking needs of the proposed development.
Dear Meagan,

I was unable to attend last night's public meeting regarding the proposed development at 1555 Ridge Avenue. However, as the Rector of St. Mark's Episcopal Church – across the street from the proposed development – I have a few concerns:

1. Parking. The proposed residential building will have 68 units but only 61 parking spaces. Even if we assume 1.5 cars per unit, we are talking about the potential of 100 additional cars needing parking in a neighborhood that already cannot support the vehicles that are present. St. Mark’s has repeatedly asked for parking enforcement to waive parking signs on Sunday mornings and for weddings and funerals so that our members can attend church without risk of ticketing or towing. Frequently these waivers are denied (or ignored). With as many as 40 additional cars looking for parking – and many of these, on weekends, for long periods of time – I wish to voice my strong objection.

2. Traffic. The corner of Ridge and Grove is the frequent site of accidents. The left hand only signs are frequently disregarded. On Sunday mornings and for weddings and funerals, guests and members of our church are frequently crossing Ridge at that intersection. The addition of more traffic to this already dangerous intersection seems ill-advised.

3. Noise. St. Mark’s receives occasional complaints about our bells tolling (only during hours when the City of Evanston sound ordinance permits it). With 68 additional residential units, I am concerned that we will again be the subject of those kinds of complaints – despite the fact that my predecessor calculated that sound from emergency vehicle sirens were more frequent and louder than the sound of our historic bells.

Again, my apologies for not being present for last night’s meeting. Please receive these comments/concerns in the spirit in which they are offered.

Debra+

The Rev. Dr. Debra K. Bullock, Rector
she/her (Why Pronouns?)

St. Mark’s Episcopal Church

1509 Ridge Avenue

Evanston, IL 60201

(847) 864-4806 (o)
(847) 732-9564 (m)

http://www.stmarksevanston.org
Please note: Email is typically received between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. on Monday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. Emails received on Tuesdays, Saturday, or Sundays or after 5 p.m. will typically be responded to during the next working day. If you need to reach me for a pastoral emergency, please call or text using my mobile number.

Disclaimer: This message is intended for the sole use of the individual and entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law.

If you are not the intended addressee, nor authorized to receive for the intended addressee, you are hereby notified that you may not use, copy, disclose or distribute to anyone the message or any information contained in the message. If you have received this message in error, please immediately advise the sender by reply email and delete the message. Thank you very much.
Fwd: 1555 Ridge Avenue Proposal

Melissa Klotz <mklotz@cityofevanston.org>  
Mon, Dec 23, 2019 at 2:42 PM

Meagan,  

See below if you didn't get this previously.  

Thanks,  

Melissa Klotz  
Zoning Administrator  
Planning & Zoning Division  
Community Development Department  
Morton Civic Center  
City of Evanston  

2100 Ridge Ave. | Evanston, IL 60201 | 847-448-4311  
mklotz@cityofevanston.org | cityofevanston.org  

Note: The contents of this electronic mail to/from any recipient hereto, any attachments hereto, and any associated metadata pertaining to this electronic mail, is subject to disclosure under the Illinois Freedom of Information Act, 5 ILCS 140/1 et. seq.

---------- Forwarded message ----------  
From: ROBERT & RACHEL EASTON <reaston2@comcast.net>  
Date: Mon, Dec 23, 2019 at 1:00 PM  
Subject: Fwd: 1555 Ridge Avenue Proposal  
To: <zoning@cityofevanston.org>  

I have tried sending this twice to the email below & keep getting an error message. Could you please make sure the appropriate people see these comments?  
Thank You,  
Rachel  

---------- Original Message ----------  
From: ROBERT & RACHEL EASTON <reaston2@comcast.net>  
To: "mmjones@cityofevanston.org" <mmjones@cityofevanston.org>  
Date: December 23, 2019 at 12:08 PM  
Subject: 1555 Ridge Avenue Proposal  

Hi Maegan,  
I was unable to attend the meeting on 12-19-19 regarding the 1555 Ridge Avenue proposal building (although I met you as I went up to choir). As a longstanding member of St. Mark's Episcopal Church, Evanston resident, and the soon to be senior warder (a member of the governing board), I have a number of concerns regarding this potential new construction.
I have personally been involved in a traffic accident at the corner of Grove & Ridge. This intersection continues to be a problem not only for cars but for pedestrians. The new restrictions that are in place from 7 AM to 7 PM regarding left turns from Grove onto Ridge are NOT being enforced. I have seen numerous occasions when people drive straight across Ridge Avenue during these hours or turn left. My concern is that the addition of increased traffic will only compound this already problematic issue. I believe that this is one of the most "dangerous" intersections in Evanston. Adding more traffic will only make this worse.

Additionally, construction traffic for this area will, I image, be problematic. Ridge Avenue is not zoned for large trucks. The road is relatively narrow and will, I anticipate, go from a 4 lane street to 2 lanes to accommodate construction needs. While this issue will be "temporary" during construction dates, it will have a significant impact. Currently, there are often lines of cars backed up north of Grove Street as a result of the decreased speed limit and the timing of lights at the intersection of Lake & Ridge. Decreasing the traffic flow at Grove & Ridge will only increase commuter frustrations and potential accidents.

Parking in the neighborhood has always been a problem. I have lived in Evanston for over 30 years and faced this issue whenever there is an event or service at church. There are numerous parking restrictions and limited public parking for visitors and those living in the surrounding multi-unit buildings. The proposed construction includes less than the number of units for parking within the building. (68 units but only 61 parking spots.) I can easily image that many tenants may have more than 1 car so they will need more than 1 space. Where will the additional vehicles park?

Another concern I have is the water run off into the sewer system since there will be an increased amount of "hard surfaces" in addition to increased waste into the existing system. My impression is that many public waste and drainage systems are already being stress and piping is old. Can the existing system accommodate increased needs?

Lastly, our church has bells that toll throughout the day (during approved hours). As has happened in the past, new residents sometime complain about the bells stating they are a noise nuisance. I would hope to avoid this issue.

Thank you for taking my concerns into consideration as the City reviews this proposed new construction.

Regards,
Rachel Easton
Senior Warden
St. Mark's Episcopal Church
DESIGN AND PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DAPR) MINUTES  
January 8, 2020

Voting Members Present:  I. Eckersberg, E. Cano, D. Cueva, M. Tristan, J. Leonard,  
S. Mangum, J. Hyink, C. Sterling, M. Griffith, M. Jones

Staff Present:  M. Rivera

Others Present:  

Presiding Member:  J. Leonard

A quorum being present, J. Leonard called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

1. December 18, 2019, DAPR Committee meeting minutes.

S. Mangum made a motion to approve the meeting minutes, seconded by E. Cano.

The Committee voted, 10-0, to approve the meeting minutes

New Business

1. 1555 Ridge Avenue  Planned Development

Thomas Meador, applicant, submits for Special Use for a Planned Development to construct a 5-story, 68 dwelling unit multi-family residence with 47 off-street parking spaces in the R6 General Residential District. The applicant seeks site development allowances for: 1) Building lot coverage of 65.2% where 65% is permitted with Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (IHO) bonus, 2) To eliminate the required 10-foot wide transition landscape strip along the north property line, and 3) To reduce the required number of handicapped accessible off-street parking spaces from 3 to 2.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY:  Jay Keller, architect for applicant

DISCUSSION:

- J. Keller presented renderings of past projects by the applicant. Proposed exterior building materials to include face brick, limestone, and metal balcony railings, traditional materials and architectural design. Proposed materials are consistent with the materials found in the neighborhood.
- J. Keller stated the applicant will meet the Mayor’s Monarch Pledge.
- J. Keller stated one of the requested site development allowances concerns the required setback at the north property line.
- J. Keller stated parking is mostly inside on the 1st floor. Parking is accessible from the alley. The first floor also includes a lobby, gym, package room, bike room, composting, and the manager’s office. Every dwelling until will have an outdoor space.
- J. Keller stated the site development allowance request to reduce the setback at the north property line keeps the building height lower, the zoning code allows for a taller building.
J. Hyink asked how the bike room is accessed, how many bike spaces will be provided.
J. Keller stated the bike room is accessible from a hallway off the lobby, from the side entrance on Ridge Avenue, and through the garage. He stated bike spaces are in the bike room and several wall mounted bike racks in the garage.
I. Eckersberg noted that the wall mounted bike racks at the northwest corner of the garage are not accessible if a vehicle is in the adjacent parking space.
J. Keller stated they will review the garage bike rack locations.
J. Leonard asked about the architectural details, questioning whether the proposed architecture fits into the neighborhood.
J. Keller stated they are attempting to mimic the turn of the century architecture found in the neighborhood.
J. Leonard stated the 1st floor does not encourage pedestrian activity, the 1st floor should have living space to increase the residential character at street level.
J. Keller stated the number of parking spaces will be reduced if there are ground floor units.
S. Mangum asked whether louvers will be installed at the garage level, noting a previous response to comments stated there would be louvers.
J. Keller stated louvers would be located on the north and alley side for air circulation.
S. Mangum asked about the exterior brick size.
J. Keller stated the proposed bricks are 4” x 12”.
S. Mangum stated a brick with less height is preferred.
M. Jones stated a text amendment is currently pending before the City Council to allow a reduction in the required 15-foot setback at the north property line as a site development allowance.
M. Jones noted the revised plan includes 3 handicapped accessible parking spaces as required and is compliant with the impervious surface requirement.
E. Cano asked about the refuse pick-up location.
J. Keller stated refuse pick-up will be from inside the building.
E. Cano stated refuse pick-up is required to be by the City’s franchise hauler, refuse containers should be placed outside next to the alley for pick-up.
M. Rivera asked if visitor parking will be provided.
J. Keller stated visitor parking is not provided.
J. Leonard stated move-ins should be via the alley and the loading zone, on-street loading activity should be prohibited.
S. Mangum asked about exterior lighting.
J. Keller stated the balconies will have an exterior light, sconces will be at the exterior doors, no uplighting is proposed.
M. Jones if the garage door width is adequate.
J. Keller stated the garage door is 16’ wide and should be adequate.
M. Griffith noted the drive aisle width adjacent to the loading zone does not appear to meet the requirement.
J. Leonard stated a Construction Management Plan is required prior to a building permit being issued. She stated LEED Silver is required.
I. Eckersberg stated the 8-foot tall wall at the loading zone and alley intersection creates a sight visibility issue.
E. Cano stated there are concerns with the landscape plan.
J. Leonard stated the applicant should come back to DAPR to address building design comments and to provide a list of public benefits, benefits for the community not just residents of the building.
J. Leonard stated the applicant needs to discuss at Plan Commission where the vehicles currently being parked on the property will go.
Item held in Committee to give the applicant time to provide list of public benefits and to address architectural design comments.

Adjournment
S. Mangum made a motion to adjourn, seconded by J. Hyink. The Committee voted, 10-0, to adjourn. The Committee adjourned at 3:09 p.m.

The next DAPR meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 15, 2020, at 2:30 p.m. in Room 2404 of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Griffith
DESIGN AND PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DAPR) MINUTES
January 22, 2020

Voting Members Present: I. Eckersberg, D. Cueva (arrived after minutes were approved), M. Tristan, K. Jensen, J. Leonard, S. Mangum, J. Hyink, L. Biggs, M. Griffith, M. Jones

Staff Present: M. Rivera

Others Present:

Presiding Member: J. Leonard

A quorum being present, J. Leonard called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

1. January 8, 2020, DAPR Committee meeting minutes.

L. Biggs made a motion to approve the meeting minutes, seconded by J. Hyink.

The Committee voted, 8-0, to approve the meeting minutes, with 1 abstention.

Old Business

1. 1555 Ridge Avenue Planned Development
Thom Chris Meador, applicant, submits for Special Use for a Planned Development to construct a 5-story, 68 dwelling unit multi-family residence with 59 off-street parking spaces in the R6 General Residential District. The applicant seeks site development allowances for: 1) A 3 ft. setback along the north property line where 15 ft. is required for dwelling units (text amendment pending), 2) No landscaping where a 10 ft. transition landscaped strip is required along the north property line, 3) A 2 ft. street side yard setback for open loading where a 15 ft. setback is required.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Jay Keller, architect for applicant
Thomas Meador, applicant

DISCUSSION:
- J. Keller reviewed changes made to the proposed plan. Changes include: landscaping next to the loading area instead of a masonry wall, designated location next to the loading zone for refuse containers to be placed for pick-up, bike rack located near loading zone, gym room with cardio equipment on the 1st floor on the west side of the building, added limestone architectural details at entrances on Ridge Avenue and Grove Street, larger windows at 1st floor, and louvers shown at 1st floor alley side elevation.
- J. Keller stated they do not think dwellings at the 1st floor along Ridge are desirable, adding dwelling units would require a site development allowance.
- J. Keller stated the number of parking spaces was reduced by 2, 59 spaces proposed, they still have more parking than required.
• J. Hyink stated locating the bike rack behind landscaping could increase the risk of theft, better for bike racks to be seen, more eyes are better to help deter theft.
• S. Mangum asked about the anticipated truck size for loading. Loading zone location is a site development allowance; it is located within a required setback. He asked if the loading zone could be located at the north end of the site, could consider a smaller loading zone.
• J. Keller stated the typical truck size is 15-25 feet long.
• L. Biggs stated concerns with the loading zone location, the ability of trucks to maneuver into and out of the space given the adjacent alley. Assuming trucks pull forward into the space, trucks will have to back out into the alley, and this is a busy alley. Concerned the loading zone will not be used for loading, Grove Street will be used instead.
• Continued discussion regarding the loading zone location and use. Possible that visitors, package and delivery drivers will use the loading zone, this could conflict with move-ins outs. Loading zone location does not seem convenient for move-ins-outs. The refuse containers located next to the loading zone would be blocked when there is a vehicle in the loading zone.
• L. Biggs noted the traffic study stated there is no parking available in the neighborhood, wondered if the extra parking spaces provided above the requirement should be for visitors.
• L. Biggs stated the loading zone is triple booked by loading, drop-offs, and dumpsters, this is a poor design. The trash room is at the center of the building, furthest point from the alley or street for pick-up.
• J. Keller stated the trash room location is a function of the trash chute which needs to be accessible from a common area and above the trash room.
• K. Jensen asked if the trash chute accommodates recycling, encouraged providing convenient recycling options for residents.
• J. Keller stated recycling containers will be placed in the trash room.
• K. Jensen asked if solar panels will be installed on the roof.
• J. Keller stated they are considering solar panels for common area utilities. The building will be LEED Silver.
• J. Leonard stated loading zone and drop-off locations need to be sorted out. Design concerns remain, cardio equipment does not activate the ground floor, prefer smaller, thinner bricks, looking for changes to the design and materials considering the location on Ridge Avenue. Ridge Avenue is one of the main thoroughfares in Evanston with significant architecture.
• S. Mangum noted comments from Gary Gerdes, Building & Inspection Services Division Manager: The ADA parking spaces need to be close to the door, the door to the trash room conflicts with the accessible aisle, and public benefits have not been addressed.
• J. Keller stated they are looking for guidance on public benefits.
• J. Leonard stated public benefits are benefits to the public not to residents of the building.
• Applicant stated the public benefits list was revised to include a monetary contribution to parks.
• Potential public benefits were mentioned, including: burying ComEd utility lines the length of the whole alley, restoring the full length of the alley, striping pedestrian crosswalks where needed and identified by the City, money for park improvements, providing affordable housing beyond the requirement.

Public Comment:
• The Grove Street and Ridge Avenue intersection is terrible, concerned with drop-offs occurring at the entrance on Grove Street at the intersection.
• J. Leonard suggested a landscaped bump-out at the intersection could be a public benefit.

L. Biggs made a motion to hold item in Committee, seconded by M. Jones. The Committee voted, 10-0, to hold item in Committee to give the applicant additional time to address staff’s concerns.

Adjournment
L. Biggs made a motion to adjourn, seconded by J. Leonard. The Committee voted, 10-0, to adjourn. The Committee adjourned at 3:21 p.m.

The next DAPR meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 5, 2020, at 2:30 p.m. in Room 2404 of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Griffith
DESIGN AND PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DAPR) MINUTES
February 12, 2020


Staff Present: M. Rivera, C. Ruiz

Presiding Member: J. Leonard

A quorum being present, J. Leonard called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

1. January 29, 2020, DAPR Committee meeting minutes.

S. Mangum made a motion to approve the meeting minutes, seconded by J. Hyink.

The Committee voted, 8-0, to approve the meeting minutes, with 2 abstentions and 1 member absent during the vote.

Old Business

1. 1555 Ridge Avenue

Recommendation to Plan Commission

Thomas Meador, applicant, submits for Special Use for a Planned Development to construct a 5-story, 68 dwelling unit multi-family residence with 57 off-street parking spaces in the R6 General Residential District. The applicant seeks site development allowances for: 1) A 3’ setback along the north property line where 15’ is required for dwelling units, 2) No landscaping where a 10’ transition landscaped strip is required along the north property line, and 3) A 10’ X 25’ loading space with 1.5’ rear yard setback where a 10’ X 35’ loading space with a 3’ rear yard setback is required.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Jay Keller, architect

DISCUSSION:

● J. Keller, briefly described changes made to the plan since the preceding meeting.
  ○ Bump-out added on grove
  ○ One bedroom first floor residence on the west elevation with ground floor patio was added
  ○ ADA parking spaces located closer to lobby
  ○ Loading berth was relocated and reduced in size (requests a 25’ loading berth as an allowance)
  ○ Bike racks on Grove were moved in front of landscape screening
  ○ Combined two units at the fifth floor to maintain the developments bedroom composition and parking requirement
  ○ Parking spaces reduced to 57 spaces
  ○ Included a waste management plan
  ○ Plans to utilize solar for on-site water heating
  ○ Change in brick color at the first floor

● J. Keller discussed the projects public benefits
C. Sterling noted that the plant selection for the mayors monarch pledge doesn’t actually provide any benefit to butterflies. C. Sterling noted that the majority of the plant material is pachysandra, a non-native ground cover which actually inhibits native plant growth.

J. Keller stated that an arborist had selected the plants and ensured they were adequate.

C. Sterling stated that the plants were not appropriate and would need to be reviewed during permitting.

K. Jensen stated that an arborist was not the right person to select the plant material and suggested the applicant look at the monarch pledge website which has a list of appropriate plant material.

C. Sterling stated that he appreciated the attempt to alter the first floor brick color, but it had the opposite effect, actually making the building appear more bulky, the entryways are less apparent, and the first floor, which is the more problematic, stands out more.

J. Leonard stated agreement.

J. Keller stated they would change the color of the brick on the first floor back to match the red brick on subsequent upper floors.

C. Ruiz stated agreement that the design of the structure is problematic and offered the following suggestions to make the design more appropriate for Evanston and appear less mass produced:
  ○ Change the first floor brick color back to the original proposal (red)
  ○ Reduce the height of the bulkheads to allow for the brick to continue closer to grade
  ○ Introduce a more subtle lintel and include stone sills
  ○ Ensure full window transparency, particularly on the south elevation on Grove
  ○ Include a more substantial cornice
  ○ Consider design elements which are sympathetic to the surrounding architecture. This is important considering the location’s proximity to the Ridge Historic District

C. Ruiz stated that the south and east facades are also problematic. Particularly the south facade along Grove which is inactive and deadens the street frontage.
  ○ The view of the east facade from Grove, particularly in context with the adjacent single-family residential, is not appropriate. C. Ruiz suggest alterations to increase fenestration and proposed continuing the brick to this elevation.

J. Leonard agreed that parking on the first floor along Grove is not ideal and stated the committee had asked this to be addressed during previous meetings.

C. Sterling stated agreement with the proposed changes in design by C. Ruiz.

K. Jensen asked how many parking spaces would be EV ready.

J. Keller stated that 20% of the spaces would be either EV ready or charging.

L. Biggs stated that 6 spaces were EV ready according to the plans, which was closer to 10%.

L. Biggs asked if there was a significant cost associated with more EV ready spaces, simply adding conduit.

J. Keller stated that the cost could increase dramatically if the service changes and felt 20% was appropriate for this development.

L. Biggs stated concerns with the loading berth.
  ○ Problematic backing a truck off the alley and stated the current location blocks some parking spaces.
  ○ The truck turning diagram shows it clipping two of the parking spaces.
  ○ Concern with the request for a smaller loading berth and stated a 30’ truck is appropriate to design to.

J. Leonard expressed frustration with the project as it had been back to this committee many times and the same issues remain unresolved. The design must be better.
● J. Leonard stated she did not want to keep this item in committee but noted that staff continues to have significant concerns that cannot be addressed without a willingness from the applicant to explore significant changes to the design and layout
● L. Biggs stated agreement. There have been significant design concerns from the start which continuously fail to be addressed.
● J. Leonard addressed members of the public and provided a brief summary of what DAPR is.
● Multiple members of the public spoke in opposition to the developers failure to hire local union labor and stated concern with the developers safety record.
● J. Leonard stated that this committee was not the proper entity to express these concerns to and suggested they take their concerns to Council when and if the project gets to that point
● S. Mangum asked how many times a year to move-outs occur
● Applicant stated roughly 5 per month
● L. Biggs stated concern that the majority of these would use Grove street because of the ineffective loading berth

L. Biggs made a motion to move the project forward to Plan Commission without providing a recommendation for approval or denial.

Seconded by K. Jensen

The Committee voted, 11-0, to move the project to Plan Commission without a staff recommendation.

Adjournment
J. Hyink made a motion to adjourn, seconded by L. Biggs. The Committee voted, 11-0, to adjourn. The Committee adjourned at 4:09 p.m.

The next DAPR meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 26, 2020, at 2:30 p.m. in Room 2404 of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.

Respectfully submitted,
Cade W. Sterling
Subdivision & Major Adjustment to a Planned Development
1619 Chicago Avenue
19PLND-0059

Planned Development
1621 Chicago Avenue
18PLND-0112

Plan Commission
Recommending Body
Memorandum

To: Chair and Members of the Plan Commission

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

Subject: Planned Development
1605-1631 Chicago Avenue., 19PLND-0059 & 18PLND-0112

Date: February 21, 2020

Request

The applicant, Horizon Realty Group, submits for a subdivision and Major Adjustment to a Planned Development in the D4 Downtown Transition District. The requested adjustment will increase FAR from 3.15 to 4.2, increase parking spaces from 32 (23 on-site, 9 leased) to 38 (all leased off-site), and decrease the total number of units from 205 to 186 (including 65 dwelling units). No new site development allowance will be needed.

The applicant also submits for a planned development application to construct a 19-story apartment building with 240 units, 85 subterranean parking spaces, and approximately 3,540 sq. ft. of ground floor retail space in the D4 Downtown Transition District. Site development allowances are being requested for: 1) a building height of 211 ft. 8 in. where 105 ft. is allowed; 2) an FAR of 11.62 where a maximum of 5.4 is allowed; 3) 240 dwelling units where 54 is maximum is allowed; 4) 85 parking spaces where a minimum 185 is required, and 5) 1 short loading berth where 2 short loading berths are required.

Notice
The Application has been filed in conformance with applicable procedural and public notice requirements including being published in the Evanston Review on February 6, 2020.

General Information

Applicant:
Horizon Realty Group
1946 W. Lawrence Ave.
Chicago, IL 60640
Owner(s): Horizon Group XXIII, LLC
1946 W Lawrence Ave
Chicago, IL 60640

Existing Zoning: D4 Downtown Transition District

Existing Land Use: Mixed-Use Building with Senior Housing (The Merion) and ground floor commercial uses, and single-story commercial building.

Property Size: 66,616.2 sq. ft. (1.53 acres)

PINs: 11-18-403-020-0000 and 11-18-403-021-0000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surrounding Zoning and Land Uses</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>D4 Downtown Transition District &amp; R6 General Residential District</td>
<td>Commercial Business, Multi-Family Residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>D4 Downtown Transition District</td>
<td>Commercial Businesses, Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>D1 Downtown Fringe District &amp; R6 General Residential District</td>
<td>First United Methodist Church, Multi-Family Residences, Mixed-Use Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>D2 Downtown Retail Core District &amp; D3 Downtown Core Development District</td>
<td>Whole Foods Market and parking garage, Park Evanston Multi-Family Residential, Commercial Businesses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis

Project Description

Subdivision and Major Adjustment:
In 2013, the existing Merion building on the northeast corner of Chicago Avenue and Davis Street, was approved for an 8-story addition to the north. The Planned Development for the addition was approved for up to 205 dwelling units, 32 parking spaces (23 on-site, 9 leased), an FAR of 3.15 and established a special use for an Independent Living Facility. No site development allowances were needed and the development was to take place all on one 66,616.2-square foot parcel with 170.2 feet of frontage on Davis Street. The development has since been constructed and is currently operating.
No physical change is proposed for this portion of the existing property, however, a subdivision of the parcel is proposed that would create two parcels: a 21,644-square foot parcel with 127.1 feet of frontage on Chicago Avenue containing the existing one-story commercial building; and a 44,972.2-square foot parcel with 264.39 feet of frontage on Chicago Avenue containing the original Merion building and its addition. The change in zoning lot size triggers the need for a Major Adjustment to the 2013 planned development. By reducing the lot size the proposed adjustment would increase the FAR from 3.15 to 4.2. The applicant also proposes to increase the total number of parking spaces from 32 (23 on-site, 9 leased) to 38 (all leased off-site) and reduce the total number of units from the 205 that were originally approved to 186 (including 65 dwelling units) as constructed. No new site development allowance would be needed.

*Planned Development:*
The applicant proposes to demolish the existing one-story commercial building and construct a 19-story (211’8”) mixed-use building with 3,540 square feet of ground floor retail and 240 residential units above targeting senior residents. There will be 85 parking below-grade parking spaces accessed from a porte-cochere located on Chicago Ave. which will also act as an area for pick-ups/drop offs.

*Northeast Rendering*
The proposed site would consist of a single parcel (subdivided from the previously constructed Merion development lot) between Church Street and Davis Street. There is a single-story commercial building with a variety of shops and restaurants including Found, Tsim Sha Tsui Hot Pot Café, La Cocinita, and Best Care Cleaners.

Uses surrounding the site include commercial businesses (PNC Bank, Whole Foods, Pete’s Coffee, Golden Olympic, Accent Plus, etc.), residential buildings (Park Evanston, 522 Church Street Condominiums), First United Methodist Church, and other mixed-use buildings.

Site Layout:
The site for the proposed planned development is a slightly rectangular shaped area with approximately 127 feet of street frontage along Chicago Avenue. The development consists of two below-grade parking levels and a ground floor with approximately 3,540 square feet of retail space, lobby area for the residences above and a porte-cochere. The proposed building will be constructed lot line to lot line with a 12 in. overhang from residential windows beginning at 45 ft. above grade level. A 10 ft. setback from the north property line is proposed beginning at the 2nd floor and an approximately 15 ft. setback from the south property line is proposed beginning at the 9th floor.
The southeast corner of the ground floor will consist of retail space accessed from both the exterior (Chicago Ave.) and the interior of the building (the lobby to the residences). Just north of this area is lobby space for the residences and north of this area is the porte-cochere which is both the sole vehicular entry point to the below grade parking and a covered area for valet, pick-ups and drop-offs for the building residents. There is also a connection to the existing Merion development to the south. Loading and trash collection will take place within a loading berth located off of the alley to the east of the property.

One of the two below-grade parking levels will consist of 38 parking spaces, parking for 92 bicycles and resident storage space. The parking level below will have 47 parking spaces, parking for 11 bicycles and additional residential storage space. A total of 4 ADA accessible parking spaces will be provided.

Building materials consist of brick and cast-in-place concrete on the ground floor, with the tower proposed to be painted concrete and metal. The concrete will have scored reliefs and possibly fluted to provide detail, with metal at the bay windows.

**Compliance with the Zoning Ordinance**

The intent of the D4 General Residential District is “to provide for business infill development and redevelopment within downtown Evanston. The massing and scale of structures within the D4 district should be reflective of established uses and should provide suitable transition between downtown districts and those districts adjacent to the downtown. The district is also intended to encourage and sustain a mix of office, retail, and residential uses.”

The proposed use of ground floor retail with residential units above is a permitted use within the D4 district. This use reflects similar uses of neighboring properties and generally meets the intent of the zoning district. However, the massing and scale is out of character with the intent of the D4 district and the neighboring properties, despite the 24-story Park Evanston building being located across the street within the D3 Downtown Development Core District.

The building will generally meet the setback requirements for the D4 Zoning District but will require an easement for the windows which extend into the public right-of-way. Additionally, the applicant requests five Site Development Allowances:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Development Allowance Requested</th>
<th>Required / Max. Permitted in the D4 District</th>
<th>Site Development Allowance Max.</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>105’</td>
<td>+ 40’ = 145’</td>
<td>211’8”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>+ .6 = 6.0</td>
<td>11.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dwelling Units</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>No max</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parking Spaces</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Loading Berths</td>
<td>2 short</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 short</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the proposed FAR and building height are above the maximum site development allowances for planned developments, a favorable super-majority (two-thirds) vote from City Council is required.

**Building Height:**
The proposed height of the development is 19 stories at 211 ft. 8 in. This is well above the 145 foot height maximum that is permitted in the D4 District with a site development allowance. Although the Park Evanston apartment building across the street is 24 stories, that building is within the D3 Downtown Core Development District, the City’s most dense zoning district. The D4 District in which the proposed building is located is intended to act as transition to lower density uses adjacent to the downtown

**FAR:**
The applicant proposes an FAR of 11.62 which is nearly double the maximum site development allowance and, as stated above, will require a favorable two-thirds vote from the City Council. This high FAR is due to the increased height of the building.

**Number of Dwelling Units:**
The proposed number of dwelling units is 240, with a mix of 33 studios, 120 one-bedroom units, 82 two bedroom units and 5 three-bedroom units. The maximum number of units that are permitted on a lot of this size is 54.
**Number of Parking Spaces:**
The applicant proposes 85 below-grade parking spaces for the development (.26 parking spaces per bedroom, .35 parking spaces per unit). Given the number of units, the amount of retail space and the location of the building within a Transit Oriented Development (TOD) area a total of 185 parking spaces is required. Though less parking is encouraged within TOD areas, this is significantly less than an already reduced requirement for the area.

**Number of Loading Berths:**
There is one 10 ft. X 35 ft. loading berth proposed off of the alley in the rear of the building where two are required. Given the number of dwelling units in the building and the ground floor retail which will likely also be receiving deliveries, this may not be sufficient for the traffic that is generated.

**Compliance with the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (IHO)**
The planned development application was submitted in December of 2018 and is not required to meet the current IHO requirements that went into effect on January 1, 2019. As such, the Applicant proposes to pay a fee-in-lieu of $2,400,000 which meets the previous IHO requirements. No on-site affordable units are proposed at this time.

**Parking and Traffic**
The Applicant submitted a Traffic Impact Study conducted by KLOA which looked at the possible effects the proposed development may have on traffic in the area. The study noted that the site is considered a Transit Oriented Development that served by several nearby CTA bus lines and is within walking distance of CTA and Metra transit stations. Additionally, a two-way barrier protected bike lane runs in front of the site on the east side of Chicago Ave. Vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian counts were taken at peak morning and evening times at several intersections and possible points of conflict, including points where Chicago Ave. intersects with various access points to other properties along that block.

The study described the function of the proposed porte-cochere off of Chicago Ave, noting that it will function as both an on-site location for pick-ups/drop offs and access to the parking garage minimizing on-street activity. It suggests that some benefits of the porte-cochere will be: easier circulation for valet service, all pick-up/drop off activity occurring in the interior of the site, controlled access in and out of the site onto northbound Chicago Avenue and less possible points of conflict between vehicles and bicyclists in the bike lane than if the entry were off of the alley.

The total project traffic volumes included the existing traffic volume, increase in background traffic due to ambient growth and traffic estimated to be generated by the proposed development. The study concludes that given the site’s location downtown and its proximity to transit, that the number of trips generated by the development will be minimized and that given it will be replacing traffic generating commercial uses, the
net increase in parking generated will be reduced. The existing roadways around the
development will be able to accommodate these trips and maintain a good level of
service. The study did provide recommendations that would reduce impacts of the
access drive to the porte-cochere on pedestrians and bicyclists including:

- Restricted outbound access to right-turn only.
- Provide signage within the bike lane and access drive to alert bicyclists and
  motorists of each other.
- Providing warning devices for pedestrians to alert them when vehicles are
  exiting.

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

1. Contribution of 0.5% of Construction Budget to Public Projects – HRG proposes
   the establishment of a fund in an amount equal to the lesser of $300,000 or 0.5%
   of the Construction Budget that will be used to first pay for repairs to the public
   alley to the east of the Merion (between Davis St. and Church St.) for the
   purpose of improving alley use and access for its various users. The balance of
   the fund, if any, will be used to pay for safety enhancements to selected curb-
   cuts in bicycle lanes or routes that pose an elevated safety risk.
2. Promote Local Artists – Work with Evanston arts organizations to curate art from
   local Evanston artists to be displayed throughout the common areas of The
   Legacy.
3. Environmental Site Clean Up – The Merion Legacy will be developed on a site
   that is the subject of an NFR (former cleaner’s site). The development will enable
   us to remove contaminated soil and clean up a site in Evanston and eliminate
   potential harm to neighboring sites.
4. Electric Vehicle Charging Station – Provide one electric vehicle charging station
   that is available to the public for use. Additionally, provide 5% of spaces to be EV
   charging stations along with an additional 15% of parking spaces to be EV ready
   in the case of increased demand.
5. Provide for Composting & Recycling of Waste - The Merion Legacy shall provide
   composting and recycling capabilities for its residents.

Staff feels that the proposed public benefits list largely consists of items that are
requirements, specifically benefit the development and not the general public or are
inherent to the proposed development itself. Given the extent of the five requested site
development allowances, the requested public benefits are limited in scope.

Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan
The proposal generally complies with the Evanston Comprehensive General Plan with
regards to use. As a higher density development located within walking distance of the
Davis Street transit station, this Transit Oriented Development (TOD) will be consistent
with the Comprehensive Plan’s vision to provide higher density housing near transit 
stations and along major corridors. There is concern, however, that the number of units, 
building height, and FAR are significantly greater than what is permitted, even with 
development allowances.

The proposal will be in line with the objective to “recognize the benefits of mixing 
residential, commercial, and institutional uses in neighborhoods.” The proposed 
Planned Development will provide additional housing options for residents and include 
3,540 square feet of ground floor commercial space, however, the addition of a porte-
cochere is not desired on a busy thoroughfare with a number of existing curb-
cuts/driveways, high pedestrian usage, and a two-way barrier protected bike facility. 
The bike facility was completed in 2018 as part of the $13M multi-modal Sheridan Road - 
Chicago Avenue improvement project which connects downtown to the Northwestern 
University Campus and subsequently was acknowledged with the Project of Year Award 
by the Chicago Metro Chapter of the APWA. Also, while the affordable housing payment 
proposed is compliant with the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (IHO) that was in place 
at the time the application was submitted, providing some on-site affordable units, as 
provided by other planned developments subject to the previous IHO, would be more 
immediately beneficial for residents.

Compliance with the 2009 Downtown Plan
This site is designated as East Edge subarea which calls for mixed-use development 
with ground floor retail or office and heights between 6 to 10 stories to keep a walkable 
commercial stretch for this section of the Downtown. The overall height of the proposed 
development is well above this suggested height, however, it does provide a building 
massing consisting of a one-story masonry base to more closely match adjacent 
buildings and ground floor retail present along Chicago Avenue. 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. 
Much of this is provided by the development, however, it is disturbed with the proposed 
entry to the porte-cochere which breaks up the desired walkable and bikeable nature of 
the location, and also introduces a gap in active uses along the street frontage.

Compliance with the Design Guidelines for Planned Developments
The proposed building has some inconsistency with the Design Guidelines for Planned 
Developments. The building massing is out of appropriate scale and context to the site, 
which is zoned to provide a transition to the neighboring properties to the east. Though 
higher density residential, the adjacent residential buildings are of a smaller scale than 
what is proposed.

The proposal was reviewed by the Design and Project Review committee on July 17, 
2019 and September 18, 2019. There was appreciation for the below-grade parking 
provided as that can open up the above grade levels for more active and pedestrian-
friendly uses and facades. However, the proposed porte-cochere presents a new 26 ft.
wide curb cut along Chicago Avenue that creates conflict points with both pedestrians and bicyclists in the new two-way barrier protected bike facility. The loading area is covered and accessed from the alley. Should the project move forward, staff will continue to work with the applicant on the overall building design, materials and colors throughout the formal review process.

DAPR Committee Review
As stated above, the Design and Project Review Committee reviewed the proposed Planned Development on July 17, 2019 and September 18, 2019. The Committee was supportive of the proposed subdivision and major adjustment to the existing development that results. The Committee did, however, express concern over the conflict points the proposed curb cut and porte-cochere creates between vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists as well as the loss of on-street parking spaces. Vehicular access should instead be provided to the rear of the building via the 20-foot wide alley. The reduced number of parking spaces provided for the number of units proposed was also of some concern, though as previously stated, below-grade parking was a good design decision. Additionally, the proposed height and FAR for the development is significantly higher than what zoning regulations permit, even with the addition of site development allowances. Suggestions were made to ensure proper access to the bike parking that is proposed with the garage. The Committee unanimously recommended approval of the subdivision and major adjustment to the existing Merion planned development but unanimously recommended denial of the proposed new planned development.

Standards of Approval
The proposed development must satisfy the Standards for Special Use in Section 6-3-5-10, the Standard for Planned Development in Section 6-3-6-9, and the standards and guidelines established for Planned Developments in the D4 Downtown Transition District. (Section 6-11-1-10). Staff finds that, with additional improvement to the aesthetic design of the additions, the proposed Planned Development does not meet all of the Standards for approval.

Standards for Special Use (Section 6-3-5-10)
A Planned Development is an eligible special use in the D4 Downtown Transition District. The proposal, while it generally follows the purposes and policies outlined in the Comprehensive Plan, contributing to a variety of housing types and the local economy, the height and density do not fit the context of adjacent properties within the same zoning district. Denser uses in close proximity are within denser zoning districts which allow for more height and density. The proposal

The proposed special use for the development will not cause a negative cumulative effect when considered in conjunction with other special uses in the area. Surrounding uses include a number mixed-use residential buildings, retail, office, and high density multiple family residences. The extent of the proposed use, however, does greatly
exceed what is permitted.

The proposal can be adequately served by public facility infrastructure already available. Though due to the height of the building (greater than 70 feet), a dual water service will be needed. There are no significant historical and architectural resources or environmental features present on the site. One of the public benefits of the project is the proposed remediation of the existing environmental contamination on site.

The applicant submitted a traffic study that found the existing roadways will maintain a good level of service and, with recommended safety measures, porte-cochere will aid in site circulation. As mentioned above, staff is opposed to the proposed entry creating an additional conflict point along Chicago Avenue where there currently is not one.

Finally, the proposal meets all zoning requirements except for the five site development allowances requested and outlined above.

Standards and Guidelines for Planned Developments in R6 General Residential District (Sections 6-3-6-9 and 6-8-1-10)
The proposed Planned Development complies with the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposal will greatly increase the bulk of structures on the east side of Chicago Avenue and be out of scale with other development with other structures on that block in zoning district which is meant to act as a transition to less intense uses on the edge of downtown with smaller bulk. The proposal is largely consistent with the vision and goals of the Comprehensive Plan for redevelopment of underutilized properties with uses compatible with the surrounding neighborhood, however, the bulk of proposed development is out of scale with neighboring properties.

As described above, the site layout does provide some concern to staff with the creation of a new entry off of Chicago Avenue. This creates additional conflict points between vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists, takes away on-street parking spaces and takes away from a walkable experience at the ground level.

The proposed site development allowances for height, FAR and dwelling units greatly exceed the maximum site development allowances permitted without Supermajority City Council approval.

Recommendation
Staff and the DAPR Committee recommend the Plan Commission provide a favorable recommendation for the approval of a Subdivision and Major Adjustment for the existing Merion development. However, Staff and DAPR Committee recommend denial of the Planned Development for the proposed building at 1621 Chicago Avenue. Should the Commission vote to recommend approval of the development, staff recommends the following conditions be included:
1. The applicant shall continue to work on the aesthetic design of the new building.
2. The applicant must agree to a Construction Management Plan (CMP) before issuance of the building permit.
3. The proposed planned development shall substantially conform to the documents and testimony on record.
4. Additional parking spaces are leased from the City of Evanston within the Church Street garage.
5. The building residents will not be eligible for residential on-street parking permits in the area.
6. Restrict outbound access from the porte-cochere to right-turn only.
7. The east adjacent alley is reconstructed to support additional traffic.
8. LEED 55 Bird-Friendly Standards are incorporated into the proposed building.
9. An easement is obtained for the 12” overhang of windows into the Chicago Avenue right-of-way.

Attachments
Ordinance 86-O-13, Approving 1611-1629 Chicago Avenue
Full Subdivision and Major Adjustment Application for 1619 Chicago Avenue
Zoning Analysis for Subdivision and Major Adjustment– June 24, 2019
Development Narrative
Proposed Development Plans
Zoning Analysis for Proposed Planned Development - January 24, 2019
Link to Traffic Study
Link to Fiscal Impact Study Submitted February 20, 2020
Merion Legacy Policy Memo Dated August 28, 2019
Comments received as of February 20, 2020
Meeting Minutes – September 18, 2019 DAPR Meeting
Meeting Minutes -- July 17, 2019 DAPR Meeting
Link to Full Planned Development Application
86-0-13

AN ORDINANCE

Granting Special Use Permits for a Planned Development and Independent Living Facility Located at 1611-29 Chicago Avenue in the D4 Downtown Transition District ("North Shore Residence")

WHEREAS, the City of Evanston is a home-rule municipality pursuant to Article VII of the Illinois Constitution of 1970; and

WHEREAS, as a home rule unit of government, the City has the authority to adopt ordinances and to promulgate rules and regulations that protect the public health, safety, and welfare of its residents; and

WHEREAS, Article VII, Section (6) of the Illinois Constitution of 1970, which states that the "powers and functions of home rule units shall be construed liberally," was written "with the intention that home rule units be given the broadest powers possible" (Scadron v. City of Des Plaines, 153 Ill.2d 164); and

WHEREAS, it is a well-established proposition under all applicable case law that the power to regulate land use through zoning regulations is a legitimate means of promoting the public health, safety, and welfare; and

WHEREAS, Division 13 of the Illinois Municipal Code (65 ILCS 5/11-13-1, et seq.) grants each municipality the power to establish zoning regulations; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to its home rule authority and the Illinois Municipal Code, the City has adopted a set of zoning regulations, set forth in Title 6 of the Evanston City Code of 2012, as amended, ("the Zoning Ordinance"); and
WHEREAS, Horizon Group XXIII, LLC (the "Applicant"), owner of the property located at 1611-29 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Illinois (the "Subject Property"), legally described in Exhibit A, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, applied, pursuant to the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, specifically Section 6-3-5, "Special Uses," Section 6-3-6, "Planned Developments," Subsection 6-11-1-10, "Planned Developments" in Downtown Districts, and Subsection 6-11-5-3, "Special Uses" in the D4 Downtown Transition District ("D4 District"), to permit the construction and operation of a Planned Development and Independent Living Facility located at the Subject Property in the D4 District; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant sought said Special Use Permits to replace its status as a legal non-conforming use, "Retirement Hotel," and allow construction of an addition, approximately eighty-five feet (85') tall, with approximately two thousand six hundred square feet (2,600 ft²) of first-floor commercial space, yielding no more than two hundred five (205) residential units and zero (0) new on-site parking spaces; and

WHEREAS, on July 10, 2013, in compliance with the provisions of the Illinois Open Meetings Act (5 ILCS 120/1 et seq.) and the Zoning Ordinance, the Plan Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals ("ZBA") held a joint public hearing on the application for Special Use Permits, case no. 13PLND-0052, heard testimony, received other evidence, and made written minutes, findings, and recommendations; and

WHEREAS, the Plan Commission and ZBA's written findings state that the application for the proposed Planned Development meets applicable standards set forth for Special Uses in Subsection 6-3-5-10 of the Zoning Ordinance and Planned Developments in the D4 District per Subsection 6-11-1-10 of the Zoning Ordinance; and
WHEREAS, the Plan Commission and ZBA recommended the City Council approve the application with conditions; and

WHEREAS, on July 22, 2013, the Planning and Development ("P&D") Committee of the City Council held a meeting, in compliance with the provisions of the Open Meetings Act and the Zoning Ordinance, received input from the public, carefully considered and adopted the findings and recommendations of the Plan Commission and ZBA, and recommended approval thereof by the City Council; and

WHEREAS, at its meetings of July 22 and August 12, 2013, held in compliance with the Open Meetings Act and the Zoning Ordinance, the City Council considered the recommendation of the P&D Committee and ZBA, received additional public comment, made certain findings, and adopted said recommendation; and

WHEREAS, it is well-settled law that the legislative judgment of the City Council must be considered presumptively valid (see Glenview State Bank v. Village of Deerfield, 213 Ill.App.3d 747) and is not subject to courtroom fact-finding (see National Paint & Coating Ass'n v. City of Chicago, 45 F.3d 1124),

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

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

SECTION 2: Pursuant to the terms and conditions of this ordinance, the City Council hereby grants the Special Use Permits applied for in case no. 13PLND-0052, to allow construction and operation as described herein.
SECTION 3: Pursuant to Subsection 6-3-5-12 of the Zoning Ordinance, the City Council imposes the following conditions on the Special Use Permits granted hereby, violation of any of which shall constitute grounds for penalties or revocation of said Special Use Permits pursuant to Subsections 6-3-10-5 and 6-3-10-6 of the Zoning Ordinance:

(A) Compliance with Applicable Requirements: The Applicant shall develop and operate the Special Uses authorized by the terms of this ordinance in substantial compliance with; the terms of this ordinance; the Site Plans in Exhibit B, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference; all applicable legislation; the Applicant’s testimony and representations to the Site Plan and Appearance Review Committee, the Plan Commission, ZBA, the P&D Committee, and the City Council; and the approved documents on file in this case.

(B) Parking: Pursuant to Subsection 6-16-2-1-(B)-1 of the Zoning Ordinance, the Applicant shall license no fewer than nine (9) parking spaces, required for the Special Use Permits authorized by this ordinance, from the City in an off-street parking facility within one thousand feet (1000’) of the Subject Property. For as long as the Applicant operates said Special Uses, it shall maintain and keep current said license(s), and shall comply with all terms thereof and any amendments thereto.

(C) Recordation: Pursuant to Subsection 6-3-6-10 of the Zoning Ordinance, the Applicant shall, at its cost, record a certified copy of this ordinance, including all exhibits attached hereto, with the Cook County Recorder of Deeds, and provide proof of such recordation to the City, before the City may issue any permits pursuant to the Special Use Permits authorized by the terms of this ordinance.

SECTION 4: When necessary to effectuate the terms, conditions, and purposes of this ordinance, “Applicant” shall be read as “Applicant’s agents, assigns, and successors in interest.”

SECTION 5: Except as otherwise provided for in this ordinance, all applicable regulations of the Zoning Ordinance and the entire City Code shall apply to the Subject Property and remain in full force and effect with respect to the use and development of the same. To the extent that the terms and provisions of any of said documents conflict with the terms herein, this ordinance shall govern and control.

~4~
SECTION 6: This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval, and publication in the manner provided by law.

SECTION 7: All ordinances or parts of ordinances that are in conflict with the terms of this ordinance are hereby repealed.

SECTION 8: If any provision of this ordinance or application thereof to any person or circumstance is ruled unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of this ordinance that can be given effect without the invalid application or provision, and each invalid provision or invalid application of this ordinance is severable.

SECTION 9: The findings and recitals herein are hereby declared to be prima facie evidence of the law of the City and shall be received in evidence as provided by the Illinois Compiled Statutes and the courts of the State of Illinois.

Introduced: July 22, 2013
Adopted: August 12, 2013

Approved: August 15, 2013

Elizabeth B. Tisdahl, Mayor

Attest:

Rodney Greene, City Clerk

Approved as to form:

W. Grant Farrar, Corporation Counsel

Deputy City Attorney
EXHIBIT A

Legal Description

LOT 4 (EXCEPT THE NORTH 5 FEET THEREOF) AND ALL OF LOTS 5, 6, 7, 8 AND 9 IN BLOCK 20 IN EVANSTON IN THE NORTHWEST ¼ OF THE SOUTHEAST ¼ OF SECTION 18, TOWNSHIP 41 NORTH, RANGE 14 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

PIN: 11-18-403-019-0000

COMMONLY KNOWN AS: 1611-29 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Illinois
EXHIBIT B

Site Plans
PLAT OF SUBDIVISION
APPLICATION

CASE #: ____________________________

1. PROPERTY

Address: 1605-1631 Chicago Ave.
Permanent Identification Number(s):
PIN 1: 11-18-4030200000000000 PIN 2: 11-18-4030210000000000
(Note: An accurate plat of survey for all properties that are subject to this application must be submitted with the application.

2. APPLICANT

Name: 
Organization: Horizon Realty Group (attn: Jeff Michael)
Address: 1946 West Lawrence Ave.
City, State, Zip: Chicago, IL 60640
Phone: Work: (773) 529-7200 Home: Cell/Other: (847) 812-8768
Fax: Work: Home: 
E-mail: JMicheal@horizonrealtygroup.com
What is the relationship of the applicant to the property owner?
□ same
□ builder/contractor
□ architect
□ attorney
□ officer of board of directors
□ contract purchaser
□ lessee
□ other: agent
□ potential lessee
□ real estate agent

3. PROPERTY OWNER (Required if different than applicant. All property owners must be listed and must sign below.)

Name(s) or Organization: Horizon Group XXIII, LLC
Address: 1946 West Lawrence Ave.
City, State, Zip: Chicago, IL 60640
Phone: Work: (773) 529-7200 Home: Cell/Other: (847) 812-8768
Fax: Work: Home:
E-mail: JMicheal@horizonrealtygroup.com

"By signing below, I give my permission for the Applicant named above to act as my agent in all matters concerning this application. I understand that the Applicant will be the primary contact for information and decisions during the processing of this application, and I may not be contacted directly by the City of Evanston. I understand as well that I may change the Applicant for this application at any time by contacting the Zoning Office in writing."

Property Owner(s) Signature(s) -- REQUIRED

Date 5/31/19

4. SIGNATURE

"I certify that all of the above information and all statements, information and exhibits that I am submitting in conjunction with this application are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge."

Applicant Signature – REQUIRED

Date 5/31/19
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5. REQUIRED DOCUMENTS AND MATERIALS

The following are required to be submitted with this application:

☑  (This) Completed and Signed Application Form
☑  Original Plat of Survey (3 copies) Date of Survey: April 17, 2019
☑  Compliant Zoning Analysis Date: ______________ Case#: see 19ZONA-0014 (updated)
☑  Proof of Ownership Document Submitted: Chicago Title Owner's Policy
  (Policy No. 1401-008861207 D1)
☑  Proposed Plat of Subdivision (3 copies)
☑  Legal Description of the Proposed Lots
☑  Electronic version of all documents above (pdf version preferred)
☑  Application Fee $330

Notes:

• Incomplete applications will not be accepted. Applications lacking any required documents or materials will not be accepted. Incomplete applications cannot be “held” at the zoning office.

• Documents, drawings, or other materials submitted as part of other applications (for example, building permit applications, or applications for Certificates of Appropriateness [Preservation Commission]) cannot be copied by the Zoning Office for submission with this application. Separate copies must be provided.

• Recorded Plat of Subdivision - Mylar Plat of subdivision will have to be submitted prior to City Council review of the proposed subdivision. If approved and once recorded, one (1) paper copy of the recorded plat must be submitted to the Community Development Department – Zoning Office.

• Compliant Zoning Analysis and Certificate of Zoning Compliance - Prior to filing for subdivision approval, you must first apply for a zoning analysis of the proposed subdivision. Only a compliant zoning analysis can be submitted with the application for approval of the subdivision.

• Proof of Ownership - Accepted documents for proof of ownership include: deed, mortgage, contract to purchase, and closing documents (price may be blacked out on submitted documents). A tax bill cannot be accepted as proof of ownership.

• The application and all required additional materials need to be submitted in person to:

  City of Evanston,
  Community Development Department,
  Zoning Office Room 3202
  2100 Ridge Avenue
  Evanston, IL 60201

  Hours of Operation:
  Monday – Friday, 8:30am – 5:00 pm
  Excluding holidays
A. Describe the proposed subdivision, consolidation or re-subdivision:
The subject property consists of two tax parcels. The proposed subdivision would create 2 lots contiguos with the existing tax parcels. Proposed Lot 1 encompasses the existing Merion buildings at 1605-1619 Chicago Ave. consisting of The Merion non-residential retirement home/independent living use and ground level retail, as permitted in the D4 zoning district and by special use zoning approved by Ordinance No. 86-O-13. Proposed Lot 2 encompasses the existing single-story multi-tenant retail commercial building. This proposed Lot 2 is the site of a proposed Planned Development apartment building to be known as the Merion Legacy at 1621-1631 Chicago Ave.

B. What is the purpose of the proposed subdivision, consolidation or re-subdivision?
The proposed subdivision is necessitated by the pending proposed Planned Development for an apartment building at 1621-1631 Chicago Avenue. The proposed Merion Legacy apartment PD land area needs to be separated from the land area encompassing the Merion PD. The ordinance approving the Merion PD, Ord. No. 86-O-13, encompasses the all of proposed Lots 1 and 2. This subdivision would (i) separate proposed Lot 1 to encompass only the existing multi-story Merion retirement home/independent living buildings, and (ii) separate Lot 2 for future development as the Merion Legacy apartment PD. With this subdivision, the existing Merion PD could be amended to reduce the land area such that only proposed Lot 1 is subject to Ord. No. 86-O-13. This would remove proposed Lot 2 from Ord. No. 86-O-13 and allow consideration of the proposed Merion Legacy planned development on proposed Lot 2.
CHICAGO TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY
OWNER'S POLICY (2006)
SCHEDULE A

DATE OF POLICY:  SEPTEMBER 12, 2012
AMOUNT OF INSURANCE: $__

1. NAME OF INSURED:
   HORIZON GROUP XXIII, AN ILLINOIS LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

2. THE ESTATE OR INTEREST IN THE LAND THAT IS INSURED BY THIS POLICY IS:
   FEE SIMPLE, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

3. TITLE IS VESTED IN:
   THE INSURED

4. THE LAND HEREIN DESCRIBED IS ENCUMBERED BY THE FOLLOWING MORTGAGE OR TRUST DEED
   AND ASSIGNMENTS:
   COMMERCIAL MORTGAGE (INCLUDING SECURITY AGREEMENT, ASSIGNMENT OF RENTS AND LEASES AND
   FIXTURE FILING) DATED AUGUST 30, 2012 AND RECORDED SEPTEMBER 12, 2012 AS DOCUMENT
   1225601077 MADE BY HORIZON GROUP XXIII, AN ILLINOIS LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY TO
   THE NORTHERN TRUST COMPANY TO SECURE A NOTE IN THE AMOUNT OF $__

THIS POLICY VALID ONLY IF SCHEDULE B IS ATTACHED
5. THE LAND REFERRED TO IN THIS POLICY IS DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
LOT "A" IN THE PLAT OF CONSOLIDATION, OF LOT 4 (EXCEPT THE NORTH 5 FEET THEREOF) AND ALL OF LOTS 5, 6, 7, 8 AND 9 IN BLOCK 20 IN THE VILLAGE OF EVANSTON, BEING A SUBDIVISION OF THE NORTHWEST 1/4 OF THE SOUTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 18, TOWNSHIP 41 NORTH, RANGE 14 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
CHICAGO TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY
OWNER'S POLICY (2006)
SCHEDULE B

EXCEPTIONS FROM COVERAGE

THIS POLICY DOES NOT INSURE AGAINST LOSS OR DAMAGE, THE COMPANY WILL NOT PAY
COSTS, ATTORNEY'S FEES OR EXPENSES THAT ARISE BY REASON OF:

GENERAL EXCEPTIONS:

(1) RIGHTS OR CLAIMS OF PARTIES IN POSSESSION NOT SHOWN BY PUBLIC RECORDS.

(2) ANY ENCROACHMENT, ENCUMBRANCE, VIOLATION, VARIATION, OR ADVERSE
CIRCUMSTANCE AFFECTING THE TITLE THAT WOULD BE DISCLOSED BY AN ACCURATE
AND COMPLETE LAND SURVEY OF THE LAND.

(3) EASEMENTS, OR CLAIMS OF EASEMENTS, NOT SHOWN BY PUBLIC RECORDS.

(4) ANY LIEN, OR RIGHT TO A LIEN, FOR SERVICES, LABOR OR MATERIAL HERETOFORE OR
HEREAFTER FURNISHED, IMPOSED BY LAW AND NOT SHOWN BY THE PUBLIC RECORDS.

(5) TAXES OR SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS WHICH ARE NOT SHOWN AS EXISTING LIENS BY THE
PUBLIC RECORDS.

1. TAXES FOR THE YEAR(S) 2011 AND 2012
2012 TAXES ARE NOT YET DUE OR PAYABLE.

1A. NOTE: 2011 FIRST INSTALLMENT WAS DUE MARCH 1, 2012
NOTE: 2011 FINAL INSTALLMENT WAS DUE AUGUST 1, 2012

PERM TAX# 11-18-403-019-0000
PCL 1 OF 1
YEAR 2011
1ST INST $368,685.81
STAT PAID

FINAL INSTALLMENT OF 2011 TAXES IN THE AMOUNT OF $305,002.65 IS PAID

PERM TAX# 11-18-403-019-0000
PCL 1 OF 1 VOLUME 57

4A SPECIAL SERVICE AREA NUMBER 4, CITY OF EVANSTON, RECORDED AS DOCUMENT
NUMBER 0434404070, ORDINANCE NUMBER 52-0-97.

7. RESTRICTIONS CONTAINED IN DEED RECORDED FEBRUARY 17, 1857 AS DOCUMENT 81567 AND
RECORDED MARCH 3, 1863 AS DOCUMENT 63409 PROHIBITING THE MANUFACTURE, SALE OR
GIVING AWAY OF LIQUORS

NOTE: SAID INSTRUMENT CONTAINS NO PROVISION FOR A FORFEITURE OF OR REVERSION OF
EXCEPTIONS FROM COVERAGE (CONTINUED)

TITLE IN CASE OF BREACH OF CONDITION

(AFFECTS LOTS 6, 7, 8 AND 9)

E 8. COVENANT RECORDED SEPTEMBER 14, 1978 AS DOCUMENT 24627321 MADE BY EXCHANGE NATIONAL BANK AS TRUSTEE UNDER < NO 25168 AND NORTH SHORE HOTEL LTD., THAT THE PRESENT AND FUTURE OWNERS OF THE BUILDING SHALL LEASE OR OTHERWISE PROVIDE ONE OFF-STREET PARKING SPACE FOR EACH VEHICLE OWNED OR REGISTERED TO A RESIDENT OF THE RETIREMENT HOTEL. IN NO EVENT SHALL THE SPECIAL USE PERMITTEE PROVIDE LESS THAN 15 OFF STREET PARKING SPACES.

(AFFECTS LOTS 6, 7, 8, AND 9)


G 10. ENCROACHMENT OF CANOPIES OVER THE WEST LINE AND SOUTH LINE AND ENCROACHMENT OF CONCRETE WALL OVER THE EAST LINE BY 1.10 FEET MORE OR LESS AS DISCLOSED BY SURVEY AFORESAID.

H 11. ENCROACHMENT OF ONE STORY BRICK BUILDING LOCATED ON PROPERTY NORTH AND ADJOINING OVER AND ONTO THE LAND BY 0.10 FEET AS DISCLOSED BY SURVEY AFORESAID.

AK 12. EXISTING UNRECORDED LEASES AS DISCLOSED BY THE RENT ROLL ATTACHED TO ALTA STATEMENT DATED AUGUST 30, 2012 WHICH CONTAIN NO RIGHT TO EXTEND OR PURCHASE.
Plat of Survey

and

proposed 2-lot plat of The Merion Subdivision

Full size copies of the Plat of Survey and the proposed plat of The Merion Subdivision were previously filed with the City of Evanston.
Legal Description of the two proposed lots of The Merion Subdivision:

Lots 1 and 2 in The Merion Subdivision being a subdivision of Lot A in Plat of Consolidation of Lot 4 (except the North 5 feet thereof) and all of Lots 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 in Block 20 in Evanston, in the Northwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 18, Township 41 North, Range 14 East of the Third Principal Meridian, in Cook County, Illinois.
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION

Case Number: ____________________________

1. PROPERTY

Address(es)/Location(s)
1605-1631 Chicago Avenue

Brief Narrative Summary of Proposal:
This application is filed as an adjustment of lot size to Ordinance 86-O-13 (Case No. 13PLND-0052) "Granting Special Use Permits for a Planned Development and Independent Living Facility at 1611-1629 Chicago Ave.", commonly known as The Merion. The subject property in Ord. 86-O-13 included a parcel that is currently the subject of a PD application concerning 1621-1631 Chicago Ave., known as the Merion Legacy apartment development. Subsequent to approval of Ord. 86-O-13, the owner, Horizon Group XXIII, LLC, in 2015 obtained a tax parcel division of the subject property. In connection with the currently proposed PD application for 1621-1631 Chicago Ave., and to accomplish a legal separation of the properties, Horizon Group XXIII, LLC has filed a 2 lot plat of subdivision consistent with the tax parcel boundaries. This application is filed to reduce the land area applicable to Ord. 86-O-13. The resulting FAR increases from 3.15 to 4.19 [calculated as: 188,457 sf (existing Merion buildings) / 45,025 sf (reduced site area of Lot 1)]. The resulting 4.19 FAR on Lot 1 is below the maximum 4.5 FAR for the Merion, an existing non-residential retirement home/independent living use in the D4 zoning district. No site development allowance is required by this reduction in lot area.

2. APPLICANT

Name: ____________________________ Organization: Horizon Realty Group (attn: Jeff Michael)
Address: 1946 West Lawrence Ave. City, State, Zip: Chicago, IL 60640
Phone: Work: (773) 529-7200 Home: ____________________________ Cell/Other: (847) 812-8768
Fax: Work: ____________________________ Home: ____________________________
E-mail: JM@horizonrealtygroup.com also: David@beckergurian.com

What is the relationship of the applicant to the property owner?

☐ same  ☐ builder/contractor  ☐ potential purchaser  ☐ potential lessee
☐ architect  ☐ attorney  ☐ lessee  ☐ real estate agent
☐ officer of board of directors  ☐ other: agent

3. SIGNATURE

"I certify that all of the above information and all statements, information and exhibits that I am submitting in conjunction with this application are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge."

Applicant Signature – REQUIRED ____________________________ Date 5/31/19
4. PRE-SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Prior to actually submitting an application for Planned Development, you must:

A. Complete a Zoning Analysis of the Development Plan
   The Zoning Office staff must review the development plan and publish a written determination of
   the plan's level of compliance with the zoning district regulations. Apply at the Zoning Office.

B. Present the planned development at a pre-application conference
   Contact the Zoning Office to schedule a conference with the Site Plan and Appearance Review
   Committee, the alderman of the ward and the chairman of the Plan Commission.

5. REQUIRED SUBMISSION DOCUMENTS AND MATERIALS

☒ (This) Completed Application Form
☒ Application Fee, including postage for required mailing
☒ Two (2) Copies of Application Binder

Your application must be in the form of a binder with removable pages for copying.
You must submit two application binders for initial review.
The Application Binder must include:

☐ Certificate of Disclosure of Ownership Interest Form
☐ Plan drawing illustrating development boundary and individual parcels and PINs (See tax parcel division Report of the Cook County
   Assessor and tax parcel division illustration)
☐ Plat of Survey of Entire Development Site
☐ Zoning Analysis Results Sheet **[see Case No. 19ZONA-0014 (updated)]
☐ Preliminary Plat of Subdivision.
☐ Pre-application Conference Materials.
☐ Development Plan
☐ Landscape Plan
☐ Statement addressing how the planned developments approval will further public benefits
☐ Statement describing the relationship with the Comprehensive Plan and other City land use plans
☐ Statement describing the development's compliance with any other pertinent city planning and development policies.
☐ Statement addressing the site controls and standards for planned developments
☐ Statement of proposed developments compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood
☐ Statement of the propose developments compatibility with the design guidelines for planned developments
☐ Statements describing provisions for care and maintenance of open space and recreational facilities and proposed
   articles of incorporation and bylaws.
☐ Restrictive Covenants
☐ Schedule of Development
☐ Market Feasibility Statement
☐ Traffic Circulation Impact Study
☐ Statement addressing development allowances for planned developments

Notes:

- Plats of survey must be drawn to scale and must accurately and completely reflect the current conditions of the
  property.
- Building plans must be drawn to scale and must include interior floor plans and exterior elevations.
- Application Fees may be paid by cash, check, or credit card.
6. OTHER PROFESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVE INFORMATION

**Attorney**

Name: David Meek  
Organization: The Law Office of David Meek, LLC

Address: 513 Central Ave., Suite 400  
City, State, Zip: Highland Park, IL 60035

Phone: (847) 579-6943  
Fax: (847) 433-2025  
Email: david@beckergurian.com

**Architect**

Name:  
Organization:  

Address:  
City, State, Zip:  

Phone:  
Fax:  
Email:  

**Surveyor**

Name: Raymond R. Hansen  

Address: 450 Skokie Blvd., Ste. 150  
City, State, Zip: Northbrook, IL 60062

Phone: (847) 864-6315  
Fax: (847) 864-9341  
Email: surveyor@bhsuhr.com

**Civil Engineer**

Name:  
Organization:  

Address:  
City, State, Zip:  

Phone:  
Fax:  
Email:  

**Traffic Engineer**

Name:  
Organization:  

Address:  
City, State, Zip:  

Phone:  
Fax:  
Email:  

**Other Consultant**

Name:  
Organization:  

Address:  
City, State, Zip:  

Phone:  
Fax:  
Email:  
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7. MULTIPLE PROPERTY OWNERS

"I understand that the regulations governing the use of my property may change as a result of this petition. By signing below, I give my permission for the named petitioner on page 1 of this form to act as my agent in matters concerning this petition. I understand that 1) the named petitioner will be the City of Evanston's primary contact during the processing of this petition, 2) I may not be contacted directly by City of Evanston staff with information regarding the petition while it is being processed, 3) I may inquire the status of this petition and other information by contacting the Zoning Office, and 4) the property owners listed below may change the named petitioner at any time by delivering to the Zoning Office a written statement signed by all property owners and identifying a substitute petitioner."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME and CONTACT INFORMATION</th>
<th>ADDRESS (es) or PIN(s) of PROPERTY OWNED</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horizon Realty Group XXIII, LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946 W. Lawrence Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL 60640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attn: Jeff Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:JMicheal@horizonrealtygroup.com">JMicheal@horizonrealtygroup.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621-1631 Chicago Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-18-403-021-0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and also: 1605-1619 Chicago Ave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-18-403-020-0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copy this form if necessary for a complete listing.
City of Evanston
DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

(This form is required for all Major Variances and Special Use Applications)

The Evanston City Code, Title 1, Chapter 18, requires any persons or entities who request the City Council to grant zoning amendments, variations, or special uses, including planned developments, to make the following disclosures of information. The applicant is responsible for keeping the disclosure information current until the City Council has taken action on the application. For all hearings, this information is used to avoid conflicts of interest on the part of decision-makers.

1. If applicant is an agent or designee, list the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of the proposed user of the land for which this application for zoning relief is made: Does not apply.

2. If a person or organization owns or controls the proposed land user, list the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of person or entity having constructive control of the proposed land user. Same as number _x_ above, or indicated below. (An example of this situation is if the land user is a division or subsidiary of another person or organization.)

3. List the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of person or entity holding title to the subject property. Same as number _x_ above, or indicated below.

4. List the name, address, phone, fax, and any other contact information of person or entity having constructive control of the subject property. Same as number _x_ above, or indicated below.
If Applicant or Proposed Land User is a Corporation

Any corporation required by law to file a statement with any other governmental agency providing substantially the information required below may submit a copy of this statement in lieu of completing a and b below.

a. Names and addresses of all officers and directors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Names, addresses, and percentage of interest of all shareholders. If there are fewer than 33 shareholders, or shareholders holding 3% or more of the ownership interest in the corporation or if there are more than 33 shareholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>% Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Applicant or Proposed Land User is not a Corporation

Name, address, percentage of interest, and relationship to applicant, of each partner, associate, person holding a beneficial interest, or other person having an interest in the entity applying, or in whose interest one is applying, for the zoning relief.

See attached organizational chart.
ORGANIZATIONAL CHART:

Property
1621-1631 Chicago Ave., Evanston, IL

100% ownership interest
Horizon Group XXIII, LLC
Manager: Horizon Group Realty Holdings, LLC

100% ownership interest
HORIZON GROUP REALTY HOLDINGS, LLC,
an Illinois limited liability company
Manager: Daniel Michael

Managed by
HRG Realty Management, LLC, an Illinois limited liability company

100% ownership interest
Jeffrey Michael

David S. Michael
Jeffrey E. Michael
Tracy H. Wolfe,
trustee of
Daniel & Martha Michael 2009 Revocable Trust
12/1/09
24.67%

Daniel Michael,
trustee of
the Jeffrey E. Michael Revocable Trust
6/9/2004
23.68%

Jeffrey E. Michael
23.68%

Daniel Michael,
trustee of
the Tracy H. Michael Revocable Trust
6/9/2004
23.68%

David S. Michael
1.43%

Jeffrey E. Michael
1.43%

Tracy H. Wolfe
1.43%
Development Parcel Boundaries

See enclosed records of the tax parcel division of the subject property as it existed when Ord. 86-O-13 was approved. The owner subsequently divided the subject property into 2 separate tax parcels. See also proposed Plat of Subdivision of the subject property, as indicated in the Plat of Subdivision Application filed concurrently with this major adjustment of The Merion Planned Development (Ord. 86-O-13).
Division Report

Division: 2016-01046
Township: EVANSTON

Tax Year: 2016
Division Date: 12/03/2015

Petition No. 2016-0563
Date 10/20/2015
Petitioner
MICHAEL JOHN PETERS

Existing PIN(s)
Permanent Index Number: 11-18-403-019-0000

Tract
Tax Payer
HORIZON REALTY GROUP
1948 W LAWRENCE AVE CHICAGO, IL 60640-4010
P/A: 1611 CHICAGO AVE
EVANSTON, IL 602016019
Assessment Status: Assessable
Exempt Code: 0
Volume: 57
Taxcode: 17021

Legal Description:

New PIN(s)
Permanent Index Number: 11-18-403-020-0000

Tract 1
Tax Payer
HORIZON GROUP XXIII, LLC
1940 W LAWRENCE AVE CHICAGO, IL 60640
P/A: 0000001611 CHICAGO AVE
EVANSTON, IL 602010000
Assessment Status: Assessable
Exempt Code:
Volume: 57
Taxcode: 17021

Legal Description:
THAT PART OF LOT A DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY, ALONG THE NORTHWESTERLY LINE, 264.39 FEET; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY AT APPROXIMATELY A RIGHT ANGLE, 170 FEET TO THE SOUTHEASTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY, ALONG THE SOUTHEASTERLY LINE, 264.46 FEET; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY, ALONG THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE, 170 FEET TO THE POB
IN PLAT OF CONSOLIDATION OF LOT 4 (EXCEPT THE NORTH 5 FEET) AND ALL OF LOTS 5 TO 9 IN BLOCK 20 IN THE VILLAGE OF EVANSTON IN SECTION 13-41-13 AND IN 7, 19 AND OF
Permanent Index Number: 11-18-403-021-0000

Tract 2

Tax Planer
HORIZON GROUP XXIII, LLC
1940 W LAWRENCE AVE CHICAGO, IL 60640
P/A: 0000001627 CHICAGO AVE
EVANSTON, IL 602010000
Assessment Status: Assessable
Exempt Code: 
Volume: 57
Taxcode: 17021

Legal Description:
LOT A (EXCEPT THAT PART OF LOT A DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY, ALONG THE NORTHWESTERLY LINE, 264.39 FEET; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY AT APPROXIMATELY A RIGHT ANGLE, 170 FEET TO THE SOUTHEASTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY, ALONG THE SOUTHEASTERLY LINE, 264.46 FEET; THENCE NORTHWESTERLY, ALONG THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE, 170 FEET TO THE PDB)

IN PLAT OF CONSOLIDATION OF LOT 4 (EXCEPT THE NORTH 5 FEET) AND ALL OF LOTS 5 TO 9 IN BLOCK 20 IN THE VILLAGE OF EVANSTON IN SECTION 13-41-13 AND IN 7, 19 AND OF
Zoning Analysis Results Sheet

(See updated zoning analysis for Case No. 19ZONA-0014)
Plat of Survey

and

proposed 2-lot plat of The Merion Subdivision

Full size copies of the Plat of Survey and the proposed plat of The Merion Subdivision were previously filed with the City of Evanston.
Zoning Analysis
Summary

Case Number: 19ZONA-0101
Case Status/Determination: Compliant

Proposal:
Subdivision of existing parcel and subsequent Major Adjustment of a Planned Development for the Merion (Case 13PLND-0052 approved by Ordinance 86-O-13). No proposed changes to existing structures.

Zoning Section: Comments:
6-11-5-6  FAR increase from 3.15 to 4.5 compliant, no site development allowance needed. 38 total parking spaces all leased off-site within 1,000 ft. of the property. 9 required to be leased per 86-O-13. 23 on-site parking spaces will be on different parcel with proposed subdivision and will possibly be removed with a new development. No site development allowance needed.
6-11-5-4  Number of total units is 186 down from 205 as listed in 86-O-13. This includes 65 dwelling units with full kitchens. No site development allowance needed.

Note:
**City of Evanston**  
**ZONING ANALYSIS REVIEW SHEET**

**APPLICATION STATUS:** June 24, 2019  
**RESULTS OF ANALYSIS:** Compliant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Z.A. Number:</th>
<th>19ZONA-0101</th>
<th>Purpose:</th>
<th>Plat of Subdivision, Consolidation, etc.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>1619 Chicago AVE</td>
<td>District:</td>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Overlay:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Jeff Michael</td>
<td>Reviewer:</td>
<td>Meagan Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>7735297200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- New Principal Structure
- New Accessory Structure
- Addition to Structure
- Alteration to Structure
- Retention of Structure
- Change of Use
- Sidewalk Cafe
- Business License
- Home Occupation
- Plat of Resubdivision/Consolidation
- Independent Living Facility
- Independent Living Facility

**ANALYSIS BASED ON:**

- Plans Dated:
- Prepared By: B.H. Suhr
- Survey Dated:
- Existing Improvements:

**Proposal Description:**

Plat of Subdivision and Major Adjustment to existing PD approved by ordinance 86-O-13

---

### PLANNED DEVELOPMENT THRESHOLDS

| 1. | Is the request for construction of substantially new structures or a substantial rehabilitation or substantial addition as defined by increasing floor area of principal structure by 35% or more? If not, skip to 2 & 4 below. | Yes |
| 2. | Does the zoning lot area exceed 30,000 sqft? | Yes |
| 3. | Does the proposal entail more that 24 new residential, commercial, business, retail or office units in any combination? | Yes |
| 4. | Does the proposal entail the new construction of more than 20,000 sqft of true gross floor area at or above grade including areas otherwise excluded from defined gross floor area? | No |

### RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT CALCULATIONS

The following three sections apply to building lot coverage and impervious surface calculations in Residential Districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front Porch Exception (Subtract 50%)</th>
<th>Pavers/Pervious Paver Exception (Subtract 20%)</th>
<th>Open Parking Debit (Add 200sqft/open space)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Eligible</td>
<td>Total Paver Area</td>
<td># Open Required Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Paver Regulatory Area</td>
<td>Addtn. to Bldg Lot Cov.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PRINCIPAL USE AND STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USE:</td>
<td>Independent Living Facility</td>
<td>Indep Living Facility</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Lot Width (LF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Lot Width (LF)</th>
<th>No Requirement</th>
<th>393.2</th>
<th>266.1</th>
<th>Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USE:</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Lot Area (SF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Lot Area (SF)</th>
<th>66616.2</th>
<th>44972.2</th>
<th>Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LF:** Linear Feet **SF:** Square Feet **FT:** Feet

---
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### Building Lot Coverage
(SF) (defined, including subtractions & additions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impervious Surface Coverage (SF, %)

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

### Accessory Structure Rear Yard Coverage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gross Floor Area (SF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>210088.2</td>
<td>188457.2</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Height (FT)

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

### Front Yard(1) (FT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Front Yard(2) (FT)

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

### Street Side Yard (FT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

### Rear Yard (FT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PARKING REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 off-street + 9 leased</td>
<td>38 (off-site, leased)</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:** 86-O-13 required 9 spaces to be leased to add to onsite open parking.
### Use(2):

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

### Use(3):

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL REQUIRED:</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Handicap Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Sec. 6-16-2-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access:</td>
<td>Sec. 6-16-2-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Clearance (LF)</td>
<td>7'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surfacing:</td>
<td>Sec. 6-16-2-8 (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Sec. 6-4-6-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Sec. 6-4-6-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Angle(1): Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Width(W) (FT) Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depth(D) (FT) Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aisle(A) (FT) Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module (FT) Comments:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Angle(2): Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Width(W) (FT) Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depth(D) (FT) Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aisle(A) (FT) Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module (FT) Comments:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garage Setback from Alley Access (FT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### LOADING REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loading Use: Institutional Living 1 short 10K to 200K, 1 short each addtl. 100K.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

LF: Linear Feet  SF: Square Feet  FT: Feet
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### Standard | Existing | Proposed | Determination
---|---|---|---
TOTAL (long): | | | |
TOTAL (short): | | | |
Long Berth Size (FT) | 12' wide x 50' deep | | |
Comments: | | | |
Short Berth Size (FT) | 10' wide x 35' deep | 10' X 35' | No Change
Comments: | | | |
Vertical Clearance (FT) | | 14' | |
Comments: | | | |
Location: | | Sec. 6-16-4-1 | |
Comments: | | | |

### MISCELLANEOUS REQUIREMENTS

| Requirement (1): | | | |
Comments: | | | |

| Requirement (2): | | | |
Comments: | | | |

| Requirement (3): | | | |
Comments: | | | |

### COMMENTS AND/OR NOTES

Analysis Comments

### RESULTS OF ANALYSIS

Results of Analysis: This Application is **Compliant**

Site Plan & Appearance Review Committee approval is: **Required**

See attached comments and/or notes.

---

SIGNATURE | DATE
Project Overview

Horizon Realty Group, which successfully redeveloped The Merion senior living facility at Chicago Avenue and Davis Street, is proposing a new market-rate active adult residential rental building at 1621-1631 Chicago Avenue. Named The Legacy, the building, designed by Pappageorge Haymes Partners, will transform a tired commercial stretch of an important Evanston corridor into a luxury living destination with retail and restaurants on the ground floor. The 19-story, 240-unit Legacy will closely match the reddish brown brick exterior already seen in The Merion and its recent addition, to create an ensemble of complementary buildings with an activated street front. The Legacy aims to fulfill the continuing strong demand for downtown Evanston luxury rental residential living rich with amenities that both empty nesters and younger populations are seeking.

The Legacy will contribute to the economic vitality of downtown, a bustling place that attracts and retains residents. Adding more residential living in downtown Evanston will increase the customer base of pedestrian walk-by traffic that is necessary for independent retail and restaurant establishments to prosper. Further, The Legacy will add substantially to the property tax base, as well as bringing more sales taxes, utility and other taxes, and considerable permit and development fees. In short, The Legacy will be compatible with surrounding development in the downtown urban core of Evanston, enhancing the value of nearby properties, and positively contributing to the mixed-use vitality of the North Shore’s leading community.

The Legacy also plans to make a social contract with the city and its stakeholders by designing the building for LEED-Silver certification, by making a significant contribution to Evanston’s affordable housing program, and by substantially investing in underground parking to create a better transportation aesthetic to both preserve and augment the character of the downtown.
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New 19-Story Residential Building

**Landscape Plan**

**1621-31 Chicago Ave.**

- **New "Purple Robe" Locust Tree** (8" Caliper) Typ.
- **Existing Tree** (To Remain)
- **Existing Street Light**
- **Provide Mixture of Perennial Grasses and Annual Flowering Plants. Typ.**
- **Existing Fire Hydrant**
- **Existing Planter**
- **New Concrete Sidewalk**
- **Public Sidewalk**
- **New Planter**
- **24'-8"**
- **10'-0"**
- **24'-8"**
- **10'-0"**
- **Auto Entrance**
- **Bike Lane**
- **Parallel Parking**

**Chicago Ave**

**Scale: 1" = 10'**

**2/14/19**

**Valenti**

**PAPPAGEORGE HAYMES**

**30**
# 1621-31 Chicago Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th># Floors</th>
<th>Height (ft)</th>
<th>Height (m)</th>
<th>Studio (581-621sf)</th>
<th>1 Bed (727-844sf)</th>
<th>2 Bed (1062-1348sf)</th>
<th>3 Bed (1683-2125sf)</th>
<th>Total Units/FL</th>
<th>Retail Res SF</th>
<th>Common SF</th>
<th>Amenity SF</th>
<th>Parking Load SF</th>
<th>Vertical Service SF</th>
<th>Mech SF</th>
<th>Gross SF</th>
<th>FAR SF</th>
<th>Cars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basement 02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,383</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement 01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,594</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,590</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,539</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,733</td>
<td>16,183</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8,585</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>6,882</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>17,807</td>
<td>16,752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13,733</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>16,103</td>
<td>15,048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13,733</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>16,103</td>
<td>15,048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13,733</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>16,103</td>
<td>15,048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13,733</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>16,103</td>
<td>15,048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13,733</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>16,103</td>
<td>15,048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13,733</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>16,103</td>
<td>15,048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth Floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12,169</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>14,422</td>
<td>13,367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth Floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12,169</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>14,422</td>
<td>13,367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleventh Floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12,169</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>14,422</td>
<td>13,367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth Floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12,169</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>14,422</td>
<td>13,367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirteenth Floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12,169</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>14,422</td>
<td>13,367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourteenth Floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12,169</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>14,422</td>
<td>13,367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifteenth Floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12,169</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>14,422</td>
<td>13,367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixteenth Floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12,169</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>14,422</td>
<td>13,367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventeenth Floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12,169</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>14,422</td>
<td>13,367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penthouse Floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11,585</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>13,704</td>
<td>12,649</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sky Amenity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,997</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>3,079</td>
<td>6,874</td>
<td>3,133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>211.667</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>5,539</td>
<td>212,089</td>
<td>33,291</td>
<td>8,018</td>
<td>39,603</td>
<td>14,196</td>
<td>13,221</td>
<td>323,957</td>
<td>251,453</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Percentage   | 14%     | 50%        | 34%       | 2%     |
| Goal         | 20%     | 60%        | 20%       |        |

| Total Units  | 240 DU  | 884 SF    | 320 DU    | 346 SF |
| Avg Unit Size| 0.35 SF |           |           |        |
| Parking Ratio| 0.35    |           |           |        |
| Parking Eff. | 466 SF  |           |           |        |
| Typ. Floor Eff. - Tier 1 | 85.28% |           |           |        |
| Typ. Floor Eff. - Tier 2 | 84.38% |           |           |        |
| Total Eff.   | 76.74%  |           |           |        |
| Amenity/Unit | 33.41 SF |           |           |        |

## Project Data

**1621-31 Chicago Ave.**

**Valenti**

**The Right Partner**

**Pappageorge Haymes**

**Project Data**

2/14/19
### Zoning Analysis

#### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number:</th>
<th>Case Status/Determination:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19ZONA-0014</td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposal:

New 19-story planned development with 240 units, 85 parking spaces and 3,539 sq. ft. of ground floor commercial space.

#### Zoning Section: Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calculations assume a two-lot Plat of Subdivision to match existing tax parcels (21,644 sq. ft. proposed development lot).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6-11-5-8</td>
<td>The proposed garage entry off of Chicago Ave. creates points of conflict between vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles on the newly installed protected bike lane. It would also impact the flow of traffic and a number of metered parking spaces would need to be removed, not only for the driveway access, but also to provide proper sight line for drivers egress from the building. Given the overall issues and concerns, the parking garage access/egress should be from the alley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6-11-5-6</td>
<td>Maximum height permitted in the D4 District is 105 ft. to roof (excluding floors dedicated to parking) with an additional 40 ft. as an eligible site development allowance. The proposed height is 211 ft. 8 in. Exceeds eligible site development allowance. <em>Approval shall require a favorable two-thirds (2/3) of the City Council.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6-11-5-4</td>
<td>The maximum number of units permitted (at 400 sf/du) is 54. 240 units are proposed. Eligible site development allowance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6-16-3-5 Table 16B</td>
<td>185 parking spaces are required. 85 parking spaces (with 4 ADA spaces) are proposed. Eligible site development allowance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6-16-5 Table 16E</td>
<td>2 short loading berths required. 1 short loading berth proposed. Eligible site development allowance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Evanston

ZONING ANALYSIS REVIEW SHEET

APPLICATION STATUS: January 24, 2019

Z.A. Number: 19ZONA-0014
Purpose: Zoning Analysis without Bld Permit App
Address: 1621 Chicago AVE
District: D4
Applicant: Jeff Michael
Overlay: Preservation
Phone: 7735297200
Reviewer: Meagan Jones

THIS APPLICATION PROPOSES (select all that apply):

X New Principal Structure
Change of Use
Sidewalk Cafe
New Accessory Structure
Retention of Use
Other
Addition to Structure
Plat of Rasubdiv/Consol.
Alteration to Structure
Business License
Retention of Structure
Home Occupation

ANALYSIS BASED ON:
Plans Dated: 12.21.18
Prepared By: Papageorge Hames
Survey Dated: 5.1.18
Existing Improvements: 1-story commercial building

Proposal Description:
Proposed 19-sty building with 240 residential units, 3,539 sq. ft. of ground floor commercial space and 85 parking spaces

ZONING ANALYSIS

PLANNED DEVELOPMENT THRESHOLDS

Does not apply to H, II, III, OS, U3, or Excluded T1 & T2 Properties. See Section 6-6-1-10(D) for R's; Section 6-9-1-4(D) for B's; Section 6-10-1-4(D) for C's; Section 6-11-1-10(D) for D's; Section 6-12-1-7(D) for RP; Section 6-13-1-10(D) for MU & MUE; Section 6-15-1-9 for O1, T's, U's, oH, oRE, & oRD.

1. Is the request for construction of substantially new structures or a substantial rehabilitation or substantial addition as defined by increasing floor area of principal structure by 35% or more? If not, skip to 2 & 4 below.
   Yes
2. Does the zoning lot area exceed 30,000 sqft?
   No
3. Does the proposal entail more than 24 new residential, commercial, business, retail or office units in any combination?
   Yes
4. Does the proposal entail the new construction of more than 30,000 sqft of true gross floor area at or above grade including areas otherwise excluded from defined gross floor area?
   Yes

RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT CALCULATIONS

The following three sections apply to building lot coverage and impervious surface calculations in Residential Districts.

Front Porch Exception (Subtract 50%)
Total Ellibgle
Front Porch
Regulatory Area

Pavers/Paving Exception (Subtract 26%)
Total Paver Area
Paver Regulatory Area

Open Parking Debit (Add 200sqft/open space)
# Open Required Spaces
Addtn. to Bldg Lot Cov.

PRINCIPAL USE AND STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Minimum Lot Width (LF)
USE: Other
Minimum Lot Area (SF)
USE: Multi Family

Dwelling Units:
USE: 54
Comments: 400 sfdu or 54
Comments: 240

LF: Linear Feet
SF: Square Feet
FT: Feet
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rooming Units:</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Building Lot Coverage (SF) (defined, including subtractions & additions): | None |
| Comments: |          |

| Impervious Surface Coverage (SF, %) |          |
| Comments: |          |

| Accessory Structure Rear Yard Coverage: | 40% of rear yard |
| Comments: |          |

| Gross Floor Area (SF) | 5.4 or 118,878 sf |
| Use: | All Uses |
| Comments: | 251430   | 11.62 |
| Non-Compliant |

| Height (FT) | 105 ft |
| Comments: | 211 ft 8 in |
| Non-Compliant |

| Front Yard(1) (FT) | 0 |
| Direction: W |
| Street: | Chicago Ave. |
| Comments: Please clarify setbacks and dimensions of window projections. |
| Compliant |

| Front Yard(2) (FT) | Direction: Does Not Apply |
| Comments: | |

| Street Side Yard (FT) | Direction: Does Not Apply |
| Comments: | |

| Interior Side Yard(1) (FT) | 0 |
| Direction: N |
| Comments: | Compliant |

| Interior Side Yard(2) (FT) | 0 |
| Direction: S |
| Comments: | Compliant |

| Rear Yard (FT) | 0 |
| Direction: E |
| Comments: | Compliant |

### PARKING REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use(1): Multi-family (Nonres District)</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.55/du&lt;1 bd; 1.1/du=2 bd; 1.65/du=3 bd</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comments: | |

LF: Linear Feet  SF: Square Feet  FT: Feet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use(2): Retail Goods Establishment</th>
<th>1 per 350 sqft gross floor area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Comments:**

**Use(3):**

**Comments:**

**TOTAL REQUIRED: 183+[(3539-3000)/350]*8=185**

**Comments:**

Handicap Parking Spaces: Sec. 6-16-2-6

**Comments:**

Access: Sec. 6-16-2-2

**Comments:** Street access creates conflict points between cars, pedestrians and bicyclists. Alley access should be provided

Vertical Clearance (LF) 7”

**Comments:**

Surfacing: Sec. 6-16-2-8 (E)

**Comments:**

Location: Sec. 6-4-6-2

**Comments:**

**Angle(1): 90 Degree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Width(W) (FT)</th>
<th>8.5</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth(D) (FT)</th>
<th>18.0</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aisle(A) (FT)</th>
<th>24.0</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module (FT)</th>
<th>SL 42.0, DL 60.0</th>
<th>SL 42.0, DL 60</th>
<th>Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Angle(2):**

**Comments:**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-module</th>
<th>SL 42.0, DL 60</th>
<th>SL 42.0, DL 60</th>
<th>Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOADING REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loading Use: Multi-family</th>
<th>1 short 30K to 100K, 1 short each addtl. 200K.</th>
<th>1 short</th>
<th>Non-Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

**LF:** Linear Feet  **SF:** Square Feet  **FT:** Feet
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (long):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (short):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Berth Size (FT)</td>
<td>12' wide x 50' deep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Berth Size (FT)</td>
<td>10' wide x 35' deep</td>
<td>10 ft X 35 ft</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Clearance (FT)</td>
<td>14'</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Sec. 6-16-4-1</td>
<td>alley access</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MISC. I ANFOLS REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirement (1):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement (2):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement (3):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS AND/OR NOTES**

Analysis Comments

**RESULTS OF ANALYSIS**

Results of Analysis: This Application is Non-Compliant

Site Plan & Appearance Review Committee approval is: Required

See attached comments and/or notes.

[Signature] [Date: 1/24/19]
The Merion Legacy Policy Memo

Significant Issues and Considerations Arising from the Proposed Curb Cut at the Development at 1621-31 Chicago Avenue

August 28, 2019
Introduction

Over the last 18 months, Horizon Realty Group’s proposed Merion Legacy project has raised a number of worthy public policy debates and discussions. These have ranged from the footprint of the building and architectural materials to public benefits and affordable housing. The public meetings have raised scant meaningful objection to the planned development. Meanwhile, City staff review comments have focused predominantly on the proposed curb-cut which crosses a cycle track as it relates to the ingress/egress of the proposed below-ground parking garage entrance on Chicago Avenue.

These are indeed important considerations but too often they are talked about in a siloed fashion when intrinsic to the project are broad public policy issues of land use, tax revenue, and downtown livability that we believe also merit attention. Thus, the purpose of this memo is to connect the issues of curb-cuts and vehicular access to the bigger picture and bring a focus to problem-solving rather than adverse effects.

At the core, some have seen things in the Merion Legacy project and asked, “Why?” We want to dream things for Evanston that never were and ask, “Why not”.


A.) Flexibility Rather than Strict Policy: Over the last several years, the City has had ample opportunity to codify a curb-cut policy but has not done so. One can infer that by not creating a formal policy, the City wants to allow for flexibility, which, on its face, may be beneficial for the City. How that “flexibility” plays out for developers, however, is another matter. In the case of the D4 zone, where the Merion Legacy is proposed, if the City had wanted to prohibit all curb-cuts leading to parking areas, one would think it would have done so.

B.) City Code Does Not Restrict Consideration of New Curb Cuts: The Code itself does not speak to the density or frequency of curb cuts along a street. The result is a veritable hodgepodge of bicycle routes with numerous curb-cuts in busy commercial areas and on major arteries. Even in recent years, the City has permitted curb-cuts for major new development projects (i.e. AMLI Evanston, E2, and Centrum). What the City Code does say, however, is that “no curb cut plans and/or designs shall be approved by the City which may result in the standing of vehicles on any public street, public sidewalk, alley or other public property.” (Sec. 7-3-8(A).) Interestingly, that is exactly what the Merion Legacy’s proposal is designed to prevent. Without access from Chicago Avenue to the garage, the result would be standing vehicles along Chicago Avenue.

A second part of the Code notes that to permit a curb cut, the Director of Public Works must find that “(1) the proposed driveway does not create undue safety hazards in the use of the street, parkway or sidewalk by vehicular or pedestrian traffic; (2) the proposed driveway does not impede the safe and efficient flow of traffic on the streets and sidewalks adjoining the property for which the driveway is proposed; and (3) the existing and proposed use of the property to be connected by said driveway is in all respects in conformity with the existing traffic, zoning and building ordinances and with the relevant goals of the City as set forth in the Comprehensive General Plan.”- (Sec. 7-3-8(A). The first two requirements are based on subjective opinion, “undue safety hazards” and “safe and efficient flow”. Below, we will outline
why the Merion Legacy’s proposal meets these requirements and conforms to existing ordinances and goals of the important plans of the City of Evanston.

Finally, the Code specifies additional standards for the creation of new curb cuts when there is a showing of (“1) a clear need for the proposed location; (2) the need for the additional width or curb cut; and (3) evidence that the proposal will minimize or not substantially increase interference with pedestrian or vehicular traffic beyond that which would result from compliance with the basic requirements. (Sec. 7-3-8(B).) This memo will demonstrate why there is a “clear need” for a curb cut at the Merion Legacy.

With respect to the designation of bicycle routes, the Code is relatively silent except that such bicycle routes may be authorized by the City traffic engineer with consent of the City Council. (See Sec. 10-9-7.) There is nothing in the Code about criteria, evaluation, methodology, or how the bicycle route may restrict or encourage other economic and transportation activity.

C.) City Staff Reports and Memoranda: In July 2017, City staff prepared a memo with a series of recommendations to approve a Downtown Curb Cut Management policy. The recommendations were considered by the City Transportation and Parking Committee on July 26, 2017. The Committee, however, took no action nor has it discussed the issue for the last two years. Given the lack of interest by the Committee – and by extension, the City Council, it would appear that curb cut policy is a low priority for the City and rather than have codified regulations, the City Council would prefer to allow for flexibility. In fact, the Committee discussion included a number of suggestions about ways to make curb cuts more palatable including using audible signals as well as visual aids like mirrors to increase safety for pedestrians crossing motor vehicle entry/egress points. The Committee also liked the idea of using materials that would indicate a curb cut for increased awareness.

Two other key points emerged from this meeting of the Transportation and Parking Committee:

First, given the Committee offered best practice and examples of ways to make curb cuts work better like raised crosswalks, pavement markings, signs, and other roadway elements, one could say that if more curb cuts were added, there is a rubric established to guide their implementation.

Second, nowhere is it codified that one mode of transportation trumps another. Nor could one infer from any of the discussions that one mode of transportation takes priority when considering rights-of-way policy.

The conclusion here is that City policy with regard to curb cuts and bicycle routes/lanes is inconsistent in its application, has been low priority for codifying policy, and will have a chilling effect on future development projects and investments in Evanston. All of which demonstrates the City’s lack of clear direction about handling requests for new curb cuts should not now shut down any fair consideration of the Merion Legacy’s proposed innovative curb cut and porte-cochere garage entry on Chicago Avenue.
II.) Public Policy Considerations About Curb Cuts and Public Right-of-Way

One of the challenges Evanston faces with land-use decisions is that despite a constant need for additional revenue, jobs, and economic growth; the expansion of Evanston’s tax base is rarely considered because most of the public discussion is framed around aesthetics, traffic, parking, and other perceived externalities. The approval process for development projects also tends to create silos of discussion and the process yields little opportunity for the “big picture”. Below are some of the key public policy considerations the City may want to focus on when weighing the merits of the Merion Legacy:

A.) Pre-Existing Conditions: The Merion Legacy is adjacent to a two-way cycle track that allows bicycle movement in both directions on the east side of Chicago Avenue. It is configured as a protected cycle track at street level with bollards and between the cycle track and parking lane. At either end of the block are some concrete barriers which separate the cycle track from the northbound motor vehicle lane.

The only difference between the Merion Legacy curb cut on the Chicago Avenue cycle track and other pre-existing ones along the same path is that the Merion Legacy proposal came after the cycle track was developed. How is that fair or even relevant? In other words, the City, in designing the Chicago Avenue cycle track, knew there would be numerous conflicts with existing curb cuts and yet it felt that whatever risk would be created, it was still worthwhile to build the cycle track.

So, if those existing conflict points are acceptable, why isn’t the Merion Legacy proposed curb cut acceptable? Is there a known maximum number of curb cuts on a cycle track route? The Merion Legacy curb cut proposal deserves a fair, objective consideration. To date, there is no rational basis for concluding that one more curb cut can’t be properly designed to operate as effectively and safely as any existing curb cut.

B.) Precedent: Is Evanston willing to make this project a precedent-setting case and block future potential tax generating developments along the Chicago Avenue cycle track and other miles of bike routes?

C.) Flexibility: There is no need for a hard “line-in-the-sand” when it comes to curb-cuts. Development proposals should be considered on a case by case basis; which is exactly the flexibility that is required because the City has not codified any hard policy. Moreover, not all curb cuts serve the same operational characteristics and therefore do not present the same issues for consideration. For example, the City should not evaluate a Dunkin’ drive-thru curb cut the same as a multi-million-dollar residential development.

D.) Design Model: Rather than looking only at the “problem”, shouldn’t Evanston be a proponent of designing safe conflict points and balancing different kinds of uses/needs in the public right-of-way? There is no reason to take an absolutist approach to future consideration of any new curb cuts on an existing cycle track. As the City has noted in its bike route planning efforts to date, the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) promulgates engineering design standards and other best practices to create a safe and effective curb cut.

E.) Regulatory Taking: The City of Evanston’s arbitrarily applied prohibition of future curb cuts on the Chicago Avenue cycle track arguably constitutes a partial regulatory taking subjecting itself to potential legal attacks. When the Chicago Avenue cycle track was designed
and implemented, the City decreased the value of the properties adjacent to the new bicycle infrastructure.

III.) Site Realities on Chicago Avenue and other Public Right-of-Ways in Downtown Evanston

A) Observed Experience in the Cycle Track in the 1600 Block of Chicago Ave.: As is often the case with cycle tracks, while conflict may be nominally reduced in one area, the conflict is moved unintentionally to another area. In the 1600 block of Chicago, the cycle track offers protection on much of the block but may sacrifice some safety at intersections, where most crashes occur.

1) While the cycle track is bi-directional and runs along the east side of the street, there is no corresponding cycle track on the west side of the street where several key biking destinations exist. The result is southbound cyclists tend to ride outside the cycle track, on the west side of the street.

2) It seems difficult for bicyclists to get into and out of the bike lane. For example, if one were to turn southbound on Chicago Avenue from Church Street, one approaches Chicago Avenue from the west. Before the cycle track existed, one simply turned right onto Chicago Avenue. Now, one must cross the entirety of Chicago Avenue before turning right and as one does, they have to pass through the cars turning right, both on the west and east sides of the street.

3) Bicyclists seem to be confused by the proliferation of signs at intersections, especially as they are forced to compete with cars as they diagonally cross (i.e. going southbound at Chicago and Davis) or when they turn left going north (i.e. at Chicago and Church).

B.) Observed Experience in the Alley Behind the Site: First and foremost, this alley is a heavily used commercial alley, as distinguished from other alleys that may abut residential uses. It is narrow, unkempt, poorly lit, and choked with dumpsters and utility poles. The alley is often blocked for long periods of time by service and delivery trucks parked for loading and unloading to the various commercial and residential buildings that already utilize the alley. In the winter, alley passage is even more restricted due to snow and icy conditions which make driving more hazardous. For a building like the Merion Legacy that will be targeting the senior market, using the alley for entry/egress to a parking garage would be fatal to the furtherance of the project.

C.) Other Protected Bike Lanes in Downtown Evanston: Installing protected bike lanes in heavily used commercial corridors with curb cuts is not a foreign concept for the City of Evanston. In recent years, the City has created protected bike lanes on Church Street going eastbound and Davis Street going westbound. Additionally, bike lanes have been added on Emerson Street (a truck route) and Dodge Avenue, just to name a few. All of these bike lanes, like the Chicago Avenue cycle track, have numerous curb cuts and significant car and truck usage. For example:

- Church Street has a protected bike lane on the EB side of the street. There are numerous curb cuts along that Protected Bike Lane. Significantly notable are the curb cuts serving Church Street Plaza and Byline Bank.
Like Church Street, Davis Street has a protected bike lane on the WB side of the street. The significant curb cuts along that lane are at the Chase Bank drive-in and the public parking garage for Sherman Plaza on Davis, west of Sherman Avenue.

D.) Actual Experience with Curb Cuts: Evanston has invested heavily in infrastructure to incentivize bicycle activity. Many of the designated bicycle routes have been placed on major arterial streets, and those routes have accommodated numerous curb cuts along some of the City’s busiest streets. Where they have been permitted, the placement of curb cuts and their relative impacts on pedestrians, on other modes of transportation, and on the use and development of adjacent properties reflect inconsistencies in the City’s policy and its practices.

Among the recent curb cuts that have been granted, many of them are mid-block, including E2 at 1890 Maple Ave., Centrum at 1590 Elmwood Ave., and AMLI Evanston at 737 Chicago Ave. Interestingly, the City seems to be permissive of mid-block curb cuts for residential buildings. An argument can be made that a mid-block curb cut is potentially less problematic/disruptive than one closer to an intersection although the City has not shied away from permitting curb cuts at intersections like Byline Bank. The Merion Legacy expects a fair hearing on its mid-block curb cut proposal.

E.) Horizon Realty Group Study: Another aspect to curb cuts is they are not all alike. Besides their location, their impact is also a function of size of the garage, facility, or building they are accessing. The impact of a curb-cut is a function of its use. One way to measure that impact is to look at the size and capacity of the parking garage the curb-cut is providing entry/egress to. The Horizon Realty Group (HRG) team conducted a study which compares curb cuts, parking location, and alley usage in large mixed-use residential developments.

The Sherman Plaza Garage (1,550 spaces) and Maple Avenue Self-Park (1,400 spaces) are by-far the largest garages in downtown Evanston and both have curb-cuts (Sherman Plaza has two). In addition, the Maple Ave. Garage provides parking for hotel, entertainment and other high-volume restaurants and retail. The Church/Chicago Garage (600 spaces) also is accessed via a curb-cut. So, the public garages, interestingly, are creating the most concentrated pedestrian/car conflict with bike lanes in downtown Evanston.

With respect to privately developed buildings, the E2 building at 1890 Maple Ave. (353 spaces), Optima Horizons (345 spaces), are the largest garages in downtown Evanston accessed via a curb-cut.

By comparison, the Merion Legacy is proposing a garage with 85 spaces, which except for 1815 Oak/Ridge senior apartments (67 spaces with a curb-cut) would be, easily, the smallest rental building garage in downtown Evanston with a curb-cut.

The point here is that all curb-cuts are not the same and their impact is clearly related to the size of what is being accessed. In the case of the Merion Legacy, its garage is comparatively small to other developments which have residential traffic that crosses bike lanes at a curb cut.

Since 2013, which is about the time the City of Evanston began to seriously consider the utility of curb-cuts, six major market rate residential developments have been approved in Evanston.

- AMLI (2013): curb-cut for some of its parking, mid-block curb-cut, mid-block building
- E2 (2015): curb-cut is mid-block on Oak Ave., building is whole 900 block of Emerson.
The Main (2016): no curb-cut, corner of Main St. & Chicago Ave.
Albion (2020, under construction): no curb-cut, building includes whole block.

Trammel Crow, 1727 Oak Ave. not included because it is senior housing only.
1815 Oak/Ridge not included because it is senior housing only
1590 Elmwood Ave. (Centrum) not included because its parking is off-site.

Three of these six developments were granted a curb-cut across a bike lane, all with much larger parking garages than what the Merion Legacy is proposing. All of those curb-cuts are mid-block, which is potentially less likely to create conflicts than a curb-cut near an intersection. The other three buildings did not create new curb cuts; each is accessed from an existing alley located mid-block.

In fact, of the 20 major development projects we surveyed, 14 have curb cuts, all of which are in or very close to the mid-block.

And of the 20 major development projects, of the six that do not have curb-cuts, four direct their residents to access the parking garage from an alley, which is, of course, an existing curb-cut.

To say that Evanston would not consider new curb-cuts across bike lanes, is, respectfully, a stretch. In fact, in some cases where curb-cuts are not permitted, the result is to drive cars to alleys, which, of course, still must cross a sidewalk to gain access to the alley – again simply moving the conflict between pedestrians/bicycles to another location. The Albion is a good example. While they were not permitted to have a curb-cut on Sherman Ave., their garage will be accessed through an existing alley, where one must drive over a sidewalk (on Grove St. or Lake St.) to access. The same would apply to Focus Development’s project at 811 Emerson Ave.

One could also argue that since the Merion Legacy’s garage is relatively small, much of its parking will be handled in other existing garages and lots where there are existing locations for entry/egress which may conflict with pedestrians and bicycles.

In short, there will always be conflict between cars, and pedestrians and bicycles. A question that should be fairly addressed in any development proposal is: Where should the conflict occur that best respects and balances the rights and safety of all users of the right-of-way and the adjoining properties?

IV.) The Safety False Narrative

A.) Faulty Assumptions: The City staff’s reluctance to permit a curb cut for the Merion Legacy rests on two faulty assumptions. First, they assume that protected bike lanes are on the best streets for riding (when, in fact, are located along the most heavily trafficked streets which have a higher number of curb cuts). Second, they assume that a curb cut across a bike lane is inherently not safe and cannot be made safe (when, in fact, the City’s downtown bike lanes have many curb cuts and no data has been provided evidencing that curb cuts are inherently unsafe). The fact is the Merion Legacy’s proposed curb cut would be as good as, if not better and safer, than existing curb cuts. The Merion Legacy is able to use best practices to design and construct the very best, most functional and safe curb cut appropriate for Chicago Avenue.
B.) Alley Alternative is not a Viable Alternative: As addressed elsewhere, the condition of the alley is not conducive to being the only entry to the parking garage. There are too many other uses of the narrow alley; frequent obstructions; and this alternative would add to vehicle traffic movement and bicycle lane conflicts at Church Street and Davis Street entrances.

C.) No Data Showing a History of Accidents in the 1600 Block of Chicago Avenue: Based on a lack of any accident reports received in response to our FOIA request, we are not aware of any reported accidents involving the existing curb cuts along the protected bike routes on Chicago Avenue or anywhere else in downtown Evanston.

D.) The Defect in Assessing Safety in Isolation: The City’s evaluation of the proposed curb cut does not offer a holistic analysis of the right-of-way in question. One cannot assess the possible increased dangers of a curb cut in a vacuum – without assessing the decreased dangers of double-parking and the street loading/unloading that will be reduced/eliminated with the Merion Legacy curb cut. The two results from the proposed curb cut must be looked at together.

E.) Traffic Counts Show Little Impact from the Proposed Curb Cut: HRG commissioned KLOA to conduct a comprehensive traffic impact study in Dec. 2018, using counts from April 2018. First, according to its findings, the Chicago access drive will provide the development with greater access flexibility and will reduce additional circulation along area roadways. Second, the Net Increase in Site-Generated Traffic will only be 32 cars in the AM peak hour and 36 cars in the PM peak hour. Third, looking at the whole block, including the intersections at Chicago/Davis and Chicago/Church, according to KLOA there will be no change in Level of Service with the proposed Chicago Ave. access at the Merion Legacy. Fourth, the study notes that Chicago Ave. access and proposed porte-cochere “will provide for safer and more efficient operations and minimize the impact of the development on the flow of traffic and parking provided along Chicago Ave. Finally, the KLOA study shows only a nominal amount of bicycle traffic. In the AM peak hour, there are only 44 bicyclists going northbound and 3 going southbound. In the PM peak hour, there are only 32 bicyclists going southbound and 1 going northbound.

V.) Design and Safety – Establishing the “Gold Standard”

The potential for unsafe situations is proportional to the amount of traffic but it can be mitigated by designs which promote safety and awareness. Intersections are inherently dangerous, but the way they’re designed is based on traffic volume. Traffic engineers use a variety of techniques including yield signs, stop signs, blinker lights, full signals, and multiple turning movement signals – all of which are seen in the 1600 block of Chicago Avenue.

Rather than restricting the flow of traffic or curbing new development, the City of Evanston has created effective solutions over the years on this block of Chicago Avenue as new challenges such as a major grocery store or the expansion of The Merion have come to fruition. Using similar accepted urban design techniques that are proportional to the situation, Evanston has the opportunity to set the gold standard in designing a safety solution to a condition that exists throughout the world.

Safety concerns at the proposed curb cut can be addressed and minimized through several design features including: laser beams, signage, striping and warning devices (light/sound) to
alert cyclists, pedestrians and motorists. Evanston has already recommended the Federal Highway Administration’s “Separated Bike Lane Planning and Design Guide”, which City of Evanston staff consulted on, and which plainly notes, “many conflicts can be mitigated through good design that improves visibility and expected behaviors”.

Worthy of mention is that automotive technologies are developing at light speed to the point where many of today’s vehicles include collision warning sensors, self-braking abilities, driving automation, etc. It is likely that conflicts like these will be solved by way of other technological means in the very near future. Rather than rejecting a proposal out of hand, the City should allow for full and fair consideration of the design strategies, data, and future changes in transportation.

Like the City of Evanston, HRG is committed to safety engineering and can also utilize the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) design standards for the curb cut, which City staff presented at the July 26, 2017 Transportation and Parking Committee, the last time curb cut policy was discussed. “According to the design guide, crossings should be raised at driveways, so that the sidewalk and bike lane maintain their elevation through the crossing. Sharp inclines on the road up to the sidewalk level serve as a speed hump for motor vehicles. The NACTO design guide also proposes that color yield lines and ‘Yield to Bikes’ signage be used to identify the conflict area, and make it clear that the pedestrians and bicyclists have priority over entering and exiting motor vehicle traffic.”

By the very fact City staff has provided recommended safety guidelines for urban curb cuts, that would suggest the City contemplated the utilization of these techniques for future curb cuts in the downtown area. HRG will work with the City to design a safe and effective curb cut.

Thus, if HRG is able to design a curb cut that is demonstrably safe, the City should only reject it if the City can show that it is unsafe by demonstrating how it would be any less safe than other curb cuts that exist or that they have recently approved for other developments.

VI.) Porte-Cochere Solution

The Merion Legacy porte-cochere is an innovative solution designed to reduce conflict and ensure safe passage. When compared to alley access, the proposed Chicago Avenue entrance provides greater access flexibility, minimizes circulation, and limits the number of traffic conflicts to one location. Alley access, by contrast, creates five conflict points (including the Davis St, bike lane) and creates multiple circulation paths around the site.

According to KLOA, the porte-cochere offers the following benefits for the proposed development and area roadway system:

A.) With direct and internal access between the valet loading area and the parking garage, the proposed porte-cochere will eliminate any valet circulation along the external roadway system. If access to the parking garage is to be provided via the public alley, the valet loading area would be located along Chicago Avenue. As such, the valet would have to circulate around the block every time they parked a vehicle in the parking garage (Chicago Avenue to Church Street to the alley) and retrieved a vehicle from the parking garage (the alley to Davis Street to Chicago Avenue).
B.) The design of the Chicago Avenue access drive will allow traffic to enter and exit the porte-cochere from either northbound or southbound Chicago Avenue, whereas if access is provided via the public alley and a valet loading zone on the east side of Chicago Avenue, traffic would only be able to enter and exit via northbound Chicago Avenue. As such, the Chicago Avenue access drive will provide the development with far greater access flexibility and will reduce additional circulation along the area roadways.

C.) The Chicago Avenue access drive is proposed to be only 26 feet wide and outbound access will be restricted to right-turn movements, which will minimize the impact on pedestrian circulation. Further, if access is provided via the public alley, the valet will have to cross pedestrians at two intersections (Chicago Avenue/Church Street and Church Street/public alley) when they park a vehicle in the garage and cross pedestrians at two intersections (Chicago Avenue/Church Street and Church Street/public alley) when they retrieve the vehicle. In addition, Chicago Avenue between Davis Street and Church Street currently has a number of access drives with three access drives on the west side of the road and a drop-off/pick-up lane on the east side of the road.

D.) All of the drop-off/pick-up activity and valet parking will occur within the development as opposed to along Chicago Avenue, which will provide for safer and more efficient operations and minimize the impact of the development on the flow of traffic and the parking provided along Chicago Avenue. If drop-off/pick-up is relegated to a loading zone on Chicago Avenue, pedestrians will constantly be crossing over the bike path creating a pedestrian-cyclist conflict point that would be far more dangerous than a properly designed driver-cyclist conflict point.

E.) The proposed access drive will result in the loss of three parking spaces on the east side of Chicago Avenue. However, providing access off of the north-south alley would require the removal of several on-street parking spaces along the site frontage to provide a loading zone for the drop-off/pick-up activity and valet loading.

VII.) The Merion Legacy Use Differentiator – Seniors

The Merion Legacy is targeting the active senior market for its new living community. This is (and will continue to be) a very fast-growing demographic in Evanston and in the Chicago metro area. While the building is not exclusively for active seniors, they are expected to be a significant share of the residents. HRG wants Evanstonians to stay in Evanston as they age by providing a high-design, high-service community for which there is tremendous demand. The City should want to encourage Evanston senior residents to remain in Evanston.

Other senior-living communities in Evanston utilize a porte-cochere or an indented loading zone. The Merion at 1611 Chicago Avenue has a porte-cochere which is highly valued by its residents and staff for its safety and convenience. The Mather, in the 400 block of Davis Street, has two indented loading zones across the street from one another.

The point is, Evanston has in the past, offered special consideration for transportation amenities geared towards seniors. The porte-cochere is a solution that is particularly best for seniors who will be the prime users of the Merion Legacy and residents of a block that is already focused on senior living.
VIII.) Responses to Other City Staff Objections to The Merion Legacy Porte Cochere Curb Cut

A.) The curb cut adds a conflict point: adding a new conflict point is unacceptable, because it poses a “huge” risk to pedestrians and bicyclists. How is this risk any different than any other conflict point? And how many conflict points would a bicyclist encounter between, say, the University and some point south of the Merion Legacy site? In an urban environment, pedestrians and bicyclists will encounter dozens of potential hazards if they travel multiple blocks in any direction. HRG does not see how the addition of one (carefully designed and managed) conflict point becomes the tipping point between acceptable and unacceptable risk.

B.) The City has spent a substantial amount of money to install the bike lane in this area. One additional curb cut will not diminish the value of the City’s bicycling infrastructure investment. Horizon Realty Group will be paying for all Merion Legacy infrastructure improvements, including any modifications to the Chicago Avenue cycle track that may be necessitated by the new curb cut.

C.) Adding either a curb cut or loading zone adjacent to the curb will have a negative impact on bicycle and pedestrian safety. To date, this assertion has been unsubstantiated with any evidence.

D.) There is an adequate alley that can be used to provide the necessary access to the building. Not all alleys are equal. This particular service alley has extraordinary challenges in terms of its multiple uses, frequent congestion, navigability, and other sub-optimal conditions. Using the alley would cause frequent and significant inconvenience and potential harm to drivers – especially senior drivers.

E.) The City has generally been working to minimize or eliminate all new curb cuts in the downtown and other commercial areas. Actually, the City has continued to permit some new curb cuts in urban corridors (i.e. E2, AMLI Evanston, Centrum).

F.) The Chicago Avenue garage entry design will eliminate parking spaces. Either a Chicago Avenue entrance or an alley entrance would result in loss of on-street parking spaces. A Chicago Avenue entry would require removal of several on-street parking spaces to provide a curb cut. Alley access would also require removal of several on-street parking spaces to provide a loading zone for drop-off/pick up and valet loading.

G.) Curb cuts impair the aesthetics and the “quality” of the urban experience. By following best practices and design principles proscribed by City staff (and which the Merion Legacy intends to follow) curb cuts can be built to comport with the street aesthetics and to maintain the safety of the right-of-way for all modes of transportation. Evanston has the opportunity to establish the gold standard of urban curb-cuts.

H.) Can’t have it both ways argument (a curb cut and a cycle track). Yes, it can be done. According to the Federal Highway Administration’s “Separated Bike Lane Planning and Design Guide”, which City of Evanston staff consulted on, “many conflicts can be mitigated through good design that improves visibility and expected behaviors”. It is indeed possible to maintain the special uses of this right-of-way and provide a safe and convenient entry/egress to the Merion Legacy parking garage.
I.) Allowing the request will not benefit the public. As a major “constituent” of Evanston’s cycle track, HRG is considering a set of potential Bicycling Public Benefits that it could offer to the community, which include, (i) providing for eventual dock-less bike parking; (ii) paying for the cleaning machine that is used for bike lane maintenance; (iii) providing temporary bike parking for non-Legacy bikers in the area so that, for example, a Whole Foods shopper could have short-term sheltered bike parking; (iv) ensuring that any lost metered spaces are revenue neutral because we will be leasing other parking spots at Church/Chicago garage; and/or (v) helping fund bike education programs that the Club and Go Evanston sponsor.

IX.) The Merion Legacy’s Green Transportation Commitment

Rather than being like many of the auto-centric buildings recently built in Evanston, the Merion Legacy aims to achieve the environmental and alternative transportation principles called for by the City of Evanston’s Climate Action and Resilience Plan, published in November 2018. The Plan is one of the hallmarks of Mayor Hagerty and the Evanston City Council and lays out a bold vision for achieving carbon neutrality by 2050. To achieve this goal, the City of Evanston has asked stakeholders like HRG to not only attain carbon neutrality by 2050 but also “make significant reductions in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the short term”, defined as a 50% reduction in GHG’s by 2025 and an 80% reduction by 2035. Having the porte-cochere will contribute to this goal.

Knowing the City of Evanston’s commitment and its expectation of meeting these Transportation and Mobility goals, the Merion Legacy is obligated to share in this effort and to do everything it can to help Evanston attain GHG reductions according to the schedule laid out by the Plan.

There is an egregious environmental cost of forcing drivers to go around to an alley entrance and then exiting from the alley, rather than simply entering and exiting on Chicago Avenue.

So, in fact, the GHGs saved by utilizing the porte-cochere and avoiding the drives to/from the alley are significant in turning around Evanston’s trend in VMT and moving towards achieving its goal of reducing VMT now. Plus, these savings will occur not just once but every year once the project opens.

X.) Conclusions

Street space is one of a city’s most valuable assets. When adding cycle tracks, there are a number of goals – sometimes conflicting ones – that policymakers must choose from. Cities should not just evaluate a street by the number of bicyclists. There should be other goals considered such as increasing walking, achieving cleaner air, lowering vehicle miles driven, and enhancing economic development.

The Merion Legacy’s access proposal can be found to meet the City’s circulation design criteria. Yes, curb cuts should be minimized. However, parking facilities shall be designed “in a manner that will least interfere with street traffic movement”. The alley entrance clearly would result in more interference with street traffic movements than would a Chicago Avenue entrance.

The porte-cochere solution also promotes the planned development and land use goals of the City of Evanston. Looking at the City’s 2006 Design Guidelines for Planned Developments, the Merion Legacy plan complies with the main points outlined regarding circulation:
The internal pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular circulation systems should be designed to:

- Be compatible with and connected to existing public circulation systems for all modes
- Give strong visual clues as to where to ride bicycles, operate vehicles, and walk
- Accommodate delivery vehicles.

There are also the policy questions about risk: the City offers no formal curb cut policy, consistency or evidence-based recommendations. The risk it claims is anecdotal and at best, is difficult to substantiate. In effect, the City claims there is more risk with the proposed curb cut than one might find just getting on a bike in an urban area like downtown Evanston.

The larger policy question that the City must decide upon is this: Will protection of the existing design of the cycle tracks from any modifications, override all other considerations and thus set a precedent for future development along key development corridors in the urban setting? Or, are there planning, design, and aesthetic techniques the City and HRG can employ (as in other cities) to engineer a solution which lets all modes of transportation (bicycle, pedestrian, auto) to co-exist peacefully and safely?

We hope the City of Evanston will seize the opportunity to be forward-thinking and progressive on this issue. Let us work together to enhance an already award-winning bicycle transportation system by being innovative, cooperative and solution finders.

---

1. One of the focus areas for reducing GHGs is Transportation and Mobility and specifically reducing vehicle miles traveled. The performance metrics in the Climate Action and Resilience Plan are: reduce community vehicle miles traveled by 20% from 2005 levels by 2025, reduce community vehicle miles traveled by 35% from 2005 levels by 2035, and reduce community vehicle miles traveled by 50% from 2005 levels by 2050.

The latest data from the City regarding community vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is 142,925 MTCO2e (metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent) in 2017. MTCO2e is a proxy for GHGs.

Each day there is expected to be an average of 420 trips in and 420 trips out of the proposed 85-space parking garage by those who are actually parking. If those parking trips were to be made in the alley rather than at the proposed porte-cochere, it would result in 840 trips at 1/10 of a mile of extra driving per trip; or 84 miles per day. Multiplied by 365 days = 30,660 of additional vehicle miles/year.

Using the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) estimate for the average miles per gallon for all light duty vehicles at 22 MPG.

30,660 VMT/22 MPG = 1,394 additional gallons of gas consumed.

EPA Calculation: 12.4 Metric Tons CO2 Equivalent (MTCO2e).

This is the equivalent of:

- taking three passenger cars off the road each year
- the yearly energy use of 1.5 homes
- and the carbon sequestration of 14.6 acres of U.S. forests each year.

And, while this may not seem like a lot of savings in MTCO2e, relative to the amount currently consumed for community VMT, it is important to note that of all the emissions categories cited by Evanston’s Climate Action and Resilience Plan, one of the only emissions categories that continues to increase at an alarming rate is VMT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Alley Characteristics</th>
<th>Parking Cut</th>
<th>Curb-Cut</th>
<th># of Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Station</td>
<td>1720 Central St.</td>
<td>Parking entry on Eastwood AVE.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Surface (81)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1720 Central St.</td>
<td>Parking entry on Eastwood AVE.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Surface (64)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1620 Central St.</td>
<td>Parking entry on Eastwood AVE.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Surface (59)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1620 Central St.</td>
<td>Parking entry on Eastwood AVE.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Surface (50)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1620 Central St.</td>
<td>Parking entry on Eastwood AVE.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Surface (41)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1620 Central St.</td>
<td>Parking entry on Eastwood AVE.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Surface (30)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1620 Central St.</td>
<td>Parking entry on Eastwood AVE.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Surface (21)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1620 Central St.</td>
<td>Parking entry on Eastwood AVE.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Surface (12)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1620 Central St.</td>
<td>Parking entry on Eastwood AVE.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Surface (3)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1620 Central St.</td>
<td>Parking entry on Eastwood AVE.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Surface (6)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1620 Central St.</td>
<td>Parking entry on Eastwood AVE.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Surface (1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparison of Curb-Cuts, Parking Location, and Alley Usage in Larger Mixed-Use Residential Developments
| Building Selection | Parking Entry | Commercial/Residential | Comment | Alley Characteristics | Parking Cut |数 / 各種 | 建築物
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-block building &amp; curb-cut</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Above (85)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>The Legacy</td>
<td>1630 Chicago Ave.</td>
<td>Park Eveson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mid-block building & curb-cut | N/A | Above (139) | Yes | 1697 | | 1727 Oak Ave. | Templeton Cm.
| Mid-block building & curb-cut | N/A | Surface & below | Yes | 110 | | 1720/1740 Oak Ave. | 81st Emerson Ave.
| Building Entry from alley | N/A | Above (175) | Commercial/Residential | No | 242 | 880 Sherman Ave. | Ablon Al Eveson |
| Building Entry from alley | N/A | Above (192) | Commercial/Residential | No | 288 | 800 Elgin Rd. | Optima Horizons |
| Curb-cut & parking entry on Benson Ave. | N/A | Above (345) | Yes | 248 Condo | 207 Condo | 1720 Maple Ave. | Optima Towers |
| Building Entry from alley | N/A | Above (230) | Commercial/Residential | No | 207 Condo | 1760 Sherman Ave. | Optima Towers |
| Curb-cut & parking entry on Davis St. | N/A | Above | Yes | 28 Condo | 96 Condo | 1669 Maple Ave. | Building |
Design Evanston Project Review of the Merion Legacy

Horizon Realty Group presented the proposed Merion Legacy residential development at 1621–1631 Chicago Avenue to members of Design Evanston on April 16, 2019.

Design Evanston has developed standards for review of proposed city projects. These criteria were used in evaluating the Merion Legacy, and comments from Design Evanston are itemized, below.

In general, attending members had a favorable impression of this project and the care that has been taken by Horizon Realty Group to serve the needs of Evanston and its citizens. The Design Evanston consensus is that the City should work with the developer to approve the project, and that additional design strategies could be implemented during this process to satisfy everyone’s concerns.

In some cases there was, understandably, not enough information provided at this level of development to answer some of Design Evanston’s questions. Recommended areas for further study and improvement, and questions, are given below according the Design Evanston’s Evaluative Criteria/Standards.

Evaluative Criteria/Standards for Review of Proposed City Projects

The following are reflective of the standards, principles, values, and beliefs of Design Evanston Membership as they relate to the means by which proposed city projects are to be reviewed and evaluated.

Proposed projects should:

1. Address a perceived need in the city / community.
   - DE doesn’t have data to evaluate the need for high end rental such as this project.
   - The Task Force for Age-Friendly Evanston suggested that this project include amenities for an older age group than 55.
   - The developer referenced “public benefits” - what are these?
   - The City has indicated a need for office space - could this be incorporated on the lower floors?
   - The project, per City requirements, includes funds to add to Evanston’s affordable housing through payment-in-lieu. Affordable housing folded into the general community (i.e., within the building itself) is a perceived need and is recommended here if possible.

2. Provide for a beneficial and appropriate use in the project’s geographical context.
   - Residential, office and retail are typical in this context, and this building falls within the residential category.
   - Some office use would be a plus toward furthering City’s stated goals/needs.

3. Be of appropriate and complementary size, scale and proportion for its respective physical context.
   - The project is larger than zoning dictates now, which results in a feeling of bulk and being overbuilt. It may be possible to mitigate this through design (see design comments, below) without actually reducing the building height or mass.
   - What are the public benefits that HRG can offer to justify variances in height and FAR?
- Shading diagrams were not reviewed; we recommend the City review the impact on other properties.
- DE wondered about the impact on the building to the north (on the corner). HRG has indicated that their discussions with the building’s condo association indicated no opposition.

Design:
- Suggestions were made by DE members on strategies to minimize the overall feeling of bulk and height and to further good design in Evanston.
- In general, it is felt that the building should strive to be beautiful on its own and set a new precedent with no requirement to “blend in” with adjacent properties.
- Opportunities exist to minimize the bulk of the building using cladding materials such as glass, rain screens, panels, terra-cotta flutes or other shapes, metal. Potentially the earlier glass design should be reappraised.
- The I-shape plan is articulated in such a way that the vertical elements can easily be differentiated to achieve slenderizing of the mass.
- The current articulation of top floors’ setbacks has a positive effect on the slenderizing concept.
- It is recommended that the retail base and entry decoration, and the “white” decoration on the upper floors, be modified to be more fully integrated into the overall building design
- DE members agreed with the architect’s conclusion that the building does not need a “hat.”
- This needs to be a bird-friendly building, as an example to other developers, both for reduction in bird deaths at windows and interruption of migratory patterns resulting in bird death.

- Increased density downtown will have a positive effect on independent retail and restaurants.
- The tax base will be expanded.
- It is an unknown if this tall building will be a deterrent to development of the lot immediately north

5. Have a high revenue generating/infrastructure cost ratio: does the City gain significantly more economically than it will cost the City for infrastructure or other costs?
- This is an important issue but DE is not qualified to comment, since the financials are unknown to the meeting’s participants.

6. Provide for a positive experience at the street / sidewalk / pedestrian level.
- Handling of this intersection of vehicle entry/exit, pedestrian and bicycle traffic can probably be handled in an acceptable way.
- The Chicago Avenue vehicle entry is unfortunate, but the alley access is possibly more problematic.
- Some retail is maintained but a significant amount is lost due to the lobby and 2 garage entries. Is there a way to add more retail or public use at street level?
- The “porte cochère” ideal of the garage is positive, but it is recommended that the 2 large garage voids, which are currently unattractive, should be redesigned with the actual feeling and look of a porte cochère: open and light and attractive to the streetscape.
- The interruption and potential danger to bikes and pedestrians is a definite negative. This must be carefully designed for experiential and safety reasons. If paving is modified, the opportunity exists to make it permeable as well.
- DE recommends that HRG work with a traffic consultant to better deal with curb cuts and overlapping pedestrian/bike/car traffic, as well as truck access in the alley.
7. Complement the practices and goals of “Complete Streets” and encourage multimodal transportation use.
- Biking and walking become more dangerous along Chicago Avenue due to vehicle access at the garage, and safety must be addressed (as noted above).
- Truck access in alley needs more study (as noted above).
- Could the residents access the garage from the alley, to minimize use of its Chicago Ave access?
- Providing fewer parking spaces encourages Transit-Oriented Development goals.
- By utilizing shared spaces at adjacent properties, providing on-site rental car use, electric charging stations and significant bike storage, the project is leaning in the proper future direction for multi-modal transportation, use and accommodation.
- Bringing more people into the downtown more prone to walking and biking than driving, with disproportionately fewer vehicles, promotes Complete Streets.
- Green space at street level is not addressed at this point except for some sidewalk trees. DE recommends that a more creative approach be studied to add to the natural landscape.

Other Items;
- Energy efficiency and use of resources was not discussed. Will it meet or surpass city requirements (LEED silver?)

Date: July 22, 2019
Contact: Jack Weiss
Phone: 847 866 7480
Email: jw@jackweissassociates.com
I am writing as a neighbor to the proposed Merion Legacy project. A resident of 1616 Hinman Avenue, I live and park my car across the alley that runs behind two existing Merion buildings. In my two years of residency in Evanston, I have attended meetings of the First Ward whenever possible. In March of this year when I learned about the project, I was alarmed by its size, first of all, and by the exceptions that the developers were asking for in order to build such an out-of-scale building in a neighborhood of much smaller structures.

Since the building lot is situated only one block from single family neighborhoods, I compared the proposed 19 story Legacy building with its existing neighbors.

- The Merion on the corner of Davis and Chicago is 6 floors.
- The newer Merion on Church Street is 8 floors.
- On Davis, the next building (Northshore Kinetics) to the east across the alley is 5 floors.
- 1616 Hinman that backs up to the Merion is 7 floors.
- The Methodist Church is 3-4 floors.
- The apartment building on the corner of Chicago and Church Streets is 8 floors.

To erect a building that is three times the height of its neighbors is to create an eyesore. I suggest something more in scale with the neighborhood; something that is a lot closer to the permitted height, which I believe is 105’.

A significant oversight that I noticed at the March meeting is the impact of any new building on the alley. The alley that runs behind the Merion buildings is very narrow and made more so by all of the large trash containers that run the length of the alley. While Joy Yee has a few trash containers, the Merion has more. In addition, many trucks make deliveries on a daily basis, and most are at the end of the alley closest to Davis Street. This matters because the building where I live has 13 designated parking spaces and the Methodist church has 20. Also the businesses that would be displaced by the proposed building park behind their buildings and even a large Merion van parks there.

Most of us where I live take our cars out at some point during a normal day. I can’t tell you how many times, I have backed out of my parking space only to find that both ends of the alley are blocked and I have no place to exit. Who blocks it?

- Linen delivery
- Food delivery
- Moving vans
- Trash and recycling trucks
- Building and trades vehicles
- Electric and cable companies

Its very frustrating. Sometimes cars line up to get into or out of the alley. At the March meeting, I asked what accommodations were being made for deliveries and moving vans for the Legacy. The answer that there would be one loading dock was not reassuring. Why didn’t the second Merion Building plan for a loading dock, or two, when that was constructed?

--
Johanna N. Leonard, AICP
Community Development Director
City of Evanston
jleonard@cityofevanston.org | 847.448.8014
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MEMORANDUM

TO: JOHANNA LEONARD, DIRECTOR, EVANSTON DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
FROM: DENNIS HARDER 522 CHURCH STREET 6A, EVANSTON
DATE: SEPTEMBER 9, 2019
RE: REDEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL 1621-31 CHICAGO AVENUE, EVANSTON

[The following comments are offered from my perspective as a (mostly) retired planning and real estate professional and as a resident of Evanston living proximate to the site of the subject proposal. I've achieved a summary of my real estate and planning experience.]

I appreciated your thorough and appropriate presentation of redevelopment activity in downtown Evanston at the First Ward Meeting on September 3rd. Concerning the December 2019 version of the subject proposal, I offer the following comments:

- The developer has prepared and presented three redevelopment proposals for the site. In my opinion, the first (November 2017) and third (December 2018) proposals were each extraordinarily insensitive to the existing planning framework and zoning controls applicable to the site, while the second proposal (May 2018) was reasonably consistent with that framework and set of controls. I am sure that I am not the first to observe that the developer’s decision to move away from the May 2018 proposal to the December 2018 proposal (which again demanded significant, even massive relief from established parameters) may be indicative of the limited degree to which the developer is willing to engage in serious discussion with the community about shaping the project through the give-and-take of the planned development process.

- All three proposals included essentially the same Chicago Avenue access (ingress/egress/drop-off) proposal involving a mid-block curb cut with two vehicular traffic lanes crossing the sidewalk and bicycle path. As the City staff has noted, this arrangement is very likely to exacerbate existing mid-block traffic congestion in the 1600 block of Chicago Avenue, significantly disrupt both sidewalk and bicycle path movement, and reduce the number of on-street parking spaces. Such an unwavering stance is additional evidence as to the developer’s low level of commitment to shape the project through the process.

- Although the developer’s reluctance to consider alternative designs for Chicago Avenue access to the site is unfortunate in many ways both obvious and subtle, should the developer decide to modify site access/egress in a manner acceptable to the City and the community, I suggest that such action should not be given substantial weight as a “community benefit.” A similar perspective is appropriate re: labelling as a ‘community benefit” any developer proposal to increase on-site parking or the number/size of loading docks or to reduce the proposed height, FAR, unit count, etc. for the project.

- Further on the general point of “community benefits:”
  - During the First Ward meeting on September 3 an attendee made a comment about how important it is that, in the context of the planned development process, City staff and elected officials rigorously assess the degree to which any proposed set of “community benefits” is balanced against the relief from planning framework and zoning parameters being sought by the developer, that balance being basic to the planned development approach. I strongly agree with that perspective, particularly because I believe the set of “community benefits” included in the the current (December 2018) proposal for 1621-31 Chicago is extraordinarily scant in relation to the size of developer requests for relief from base maximum/minimums for height, # of units, floor area, # of parking spaces, among others.
  - The 1621-31 Chicago developer has often labelled project components that provide marketing advantages to, and enhance the profitability of, the development as “community benefits.” The City decision-makers should continue to question the inclusion of such items in the rationale for granting the developer relief from planning framework and zoning parameters.

Johanna N. Leonard, AICP
Community Development Director
City of Evanston
jleonard@cityofevanston.org | 847.448.8014
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DESIGN AND PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DAPR) MINUTES
September 18, 2019


Staff Present:  M. Rivera

Others Present:

Presiding Member:  J. Leonard

A quorum being present, J. Leonard called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

1.  September 4, 2019, DAPR Committee meeting minutes.

L. Biggs made a motion to approve the September 4, 2019, meeting minutes, seconded by S. Mangum.

The Committee voted, 6-0, 1 abstention, to approve the September 4, 2019, meeting minutes.

2.  September 11, 2019, DAPR Committee meeting minutes.

L. Biggs made a motion to approve the September 11, 2019, meeting minutes, seconded by S. Mangum.

The Committee voted, 6-0, 1 abstention, to approve the September 11, 2019, meeting minutes.

New Business

1.  1605-1631 Chicago Avenue  Subdivision and Major Adjustment to a Planned Development

The applicant, Horizon Realty Group, submits for a subdivision and Major Adjustment to a Planned Development in the D4 Downtown Transition District. The requested adjustment will increase FAR from 3.15 to 4.2, increase parking spaces from 32 (23 on-site, 9 leased) to 38 (all leased off-site), and decrease in total number of units from 205 to 186 (includes 65 dwelling units). No new site development allowance will be needed.

2.  1621 Chicago Avenue  Planned Development

The applicant, Horizon Realty Group, submits a planned development application to construct a 19-story apartment building with 240 units, 85 subterranean parking spaces, and approximately 3,540 sq. ft. of ground floor retail space in the D4 Downtown Transition District. Site development allowances are being requested for: 1) a building height of 211 ft. 8 in. where 105 ft. is allowed), 2) an FAR of 11.62 where a maximum of 5.4 is allowed, 3) 240 dwelling units
where 54 is maximum is allowed, 4) 85 parking spaces where a minimum 185 is required, and 5) 1 short loading berth where 2 short loading berths are required.

APPLICATIONS PRESENTED BY: Jeff Michael, applicant
Tim Kent, architect

DISCUSSION:
- Proposed development is designed to create a senior campus between The Merion and the proposed Marion Legacy. Both buildings will share services and amenities, including staff, counselors, caretakers, health care services, and social activities; there will be an internal connection between both buildings.
- Applicant reviewed their list of public benefits:
  - Contribution of 0.5% of construction budget to public projects.
  - Promote local artists to curate art to display in the building.
  - Environmental site clean-up.
  - One electric vehicle charging station available for public use, additional spaces for building resident use.
  - Provide composting and recycling for building residents.
- Applicant stated the site development allowances requested are in line with other developments.
- J. Leonard asked about where the art will be displayed.
- Applicant stated art would be displayed in common areas of the building.
- J. Leonard clarified the proposed public benefit is promoting local artists and not providing a public art display.
- L. Biggs stated the alley needs to be reconstructed; the estimated cost is $430,000. She asked if recycling is already required by City Code.
- It was noted by the Committee that recycling is required by the City’s refuse franchise agreement.
- S. Mangum stated site clean-up is required in order to develop the site.
- Applicant stated they are proposing a curb cut and loading off Chicago Avenue because it is safer than alternatives, such as loading on the street. Applicant provided a City of Evanston Bike Infrastructure map showing bike routes. Applicant noted existing curb cuts and pedestrian crossings. Applicant reviewed their policy paper in support of a curb cut off Chicago Avenue. Applicant stated the alley is in poor condition, used for commercial activities, and is congested. If there is not a curb cut off Chicago Avenue, the conflict points are not eliminated, just shifted to be on-street or at the street intersection and the street and alley intersection.
- Applicant presented a video of the bike lane along Chicago Avenue and Sheridan Avenue through Northwestern University’s campus, video taken around noon on August 21, 2019. Applicant stated the video shows several existing curb cuts, lack of signage at curb cuts, cars in the bike lane, and other various activities in the bike lane.
- Applicant proposes to install proper signage to identify the proposed curb cut.
- L. Biggs stated concerns with the proposed curb cut have not changed. She noted that standards change over time. She stated it would be difficult to install a bike lane without curb cuts, not all curb cuts should be denied, but the preference is not to have a curb cut cross a bike lane. She stated plan being considered is a new curb cut. She stated the public way is not benefited by the proposed development. She stated the City works to minimize conflicts, the proposed curb cut is located mid-block, traffic should be directed towards existing infrastructure. She noted seniors would have to navigate through several conflict points with a curb cut off Chicago Avenue.
• J. Leonard stated it is likely vehicles could be stacked onto the sidewalk with the three spaces in the proposed loading zone. She stated if on-street loading is proposed as an alternative, the plan can be revised and reviewed by staff.
• Applicant stated the anticipated traffic volume is low given the number of garage parking spaces.
• M. Rivera stated that an on-street loading zone for the proposed development is not acceptable, the City prefers to locate on-street loading zones at the end of a block for general use.
• M. Rivera asked if valet parking will be provided and if parking is available to the retail space.
• Applicant stated valet parking will be provided, parking garage provides parking to the retail space, and they will lease off-site parking spaces to meet the parking requirement.
• S. Mangum stated pedestrian friendly store fronts at street level are preferred over vehicle areas. He stated the site development allowances requested are a big ask, agrees with other staff regarding the curb cut.
• Applicant stated they will comply with Pilot 55 LEED Silver bird friendly measures.
• M. Jones stated windows overhang into the public street right-of-way, an easement will be required.
• S. Mangum asked if a construction value has been determined.
• Applicant stated no, not at this time.
• S. Mangum asked if the high water table has been addressed related to the proposed underground parking.
• Applicant stated they do not have additional details to provide at this time.

Public Comment:
• Dennis Harden concerned with the condition of the alley and the cost to repair it, project lacks public benefits, the ask is more than the benefits. He stated he has design concerns, traffic backs up on Chicago Avenue.
• Ken Green stated 8-stories is the appropriate height for a transitional area, he stated building heights should step down from downtown, 19-stories is not consistent. He asked if the developer could buy on-street parking spaces for use as their loading.
• Sarah Vanderwick noted the City’s affordable housing goal, stated on-site affordable dwellings should be provided.
• Leslie Shad stated the City is located along the Mississippi bird fly-way, noted glass balconies are a concern, building height up to 36’ should have 90% bird friendly treatment and height above that should have 60% treatment. She stated lights should be lowered and directed down, a threat calculation should be provided.
• Kiera Kelly stated the proposed building height is double what is allowed, if the development is allowed it would undermine trust with residents. She noted several towers have been approved recently. She stated the senior housing development on Oak should be allowed to finish first before other senior housing projects are approved. She stated concern with traffic, the development should meet the current affordable housing regulations, and concerned with loss of storefronts.
• Bernard Reilly stated the development degrades the quality of the streetscape, concerned with building shadow, and increases obstacles along Chicago Avenue. He stated public benefits are lacking.
• Monique Petan stated construction to occupancy could take 6-7 years given the approaching election, stated the City is turning into Lakeview.
• Suzanne Carlson asked who will occupy the building, seniors only? She stated the proposed building height is out of proportion. She stated bird friendly details are needed, concerned with affordable housing.
• Zafiro Papastratakes stated building height limits should be maintained, impacts quality of life.
• Lori Keenan stated proposed development lowers quality of life, concerned with wind tunnel effects. Demolishing the building adds to landfills. Businesses close with new construction. The historic district should be kept intact, we’re losing the downtown.
• S. Mangum stated the developer is proposing to pay the fee-in-lieu of providing on-site affordable dwellings to comply with the IHO.
• S. Mangum stated both agenda items are related.
• J. Leonard encouraged the applicant to work on addressing issues as the project moves forward.
• S. Mangum stated underground parking is a plus but there are several concerns with the project.

S. Mangum made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed subdivision and major adjustment to the Planned Development at 1605-1631 Chicago Avenue, seconded by J. Leonard.

The Committee voted, 8-0, to recommend approval to Plan Commission of the proposed subdivision and major adjustment to the Planned Development at 1605-1631 Chicago Avenue.

S. Mangum made a motion to recommend denial of the proposed 1621 Chicago Avenue Planned Development, seconded by L. Biggs.

The Committee voted, 8-0, to recommend denial to Plan Commission of the proposed 1621 Chicago Avenue Planned Development.

Adjournment
L. Biggs made a motion to adjourn, seconded by S. Mangum. The Committee voted, 8-0, to adjourn. The Committee adjourned at 3:48 p.m.

The next DAPR meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 25, 2019, at 2:30 p.m. in Room 2404 of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Griffith
DESIGN AND PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DAPR) MINUTES
July 17, 2019

Voting Members Present:  J. Hyink, I. Eckersberg, D. Cueva, M. Tristan, S. Mangum, 
                         L. Biggs, M. Griffith, M. Jones

Staff Present:              M. Rivera

Others Present:

Presiding Member:          S. Mangum

A quorum being present, S. Mangum called the meeting to order at 2:40 pm.

Approval of Minutes

July 10, 2019, DAPR Committee meeting minutes.

L. Biggs made a motion to approve the July 10, 2019, DAPR Committee meeting minutes, seconded by M. Tristan.

The Committee voted 7-0 to approve the minutes with one abstention.

New Business

1.  1605-1631 Chicago Ave.  
   
   Subdivision and Major Adjustment to a Planned Development
   Horizon Realty Group, the applicant, submits for a Subdivision and Major Adjustment to a Planned Development in the D4 Downtown Transition District. The requested adjustment will increase FAR from 3.15 to 4.2, increase parking spaces from 32 (23 on-site, 9 leased) to 38 (all leased off-site), and a decrease in total number of independent living units from 205 to 186 (includes 65 dwelling units). No new site development allowance will be needed.

2.  1621 Chicago Ave.  
   
   Planned Development
   Horizon Realty Group, the applicant, submits for a Planned Development to construct a 19-story apartment building with 240 dwelling units, 85 subterranean parking spaces, and approximately 3,540 sf of ground floor retail space in the D4 Downtown Transition District. Site development allowances are being requested for: 1) a building height of 211.7’ where a maximum of 105’ is permitted, 145’ with site development allowance), 2) an FAR of 11.62 where a maximum of 5.4 is permitted, 6.0 with site development allowance, 3) 240 dwelling units where 54 is the maximum permitted, 4) 85 parking spaces where a minimum of 185 is required, and 5) 1 short loading berth where 2 short loading berths are required.
APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Jeff Michael, applicant
Tim Kent, architect

DISCUSSION:

- S. Mangum stated both agenda items are related. He stated the first agenda item involves a proposed subdivision of the property to create a new zoning lot and a major adjustment to The Merion Planned Development to reflect it being on a smaller lot.
- J. Michael stated the building north of The Merion is an eyesore, the property is underused, they are proposing to create a senior campus which will be unique to the area. He stated the proposed development will be a feeder to The Merion, the amenities available at The Merion will be available to residents of the proposed development. The objective is to keep seniors in Evanston. The proposed development will increase the tax base and is expected to generate 15-50 permanent jobs. The proposed size and density were reduced and architectural details changed after the first community meeting.
- T. Kent presented drawings showing the massing for the proposed development; he described uses for each floor. He reviewed the massing and architectural details.
- T. Kent noted the proposed driveway off Chicago Avenue leads to a porte-cochere for vehicle pick-ups and drop-offs, to avoid this activity occurring on Chicago Avenue. The same driveway leads to underground parking.
- M. Rivera asked for the width of the proposed driveway.
- Proposed driveway is 26’ wide.
- Sue Carlson asked about affordable housing.
- S. Mangum stated the applicant is proposing cash-in-lieu of units to comply with the previous version of the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (IHO).
- S. Mangum noted some of the required parking for The Merion is located on the development site, asked how required parking for The Merion will be met.
- Applicant stated they will lease spaces off-site.
- S. Mangum asked about building materials.
- T. Kent stated the ground floor will be brick and stone, the tower will be painted concrete and metal. He stated the concrete will have scored reliefs and possibly fluted to provide detail, with metal at the bay windows. He stated the architecture has a historic flavor with a contemporary twist. He stated the windows will be inset from the exterior wall by 4”-6”.
- S. Mangum asked about bird friendly measures.
- T. Kent stated they are still working on those details.
- L. Biggs stated her concern with the proposed driveway off Chicago Avenue instead of the alley. She stated there is a protected bike lane which will be less protected by the driveway.
- T. Kent stated the alley is not practical; it is too narrow, lined with several dumpsters, with heavy service traffic.
- J. Michael stated the proposed driveway reduces conflicts, stating there are existing conflicts getting to the alley which would increase with additional traffic to the alley generated by the proposed development.
- J. Hyink stated the proposed driveway increases the number of conflict points between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.
- L. Biggs stated the conflicts noted are existing, the driveway will add conflict points. The bike lane at Church Street and Davis Street are signaled; the alley is 20’ wide.
- S. Mangum stated improving the alley conditions could be achieved since the applicant is the owner of the majority of the south portion of the block as a benefit to the existing and proposed developments. Provided recent bike and pedestrian counts in front of the site for three 1-hour periods, 171 bikes and 381 pedestrians were counted.
S. Mangum stated the proposed driveway off Chicago Avenue creates a dead zone, less street activity.
M. Rivera stated about 3 on-street parking spaces will be lost due to the proposed driveway.
S. Mangum noted the proposed number of parking spaces is less than required even after the City reduced parking requirements.
J. Michael stated they are comfortable with the number of parking spaces to be provided given their history with The Merion.
L. Biggs stated the bay windows project over into the street right-of-way, an easement will be required.
The encroachment was noted to be 12” at a height 45’ above the street.
L. Biggs asked about stormwater management and ground water.
T. Kent stated they are still working through those details.
I. Eckersberg stated shoring will be needed when the foundation is being constructed.
S. Mangum stated the proposed height and FAR are excessive based on what has been approved, suggested the previously proposed 13 stories is more appropriate.
S. Mangum asked about public benefits.
J. Michael noted proposed public benefits include: an art project, opening the building up to civic events, environmental cleanup of the site, electric vehicle charging stations, and financial contribution to a local foundation for public improvements.
S. Mangum stated some of the proposed benefits are inherent to the proposed development, he suggested going beyond IHO requirements could be a public benefit.
S. Mangum read comments from Gary Gerdes, Building and Inspection Services Manager, asking about project valuation and schedule.
Applicant stated they are working on those details.
J. Hyink noted bike parking is proposed to be located on the lower level, asked if the elevator can accommodate bikes, how many bikes, and if it is designed for older persons. She stated at the least the elevators should be sized to accommodate up to 3 bikes being rolled into the elevator, or locate the bike room on the ground level.
S. Mangum stated he was not certain the Committee could recommend approval at this time, asked if the applicant would like to return with revisions.
Applicant stated they preferred to return to the Committee.

L. Biggs made a motion to hold item in Committee to allow the applicant time to address staff concerns, seconded by J. Hyink.

The Committee voted, 8-0, to hold item in Committee.

Adjournment

L. Biggs made a motion to adjourn, seconded by J. Hyink. The Committee voted, 8-0, to adjourn. The Committee adjourned at 4:12 pm.

The next DAPR meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 24, 2019, at 2:30 pm in Room 2404 of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Griffith