PLAN COMMISSION
Wednesday, March 11, 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: February 12, 2020

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.

4. NEW BUSINESS

   A. Planned Development
      605 Davis Street
      19PLND-0036
      Davis Street Development Company, LLC, the applicant, submits for a Planned Development
      and Special Uses in order to construct a an 18-story Class A office building with 40 parking
      spaces and 4,170 square feet of ground floor retail space and a Special Use for a Chase Bank
      drive-through facility. Site development allowances are being requested for: 1) FAR of 13.0
      where 4.5 is allowed, 2) Proposed building height of 220 feet where 85 feet (excluding parking)
      is allowed, 3) 40 parking spaces where 420 are required, 4) A 15-foot Ziggurat setback is
      proposed above 29 feet along Davis where a 40-foot Ziggurat setback is required above 42-foot
      height, 5) A 0-foot Ziggurat setback is requested along the east interior lot line at 29-foot height

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).
where a 25-foot Ziggurat setback is required above 42-foot height and 6) A 0-foot Ziggurat setback is requested along the west interior side lot line at 29-foot height where a 25-foot Ziggurat setback is required above 42-foot height. 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.

5. COMMUNICATIONS
   A. Potential Text Amendments (no action needed at this time)

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

7. ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the Plan Commission is scheduled for WEDNESDAY, April 8, 2020 at 7:00 P.M. in JAMES C. LYTLE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.
MEETING MINUTES
PLAN COMMISSION
Wednesday, February 12, 2020
7:00 P.M.
Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, James C. Lytle Council Chambers

Members Present: Peter Isaac (Chair), Jennifer Draper, Carol Goddard, John Hewko, Brian Johnson, Jane Sloss

Members Absent: George Halik, Andrew Pigozzi

Staff Present: Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Manager
Meagan Jones, Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Brian George, Assistant City Attorney

Presiding Member: Chair Isaac

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chair Isaac called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. Ms. Jones called the roll and a quorum was established.

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: January 8, 2020

Commissioner Goddard suggested a minor edit.

Commissioner Goddard made a motion to approve the minutes from the January 22, 2020 meeting as amended. Seconded by Commissioner Sloss. A voice vote was taken and the minutes were approved, 5-0, with one abstention.

3. OLD BUSINESS (Continued from January 8, 2020 meeting)

A. Text Amendment
Ground Floor Retail Uses in the Downtown 19PLND-0107
A Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment pursuant to City Code Title 6, Zoning, to revise regulations related to ground floor retail uses in the D2 Downtown Retail Core Zoning District

Ms. Jones provided a review of previous conversation on the proposed amendment and presented revisions that followed from that discussion.
Chair Isaac opened the hearing to questions from the Commission and Public. Hearing none he then asked if there was any public comment on the proposed amendment. Hearing none, Chair Isaac closed the hearing and the Commission reviewed the standards.

It was generally agreed that each standard had been met with intentions to follow the Comprehensive Plan, better fit within retail oriented areas and no evidence being shown that negative impacts would occur to adjacent properties. Standard 4 was not applicable.

Commissioner Draper asked for clarification on the language regarding placement of uses at the ground floor or above the ground floor. Ms. Jones responded that above ground floor financial institutions would likely have a greater variety of uses within it (such as investment and corporate banking) while on the ground floor, the intention is to have the retail banking portion of the financial institutions since that would create more pedestrian traffic.

Chair Isaac proposed to rework the language within the proposed text amendment to make it clearer.

Commissioner Goddard inquired if a financial institution could just have an ATM on the ground floor and meet the intent of the amendment. Ms. Jones responded that for this amendment that would not suffice, staff would take a look at what percentage of a financial institution is dedicated to retail banking type uses versus another use such as investment banking. Commissioner Goddard replied that the amendment language should better reflect that.

Some discussion continued regarding the wording of the amendment. It was agreed that reference to ATMs could be removed and wording describing retail banking as the primary use be added.

Commissioner Johnson asked if it would be advisable to use the phrase retail financial services to address uses such as investments brokerage that may have the appearance of the floor of a bank. Chair Isaac stated that previous discussion centered on the goal of the area to have ground floor retail and to not just have any type of financial services on the ground floor but to have uses that would also encourage pedestrian traffic, especially as it relates to the D2 District.

**Commissioner Goddard made a motion to recommend approval of the text amendment as amended. Seconded by Commissioner Hewko. A roll call vote was taken and the motion was approved, 6-0.**
4. NEW BUSINESS

A. Map Amendment
2044 Wesley Avenue 20PLND-0002
John Cleary, owner, submits for a Zoning Ordinance Map Amendment pursuant to City Code Title 6, Zoning, to remove property, known as 2044 Wesley Ave., from the West Evanston Overlay (oWE) District. This map amendment is in anticipation of a future planned development that would include this and additional properties, and consist of 3-story townhouses and one 4-story apartment building with indoor and outdoor parking.

Mr. Mangum provided an overview of past plans for the area such as the West Evanston Master Plan and the Canal-Green Bay Road- Ridge Avenue-Church Street Study Area Report. He then reviewed some existing regulations for the West Evanston Overlay District and properties within the district that had been developed. He then introduced the proposed map amendment.

Chair Isaac opened the hearing up to questions from the Commission. He then asked why the removal from the overlay was needed. Mr. Mangum replied that it was a request from the applicant due to not owning enough of the needed properties (such as the Public Storage and Parking Lot) to fully comply with the overlay.

Commissioner Sloss then asked how the development would follow the West Evanston Master Plan versus the overlay district and does that relate the form-based code. Mr. Mangum replied that the form based code of the West Evanston Overlay District implements the West Evanston Plan.

Mr. John Cleary, the applicant, stated he moved to Evanston in 2013 and lives near the site with children in the local schools. He then expressed that the overlay is very restrictive. He then explained that part of the overlay requirements include connecting the streets; on a lot that is 100 ft. deep this would be restrictive for building once the streets are in place. Mr. Cleary then stated that he is looking to build 2.5 to 3 -story townhouses; the proposed apartment building is not within the overlay district. If the properties are not in the overlay he would seek to build within the underlay zoning code regulations.

Chair Isaac inquired why the applicant was not applying for the map amendment and planned development at the same time. Mr. Cleary responded that due to cost, approximately $100,000 in plans, civil engineering and environmental work, it makes more sense to do the map amendment first then apply for the development. If the City
wants only townhouses, he would agree to sign an agreement or undertaking to proceed and appear before City Council. He went on to state that there is very little new affordable housing construction and townhomes are a form of housing that is missing.

Commissioner Draper asked Mr. Cleary what his plans would be if the proposed text amendment does not pass. Mr. Cleary responded that building a road between Wesley Ave. and Jackson St. would be impossible, however, if the overlay is removed then the site would be developed and generate taxes.

Commissioner Hewko stated that the materials indicate a need for the Public Storage lot along Simpson St. to be a part of development and inquired if the development is contingent on obtaining that property. Mr. Cleary responded that the proposal has nothing to do with the Public Storage facility and the parking owned by Walgreens.

Chair Isaac then opened up the hearing to questions from the public.

Mr. Marcus Lechleidner asked if all of the parcels are needed for the project to make financial sense. Mr. Cleary responded that the way the plan is laid out, development would require the purchase of the public storage facility, Walgreen's parking lot, and property along Green Bay Road as well as putting in a road, which would be very expensive. He added that the plan was created in an era when a lot of development was occurring.

Mr. Lechleidner then asked what the expected cost of the townhomes would be. Mr. Cleary replied that townhomes costs are proposed to be $500,000 - $550,000 once complete, approximately $2,000 per month mortgage. Expected to be 2,000 square feet with 2-car garages.

Mr. Lechleidner then stated that a lot of people walk through the property and asked if it would still be possible with the development? Mr. Cleary responded that it could be possible to have access. He has an option on the properties but the City may have to foot the bill to clean the property. It would still be possible to walk through from Jackson St.

Jeff Masters inquired if the public storage facility does not go away if there would still be a road between the two properties. Mr. Cleary responded that there would be a private drive linking Jackson Ave. and Wesley Ave. between the facility and the townhome buildings, owned by the townhome owners.

Chair Isaac stated that it appears that the front of the townhomes would be south facing and to access the homes, one would need to go from the public street to the private sidewalk to access the townhomes and there would be a private alley to access public streets to get to the garages in the back.
Jeff Masters asked for clarification on the zoning change. Mr. Cleary stated that the Plan calls out the layout of roads and development. The underlying zoning would remain R4 and building could occur. Mr. Mangum stated that the overlay calls out the area for the public roads and then calls for development regulations. If it is removed, the underlying zoning district regulations would have to be followed. The R4 District provides for a wider variety of housing than the overlay. Mr. Cleary added that the R4 District has lower height restrictions as well as density.

Ms. Carolyn Dellutri asked what the maximum height is for the R4 District. Mr. Mangum responded that the maximum height is 35 ft. or 2.5 stories. R5 is 50 ft. or five stories.

Ms. Amy Masters voiced concern over the amount of greenspace and asked if removing the property from the overlay would remove those requirements? Mr. Mangum responded that the overlay requirements would be removed. One way to ensure keeping the greenspace could be to tie the two together, the map amendment and planned development. Chair Isaac stated the other option would be to amend the plan.

Ms. Dellutri asked if the property is removed and a planned development follows, could variances be granted regarding height. Mr. Mangum confirmed that could be done.

Chair Isaac then opened the hearing up to public comment.

Mr. Masters voiced concern of the proposal coming in two parts. There was a long process to implement the plan. If the proposed change occurs but the property is sold, there are no guarantees that “good faith” would be followed.

Ms. Dellutri asked for the Commission to consider the character of the area which should be kept. In the discussion about the R5a zoning Commissioners stated that the study should be looked at again. The Study called for downzoning. If the parking lot and storage facility are sold then they are stuck so the entire area should be considered.

Ms. Masters stated that there is a lot of resentment in the 5th Ward towards developers and residents are angry. The whole area should be restudied and the people in the area should be considered, not add too many people and density to the area.

Mr. Chris Gotschall stated that there are decisions being made based on old plans and data. There is a lot of tension. He added that townhomes are not necessarily bad but items addressed in the plan spoke to density.

Mr. Cleary stated that part of the parcel does not restrict but extends Jackson St. at his cost. He has no problem committing to just townhomes. There is density further south with very dense zoning, this area is less dense.
Chair Isaac closed the public hearing and the Commission began deliberations.

Commissioner Goddard asked what has been developed within the overlay. Mr. Mangum reviewed three properties, Emerson Square, Y.O.U. building and a ComEd station. He added that some properties have become available but not enough TIF increment has been created for public aggregation of properties.

Commissioner Draper asked if there was a public-private partnership possible for the street. Mr. Mangum stated that there would have to be a discussion with the City Council.

Commissioner Johnson stated in looking at the 5 principles, how would principles one and three affect connectivity. Mr. Mangum responded that the project would create a connection with the private drive. There would be some extension of the road, but it would compromise the quality of the connections contemplated including the orientation of development towards public streets as a traditional neighborhood design would.

Commissioner Isaac asked the Commissioners how they feel about a partial removal and not having a continuous block.

Commissioner Goddard stated that they need to consider if the overlay has accomplished its goals. If it has, it should be kept; if not, it should be removed. Chair Isaac inquired why one parcel should be removed that is the central area of this portion of the overlay district. It could be compromising that portion of the overlay.

Commissioner Draper stated that it would be difficult to development the site and has not been done in 15 years. Rather than leave the property vacant, attempts could be made at figuring out a compromise.

Chair Isaac stated that the proposal is a smart use of space but that he has an issue of doing so piecemeal without knowing what is being done with it. Only one step could be compromising the overlay, so there is the need to see the next step.

Commissioner Johnson agreed with Chair Isaac. He explained that while it is less expensive this way, there is a great amount of uncertainty. If it were done with a developed plan it would ensure greater certainty.

Commissioner Draper stated that the applicant should work more with the City on the drives and roads. Cannot guarantee the proposal will be built so she agreed with previous comments.

The Commission then reviewed the standards. There was some disagreement on the 1st
standard. The property would be removed from the overlay but still meet the intent of the Comprehensive Plan; however, there is no guarantee that the proposal would be built. Standard 2 was met as the underlying zoning is not changing. Standard 3 could possibly not be met. There is the possibility that the change could adversely affect other properties but no testimony was provided proving this. Standard 4 does not apply to the proposed amendment.

Commissioner Goddard stated that she is not sure that the plan has been successful and the TIF has not been at this point. If the amendment is not approved the property may sit vacant.

Commissioner Hewko made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed map amendment to remove 2044 Wesley from the West Evanston Overlay District. Seconded by Commissioner Goddard.

A roll call vote was then taken and the motion failed, 2-4.

Ayes: Goddard, Hewko
Nays: Draper, Johnson, Sloss, Isaac

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment provided.

6. ADJOURNMENT

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

A voice vote was taken and the motion was approved by voice vote 6-0. The meeting was adjourned at 8:27 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Meagan Jones
Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Community Development Department
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: March 6, 2020

Update Since the February 26, 2020 Meeting
During the February 26, 2020 Plan Commission meeting, this case was continued at the request of a nearby property owner, per Section 6-3-6-11 of the Zoning Ordinance, in order to rebut information presented by the applicant.

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.
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 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Max. Minimum</th>
<th>Permitted Required</th>
<th>IHO Incentive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>57 parking spaces (No parking required for inclusionary units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Lot Coverage</strong></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>+ 15% = 65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impervious Surface Coverage</strong></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>+ 15% = 80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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:
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. (Section 6-8-1-10). 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
1.00 CONTEXTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN

1555 RIDGE AVE.
EVANSTON, IL
SITE - 32,518 S.F.

GROVE ST.

PROPOSED TREES TO BE REMOVED DURING CONSTRUCTION AND REPLACED:
1@ 10" CAL AND 2@ 8" CAL.

SITE COMPOSTING AREA

PROTECT PARKWAY TREES DURING CONSTRUCTION:

BUILDING IS FULLY SPRINKLED

CONTEXTUAL LANDSCAPE PLAN

3/32" = 1'-0"
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 90° 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 rye 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.
DEWELLING UNIT MATRIX:

EFFICIENCY:
(3) @ 584 SF
(4) @ 504 SF

1 BEDROOM:
(4) @ 766 SF
(3) @ 691 SF
(4) @ 694 SF
(4) @ 933 SF
(1) @ 946 SF

2 BEDROOM:
(4) @ 1232 SF
(4) @ 1155 SF
(4) @ 1133 SF
(4) @ 1272 SF
(4) @ 1228 SF
(4) @ 1188 SF
(4) @ 1095 SF
(4) @ 1079 SF
(4) @ 1075 SF
(4) @ 1072 SF
(4) @ 1275 SF

TOTAL - 68 UNITS 67,486 SF

FULLY SPRINKLED
FIRST FLOOR
0' - 0"
SECOND FLOOR
14' - 2 1/2"
THIRD FLOOR
26' - 2 1/2"
FOURTH FLOOR
38' - 2 1/2"
FIFTH FLOOR
50' - 2 1/2"
ROOF
62' - 2 1/2"
PARAPET
65' - 3"
FROSTED GLASS @ GARAGE - TYP.
CAST STONE CLADDING - TYP.
CAST STONE COPING - TYP.
CAST STONE BANDING - TYP.
ALUM./GLASS WINDOWS/DOORS - TYP.
STEEL BALCONIES - TYP.
ALUM. RAILINGS - TYP.
LIMESTONE HEADERS/SILLS - TYP.
MODULAR FACE BRICK - TYP.
CAST STONE BASE - TYP.
ALUM. GARAGE DOOR - TYP.
EGRESS DOOR
HVAC LOUVERS - TYP.
PROJECT NAME: 1555 RIDGE AVE.
PROJECT ADDRESS: 1555 RIDGE AVE., EVANSTON, IL 60201
SCALE : 1/4" = 1'-0"
## Zoning Analysis

### Summary

1555 Ridge Ave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number:</th>
<th>Case Status/Determination:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19ZONA-0157</td>
<td>Non-Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposal:

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

### Zoning Section: Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Section</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-8-1-10</td>
<td>Planned Development required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-8-3</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-1-10-C-3</td>
<td>A 15 ft. setback for all dwelling units from all development boundary lines is required, 3 ft. is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8-1-10-B-3</td>
<td>10 ft. transition landscaped strip consisting of vegetative screening, fencing, or decorative walls is required along the north property line, none is proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-16-4-4 &amp; 6-8-8-7</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# City of Evanston

## ZONING ANALYSIS REVIEW SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICATION STATUS:</th>
<th>September 24, 2019</th>
<th>RESULTS OF ANALYSIS:</th>
<th>Non-Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z.A. Number:</td>
<td>19ZONA-0157</td>
<td>Purpose:</td>
<td>Zoning Analysis without Bld Permit App</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>1555 Ridge AVE</td>
<td>District:</td>
<td>R6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Jay Keller</td>
<td>Overlay:</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>3128293666</td>
<td>Reviewer:</td>
<td>Meagan Jones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIS APPLICATION PROPOSES (select all that apply):**
- [X] New Principal Structure
- New Accessory Structure
- Addition to Structure
- Alteration to Structure
- Retention of Structure
- Change of Use
- Sidewalk Cafe
- Retention of Use
- Plot of Resubdiv./Consol
- Business License
- Home Occupation
- Other

**ANALYSIS BASED ON:**
- Plans Dated: 1.30.20
- Prepared By: Space Architects + Planners
- Survey Dated: 6.3.19
- Existing Improvements: Surface parking lot

## ZONING ANALYSIS

**PLANNED DEVELOPMENT THRESHOLDS**

Does not apply to I1, I2, I3, OS, U2S, or Excluded T1 & T2 Properties. See Section 6-8-1-1.9(D) for R7a; Section 6-10-1-9(D) for B’s; Section 6-11-1-10(D) for C’s; Section 6-11-1-9(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 D1, D1a, U’s, O, 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.
2. Does the zoning lot area exceed 30,000 sqft?
3. Does the proposal entail more that 24 new residential, commercial, business, retail or office units in any combination?
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?

## RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT CALCULATIONS

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

### Front Porch Exception (Subtract 50%)

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

## 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>Parking Lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling - MF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

Minimum Lot Width (LF)

| Minimum Lot Width (LF) | 50 | 175.6 | 175.6 | No Change |

**USE:** Multi Family

**Comments:**

Minimum Lot Area (SF)

| Minimum Lot Area (SF) | 5,000 sqft plus 400 sqft per dwelling unit therein | 32518 | 32518 | Compliant |

**USE:** Multi Family

**Comments:**

Dwelling Units

| Dwelling Units | 69 | 0 | 68 | Compliant |

**Comments:**

LF: Linear Feet  SF: Square Feet  FT: Foot
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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): | 21137 (with IHO bonus) | 0 | 20995 | Compliant |
| Comments: With IHO being compliant (5% onsite units), a 15% bonus is applied for building lot coverage |

| Impervious Surface Coverage (SF, %) | 25014 (with IHO bonus) | 30700 | 25826 | Compliant |
| Comments: With IHO being compliant (5% onsite units), a 15% bonus is applied for impervious surface coverage |

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

| Gross Floor Area (SF) Use: |          |
| Comments: |          |

| Height (FT) | 0 | 62.2 | Compliant |
| Comments: |          |

| Front Yard(1) (FT) Direction: W | 21.85 | Compliant |
| Street: Ridge Ave | Comments: Average setback on the block is 21 feet. |

| Front Yard(2) (FT) Direction: |          |
| Street: |          |
| Comments: |          |

| Street Side Yard (FT) Direction: S | 15 | Compliant |
| Street: Grove St | Comments: |

| Interior Side Yard(1) (FT) Direction: N | 3 | Non-Compliant |
| Comments: 15 ft minimum required for planned developments with a 10 ft landscaped buffer |

| Interior Side Yard(2) (FT) Direction: |          |
| Comments: |          |

| Rear Yard (FT) Direction: E | 30.5 | Compliant |
| Comments: |          |

---

**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:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open Off-street Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Permitted Required Yard: | Rear Yard | Compliant |
| Comments: | | | | |
### Additional Standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height (FT)</td>
<td>Flat or mansard roof 14.5', ct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Distance from Principal Building:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easy 10.00'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Front Yard(1A) (FT)
- **Direction:** W
- **Street:** Ridge Ave

### Front Yard(1B) (FT)
- **Direction:**
- **Street:**

### Street Side Yard (FT)
- **Direction:** S
- **Street:** Grove St

### Interior Side Yard(1A) (FT)
- **Direction:** N

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interior Side Yard(1B) (FT)</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rear Yard (FT)
- **Direction:** E

### PARKING REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use(1): Multi-family (Res District)</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 1 bdrm -&gt; 1/2 DU</td>
<td>1 bdrm -&gt;</td>
<td>2 bdrm -&gt;</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/2 DU &gt; 3 bdrm -&gt;</td>
<td>2 /DU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Use(2):

### Use(3):

### TOTAL REQUIRED:

\[
(27' * .55) + (38' * 1.1) = 56.7 = 57
\]

Comments: includes HO bonus which allows no parking requirement for on-site affordable units: one 1-bed, two 2-bed units
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Handicap Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. 6-16-2-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Access: | Standard | 3 | Compliant |

| Vertical Clearance (LF) | Standard | 7 | > 7' | Compliant |

| Surface: | Standard | paved | Compliant |

| Location: | Standard | enclosed/open, rear alley access | Non-Compliant |

**Comments:** Loading space is located 1.5' from rear property line.

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

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

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

**Loading Requirements**

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

**Comments:**

**TOTAL (long):**

**TOTAL (short):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long Berth Size (FT)</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>12' wide x 50' deep</th>
<th>Non-Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Berth Size (FT)</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>10' wide x 35' deep</th>
<th>Non-Compliant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Vertical Clearance (FT) | Standard | 14' | Compliant |
| Comments:               |          |     |          |

| Location: | Standard | Sec. 6-16-4-1 | Compliant |

**Comments:**

**LF:** Linear Feet  **SF:** Square Feet  **FT:** Feet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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:

See attached comments and/or notes.

[Signature]  
2/5/20

SIGNATURE DATE
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.
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.
### Table 1
**ESTIMATED TOD-GENERATED MULTI-MODAL TRIPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITE Land Use Code</th>
<th>Type/Size</th>
<th>Weekday Morning Peak Hour</th>
<th>Weekday Evening Peak Hour</th>
<th>Daily Traffic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Vehicles (39%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Transportation (23%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walk (19%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ridesharing (10%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work at Home (6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
Meagan Jones <mmjones@cityofevanston.org>

---

**Fwd: 1555 Ridge Avenue Proposal**

Melissa Klotz <mklotz@cityofevanston.org>  
To: Meagan Jones <mmjones@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


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

Thomas 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 locations 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
Planned Development
605 Davis Street
19PLND-0036

Plan Commission
Recommending Body
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  
605 Davis Street, 19PLND-0036

Date: March 6, 2020

Request
The applicant is requesting approval of a Planned Development and Special Uses in order to construct an 18-story Class A office building with 40 parking spaces and 4,170 square feet of ground floor retail space and a Special Use for a Chase Bank drive through facility. Site development allowances are being requested for: 1) FAR of 13.0 where 4.5 is allowed and 8.0 may be requested as a maximum Site Development Allowance, 2) Proposed building height of 220 feet where 85 feet (excluding parking) is allowed and 220 may be requested as a Site Development Allowance, 3) 40 parking spaces where 420 are required, 4) A 15-foot Ziggurat setback is proposed at 29 foot height along Davis where a 40-foot Ziggurat setback is required above 42-foot height, 5) A 0-foot Ziggurat setback is requested along the east interior lot line at 29-foot height where a 25-foot Ziggurat setback is required above 42-foot height and 6) A 0-foot Ziggurat setback is requested along the west interior side lot line at 29-foot height where a 25-foot Ziggurat setback is required above 42-foot height. In addition, the applicant may seek and the Plan Commission may consider additional Site Development Allowances as may be necessary or desirable for the proposed development.

Notice
The Application has been filed in conformance with applicable procedural and public notice requirements with notice published in the February 13, 2020 Evanston Review.

General Information
Applicant: Davis Street Development Company 2015, LLC  
David Cocagne
Owner(s): Wayne Hummer Trust u/t/a/ Martha Koch  
P.O. Box 190  
Lake Forest, IL 60045  

J.P. Morgan Chase Bank, NA  
Greg Coleman  
240585 El Toro Road, Floor 2  
Laguna Hills, CA 92653  

Existing Zoning: D3 Downtown Core Development District  

Existing Land Use: Commercial (financial institution drive-through facility) and Vacant  

Property Size: 19,910.2 sq. ft. (0.46 acres)  

PINs: 11-18-306-040-0000, -026-0000, -029-0000, -030-0000  

<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>D3, Downtown Core</td>
<td>Residential, Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>(Apartment Building, Retail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>D2, Downtown Retail Core</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Retail, Office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>D2, Downtown Retail Core</td>
<td>Residential, Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D4, Downtown Transition</td>
<td>(The Merion, Retail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>D3, Downtown Core</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>(Restaurant, Office)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis  

Project Description  
The applicant is requesting to construct an 18-story Class A office building with 40 parking spaces and 4,170 square feet of ground floor retail space (including a drive through facility for a financial institution, Chase Bank).
The site consists of four parcels north of Davis Street and west of Chicago Avenue for a total of .46 acres. It currently consists of a Chase Bank drive through facility and an unimproved vacant lot.

The uses surrounding the site include several 2 to 4 story buildings containing retail, restaurant and office uses directly south of Davis Street. To the east is the two-story University Building and nine-story Merion retirement building with some ground floor retail. Just north of the site on the west side of the street is a parking deck with some existing retail uses along Chicago Avenue, the Park Evanston apartment building and the Whole Foods grocery store. To the immediate west is the Chase Bank plaza and office building.

Site Layout:
The site is a slightly rectangular shaped area with approximately 151 feet of frontage along Davis Street. The massing of the proposed building is in 2 sections: a two-story brick veneer building housing the commercial space, lobby area and the Chase Bank drive through on the ground floor and parking on the second level, and a 16-story glass and metal veneer office portion above that is set back from Davis Street and the property to the north. The lower podium portion of the new building is built to all four property lines with the exception of the entry plaza, which is set back 15 feet at the ground level. The south side of the office tower portion of the building is set back 15 feet from the property line at the 3rd floor while the north side of the tower is set back 5 feet beginning at the 4th floor. A mechanical penthouse is located on the roof.

The ground floor is dedicated to the 4,170 square feet of commercial space, which is split by a Chase Bank drive through that creates a tunnel through the building, in addition to the lobby and building loading area. The parking level will have 40 parking spaces.

Vehicular access will be from the 20-foot wide alley just west of the property. Both the garage entrance and two loading spaces will be located at the northern end of the building. Both retail and office trash collection will be in the loading dock area. The proposed drive through will also use the alley as an exit just south of the proposed
loading areas.

The building meets required ground level setbacks for the D3 Zoning District but does not meet the required upper-level ziggurat setbacks along Davis Street and the east and west property lines. The actual building height is 232 feet to the roof with a single floor of parking. The height of the floors dedicated to parking may be deducted from the maximum height allowed (up to 40 feet) per Section 6-11-4-8. With this reduction the portion of the building that counts toward the maximum height requirement is 220 feet tall, which meets the maximum permitted site development allowance. This podium portion of the building is built to the west, north and south property lines.

Proposed First Floor Plan

The applicant will install new streetscape elements along Davis Street including a new approximately 7-foot wide public sidewalk with 4 new street trees. Protection measures, including warning striping and a “yield to bikes” sign, will be added to the bike lane to alert drivers of the presence of the protected bike lane. A bike room with 150 bike parking spaces will be located on the ground floor of the building and have its own entrance off of Davis Street.

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

**Planned Development**
The applicant is requesting Special Use approval for a Planned Development and Drive through to construct the 18-story (220-foot high) office building with 4,170 square feet of commercial space and 40 parking spaces.

The applicant is requesting approval of six site development allowances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Development Allowances Requested</th>
<th>Required / Max. Permitted in the D3 District</th>
<th>Site Development Allowance</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Exceeds Max Site Development Allowance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>85 feet (not including up to 4 floors of parking)</td>
<td>220 feet= (not including up to 4 floors of parking)</td>
<td>220 feet (232 feet including parking levels)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>+3.5 = 8.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of parking spaces</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziggurat setback (east property line)</td>
<td>25 ft. at a height of 42 ft.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 ft. at 29 ft. building height</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziggurat setback (west property line)</td>
<td>25 ft. at a height of 42 ft.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 ft. at 29 ft. building height</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziggurat setback (Davis St)</td>
<td>40 ft. at a height of 42 ft.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>15 ft. at 29 ft. building height</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that in Downtown Districts, building levels with at least 75% of the gross floor area dedicated to parking are excluded in the zoning calculation of building height. In this case, the actual building height to the roof is 232 feet, however discounting the parking level, the zoning height is then reduced to 220 feet. Because the proposed development exceeds the site development allowance set forth in Section
6-11-1-10(C) for Floor Area Ratio (FAR), a super-majority (two-thirds) vote by the City Council is required for approval.

Parking and Traffic
Based on the type of use proposed (office and retail), the proposed building is required to have a total of 420 parking spaces. The applicant is proposing a total of 40 parking spaces (0.15 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet) for the proposed development. It should be noted that the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) parking reduction frequently used and discussed only applies to residential uses within TOD areas.

The applicant has submitted a TOD Parking Study that analyzes the current office building parking trends and the proposed parking arrangement. The property is located approximately less than ¼ mile from the Davis Street CTA and Metra stops. Considering that the building is located in close proximity to amenities, transit stops, multiple bus lines (CTA Bus Routes 201 and 205), an existing Divvy Bike Station at Benson Avenue and Church Street, existing car sharing locations and several City parking facilities, the applicant’s study concludes that the proposed parking arrangement will meet the parking demand of the building tenants. The proposed storage space for 150 bikes encourages bicycle ridership and adds to the study’s conclusion.

The study included Work Trip Flow Data collected by Regional Transportation Asset Management System (RTAMS) which indicated that office developments within close proximity to transit reduce the auto dependency and thus the parking demand. The study also referenced one local office building at 909 Davis Street, which is 207,743 square feet and provides 57 parking stalls on-site, with a parking ratio of 0.29 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet.

The study does make some suggestions to aid in encouraging reduced vehicle use, such as installation of real-time transit monitors in the building lobby and implementation of Travel Demand Measures such as bike storage (provided) carpool matching services, preferred carpool parking and telecommuting. Staff encourages these to be considered in addition to leasing additional parking spaces from the City’s parking garage located 525 Church Street to offset the possible parking shortage. As part of the leasing of additional parking spaces, submission of data on parking space usage would be required to help inform parking space needs.

Staff conducted traffic counts on April 9, 2019 and May 16, 2019 to capture the use of the alley, existing drive through, bike lane, and pedestrian traffic on Davis Street. Counts were taken during the morning and evening rush hours and at noon. The results of those counts are below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 9, 2019</th>
<th>8-9am</th>
<th>noon-1pm</th>
<th>5-6pm</th>
<th>April Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Public Benefits

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

1. Public art (green wall) prominently located at the entry plaza on Davis Street.
2. Extend bollards and other safety measures for the Davis Street bike lane in front of the development site.
3. Provide $50,000 support for Downtown Evanston.
4. Provide $50,000 support for improvements to Downtown Evanston viaducts.
5. Apply bird friendly measures to the building, including but not limited to bird friendly glass, fritted balcony rails and lighting control at night.
6. Comply with the Mayor’s Monarch Pledge.
7. Provide eight (8) electric vehicle charging stations in the garage with additional conduit to allow easy installation of additional electric vehicle charging stations in the future.
9. Two new metered parking spaces along Davis Street.
10. Reconstruct west side of alley adjacent to the development site.
12. Sponsor an Evanston Township High School (ETHS) trade fair.
13. Pursue hiring of Evanston Business Enterprises during construction and as part of building retail.
During Design and Project Review Committee (DAPR) meetings, staff shared concerns regarding the extent of public benefits presented at that meeting for the proposed development as several items listed in that summary of public benefits were items that are required by ordinance or would be standard occurrences with development of the land. It should be noted that the public benefits provided to the Plan Commission reflect changes since the last DAPR meeting. The number of site development allowances as well as the extent of the requested allowance that would require a supermajority vote from City Council, would lend itself to an increase in the proposed public benefits to mitigate the effects of the proposed development. Should changes be made, the complete list of public benefits would be finalized prior to the consideration by the City Council and will be explicitly required within the Planned Development Ordinance.

**Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan**

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

The proposed development is also consistent with the Plan objective to maintain the appealing character of Evanston’s neighborhoods while guiding their change. The new building will have a façade which fits within the context of the masonry construction of adjacent buildings as well as the more contemporary buildings that are along Davis Street while also providing the office space stated above. The proposed Planned Development will include 4,170 square feet ground retail space, however, the drive through portion is not a desired use in the downtown area.

The proposal is consistent with the Plan’s objective to enhance the economic vitality of Downtown Evanston and encourage a compatible mix of uses in the downtown. It will be taking an under-utilized property and replacing it with a mixed-use building that will provide both retail and office space that will contribute to the City’s economy. Though it does follow the trend of locating denser uses near transit areas, there is concern that the FAR is significantly greater than what is permitted. Based on staff research a Planned Development has never been constructed in the D3 District that has exceeded the maximum site development allowance of 8.0.

**Compliance with the 2009 Downtown Plan**

This site is designated as South Traditional subarea which calls for mixed-use development with heights between 3 stories (38 ft.) to 5 stories (60 ft.) to keep a walkable commercial stretch for this section of the Downtown. The podium portion of the building is below this range at 2 stories (29 ft.). This contributes to a street level massing that more closely matches the adjacent University Building and buildings across Davis Street; however, the overall height of the proposed development at 18 stories (220 feet excluding parking level height) is above the suggested height. The
Downtown Plan also states that more opportunities should be provided for affordable Class A office space, a use that has seen more demand in recent years due in part to Evanston’s access to public transportation and low vacancy rates for existing office space. 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 drive through facility that breaks up the desired walkable and bikeable nature of the location.

Compliance with the Design Guidelines for Planned Developments
The proposed building is consistent with the Design Guidelines for Planned Developments. The proposal was reviewed by the Design and Project Review committee on November 20, 2019 and December 11, 2019 (approved minutes for both meetings are attached) and received a recommendation for approval of the project with some additional conditions related to a sunset provision for the drive-through should its use cease, a parking lease with the City including a look-back provision and refining the proposed public benefits. The building height is in line with zoning requirements and site development allowances, however, the proposed ziggurat setbacks on the south, east and west property lines are significantly less than required. The setbacks along the east and west property lines are of less concern as the building is adjacent to a 20 foot alley to the west and a two-story building to the east. The 15 foot ziggurat setback proposed along Davis Street is less than the required 40 feet which would better assist in keeping the pedestrian scale along Davis Street. The two-story podium base does use similar materials to adjacent buildings on the block and the fully-enclosed “woven” brick design at the parking levels prevents vehicle headlights on adjacent properties. The drive through still presents a conflict point for both bicyclists and pedestrians.

Parking access is provided on the west side of the building, off of the adjacent alley, with parking spaces on the 2nd floor of the development. The loading area and trash enclosure located on the western portion of the property will be accessed off of the alley as well as the drive through exit. The proposal will reduce the width of the existing curb cut on Davis Street. New streetscape elements with street trees will be installed along Davis Street.

The proposed brick and metal veneer materials are appropriate given the materials of surrounding buildings. The massing of the building is broken up into two portions. The front façade is in line with the right-of way for the first 2 stories and includes an inset plaza with a green wall. The design for the office portion of the building above is more contemporary and is set back from Davis Street and the north property line. Staff will continue to work with the applicant on the building design details, materials and colors throughout the formal review process.

DAPR Committee Review
The Design and Project Review Committee reviewed the proposed Planned...
Development on November 20, 2019 and on December 11, 2019. The Committee recommended approval of the proposed development at the December 11, 2019 with the inclusion of conditions related to a sunset provision for the drive-through should its use cease (including removal of the Davis Street curb cut and absorbing the area into the surrounding retail space), a parking lease with the City including a look-back provision and refining the proposed public benefits.

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

Staff finds that the proposed development meets most standards for approval; however, there are several points of concern.

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

The proposed building with a ground floor commercial space will not cause a negative cumulative effect when considered in conjunction with other special uses in the area. Most other surrounding uses are commercial or mixed-use and therefore compatible with the proposed office/retail building. Commercial use already exists on the site without any negative effect on surrounding uses. As such, the proposal will likely not interfere with or diminish the value of other properties in the neighborhood. It should be noted, however, that while a banking facility is permitted and could be an acceptable use at the site, a drive-through ATM is not a desirable commercial use for this site or the walkable core downtown area in general. For this reason, staff encourages the inclusion of a condition that, should that use cease operation, that the space be absorbed into the surrounding retail spaces.

As indicated above, the proposal can be adequately served by public facility infrastructure already available. The street and sidewalk network, as well as water, sewer, electricity and gas infrastructure already exist and service the existing building and structures on the site, however, added attention will need to be paid to the water and sewer connection due to the size of the building and the water and sewer main near the site.

Staff, has concerns regarding possible points of conflict with the inclusion of the drive-through. The applicant has submitted a parking study that explains that, due to the site being within a TOD area and considering current trends, the parking provided will be adequate for the site. The access to the parking garage will be provided via the alley as
will the loading docks and trash area. The applicant proposes to preserve an existing curb cut on Davis Street by narrowing it to accommodate the Chase Bank drive through. The combination of this drive through and traffic from the parking garage and loading docks raises concerns of points of conflict with the existing protected bike lane along the north side of Davis Street.

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

**Standards and Guidelines for Planned Developments in D3 District (Sections 6-3-6-9 and 6-11-1-10)**
The proposed Planned Development generally complies with purposes and the intent of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposal is a dense, business infill development with a mix of office and retail that is a compatible land use with surrounding downtown properties. The proposal is largely consistent with the vision and goals of the Comprehensive Plan for redevelopment of underutilized properties with uses compatible with surrounding neighborhood as well as the objective to retain and attract business in Evanston.

As stated above, the ground floor site layout causes some concern with regards to safety and continuity of a pedestrian and walkable experience. The drive through in the middle of the development, though significantly reduced in width from its existing size, reduces the traffic flow on this block. The alley will have a number of points of conflict with not just traffic from building tenants and trash pick-up but also with vehicles exiting the proposed drive through. The proposed site development allowance for FAR also greatly exceeds the maximum site development allowance permitted without Supermajority City Council approval. The proposed site development allowance for a reduced ziggurat setback from Davis Street also increases the perceived mass of the building.

**Recommendation**

Based on the analysis above, and the DAPR Committee recommendation, staff recommends the Plan Commission make a recommendation for approval of the Special Uses for the proposed Planned Development at 605 Davis Street to the City Council, subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed planned development shall substantially conform to the plans and documents attached to this report.
2. The applicant must agree to a Construction Management Plan (CMP) before issuance of the building permit.
3. Any change in use must be approved as an amendment to the Planned Development.
4. The Applicant shall reconstruct the alley adjacent to the development site.
5. The Applicant shall provide $50,000 support for Downtown Evanston.
6. The Applicant shall provide $50,000 support for improvements to Downtown Evanston viaducts.

7. The Applicant shall apply bird friendly measures to the building, including but not limited to bird friendly glass, fritted balcony rails and lighting control at night.

8. The Applicant shall comply with the Mayor’s Monarch Pledge.

9. The Applicant shall provide eight (8) electric vehicle charging stations in the garage with additional conduit to allow easy installation of additional electric vehicle charging stations in the future.

10. The Applicant shall provide two new metered parking spaces along Davis Street.

11. The Applicant shall extend bollards and other safety measures for the Davis Street bike lane in front of the development site.

12. Prior to issuance of building permit, the applicant shall execute a long term parking lease agreement with the City of Evanston to lease one hundred and fifty (150) parking spaces based on the standard current monthly parking fee from the 525 Church Street parking garage. The lease of Fifty (50) parking spaces would be initiated upon issuance of a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (TCO). The remaining leased spaces would be leased by the developer as the building is occupied and prorated by a percentage gross floor area leased. After 18 months of the issuance of said (TCO) the developer would be required to lease the full 150 spaces, regardless of the building occupancy. The parking spaces shall be leased at market rate without fixed pricing, and be subject to increases annually. The lease agreement will mandate that the Applicant pay any increase in the rental rate structure through the term of the agreement. For a period of 60 months, starting from the issuance of the temporary certificate of occupancy (TCO), the Applicant must provide to the City, parking data detailing how many parking spaces (leased from the City and provided within the building) are utilized by building tenants. This data must be provided by January 31st of each year following the issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy (FCO). At the end of the 60th month, the parking lease agreement may be amended to match the highest number of vehicles leased within the Church Street parking garage.

13. The Drive-through facility shall be limited to use by Chase Bank or its successor as a financial institution. Shall the drive-through cease operations for sixty (60) days or greater, the Davis Street curb cut must be removed by the building owner and the building owner shall obtain a building permit to absorb the drive-through area into the adjacent ground floor retail spaces within ninety (90) days, and complete the work within one (1) year of obtaining the building permit. Should the building owner fail to remove the curb cut as required by this section, the City
shall be empowered to remove the curb cut and place a lien on the property, should it so choose.

14. The Applicant will engage Collective Resource to establish a composting program in the building.

15. Deliveries for the on-site commercial use must be performed from the alley and are prohibited during the hours of 7 AM – 9 AM and 4 PM – 6 PM Monday through Friday.

16. The Applicant shall sponsor an Evanston Township High School (ETHS) trade fair.

17. The Applicant shall pursue hiring of Evanston Business Enterprises during construction and as part of building retail.

Attachments

605 Davis Street Proposed Development Plans
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Link to original Planned Development Application
Public Benefits Summary
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TOD Parking Study
Comments received as of March 6, 2020
Approved Minutes from December 11, 2019 and November 20, 2020 DAPR Meetings
LEVEL 2 : 40 PARKING SPACES including 2 ADA
PLAN | TYPICAL OFFICE FLOOR PLAN

GROSS FLOOR AREA: 16,430 SF
GROSS FLOOR AREA: 15,105 SF
GROSS FLOOR AREA: 14,705 SF
ZONING ORDINANCE ZIGGURAT SETBACK | CONTEXT ANALYSIS

1580 ORRINGTON (OPTIMA TOWERS)
NO SETBACK
PODIUM HEIGHT 41'
ZIGGURAT SETBACK 35'
BUILDING HEIGHT 110'

630 DAVIS (CHANDLER’S BUILDING)
NO SETBACK
NO ZIGGURAT SETBACK
BUILDING HEIGHT 60'

520 ~ 624 DAVIS
NO SETBACK
NO ZIGGURAT SETBACK

500 DAVIS (500 DAVIS CENTER)
NO SETBACK
PARTIALLY ZIGGURAT SETBACK 18'
PODIUM HEIGHT 48'
BUILDING HEIGHT 118'

1603 ORRINGTON (ORRINGTON PLAZA)
FRONT YARD SETBACK 105'
NO ZIGGURAT SETBACK
PODIUM HEIGHT 20'
BUILDING HEIGHT 270'

601 DAVIS (UNIVERSITY BUILDING)
NO SETBACK
NO ZIGGURAT SETBACK
BUILDING HEIGHT 28'

1607 CHICAGO (THE MERION)
NO SETBACK
NO ZIGGURAT SETBACK
BUILDING HEIGHT 80'

1600 HINMAN (THE JOHN EVANS BUILDING)
NO SETBACK
NO ZIGGURAT SETBACK
BUILDING HEIGHT 54'

821 DAVIS (SHERMAN PLAZA PARKING GARAGE)
NO SETBACK
NO ZIGGURAT SETBACK
BUILDING HEIGHT 126'

807 DAVIS (SHERMAN PLAZA)
NO SETBACK
ZIGGURAT SETBACK 20'
PODIUM HEIGHT 66'
BUILDING HEIGHT 259'

422 DAVIS (THE MATHER PLACE AT THE GEORGIAN)
FRONT YARD SETBACK 10'
NO ZIGGURAT SETBACK
BUILDING HEIGHT 100'

425 DAVIS (THE MATHER)
FRONT YARD SETBACK 20'
NO ZIGGURAT SETBACK
BUILDING HEIGHT 108'

821 DAVIS (SHERMAN PLAZA)
NO SETBACK
NO ZIGGURAT SETBACK
BUILDING HEIGHT 126'

601 DAVIS (UNIVERSITY BUILDING)
NO SETBACK
NO ZIGGURAT SETBACK
BUILDING HEIGHT 28'

1600 HINMAN (THE JOHN EVANS BUILDING)
NO SETBACK
NO ZIGGURAT SETBACK
BUILDING HEIGHT 54'

520 ~ 624 DAVIS
NO SETBACK
NO ZIGGURAT SETBACK

500 DAVIS (500 DAVIS CENTER)
NO SETBACK
PARTIALLY ZIGGURAT SETBACK 18'
PODIUM HEIGHT 48'
BUILDING HEIGHT 118'

1603 ORRINGTON (ORRINGTON PLAZA)
FRONT YARD SETBACK 105'
NO ZIGGURAT SETBACK
PODIUM HEIGHT 20'
BUILDING HEIGHT 270'

601 DAVIS (UNIVERSITY BUILDING)
NO SETBACK
NO ZIGGURAT SETBACK
BUILDING HEIGHT 28'

1607 CHICAGO (THE MERION)
NO SETBACK
NO ZIGGURAT SETBACK
BUILDING HEIGHT 80'

1600 HINMAN (THE JOHN EVANS BUILDING)
NO SETBACK
NO ZIGGURAT SETBACK
BUILDING HEIGHT 54'
SHADOW STUDY | SUMMER SOLSTICE
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CONCEPT DIAGRAM | EXTRUSION AT DIFFERENT HEIGHTS
PROPOSED TOWER TYPICAL FLOOR PLAN

GROSS FLOOR AREA: 16,430 SF
NET LEASABLE AREA: 13,144 SF
TOTAL GROSS LEASABLE AREA: 206,570 SF
TOWER HEIGHT: 220 FT

TOWER TYPICAL FLOOR PLAN PER ZONING ORDINANCE REQUIREMENTS

GROSS FLOOR AREA: 9,274 SF
NET LEASABLE AREA: 5,988 SF
TOTAL GROSS LEASABLE AREA: 206,570 SF
TOWER HEIGHT: 458 FT
1. Podium Brick 1

2. Store Front System

3. Metal Cladding between Podium & Tower

4. Tower Cladding 2

5. Glass Curtain Wall

6. Low-E Insulating Glass

PODIUM MASONRY | METAL PANEL | TOWER GLASS
PERSPECTIVE VIEW | LOOKING UP TOWER FROM PLAZA
ZONING | SUMMARY & SETBACKS

Proposed Project: Mixed use office building with ground floor retail and parking. University Building to remain.

Site: 605 Davis Street

Site Area: 19,909 sf

Existing Proposed
Zoning District: D3 D3 with Planned Development Ordinance

FAR: 4.5 13.02

*Aggregate maximum FAR is 8.00 per Zoning Ordinance 6-15-13-11. – Incentive System

Enclosed Building Area: approx. 3,010,560 sf

FAR Building Area: approx. 2,359,230 sf

Building Height: 18 Floors

Office Tower

Floors: -

Feet: 2272'-0"

- 1 floors parking = 12' max.

Zoning Height: 240'-0"

Building Setbacks: (See diagram to right.)

Parking Spaces: 40

Parking Ratio: 0.16 / 1000 GSF

Bicycle Parking: 150 Interior Bike Parking Spaces

Loading Berths: 2 short berths (Interior)

Sustainability: LEED Silver

MAX ALLOWED HEIGHT: 232ft

(220ft + 12ft PARKING EXAMPTION)
### 601 Davis Office Tower

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Floors</th>
<th>Office Floors</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Floor to Floor Height</th>
<th>Building Gross</th>
<th>Attributable Gross Area</th>
<th>Office Gross</th>
<th>Net Leasable Area</th>
<th>Parking Spaces</th>
<th># of Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Retail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>252'-0'</td>
<td>20'-0'</td>
<td>14,705</td>
<td>14,155</td>
<td>14,705</td>
<td>10,685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400sf Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>218'-6'</td>
<td>13'-6'</td>
<td>15,105</td>
<td>14,155</td>
<td>15,105</td>
<td>11,085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,115sf Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>205'-0'</td>
<td>13'-6'</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>15,480</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>13,144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>191'-6'</td>
<td>12'-6'</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>15,480</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>13,144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>179'-0'</td>
<td>12'-6'</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>15,480</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>13,144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>166'-6'</td>
<td>12'-6'</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>15,480</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>13,144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>154'-0'</td>
<td>12'-6'</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>15,480</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>13,144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>141'-6'</td>
<td>12'-6'</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>15,480</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>13,144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>129'-0'</td>
<td>12'-6'</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>15,480</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>13,144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>116'-6'</td>
<td>12'-6'</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>15,480</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>13,144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>104'-0'</td>
<td>12'-6'</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>15,480</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>13,144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91'-6'</td>
<td>12'-6'</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>15,480</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>13,144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79'-0'</td>
<td>12'-6'</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>15,480</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>13,144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66'-6'</td>
<td>12'-6'</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>15,480</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>13,144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54'-0'</td>
<td>12'-6'</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>15,480</td>
<td>16,430</td>
<td>13,144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41'-6'</td>
<td>12'-6'</td>
<td>17,410</td>
<td>16,460</td>
<td>17,410</td>
<td>13,928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,592sf Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29'-0'</td>
<td>12'-0'</td>
<td>19,140</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>17,690</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17'-0'</td>
<td>17'-0'</td>
<td>18,600</td>
<td>12,720</td>
<td>12,410</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Above Grade Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>298,550</strong></td>
<td><strong>259,230</strong></td>
<td><strong>274,670</strong></td>
<td><strong>206,570</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,610</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,270</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mechanical</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Building Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>301,050</strong></td>
<td><strong>259,230</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Zoning Height:** 220'-0''

**Site Area:** 19,909

**FAR AREA:**

- **Total Bldg Area:** 301,050
- **Parking Spaces/1000 SF (leaseable):** 0.19
- **Parking Spaces/1000 SF (gross):** 0.15

---
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605 Davis Street

Public Benefit Summary by Category

Monetary Contributions

- $50,000 support for Design Evanston
- $50,000 support for improvements to appearance of Downtown rail viaducts

Public Art and Urban Design

- Public art (green wall) prominently located at the entry plaza on Davis Street
- Extend bollards and other safety measures for the Davis Street bike lane in front of the development site

Sustainability and Resiliency

- Bird-Friendly features
  - Bird-Friendly glass
  - Fritted balcony rails
  - Lighting control at night
- Compliance with Mayor’s Monarch Pledge
- Engaging Collective Resource, the official composting partner of Evanston which is located in Evanston, to establish a composting program in the building
- Provide eight (8) electric vehicle charging stations in the garage, two (2) above the code required with additional conduit to allow easy installation of additional electric vehicle charging stations in the future
- Comply with Evanston Climate Action Plan (25% energy use reduction)

Miscellaneous

- Reconstruct west side of alley adjacent to the development site
- Sponsorship of ETHS trade fair
- Pursue hiring of Evanston Business Enterprises
- The addition of two public parking meters on Davis Street
Benefits of the Development by Category

**Economic**
- $1.30MM increase in property tax revenue
- $1.05MM in permit fees
- $175,000 increase in sales taxes
- Parking lease with City of Evanston

**Downtown Evanston**
- Additional 950 office workers
- 450+ construction jobs

**Urban Planning**
- Infill development an underutilized site (over-sized drive-thru and vacant lot)
- 4,500 SF of ground floor retail providing active use on Davis Street
- Evanston infrastructure in place for development
- Future-proof drive-thru

**Bike-Friendly**
- 150 indoor bike parking spaces access directly from Davis Street
- Shower and lockers in building
- Drive-thru curb cut reduction (70 feet)

**Sustainability and Resiliency**
- LEED Silver certification
- Green roof
- Future-proof parking level
March 21, 2019

Mr. Matthew F. Havey  
Managing Director  
Vermilion Development  
121 West Wacker Drive  
Suite 400  
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Dear Mr. Havey:

Enclosed please find the Evanston Office Market Analysis along with a survey of the Class A Buildings. Based upon the proposed location and the strong market fundamentals in Evanston, we strongly believe a new development project will be successful. Here are the facts:

- The current Class A vacancy rate in Evanston is seven percent (7%).

- There are only three blocks of contiguous space over 20,000 square feet in the Evanston Market. Currently large users considering Evanston have very limited options and growing companies may be forced to consider options outside of Evanston to accommodate their needs.

- The projects superior location in the heart of Evanston is complemented with both the Metra and CTA Purple Line in walking distance. This Transit Oriented location will be well received by the millennial generation whose preference is rail over the traditional car commuting of the past. This will benefit Evanston with less demand for vehicle parking.

- The last new development project delivered in Evanston was in 2002. With advances in technology, construction, riser management, amenities and tenant friendly buildings a new development will be in strong demand from today's discerning office users.

- Based upon the incredible shift of tenants from the traditional suburban locations of the past to a more urban environment with restaurants, bars, and entertainment all within in walking distance, makes Evanston a natural choice for new companies.

We hope that the market data we have enclosed clearly supports the facts above and encourages you to bring this exciting project to fruition. If you require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

John H. Clark  
Senior Managing Director

Robert Lundin  
Senior Managing Director
Evanston is one of the most affluent and desirable communities in the Chicagoland area. Its location provides easy commutes for decision makers living in the North Shore, as well as millennial employees commuting from downtown neighborhoods like Lincoln Park and Lakeview via Metra or CTA Purple Line making Evanston a transit oriented location.

While there are some proposed new office developments in Evanston a lack of new deliveries has kept vacancy rates low while pushing rental rates up.

Investors have shown significant interest in Evanston. In 2018 alone two of the largest office buildings in Evanston traded hands: 500 Davis Street and 1603 Orrington Avenue.

### Evanston Sales Transactions 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Buyer</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Price/SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1603 Orrington Plaza</td>
<td>GEM Realty</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>308,695</td>
<td>$296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Davis Street</td>
<td>US Equities Realty</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>127,000</td>
<td>$255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1033 University Place</td>
<td>NW Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>92,520</td>
<td>$202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>Total SF</td>
<td>Available SF</td>
<td>% Leased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Davis St Evanston, IL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>127,565</td>
<td>3,821</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1007 Church St Evanston, IL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>155,652</td>
<td>13,477</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>909 Davis St Evanston, IL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>207,743</td>
<td>17,238</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603 Orrington Ave Evanston, IL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>307,528</td>
<td>23,790</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560 Sherman Ave Evanston, IL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>368,767</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

This report summarizes the results of a parking study conducted by Kenig, Lindgren, O’Hara, Aboona, Inc. (KLOA, Inc.) for the proposed Transit Oriented Development (TOD) to be located at 601 Davis Street in Evanston, Illinois. The site, which is currently occupied by a two-story retail building, a vacant lot, and a Chase Bank drive-through, is located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Davis Street and Chicago Avenue. The site will be redeveloped with a 19-story building with approximately 192,000 of net leasable square footage. This square footage does not include the parking area or the lobby/retail/café area, which will be ancillary uses. As proposed, the site will provide a 42-space parking garage with access off the north-south alley that runs along the site’s west property line between Davis Street and Church Street. Given the proximity of the proposed office development to the Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) Davis Purple Line station (approximately 940 feet or 0.18 miles) and to the Metra Union Pacific/North Line (UP-N) Davis Street station (approximately 1,000 feet or 0.19 miles), the City of Evanston city core, residential and retail land uses, the development meets the characteristics of a TOD development. Figure 1 shows an aerial view of the site.

The purpose of this TOD parking study is to (1) inventory the existing transportation conditions within the vicinity of the site, (2) determine the characteristics of the TOD, and (3) evaluate the parking needs of the TOD.
Aerial View of Site Location and Distance to Public Transit

Figure 1

601 Davis Street
Evanston, Illinois
2. Existing Conditions

The following provides a summary of the alternative modes of transportation available in the area and the availability of parking in the area.

Site Location

The site is located on the north side of Davis Street between Chicago Avenue on the east and the north-south alley on the west. This site is located in the core of Evanston’s Central Business District, which generally consists of commercial, office, and multi-story residential developments. The site currently contains an existing two-story retail building, a vacant lot, and a Chase Bank drive-through with multiple lanes.

Alternative Modes of Transportation

Accessibility to and from the Evanston central business district is enhanced by the alternative modes of transportation serving the area as summarized below. Figure 2 shows a map of the public transportation serving the area.

Public Transportation. The area is served by several modes of public transportation including Metra commuter rail, CTA rapid transit service, and two bus lines. The following summarizes the rail lines providing service to the area:

- The *Metra Union Pacific/North Line (UP-N)* has a local stop at Benson Avenue just north of Davis Street, which is located approximately two to three blocks west of Chicago Avenue. This line provides daily service between Ogilvie Transportation Center in Chicago and Kenosha, Wisconsin.

- The *CTA Purple Transit Line* has a local stop at Benson Avenue just north of Davis Street and is located two to three blocks west of Chicago Avenue. This line provides daily service between the Linden station in Wilmette and the Howard station on the border of Chicago and Evanston. In addition, weekday peak period express service is provided between the Howard Station and downtown Chicago Loop.

The following bus routes serve the immediate area. Several other bus routes have stops that are within walking distance of the site:

- *Route Number 205 Chicago/Golf* runs mostly along Chicago Avenue, Davis Street, Church Street, and Golf Road between the Howard Street rapid transit station and the Cook County Courthouse in Skokie. Service is provided Monday through Friday.

- *Route Number 201 Central/Ridge* generally runs along Ridge Road, Sheridan Avenue, and Central Street with stops including the Old Orchard Shopping Center, Central and Davis Purple Line stations, and the Howard Red Line station. Service is provided weekdays from 5:00 A.M. to 8:00 P.M. and Saturdays from 9:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M.
Public Transportation Available

Figure 2
Non-Motorized Transportation Systems. All of the streets within the immediate area have sidewalks on both sides of the street. Standard crosswalks are provided on all approaches of the studied intersections except for the west approach at the intersection of Davis Street and Sherman Avenue. Pedestrian signals are also provided at all signalized intersections, but none provide pedestrian countdown timers.

According to the City of Evanston’s Area Bike Map, Chicago Avenue and Davis Street are designated bike routes. In addition, Davis Street and Church Street provide barrier-protected bike lanes within the vicinity of the site.

Car-Sharing Transportation Availability. Multiple vehicles are located within walking distance of the site, including two vehicles near the intersection of Davis Street with Benson Avenue and single vehicles near the intersections of Clark Street with Orrington Avenue and Chicago Avenue with Church Street.

Area Parking

The parking in the area is summarized below.

On-Street Parking. Two-hour metered parking spaces are generally provided on both sides of Davis Street, Chicago Avenue, and Church Street and on the west side of Orrington Avenue. Additionally, Sherman Avenue generally also provides two-hour metered parking on both sides of the road. All of the on-street parking spaces are free on holidays.

Public Parking Facilities. The immediate area contains a number of public parking facilities owned and operated by the City of Evanston, including the following:

- The Sherman Plaza Self Park is located in the northeast corner of the intersection of Davis Street and Benson Avenue, approximately 440 feet west of the site. This parking structure has approximately 1,583 parking spaces providing daily and monthly parking.

- The 525 Church Street Self Park is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Church Street with Chicago Avenue, approximately 615 feet north of the site. This parking structure has approximately 600 parking spaces providing daily and monthly parking.

- The 1800 Maple Self Park is located on the west side of Maple Avenue just north of Church Street, approximately 1,450 feet northwest of the site. This parking structure has approximately 1,400 parking spaces providing daily and monthly parking.
In addition to these public parking facilities, there are also two other parking facilities within close proximity to the site. These are:

- The *Orrington Garage* is located at 1603 Orrington Avenue, approximately 300 feet northwest of the site. The underground parking facility has approximately 290 parking spaces providing hourly rates.

- The *500 Davis Street Garage* is located in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Davis Street with Hinman Avenue, approximately 590 feet southeast of the site. The parking structure provides 250 parking spaces providing hourly rates.
3. TOD Parking Demand

The following provides a description of the proposed TOD and information regarding parking demand anticipated to be generated by the proposed TOD based on national data and studies.

Proposed Site and TOD Plan

The site, as previously indicated, is located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Davis Street and Chicago Avenue. As proposed, the site will be redeveloped with an 18-story building with approximately 192,000 square feet of net leasable area (NLA). This square footage does not include the parking area or the lobby/retail/café area which will be ancillary uses. As proposed, the site will provide a 42-space parking garage with access off the north-south alley that runs along the site’s west property line between Davis Street and Church Street. Given the proximity of the proposed office development to the Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) Davis Purple Line station (approximately 940 feet or 0.18 miles) and to the Metra Union Pacific/North Line (UP-N) Davis Street station (approximately 1,000 feet or 0.19 miles), the City of Evanston city core, residential and retail land uses, the proposed development meets the characteristics of a TOD development.

Characteristics of a TOD Development

Most TOD developments are defined as compact pedestrian-friendly, high density developments near transit stations. The main goals of a TOD are to improve transit accessibility, increase transit ridership and reduce the dependence on the automobile. By contrast these main goals enhance the livability of an area, broaden the housing choices and reduces the parking requirements and demand. More often than not, cities rely on established parking codes to calculate parking requirements. This in turn can lead to overparking areas and failing to strike a balance between the adequate parking supply for a TOD development. This is further validated by an offering memorandum prepared by CBRE for the Orrington Plaza office building that indicated that although downtown Evanston’s market for office development is the strongest in the Chicagoland area, the City’s strict parking requirements of 2.0 spaces per 1,000 square feet of GLA make new office development nearly impossible.

Parking Demand Evaluation

In order to determine the appropriate number of parking spaces for the proposed development, KLOA, Inc. researched various studies conducted in Chicago as well as throughout the United States to find a common characteristic in the parking demand of office TOD developments. Below is a summary of some of these studies:
2010 Work Trip Flows (RTAMS, 2010)

Based on a study conducted in 2010 by the Regional Transportation Asset Management System (RTAMS) of work trip flows from the six county northeastern Illinois region to Evanston Township, approximately 57 percent of the workers destined to Evanston Township drive alone with the remaining 43 percent utilizing other means of transportation. While this shows a significant reduction in the automobile utilization, the results are skewed given that it encompasses all of Evanston Township, which includes numerous areas with little to no immediate public transportation available. For comparison purposes, KLOA, Inc. also looked at the characteristics of the City of Chicago divided by neighborhood and the percentage of workers utilizing their personal vehicle to get to work. Based on this, Table 1 shows a breakdown of the mode share by area.

Table 1
2010 WORK TRIP FLOWS (ORIGIN – SIX COUNTY NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS REGION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Location</th>
<th>Drive Alone</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Rail</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Loop</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River North</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Michigan/Streeterville</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Loop</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Loop</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above, approximately 78 percent of the employees destined to the Chicago Loop either use public transportation or carpool to get to work while the remaining 22 percent drive alone. By contrast, approximately 60 percent of the employees destined to the surrounding neighborhoods use either public transportation or carpool with the remaining 40 percent driving alone. The West Loop, which extends from the Chicago River west to Ashland Avenue and from Grand Avenue south to Van Buren Street, experiences a modal split of 66 percent either utilizing public transportation or carpooling to get to work with the remaining 34 percent driving alone. This data clearly indicates that the availability of public transportation near workplaces coupled with the high density of the area, the numerous local dining and retail amenities, and the mix of land uses reduce the dependence on the automobile and in turn reduce the need for a large number of parking spaces for each individual land use. By applying this correlation between the Loop and the surrounding neighborhoods from the RTAMS survey results, the percentage of workers that would drive to downtown Evanston is reduced to 35 percent.
Getting the Parking Right for Transit-Oriented Development (Center for Transportation Research, University of Texas at Austin)

Based on a study prepared by the University of Texas with a grant from the U.S. Department of Transportation which looked at various communities throughout the United States, it was found that the best practices for TOD parking include:

1. Reductions: Parking requirements can typically be reduced around 20 and up to 50 percent in areas with good transit. Deregulate parking to allow developers to assess parking demand, provide market-priced parking to meet average demand, and use shared parking to accommodate peaks.

2. Management: Cities need to create/utilize parking databases to understand supply and demand and to develop programs that allow the City to track the impacts of adjustments.

3. Pricing: Pricing can be used to improve monitoring, increase enforcement, reduce spillover, and make improvements in parking districts.

The study acknowledges that while it is neither feasible nor reasonable to eliminate all parking in a TOD district, applying the conventional parking ratios to TOD projects would undermine the expected community benefits of TODs and could even cause the TOD initiative to fail. This is because the conventional parking standards are very suburban biased and are based largely on low-density single land-uses. The study further states that “Successful integration of parking is vital for capturing the benefits of TODs and achieving all of its goals. Applying suitable parking standards in TODs can improve the overall performance of the TOD and shape travel behavior, community design, and development economics”. Based on a publication titled Developing TOD Parking Strategies, APA Transportation Planning, Volume XXX, Number 1 “Mainstream data suggest that developers often rely on established parking codes to calculate parking requirements for TODs, which can lead to parking and traffic problems, obstruct land development, and reduce the impact in transit use”.


As stated in the publication, “This report was conducted to serve as a guide or handbook for communities interested in planning and implementing parking policies and programs that are supportive of Smart Growth and Transit Oriented Development (TOD)”. Based on the study, communities can be organized into five major area types: A) Regional Center, B) City Center/Urban Neighborhood, C) Suburban Center/Town Center, D) Transit Neighborhood, and E) Rural/Small Town. While each area has unique characteristics, a common trend is managing the amount of parking associated with new development in an effective way to allow increased density and to support transit. Examples of these policies that apply to regional centers and city center/urban neighborhoods are:

- Reducing parking requirements
- Providing TOD-friendly parking requirements
- Requiring parking maximums instead of minimums
- Considering shared parking

601 Davis Street
Evanston, Illinois
Based on the results of the parking demand model, office developments within a regional center TOD had a parking demand of 0.10 to 0.75 spaces per 1,000 square feet.

**Current TOD (Office Development) Trends**

It should be noted that while most of the data and guidelines available for TOD developments is for residential uses which supports a significant reduction in parking demand, it is worth noting that the same parking trends will most likely be observed and experienced in an office development within a dense urban area and within close proximity to transit such as 601 Davis Street. One development in the area that embraces this trend and characteristics is the 909 Davis Street building which is 207,743 square feet in size and provides 57 parking stalls on-site for a parking ratio of 0.29 stalls per 1,000 square feet. Together with this trend is the fact that a study prepared by the City of Evanston in 2017 showed the occupancy counts at the 1800 Maple Street, Church Street, and Sherman Plaza self-park garages at less than 60 percent occupancy at peak times on weekdays and less than 45 percent occupancy on weekends.

For comparison purposes, 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 zone as compared to a non-TOD location. By applying the same standards to an office development within close proximity to transit, the parking requirement could be reduced from 2.0 spaces per 1,000 square feet to 0.88 spaces per 1,000 square feet. This is more in line with the parking ratios discussed previously.

Given the relatively new efforts by many communities to reduce the reliance and dependence on the automobile by increasing the density and types of land uses within close proximity to a transit station and the ability of residents, visitors, and employees to walk, bike or take transit to work, new trends with regards to parking have emerged. Below is a summary of those trends.

- Reducing and/or eliminating the minimum parking requirements and instead establishing parking maximums
- Develop around or near transit within a rich mix of land uses
- Share parking whenever possible
- Encourage developments to provide ample bicycle parking stalls to increase bicycle ridership
- Provide vehicle trip reduction programs such as telecommuting and/or flexible work schedules
- Allow the private sector to make the decision as to how many parking spaces are required for the TOD
- Allow employees of tenants to seek monthly parking in adjacent or nearby parking lots/structures
As stated in the UCLA publication titled *The High Cost of Free Parking (2011)*, “Commuters will drive to work only if they can park free at work; if they have to pay to park, they will ride public transit, walk, or bike to work. Employer-parking draws commuters into cars and away from transit”. Ultimately, free parking is distorting transportation prices in favor of driving alone which increases congestion, parking demand, fuel consumption, accidents, and air pollution. Based on a model of commuter travel in Los Angeles, if commuters can park free at work, 70 percent of them would drive alone, while 15 percent would ride public transit and 15 percent would carpool. By comparison if commuters must pay for parking, only 45 percent of them would drive alone, while 34 percent would ride public transit and 21 percent would carpool. All of this points out to the fact that tenants in a setting such as downtown Evanston want to be located in an urban setting instead of a suburban one. It becomes a lifestyle choice that self-imposes a parking reduction from the employee and the employer’s perspective.

Furthermore, many recently constructed office buildings in Chicago near transit hubs have provided minimal parking, have leased to full occupancy without issue, and are currently operating as any normal office building would despite not providing the historically typical number of parking spaces required in a suburban setting. These buildings are very recent, clear examples of private markets dictating the amount of parking required for a Class A office tower. Below is a sample of these office buildings.

- 150 N. Riverside (74 stalls, 0.06 stalls per 1000 SF)
- 110 N. Wacker (110 stalls, 0.07 stalls per 1000 SF)
- 151 N. Franklin (34 stalls, 0.04 stalls per 1000 SF)
4. Evaluation and Recommendations

The following discusses the conclusions regarding the proposed development and any recommendations to reduce the TOD’s impact on area streets and parking.

Overall Evaluation

As seen from the previous discussion, the availability of alternative modes of transportation will adequately serve future employees of the proposed office development. This site is located within a walking distance of the CTA Davis Purple Line station (approximately 725 feet or 0.13 miles) and to the Metra Union Pacific/North Line (UP-N) Davis Street station (approximately 950 feet or 0.18 miles), the City of Evanston city core, residential and retail land uses. Based on a review of ridership statistics provided by 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 to the office, retail and residential uses within the City of Evanston city core.

Furthermore, given that bicycle facilities and bicycle routes are provided in the area, which allow for access to other major bike routes, the proposed office building plans to build a significant amount of indoor bicycle parking on site to encourage bicycle ridership. Lastly, sidewalks and traffic signals with pedestrian countdown timers are provided in the area and crosswalks striped with high-visibility continental striping are generally provided near the site. Therefore, biking and walking to/from the proposed office building will be very attractive and convenient.

Parking

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. As indicated earlier, these developments have experienced a significant reduction in parking demand given their location in an urban environment, such as downtown Evanston, which is in close proximity to public transit, other alternative modes of transportation and mix of uses that collectively minimize the reliance on the automobile as a primary mode of transportation. The development is also following the trend of the low amount of parking provided in other recently-constructed Class A office buildings which reflects what the private market has clearly determined that Class A office tenants no longer consider surplus parking an important amenity.
Transportation Sustainability Conclusions and Recommendations

The following summarizes transportation sustainability conclusions and measures that could be implemented by the proposed TOD to further foster alternative modes of transportation other than the automobile, and to enhance pedestrian/bicycle safety:

- Employees will benefit from sidewalks, crosswalks, and pedestrian signals which are generally provided throughout downtown Evanston.

- The proximity of the site to Divvy stations and car-share facilities will provide employees and visitors with additional alternative modes of transportation.

- Consideration should be given to providing a real-time transit monitor within the lobby in order to further encourage public transit use.

- Implementation of one or more of the following Travel Demand Measures (TDM):
  - Carpool matching services
  - Preferred carpool parking
  - Telecommuting
  - Bike storage and charging facilities
4. Conclusion

This report summarizes the results and findings of a TOD parking study conducted by Kenig, Lindgren, O’Hara, Aboona, Inc. (KLOA, Inc.) for the proposed TOD to be located at 601 Davis Street in Evanston, Illinois. As proposed, the site will be redeveloped with a 19-story building with approximately 192,000 square feet of net leasable area. The site will provide a 42-space parking garage with access off the north-south alley that runs along the site’s west property line between Davis Street and Church Street.

Based on the preceding analysis and recommendations and given the proximity of the proposed office development to the Chicago Transit Authority (CTA) Davis Purple Line station (approximately 940 feet or 0.18 miles) and to the Metra Union Pacific/North Line (UP-N) Davis Street station (approximately 1,000 feet or 0.19 miles), the City of Evanston city core, residential and retail uses, the development meets the characteristics of a TOD development. The reduction in off-street parking will not be detrimental to the future employees and the area based on the following:

- The proposed development meets the characteristics of a TOD development.
- Accessibility to and from the Evanston central business district is enhanced by the numerous alternative modes of transportation serving the area.
- The nature of the Evanston downtown area with excellent transit service, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, high density, and broad mix of land uses, lends itself to a much lower parking requirement than what the City of Evanston code requires.
- The immediate area contains a number of public parking facilities owned and operated by the City of Evanston as well as various private parking structures/lots that provide ample off-street parking.
- Based on review of numerous studies of TOD developments, it is imperative to strike a balance between the parking supply and the development. If typical parking ratios are applied it can lead to overparking areas, discouraging development and failing to create a true TOD development.
- Work Trip Flow Data collected by RTAMS clearly indicates that office developments within close proximity to transit reduces the auto dependency and thus the parking demand.
- A study conducted in California for the San Francisco Metropolitan Transportation Commission has shown that the parking demand for office buildings near public transportation ranges from 0.10 to 0.75 spaces per 1,000 square feet, which is consistent with the proposed parking supply for the proposed office development.
• Given the available off-street parking spaces in the three public parking structures owned and operated by the City of Evanston as well as those available in other public parking garages managed by private companies, the building will operate efficiently with the proposed 42 off-street parking spaces.

• The reduced parking supply of the proposed office development is consistent with the new trends in TOD developments which include the following:
  o Reduce and/or eliminate the minimum parking requirements and instead establish parking maximums
  o Develop around or near transit within a rich mix of land uses
  o Share parking whenever possible
  o Provide vehicle trip reduction programs such as telecommuting and/or flexible work schedules
  o Allow the private sector to make the decision as to how much parking spaces is required for the TOD
  o Allow employees of tenants to seek monthly parking in adjacent or nearby parking lots/structures
  o Implementation of one or more of the following Travel Demand Measures (TDM)
    ▪ Carpool matching services
    ▪ Preferred carpool parking
    ▪ Telecommuting
    ▪ Bike storage and charging facilities
  o Installation of real-time transit monitoring in the lobby to encourage/facilitate use of transit
Design Evanston Project Review of the 601 Davis Street Project

Design Evanston members attended a presentation of the proposed 601 Davis Office Building by the developer and architect on Wednesday, June 25, 2019. Following is a summary of comments by attending members based on the DE Established Evaluative Criteria / Standards outlined below:

1. A project should address a perceived need in the city / community.
   a. The need for office space in the downtown is great. The present vacancy rate is reported to be 6%, a record low.
   b. Market research indicates a need for Class A office space in the downtown is very high.
   c. Additional activation of the downtown by additional office workers is very desirable.

2. A project should provide for a beneficial and appropriate use in the project's geographical context.
   a. The site of the project is a highly appropriate site for the development of an office tower.
   b. The site is at the center of the downtown's concentration of office space.
   c. The site is close to mass transit access and the kind of services office residents desire.

3. The project should be of appropriate and complementary size, scale and proportion for its respective physical context.
   a. Commenting members felt the size, scale and proportion of the proposed building was appropriate for its location at the center of the downtown.
   b. Some members advised that the mass of the tower could be further improved by accentuating the eastern portion of the tower that is presently slightly articulated from the larger massing to the west. Comments also were presented that this portion of the tower should have a more pronounced expression at street level, particularly as this is where the entry to the tower is located.
   c. The differing materials utilized at the north side of the building where the service core is located, was complimented as a means of breaking up the scale of the tower.
   d. Further improvements to the scale of the façade were inquired about, e.g. more subtle articulation between view and spandrel glass components, and vertical glazed elements where columns are located.
   e. Some members felt that the proportion and composition of the proposed tower in the context could be improved if the tower were taller than the nearby bank and residential towers.
   f. The base of the building reflects the scaleheight of the adjacent University Building and the prominent height of storefronts of historic buildings across the street. The group felt that this relationship of scale could further be improved by providing roof-top or plaza activities and elements, e.g. landscaping, a pergola with dining accommodations, etc. The group also felt that the portion of the base devoted to the entry to the office tower needs to be further accentuated and visually made more apparent to being part of the tower. One suggestion was that the entry façade align with the tower façade and utilize similar materials. See more related information is Section 7.a.

4. The project should be representative of progressive, creative and sustainable design standards.
   a. The materials utilized on the tower represent the latest developments in curtainwall glass technology. The proposed glass represents an excellent product that provides excellent daylight penetration into the floor, provides a desirable solar reflectance of 27% and is highly energy efficient.
b. The building is to be designed and built to achieve at least LEED Silver status.
c. The open floor plate size of about 15,000 square feet of the typical office floor is ideal for a variety of tenant layouts and takes advantage of the large amount of daylight entering the space.
d. The building base of two stories provides retail space and conceals the 2nd floor parking deck. The group felt that the design and materials employed needed to be more reflective of the tower and its contemporary appearance.
e. The design reflects the progressive nationwide trend for providing fewer parking spaces of downtown office buildings. Market research bears out the viability of this practice. The fewer spaces also can provide a market for city-owned, underutilized nearby parking garages.
f. The roof top of the second floor base will be developed for amenity use. Possible landscaping, a pergola, rooftop dining could improve its street level impression. This area will also mitigate wind down-drafts from effecting street level activity.
g. The subject of bird-friendly glass was discussed. The developer and architect were well acquainted with the challenge. According to the Architect, most strikes are at lower elevations where most birds fly. The first three floors of the building will be composed of materials and elements that will not be confusing to birds and should not result in any strikes. Upper floors are much more of a challenge as glass curtainwall technology has not advanced to the degree that the skins of the building can allow desired light transmittance, energy efficiency and deter bird strikes at a remotely affordable cost. Over time this situation should improve.

5. The project should provide for present and future economic growth.
   a. The injection of 300,000 square feet of new office space into the downtown will have a major impact on the vitality of downtown businesses and services. It will increase the frequency of restaurant use, retail use and mass transit use.
   b. See below.

6. The project should have a high revenue generating / infrastructure cost ratio.
   a. The downtown infrastructure has capacity to serve the facility, particularly more so since sewer improvements along Sherman Avenue.
   b. The impact of vehicles emanating from the building is minimal given the few number of parking spaces provided in the building and the fact that this traffic will only occur at the beginning and end of each day.
   c. The revenue generated by such a significant structure (taxes, visitations to neighboring restaurants, retailers, services, etc.) would be formidable.
   d. The increased availability of desirable office space can also attract new residents to Evanston.
   e. The present multiple chase drive-thru lanes will be reduced to one, decreasing vehicle impact.
   f. The injection of 300,000 square feet of new office space into the downtown will have a major impact on the vitality of downtown businesses and services. It will increase the frequency of restaurant use, retail use and mass transit use.

7. The project should provide for a positive experience at the street / sidewalk / pedestrian level.
   a. The base of the building is an appropriate small scale construction. Retail spaces and the entry to the tower and the brick detailing above (at the garage level) represent an appropriate scale at the street level.
b. Landscaping and materials discussed would accentuate the pedestrian scale of the design.

c. A suggestion by some attendees that would allow a portion of the east end of the south elevation of the tower to meet at grade, where the entrance to the tower is located, would add an appropriate scaled element that expresses the tower at street level and creates a small scaled plaza area between the university building and the tower.

d. The alley area was commented as needing further development to improve its street level experience.

e. The downtown infrastructure has capacity to serve the facility, particularly more so since sewer improvements along Sherman Avenue. The impact of vehicles emanating from the building is minimal given the few number of parking spaces provided in the building and the fact that this traffic will only occur at the beginning and end of each day.

f. The present multiple chase drive-thru lanes will be reduced to one, decreasing vehicle impact.

g. Reference Section 3.f for further information.

8. The project should complement the practices and goals of “Complete Streets” and encourage multi-modal transportation use.

   a. The provision of minimal vehicle parking in the tower has a low impact on the downtown and encourages the use of other modes of transportation.

   b. The design provides for a bicycle entry off of the front walkway and provides a large bicycle storage room at the first floor. It is the first downtown building to so actively encourage such use.

   c. The Chase drive-thru has been minimized visually and functionally so that less impact is made at the sidewalk and bicycle lanes. Also, as a result of reducing the effect at the curb, additional street parking spaces are provided.

   d. The creation of a business tower in the downtown will encourage the use of nearby train use by tenants, adding valuable revenue to their coffers.

   e. The creation of a building of this size and occupancy will have a positive effect on further activating the streetscape in this area and along any circulation paths taken by its residents and visitors.

(Note: This project was presented at a 4th Ward meeting on Tuesday, August 6, 2019. Some changes suggested above were incorporated.)

Date: July 20, 2019
Contact: Jack Weiss
Phone: 847 866 7480
Email: jw@jackweissassociates.com
DESIGN AND PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DAPR) MINUTES
December 11, 2019


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 4, 2019, DAPR Committee meeting minutes.

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

The Committee voted, 10-0, to approve the meeting minutes, 1 abstention.

Old Business

601 Davis Street

Planned Development

Davis Street Development Company 2015, LLC, submits for a Special Use for a Planned Development to construct an 18-story Class A office building with 40 parking spaces and 4,170 square feet of ground floor retail space and a Special Use for a Chase Bank drive through facility. Site development allowances are being requested for: 1) FAR of 13.0 where 4.5 is allowed, 2) Proposed building height of 220 feet where 85 feet (excluding parking) is allowed, 3) 40 parking spaces where 420 are required, 4) A 15-foot Ziggurat setback is proposed above 29 feet along Davis where a 40-foot Ziggurat setback is required above 42-foot height, 5) A 0-foot Ziggurat setback is requested along the east interior lot line at 29-foot height where a 25-foot Ziggurat setback is required above 42-foot height and 6) A 0-foot Ziggurat setback is requested along the west interior side lot line at 29-foot height where a 25-foot Ziggurat setback is required above 42-foot height.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Kerry Dickerson, Developer

DISCUSSION:

- Applicant reviewed changes to the ground floor. The ground floor has more glass, 15’ tall, brick piers between windows reduced, making it more transparent. A brick screen above the storefront windows and pushed back from the facade hides the parking deck.
- Applicant reviewed and provided proposed exterior building material samples, including brick, glass, and metal trim. Glass used on the storefront, terrace railing, and on the tower meets bird friendly standards. Reclaimed wood used for trellis over terrace. Glass used on the tower is not a mirrored glass to reduce reflections.
- Storefront wraps around to the west facade.
- Entrance to the main building, including the bike entrance, is set back from the street. The area will be covered by a glass canopy.
- Brick used at the ground level to be used for the interior drive-thru passageway.
- Water meter room has been relocated. The water meter room is located off the lobby away from the street facade. The trash room reconfigured to accommodate recycling.
- J. Leonard asked about the drive-thru status if Chase Bank leaves.
- Applicant stated the drive-thru stays with the bank, if the bank goes then the drive-thru space will be converted to retail space.
- J. Leonard stated the drive-thru should be removed within 30 days of the bank leaving.
- L. Biggs stated the drive-thru should only be allowed to be used by Chase Bank or their successor, not to be used by a competitor. If the drive-thru is not operated for a period of time, the curb cut needs to be removed.
- Applicant stated they are fine with those conditions, requested language to consider.
- J. Leonard asked who would be responsible for removing the curb cut. She stated using the drive-thru as a parking lot is not acceptable.
- Applicant stated the building owner will be responsible for removing the curb cut.
- L. Biggs asked about measures to prevent the drive-thru from becoming a cut through, would like to see additional details with a building permit. Measures put in place need to meet City standards.
- Applicant stated bollards, signage, and curb cut configuration are designed to address that concern.
- J. Hyink asked if a walk-up bank window was considered as an alternative to the drive-thru.
- Applicant stated no.
- J. Leonard stated the Plan Commission will likely ask why the existing curb cut on Chicago Avenue cannot accommodate the drive-thru, advised the applicant to be prepared to answer that question.
- S. Mangum stated the Chicago Avenue curb cut is the preferred location to access the drive-thru due to the protected bike lane on Davis Street.
- Applicant stated they have studied the drive-thru extensively and concluded the Davis Street curb cut is the better option. Applicant stated the proposed plan reduces the curb cut width from 7 lanes to one lane.
- Applicant stated the plan maintains a 2-story massing at street level to match the adjacent University Building, the office tower will be set back 15' from Davis Street.
- Applicant reviewed the shadow study.
- Applicant reviewed the community benefits noted in their application.
- L. Biggs stated public benefits are lacking, many of the benefits noted come with developing the site.
- Applicant noted leasing parking spaces from the City will provide $200,000 annual revenue to the City.
- J. Leonard stated the noted revenue is misleading, asked for clarification.
- Applicant stated the $200,000 is a one-time payment based on the initial number of parking spaces leased from the City. They would like the lease to include a look-back period to provide flexibility to draw down the number of leased spaces over time as parking demand is evaluated.
- J. Leonard stated that if the number of leased spaces is reduced, building tenants will not be able to come back to the City for parking passes.
- J. Leonard and G. Gerdes stated public benefits need to be called out better, many of the benefits listed are requirements or benefits from developing the site.
Public Comment:
- Leslie Shad, Bird Friendly Evanston, stated the development includes bird friendly measures which should count as a public benefit.
- Janet Steidl stated she likes the proposed development. She suggested improving the CTA/Metra viaducts could be public benefits.
- Jack Weiss, Design Evanston, stated the proposed development meets the group’s design standards.
- Matt Rodgers stated his support for the proposed development, stating the City needs to take advantage of its unique location.
- S. Mangum stated the building design has improved. The required ziggurat setback is lacking, massing along Davis Street should be reduced by reducing the depth of the building floor plate by 10’ as was originally proposed resulting in an increased ziggurat setback, the curb cut on Davis Street should be eliminated, and noted the proposed FAR of 13.0 is excessive considering the highest FAR constructed in the D3 district is 7.9.
- J. Leonard stated public benefits need to be beefed up. A taller tower would be appropriate if bulk is reduced at the base.
- M. Jones stated the office use at this site is better than residential, public benefits need to be addressed, no strong objection to the curb cut due to proposed sunset language.
- E. Cano asked about resurfacing plans for the adjacent alley.
- Applicant stated they will leave it better than it is currently.
- K. Jensen stated he would like to review their LEED points to help identify additional credits.
- J. Hyink stated the curb cut design is better, but still a concern. She stated public benefits do not include bike mobility.
- J. Leonard stated removing the existing curb cut on Chicago Avenue should be considered as a public benefit.

L. Biggs made a motion to recommend approval to Plan Commission subject to the following conditions:

1) Drive-thru facility use is limited to Chase Bank or their successor;
2) If the drive-thru facility is not operated for a period of at least 60 days, then the curb cut on Davis Street is to be removed by the building owner;
3) Parking lease with the City is to include a look-back period of at least 60 months; and
4) Refine public benefits, consider increased participation in downtown programming, bike and pedestrian improvements, and public transportation;

seconded by G. Gerdes.

The Committee voted, 9-2, to recommend approval to Plan Commission subject to the conditions noted above.

Adjournment
L. Biggs made a motion to adjourn, seconded by S. Mangum. The Committee voted, 11-0, to adjourn. The Committee adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

The next DAPR meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 8, 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
November 20, 2019

Voting Members Present: I. Eckersberg, D. Cueva, M. Tristan, J. Hyink, S. Mangum,
J. Leonard, L. Biggs, C. Sterling, M. Jones, K. Jensen

Staff Present: M. Rivera

Others Present:

Presiding Member: J. Leonard

A quorum being present, J. Leonard called the meeting to order at 2:37 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

1. November 13, 2019, DAPR Committee meeting minutes.

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

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

Old Business

1. 1224 Oak Avenue

Donna Lee Floeter, architect, applies for major zoning relief to construct an attached garage, deck, and attic addition, in the R3 Two-Family Residential District and Ridge Historic District. The applicant requests a 3’ rear yard setback where 30’ is required (Zoning Code Section 6-8-4-2-7), a 3.2’ north interior side yard setback where 5’ is required (Zoning Code Section 6-8-4-2-7 (A) 3.), a 1’ south interior side yard setback for an accessory structure (deck) where 5’ is required (Zoning Code Sections 6-8-4-2-7 (C) 3. and 6-4-6-3), and building lot coverage of 51% where 45% is required (Zoning Code Section 6-8-4-6). The Zoning Board of Appeals is the determining body for this case.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Donna Lee Floeter, applicant
Noreen Edwards, owner

DISCUSSION:

● The applicant and owner discussed revisions to the plan since the November 13 DAPR meeting. These included a stormwater management plan, and minimal alterations to the bulk and mass of the rear-yard addition.
● Applicant noted that the garage addition was shrunk by 1’ and they are now requesting a rear-yard setback of 4’ where 30’ is required rather than the previous 3’.
● Owner described the intent for the project as a multi-generation residence for herself and her daughter and son-in-law.
● Owner described her belief that the zoning code conflicts with other goals the City has including its climate resilience plan, housing plan, and comprehensive plan.
● Applicant noted that the roofline of the screen porch above the garage addition was altered to reduce the perceived bulk of the building.
• Applicant noted that the width of the garage was reduced by 6" from the previous plans.
• Owner presented the intention to address stormwater through a system of gutters, catchment areas, and underground piping running from the side-yards to two large detention areas in the front-yard.
• I. Eckersberg expressed concern that the proposed stormwater plan would not function due to conflicts with the proposed detention location and utilities located in the front-yard.
• I. Eckersberg noted that engineering would require additional information on soil type and depth of the water table prior to permitting.
• Applicant stated that the proposal was adequate.
• J. Leonard stated that soil tests and water table information would be required when submitting for permit.
• Applicant stated that they would do their due diligence and submit soil testing and water table information during the permitting process.
• I. Eckersberg asked about plans to lower the basement.
• Applicant stated that they have plans to lower the basement by 1 to 1.5 feet.
• I. Eckersberg and L. Biggs stated concern with the proposal for lowering the basement.
• L. Biggs noted that the City would not permit the sump pump for the basement to be connected to the City’s sewer system.
• C. Sterling stated that he appreciated the applicant and owner returning and submitting revisions. However, the changes to the proposal are minimal and do not address concerns brought up during the November 13 DAPR meeting.
• C. Sterling noted that the proposal does not meet several of the standards for Major Variation particularly that the hardship is self-created and is not the least deviation from the ordinance.
• Owner stated that other City objectives conflict with the zoning requirements, particularly parking.
• Owner stated a section of the Comprehensive Plan which states that open parking should be screened from residential areas and located in the rear of buildings. Owner noted that the Comprehensive Plan is clear that open parking is not ideal.
• C. Sterling noted that this section of the Comprehensive Plan directly pertains to surface parking along commercial and business corridors and is irrelevant to the proposal.
• C. Sterling reiterated that open off-street parking would eliminate the rear-yard variation and variation for building lot coverage.
• Owner retorted that this was not true and variations would still be required.
• C. Sterling clarified that the rear-yard and side-yard variations would be eliminated, and the variation for building lot coverage would be significantly reduced.
• Owner stated that enclosed parking is necessary for them to age in place and provide convenient charging for the existing and future electric vehicles.
• C. Sterling noted that he would have liked to see at least some open-parking, particularly at the north property line, to reduce the requested zoning relief.
• Owner stated that they were not interested.
• C. Sterling noted that he could not support the project due to significant concerns with the mass of the building and elimination of the rear-yard.
• C. Sterling stated that if the committee is making a recommendation to the ZBA, the proposal should be judged by the standards and it does not meet the standards.
• S. Mangum stated that he had similar concerns with the mass and scale, noting that the proposed addition consumed the rear-yard and could be reduced through viable alternatives.
• Applicant stated that no alternatives exist which would eliminate the need for a variation.
• C. Sterling noted that it could be significantly reduced.
● C. Sterling looked for clarification on the City’s definition of “aging in place” noting that he felt it was only an argument for hardship if the owner currently lived in the home and could not continue to do so without zoning relief.
● C. Sterling stated concern over the precedent setting nature of approval signifying that any resident may purchase any property and build it out to their desire without adherence to the zoning code, under the guise of a desire to age in place.
● C. Sterling reiterated that the applicants perceived hardship is a projection.
● J. Leonard stated that the proposal, although unique, aligns with the intent of the zoning code and objectives of the comprehensive plan and the owners desire is admirable.
● J. Leonard stated that she disagreed with C. Sterling’s understanding of aging in place but agreed that the City should better define what it meant, noting that a lack of options for multi-generational housing, and housing options for aging adults is prevalent in the City.
● J. Leonard stated that she reviewed the standards for Major Variation and noted that whether the proposal meets the standards or not is a difficult judgement.
● J. Leonard encouraged the applicant to review the standards and take additional efforts to reduce the degree of the request prior to the ZBA hearing.
● Owner asked for suggestions.
● J. Leonard stated that the side-yard deck could be removed from the proposal.
● J. Leonard stated that she was supportive of the project with a continued effort to minimize the requested zoning relief.
● C. Sterling noted the significance of the request and dismissed removing the deck as a meaningful change.
● J. Leonard noted that this proposal pushes the boundaries of the request for variation but she remained supportive.

L. Biggs made a motion for approval, with conditions, for major zoning relief, seconded by J. Leonard.

Conditions include:
1. A stormwater management plan to be implemented in substantial compliance with the documentation and testimony on record from the November 20 DAPR Committee meeting, attached.

The Committee voted, 6-3, to recommend approval, with conditions, for major zoning relief. (C. Sterling, I. Eckersberg, S. Mangum, dissenting) J. Hyink abstained due to the proposals lack of relevance to transportation.

New Business

1. 1327 Chicago Ave./528 Greenwood St. Recommendation to ZBA
Richard A. Shapiro, property owner, submits for a Special Use for an Office use, Richard Shapiro Attorney At Law, in the R5 General Residential District.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: R. Shapiro and legal counsel.

DISCUSSION:
● Applicant’s legal counsel briefly described Mr. Shapiro’s business including the growth from a small home office, to the larger operation conducted today.
● Legal counsel stated that Mr. Shapiro recognizes that he make mistakes as his business grew, particularly by not applying for a Special Use Permit.
- Legal counsel stated that Mr. Shapiro acknowledges that previous residential tax assessments will have to be reconciled as the use is, and has been for some time, commercial in nature.
- Legal counsel stated that despite these mistakes, the use is appropriate for this location, noting proximity to business districts and zoning on Chicago Avenue and Dempster Street.
- Legal counsel made special note that the office use has operated for a significant amount of time and has been a good neighbor, trying hard to limit congestion, and maintain the significant appearance of the two residential structures.
- R. Shapiro stated that many employees work remotely and have alternating schedules.
- Legal counsel affirmed the above statement and stated that almost all of Mr. Shapiro’s clients conduct and transmit business remotely without a need to visit the office. Additionally, Mr. Shapiro, as is the nature of his business, performs many house-calls.
- Legal counsel stated Mr. Shapiro’s desire to remain in Evanston and in the two buildings he loves dearly. Permitting a special use would allow this thriving business to continue to operate.
- R. Shapiro noted that he has consistently maintained his buildings to the highest standard retaining their residential feel and aesthetic. No changes to the exterior of the buildings are anticipated.
- Legal counsel described the current parking situation including four spaces located off Chicago Avenue which are used for customer parking. Two of these spaces are planned to be removed to make space for an ADA compliant parking location. Additionally, Mr. Shapiro leases several spaces from the City as well as spaces from neighboring properties. In total, Mr. Shapiro leases 25 spaces and has received no complaints from neighbors.
- Legal counsel described recommendations by the Fire Department and Building Department, including a recent agreement based on determination by the International Code Counsel (ICC). The recommendations, including ADA improvements in the total of 20% of the applicable improvement costs to the building, as well as a full fire suppression and alarm system will be installed at substantial cost to Mr. Shapiro ($200k).
- R. Shapiro noted that he is prepared to make significant investments in the property as needed and outlined in a recent agreement with the City and ICC.
- S. Mangum asked which facilities Mr. Shapiro is leasing parking from
- R. Shapiro stated that he leases 10 spaces from Lot #14, 1 from Lot #23 and 1 from Lot #60. Additionally, R. Shapiro is on the waiting list for additional parking spaces as they become available.
- S. Mangum sought clarification that the spaces off Chicago Avenue are exclusively used by clients.
- R. Shapiro stated in the affirmative.
- S. Mangum noted that the subject properties are close to transit.
- Legal counsel stated that this is true and approximately 50% of employees arrive utilizing rapid transit.
- J. Leonard asked how many employees exist in the building at any given time.
- R. Shapiro stated that the question was misleading as the employees are spread across two buildings and schedules alternate making it hard to determine.
- J. Leonard asked the applicant to give his best estimate.
- R. Shapiro stated that at any given time 20-25 employees could be in each building.
- J. Leonard asked if 45 would be a good estimate then.
- R. Shapiro stated, something like that seems accurate but it certainly fluctuates.
• L. Biggs asked if the structures could be adapted to single-family residences in the future if the law practice moved.
• R. Shapiro stated that this could certainly happen as no significant interior or exterior alterations have occurred or are anticipated.
• Legal counsel noted that the applicant was not going to install new door levers as outlined in the proposal as it would negatively impact the architectural integrity of the structures and have limited benefit.
• R. Shapiro stated that the front entrance is rarely ever used and that preserving the look of the buildings is very important to him.
• J. Leonard asked how someone with accessibility needs would access the building.
• R. Shapiro stated that they would use the sidewalk and that grab bars would be installed where needed. They would use the stairs and be assisted if necessary.
• Legal counsel reiterated that clients rarely visit the offices.
• J. Hyink raised concern that not all those with disabilities require physical assistance. The need for accessibility is manifested in many ways.
• J. Hyink asked how other needs were being met.
• R. Shapiro stated that he would rather do things that are functional, rather than undergo improvements that address a hypothetical.
• Legal counsel stated that the applicant understands that not all accessible issues are physical.
• J. Leonard stated that a clear path needs to be identified from the ADA space to the office.
• R. Shapiro stated that a clear path already exists in the form of the sidewalk.
• S. Mangum stated that nothing on the property, other than the intensity of the interior use, is out of character with the residential zoning and commended the applicant.
• S. Mangum noted that you could walk or drive by the properties and never guess the intensity of the use inside.
• R. Shapiro stated that was a poignant remark and that the intensity of the use is appropriate and adequately mitigated.
• J. Leonard stated concern with the precedent setting nature of the use raising significant issue with the size and intensity of the use.
• I. Eckersberg asked if conditions could be included in the motion
• S. Mangum stated in the affirmative.
• C. Sterling asked Mr. Shapiro if he would consider landmarking the properties as an added level of protection.
• R. Shapiro stated that he had not thought about that but liked the idea and would look into it.
• S. Mangum noted that the properties are located in the Lakeshore Historic District.
• C. Sterling responded that he understood, but they were not individual landmarks.

**L. Biggs made a motion for a positive recommendation to the ZBA, with conditions, seconded by S. Mangum**

Conditions include:
1. Hours of operation shall be limited to M-F, 7am to 6pm.
2. Deliveries shall be limited to M-F 7am to 6pm.
3. The number of employees present on-site shall be limited to 45.

**The Committee voted, 8-2, for a positive recommendation to the ZBA with the above mentioned conditions.** (J. Leonard and J. Hyink dissenting)
J. Leonard called for a 5 minute recess at 3:45 pm. The Committee returned to regular order at 3:52 pm.

2. 601 Davis Street

Davis Street Development Company 2015, LLC, submits for a Special Use for a Planned Development to construct an 18-story Class A office building with 40 parking spaces and 4,170 square feet of ground floor retail space and a Special Use for a Chase Bank drive through facility. Site development allowances are being requested for: 1) FAR of 13.0 where 4.5 is allowed, 2) Proposed building height of 220 feet where 85 feet (excluding parking) is allowed, 3) 40 parking spaces where 420 are required, 4) A 15-foot Ziggurat setback is proposed above 29 feet along Davis where a 40-foot Ziggurat setback is required above 42-foot height, 5) A 0-foot Ziggurat setback is requested along the east interior lot line at 29-foot height where a 25-foot Ziggurat setback is required above 42-foot height and 6) A 0-foot Ziggurat setback is requested along the west interior side lot line at 29-foot height where a 25-foot Ziggurat setback is required above 42-foot height.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Representatives of Davis Street Development Company

DISCUSSION:
- Applicant provided an overview of the project focusing on revisions since it was previously submitted. Focus areas included modifications to the drive-through, parking needs, and sustainability initiatives
- Applicant stated that the new proposal is more context sensitive and utilizes contextual yet authentic materials
- Applicant stated the intent to extrude the massing of the adjacent university building west as a pedestrian scaled storefront. The massing of the main office structure would be setback from the front-facing, street level facade.
- Applicant stated the ability to mask the parking pedestal with the proposed street level facade and storefront.
- Applicant stated that the drive-through space has been designed for future in-fill.
- Applicant stated bird friendly measures that have been introduced including bird friendly glass 45’ and below as well as at the top of the structure, the two locations most vulnerable to bird strikes.
- Applicant stated new safety changes to the drive-through including pulling trees back from the entryway and widening the alley facing exits to increase the site distance.
- Applicant stated that bike facilities are provided.
- Applicant stated the economic benefits of the proposal including construction jobs, providing a market demand for Class A office space and increased tax revenue.
- Applicant stated the need for the proposed floor-plate to attract tenants. A smaller structure would not provide the return needed to finance the project and could hinder new tenants.
- S. Mangum asked if mechanical louvers would be included for ventilation
- Applicant stated that they would be included on the alley facing facade
- L. Biggs asked the applicant to clarify the widening of the drive through exits to improve the site triangle.
- Applicant stated that rather than pull the building in, the opening was widened to accommodate this request.
- L. Biggs stated that she understood
- L. Biggs asked that the western most street-tree on Davis be removed to improve site lines.
- Applicant said they would accommodate this if required
- I. Eckersberg stated that the tree would be fine where it was
- L. Biggs stated that the final location would be assessed during permitting
- L. Biggs asked where waste collection would occur
- Applicant stated it would occur in the loading dock and be wheeled out to the alley. The same for recycling
- L. Biggs stated that all parking spaces should be prepped for conversion to accommodate EV charging
- L. Biggs asked what this would entail
- Applicant stated at a minimum, conduit should be run to each space
- L. Biggs stated that separate recycling and composting is required
- Applicant stated that this would be accommodated
- K. Jensen stated that separate recycling and composting is required
- Applicant stated in the affirmative and noted that these issues are on their minds but haven’t been finalized
- K. Jensen noted if a food based business was included, a separate area would be needed to accommodate food waste appropriately.
- Applicant said this would happen in a conditioned room
- K. Jensen noted the contractual agreements the City has with a composting company
- K. Jensen asked about the tree preservation ordinance
- L. Biggs stated that it applies and the applicant would likely pay in lieu for cutting the existing caliper of trees.
- Applicant asked if they could plant trees elsewhere instead
- J. Leonard stated it was in their best interest to pay in lieu to avoid maintenance of off-site trees as required by the ordinance
- S. Mangum noted that the floor plate is larger than previously, and the setbacks are closer than previous renditions. What is the reason?
- Applicant stated the financials of the project and the need to deliver a product people want, necessitated the design
- S. Mangum noted that this is a deviation from the April submittal
- Applicant stated that the new proposal is more contextual and allows for a usable floor-plate. The new design accommodates the parking to be hidden which is a huge achievement.
- M. Rivera asked if the applicant was willing to lease spaces in City garaged
- Applicant stated they would lease whatever number the City thought was appropriate, but asked that the number of leases be consistently reviewed in case they are paying for something they aren’t using
- K. Jensen asked the applicant to clarify whether they were pursuing LEED Gold or Silver
- Applicant stated LEED Silver
- D. Cueva stated that the proposed Meter Room needs to comply with previous locational requests
- Applicant stated that the final location will be compliant and is still pending
- J. Leonard expressed a desire for additional storefront transparency
- Applicant stated that the basket-weave above the storefront is masking the parking podium and if it was more transparent, it would expose the parking area.
- Applicant stated that excluding the basket-weave area, the transparency of the front-facing facade is ~90%.
- J. Leonard requested detailed perspectives of the storefronts fronting Davis Street and the alley
- Applicant stated that they would provide them
J. Leonard asked if shadow and wind studies would be provided
Applicant stated yes
J. Leonard stated the City would want the parking lease extended beyond a single-year
Applicant stated they would entertain this, but wanted the option to have their parking use reviewed so they could adjust to meet their needs. Either up or down
J. Leonard asked if the parking area above the storefront level could be adapted to retail in the future
Applicant stated that was the intention
J. Leonard stated a need to restrict delivery hours to reduce downtown congestion
Applicant stated they would only control which delivery services they have contracts with
J. Leonard stated they should regulate services such as Amazon through lease agreements
Applicant stated they understood
J. Leonard stated a need to discuss public benefits at a future date
Applicant stated they understood
Staff supplied examples of public benefits including donations to Downtown Evanston, parking related infrastructure improvements, etc...
Applicant requested staff send detailed suggestions for review
Staff agreed
J. Hyink stated that partially financing improvements to the Davis Street CTA station would be appropriate considering the increased use it would receive as a result of the proposal
Applicant stated that that was a logical idea
S. Mangum stated that City Staff members had collected traffic counts during peak hours across multiple days. The data suggests minimal drive-through usage, but extensive use of the sidewalk and protected bike lane.
S. Mangum stated significant concerns with the curb-cut off Davis and impacts on bike safety.
S. Mangum stated significant concern with the lack of a ziggurat setback
S. Mangum stated that the Floor Area Ratio was significantly larger than the previous proposal
Applicant stated that the FAR was only larger because of a City led initiative to reduce the size of the zoning lot in question (exclude the University Building). The building is the same.

Public Comment:
Kiera Kelly
- Stated concerns that adherence to the Zoning Code is not occurring and City staff was complicit in allowing developers to get what they want at the expense of tax paying residents
- Stated concern with the City not following the 2009 Downtown Evanston Plan
- Stated that the requested zoning variations are too significant noting six major variations that instead of review by the ZBA are reviewed by the Plan Commission who lacks knowledge about zoning.
- Stated a desire for a mid-rise building in order to preserve the pedestrian character of the block
- Stated a desire to look contextually at the south side of Davis Street which are predominately two-story commercial buildings.

Lori K
o Stated disappointment with the proposal and confusion over the discussion of public benefits.
o Stated a desire for the project to have a larger MWBE and EBE component (not a public project)
o Concerned that the office space would not attract leases
o Stated that Evanston was not ready for this development
o Stated a concern that Evanston was becoming a little Manhattan

L. Biggs made a motion to hold the case in committee pending revisions, seconded by K. Jensen

The case was continued to the December 4, 2019, meeting.

Adjournment

J. Leonard made a motion to adjourn, seconded by S. Mangum. The Committee voted, 10-0, to adjourn. The Committee adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

The next DAPR meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 4, 2019, at 2:30 p.m. in Room 2404 of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.

Respectfully submitted,
Cade W. Sterling
Communication

Potential Text Amendments
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: Communication
Potential Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance

Date: March 6, 2020

Background
During the February 24, 2020 Planning and Development Committee meeting, the Committee discussed several possible text amendments proposed by staff to clarify existing zoning regulations and reduce process time for variation cases. The attached memo provides a brief summary of the proposed amendments. The Planning and Development Committee voted to move all but one of these items (relating to Planned Development extensions) forward for review by Plan Commission. These proposed text amendments will come before the Commission on a date to be determined.
Memorandum

To: Members of the Planning and Development Committee
From: Melissa Klotz, Zoning Administrator
CC: Johanna Leonard, Community Development Director; Scott Mangum, Planning & Zoning Manager
Subject: Discussion of Potential Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to Reduce Process for Variations and to Clarify Existing Zoning Regulations
Date: February 24, 2020

Recommended Action:
Staff seeks feedback from the Planning & Development Committee on proposed text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance prior to preparing materials for the Plan Commission's public hearings on the matters.

Council Action:
For Discussion

Summary:
Staff has identified potential text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance that will reduce the process time of variation cases and clarify existing zoning regulations. Many of these would address variances that are generally approved with limited discussion and little to no public comment. These proposed changes would reduce resident and business zoning and permitting review time as well as reduce staff time spent preparing memos and public notices, thereby affording staff time for other activities. Staff seeks feedback on whether to proceed to the Plan Commission with any or all of the identified text amendments.

Clarify: All accessory structure variation requests (for single family residential and two-family residential) are Minor Variations.
The Zoning Ordinance lists certain types of variation requests that are eligible for the Minor Variation process. The Minor Variation process is approximately 30-45 days, including mailed public notice, with a determination made by the Zoning Administrator which may be appealed to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). The application fee for a Minor Variation is $275. A Major Variation that is determined by the ZBA typically takes 60-75 days with a $385 application fee. Most of the listed Minor Variations may be processed as Minor only if the zoning regulation is exceeded by 35% or less. The Zoning Ordinance is unclear whether the 35% cutoff applies to accessory structures such as detached garages, decks, and patios, or if
such accessory structures are eligible for Minor Variations regardless of how much the regulation is exceeded. Staff policy for the last five years or more has been to process all accessory structure variation requests (for single-family residential and two-family residential) as Minor Variations. This text amendment would not change any policy but would clarify the current staff interpretation.

Change: All yard obstruction variation requests (for single-family residential and two-family residential) are Minor Variations.
The Zoning Ordinance currently allows yard obstructions (eaves, bay windows without foundations, chimneys) as Minor Variations when the zoning regulation (typically a setback) is exceeded by 35% or less. Any request for a yard obstruction that exceeds the zoning regulation by more than 35% must be processed as a Major Variation and is determined by the ZBA. Yard obstructions are minimal in impact and therefore should process as Minor Variations. This text amendment would change the current variation process for certain proposals and would result in a quicker process and reduced fees for the applicant, and less staff time processing the request.

Change: All accessory structure variation requests (including multiple family residential and commercial) are Minor Variations.
The Zoning Ordinance specifies only single-family residential and two-family residential uses may request Minor Variations. Any request for a variation for multiple family residential or commercial uses (except for fence variations) must process as Major Variations with a final determination by the ZBA. Accessory structure requests such as sheds, patios, decks, and pergolas, are minimal in impact and therefore should process as Minor Variations. This text amendment would change the current variation process for certain proposals and would result in a quicker process and reduced fees for the applicant, and less staff time processing the request.

Change: All setback variation requests (for single-family residential and two-family residential) for upper floors that align with a floor below are Minor Variations.
The Zoning Ordinance currently allows setback variations as Minor Variations when the zoning regulation is exceeded by 35% or less, except for second floors above existing legally nonconforming first floors where a side yard setback of at least 3’ exists (35% cutoff of a 5’ side yard setback requirement is 3.25’ but at a second floor the cutoff is changed to 3’ which is a 40% cutoff). Requests for additions that align with the floor below are common since it is structurally difficult and aesthetically odd to design an upper floor that is pulled in from existing load bearing exterior walls. Such requests have been approved 100% of the time by the ZBA in the last eight years or more. This text amendment would change the current variation process for certain proposals and would result in a quicker process and reduced fees for the applicant, and less staff time processing the request.

Change: Parking variation requests (for single-family residential and two-family residential) are determined by the ZBA.
The Zoning Ordinance currently requires all variations related to parking (number of parking spaces, location of spaces, setbacks, size of spaces) to be Major Variations that are heard by the ZBA as the recommending body, and then proceed on for a final determination by City Council. Most parking variations for single-family residential and two-family residential are requests to reduce setbacks to fit an open parking pad, or are to reduce the required number
of parking spaces by one. Since these requests are minimal in nature and can be mitigated by utilizing public transportation or by providing affordable dwelling units, the ZBA could be the final determining body. Parking variation requests for multiple family residential and commercial (typically larger requests with greater impact) should continue to be determined by City Council. This text amendment would change the current variation process for certain proposals and would eliminate approximately 1.5 months of process time for the applicant, less staff time processing the request, and would reduce the number of variation requests on the P&D/City Council agenda.

Clarity/Change: Distance requirement for Residential Care Homes and Transitional Treatment Facilities in the R4a General Residential District.
The Zoning Ordinance features a 900' separation requirement for all Residential Care Homes (Category I and II), Child Residential Care Homes, and Transitional Treatment Facilities. The distance requirement is required in all residential districts (and certain other districts). However, the R4a District was established in 2005, after the current Zoning Ordinance that was adopted in 1993, and inadvertently left the R4a District out of the distance requirement code section. The R4a District is the only residential district that is not specifically listed with the distance requirement, and therefore should be added for consistency. This text amendment would change the current regulation in the R4a District by bringing it into conformity with the other residential districts and clarifying the intent of the original regulation with the 900' distance requirement.

Clarity/Change: Planned Development Extensions and compliance with other applicable City regulations.
The Zoning Ordinance states Planned Developments must obtain a building permit and begin construction within one year of approval of the Planned Development. Many Planned Developments request extensions of more than one year to finalize site engineering, permit drawings, and financing. Some Planned Developments request multiple extensions over years (sometimes a decade) as the market and economy change and impact potential developments. When multiple extensions over multiple years are requested and approved, the proposals are not required to follow City regulations that have been implemented in the years since the initial approval (such as the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, Green Building Ordinance, etc.). The Zoning Ordinance should allow a one year extension to a Planned Development under the City regulations that were in effect when the proposal was submitted (current policy), but should be changed to require compliance with current regulations under any subsequent extension request. This text amendment would encourage developers to begin construction on approved Planned Developments in a more timely manner and subject to the regulations in place at time of approval.

Analysis:
Each proposed text amendment is either a clarification or minor change to current policy and regulations of the Zoning Ordinance. Each text amendment will result in minimal or no impact on the built environment compared to the current implementation of the Zoning Ordinance, but will result in quicker processes and reduced fees for applicants, less staff time, and a reduction in the number of cases that proceed to the ZBA and P&D/City Council. Each of the text amendments that relate to Major vs. Minor Variations will reduce the caseload at ZBA by at least three cases per year, for a total estimated reduction of 12-15 cases per year or 1/3 of
the annual ZBA caseload. This would allow for greater study and review of other cases that need public testimony or Board/Commission/Council discussion.