We love Evanston. We love the vibrancy of the community; the character of the built structures; and the diversity that exists within this town. We even appreciate the impassioned debate that ensues over issues of significant change (although not necessarily the stress and frustration that accompanies it).

In the end there’s a general feeling within this community that we want to “transmit this City not only not less, but greater, better, and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us.”
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Committee sought extensive public input – 8 public meetings, each with public comment; 4-month open public email box; May 18th Public Workshop; and community survey completed by 1,375 individuals.

- We have learned **there is no consensus on what to do with the Mansion**.

- The Council must make a values determination. What value or set of values is most important relative to the Mansion and the City at-large?


- The Answer ultimately lies in deciding which Option (or variation of these options) meets the value or set of values most important to the majority of Council Members.
VALUES DIAGRAM

Start

Should building be preserved?

NO

Should the building be demolished by the City?

NO

Issue RFP; demolish building and restore land

YES

Should the City retain building ownership?

NO

Should the City sell the building?

NO

Fundraise; if goal not achieved, return to start

YES

Establish parameters, issue RFP

Should the City invest money in building?

YES

Determine use; make investment

NO

Should the City sell for residential use?

NO

Market and sell property

YES

Should the City sell for commercial or quasi public use?

YES

Establish parameters, issue RFP

NO

Should City sell / gift to PNP / foundation for public use?
BRIEF HISTORY OF THE HARLEY CLARKE MANSION

- Built in 1927 by Harley Clarke but sold in 1949 to the Sigma Chi National Fraternity where it served as their headquarters until 1965.
- Property of 4.7 acres acquired by the city in 1965 for $750,000, and leased to the Art Center in June 1965.
- Zoned R1 until 1990’s when it was rezoned to 0S (Open Space).
- City leased the mansion to the Evanston Art Center for $1 per year, in agreement that the EAC would maintain interior and the city would be responsible for exterior.
WHERE WE’VE BEEN:
WHAT TO DO WITH THE HARLEY CLARKE MANSION

- Col. Jennifer Pritzker, an Evanstonian with significant financial means and a record of historic preservation, offered to acquire the property (excluding the beach or access to the beach) and develop a 57-room boutique hotel with parking, a restaurant, and event space.

- The City Council voted 6-3 in July 2013 **not** to have the City Manager negotiate with Pritzker.

- The IL DNR expressed an interest in renovating the Mansion and converting it into office space and a Lake Michigan center. Ultimately, IDNR did not move forward due to election of a new Governor and no ownership of land/building.

- On January 12, 2015, the City Manager discussed with the Council seeking contracts to demolish the Mansion. The Council moved to create the Harley Clarke Citizens’ Advisory Committee.

- On January 26th, the City Council unanimously approved the Appointees to the Committee.
THE COMMITTEE’S OBJECTIVE

To identify, develop, and evaluate the viability of options in the context of the criteria developed by the Committee.

The Committee also unanimously agreed upfront that it would consider NO option in which the beach or access to the beach was sold.
OUR OTHER OBJECTIVE...
TO CREATE A PROCESS THAT WAS OPEN, TRANSPARENT, INCLUSIVE & RESPECTFUL

✓ Accepted public feedback at 1st meeting on process
✓ Immediately established and promoted one central email address for citizen input harleyclarkemansion@cityofevanston.org
✓ Started our 2nd meeting with thirty minutes of Public Comment
✓ Closed each meeting with Public Comment
✓ Organized a “Town Hall” meeting on May 18, 2015
✓ Sought community opinion through a Survey
PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT BY THE NUMBERS:

- **8** Harley Clarke Committee Meetings (1 Public Workshop)
- **75** Unique Public Commenters (100 total)
- **250** Emails sent to the Harley Clarke Mansion Email address
- **200** Public Workshop Attendees
- **1,375** Survey Respondents

Note: Unaudited figures
SURVEY PARTICIPATION – MAY 18-31; N=1375

Survey Response Heat Map

Survey Responses by Ward
# PARTICIPANTS’ OPINION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion Breakdown</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Public Comment</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City retain and renovate the building for public use.</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City demolish the building and redevelop the site as park land.</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City sell (or lease) the building and land and allow it to be renovated for a</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commercial use, such as a hotel or event space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City sell the building and land and allow the site to be redeveloped under</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residential zoning, including senior housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City sell (or lease) or gift the building to an organization that would renovate</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and preserve it for public cultural and/or educational use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Committee developed and agreed upon 20 criteria by which to evaluate each option. The Committee did not weigh the criteria, leaving it to the Council to pass judgement on which criteria hold more value (e.g., Preserving the Mansion vs. having more green space).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution require the expenditure of City funds?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do alternate funding sources exist for this proposed solution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Does the facility remain publicly owned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Does the land remain publicly owned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Does public access to the grounds remain available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Does public access to the facility remain available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution preserve the building?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution preserve the Jens Jensen garden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution generate 1-time revenue for the City?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution generate recurring revenue for the City?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution generate sufficient maintenance revenue?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution require additional parking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution require a change in zoning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution increase the “green space”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution increase traffic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution increase density in the floor area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution meet an existing or anticipated long-term need in the community?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Describe how the proposed solution will be funded.
2. Describe the proposed solution’s best attribute.
3. Describe the potential environmental impact(s) this solution would have.
4. Describe how the proposed solution may change the character of the neighborhood.
5. Describe how the solution is compatible with existing City planning documents.
6. Describe the Evanston population served (including size of said population) by the solution.
7. Describe how the proposed solution affects beach access.
8. If applicable, describe sources of revenue to the City from this proposed solution.
9. **Outstanding Question(s):** What is the cost for the City to repair and renovate this structure?
OPTIONS CONSIDERED

1. City retain and renovate for public use.

2. City demolish the building and redevelop the site as park land.

3. City sell the building and land, and allow it to be renovated for a commercial use, such as a hotel or event space.

4. City sell the building and land, and allow the site to be redeveloped under residential zoning.

5. City sell or gift the building to an organization (PNP/Foundation) that would renovate and preserve it for public cultural and/or educational use.

* Note IDNR was not put forth during the public workshop because the majority of the Committee understands this option to be no longer viable. A more comprehensive list of ideas offered by the public and committee can be found in the Appendix
### SUMMARY OF OPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution require the expenditure of City funds?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do alternate funding sources exist for this proposed solution?</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Does the facility remain publicly owned?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Does the land remain publicly owned?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Does public access to the grounds remain available?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Does public access to the facility remain available?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution preserve the building?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution preserve the Jens Jensen garden?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution generate 1-time revenue for the City?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (if sale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution generate recurring revenue for the City?</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution generate sufficient maintenance revenue?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution require additional parking?</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution require a change in zoning?</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution increase the &quot;green space&quot;?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution increase traffic?</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution increase density in the floor area?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Does the proposed solution meet an existing or anticipated long-term need in the community?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/No/Maybe</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY MEMBER PRESENTATIONS

Video:
https://youtu.be/XHTD53Gg_3g

Presentations can be found at:

Presentation 1 (Sheila Sullivan)
Presentation 2 (Peter Greene)
Presentation 3 (Chris Oakley)
Presentation 4 (Patrick Donnelly)

Sheila Sullivan
✓ 30 Year Evanston Resident
✓ President, Southeast Evanston Association
✓ Environmental & Public Health Scientist

Peter Greene
✓ 30 Year Evanston Resident
✓ 1st VP, CBRE Hotels
✓ 50 Years Hotel Experience
✓ $2B in Hotel Activity

Chris Oakley
✓ 20 Year Evanston Resident
✓ Architect, 35 Years Historic Preservation, Adaptive Re-Use
✓ 10 Years, Director of Design

Patrick Donnelly
✓ Evanston Resident
✓ Organizer, www.harleyclarke.com
✓ Commercial Advertising Executive Producer

See Appendix – for entire list of attendees pros/cons
OPTION 1: CITY RETAINS AND RENOVATES MANSION FOR PUBLIC USE

PROS

✓ Remains public
✓ Provides additional programming space.
✓ Character of neighborhood remains unchanged
✓ Reinforces the principle that parkland is for the people and not to be commercialized
✓ Compatible with Lakefront Plan

CONS

✗ Most likely requires significant city funding.
✗ Would generate little to no revenue to maintain the building and address other more pressing human needs in the community.
✗ Could require additional parking and rezoning.
✗ Continues on similar path to the last 40 years expecting different result
✗ City lacks financing, knowledge, and capabilities to successfully operate mansion
✗ Unlikely city would be able to restore mansion to past grandeur

Preserves the building, maintains public ownership, and provides additional programming space.
OPTION 2: CITY DEMOLISH MANSION
REDEVELOP SITE AS PARKLAND

PROS
- Maintains and increases public use
- Eliminates future City expenditures & liability
- Increase “green space” for free play
- Restores views of lake from Sheridan Rd.
- Creates opportunity for contiguous park campus
- Creates opportunity for more beach parking and access
- Preserves some and possibly all of the Jens Jensen Gardens
- Offers Evanston opportunity to re-envision, or develop for public use

CONS
- Does not preserve the building
- Does not generate any revenue for the City
- Loss of a local historic landmark
- Does meet an existing or anticipated long-term need in the community
- Would require city funds to demolish

Offers City more park land and open programming options
OPTION 3: SELL PROPERTY
FOR BOUTIQUE HOTEL, EVENT SPACE, RESTAURANT

PROS
✓ Generate one time revenue plus annual property, sales, hotel, and liquor taxes
✓ Opportunity to create a one of a kind property near Lake Michigan.
✓ Compatible with City’s Strategic Plan
✓ Eliminates liability to City
✓ Building renovated with private (not City) funds
✓ Public access to the facility can remain available.

CONS
✗ Will alter character of neighborhood
✗ The land & facility may no longer be public/city owned
✗ Will require rezoning (affects lakefront master plan) & additional parking
✗ Requires a parking solution (garage, valet, etc)
✗ May be cost prohibitive “as is” for a b&b, restaurant, or event space
✗ Will primarily only serve affluent; access limited to those that can pay
✗ Sale may set bad precedent for other city assets
✗ May increase traffic and density

Preserves the building at owner’s expense; Offers some public access
OPTION 4: SELL PROPERTY
REDEVELOP SITE UNDER RESIDENTIAL ZONING

PROS

✓ Property Renovated with private (not City) funds
✓ Generate one time revenue plus annual property taxes
✓ Eliminates liability to City
✓ Returns property to R-1, original zoning

Returns the parcel to residential use, similar to rest of neighborhood

CONS

✓ Loss of control of a public asset
✓ Exclusive; no public accessibility; no community benefit
✓ Complete loss of park space and public use
✓ Increased density
✓ Will require rezoning
✓ Lost opportunity to create community benefit
✓ Only serves the affluent
✓ Sets bad precedent for other city assets
OPTION 5: SELL OR GIFT BUILDING TO A PNP/FOUNDATION FOR RESTORATION & PUBLIC USE

PROS

✓ Preserves building with donor funds (no public money)
✓ Eliminates liability and City Operations & Maintenance
✓ Building and property remain in use for public
✓ Provides additional programming space
✓ Character of neighborhood remains relatively unchanged
✓ Reinforces principle that parkland is for the people and not to be commercialized

CONS

✗ Large foundations did not previously express interest (e.g., Botanic Garden, Driehaus, Mitchell Museum)
✗ City loses control
✗ Uncertain whether community organization could raise $3M+
✗ No revenue generated if building is “gifted”
✗ Risk of endangering the character of neighborhood depending on use
✗ Concern that option may have an air of exclusivity
✗ Increased risk because community organization may have limited to no track record
✗ Issue been around for 3+ years and activists to publicly save mansion have not coalesced to fundraise

Preserves the building and creates a community cultural/education center
Some participants expressed concern about survey – personal information, technical errors, methodology.

Survey results indicate there is no community consensus.

Two-thirds of respondents preferred the City either retaining the building or gifting it to a non-profit/Foundation.

Find survey results and public comments at: CityofEvanston.org/mansion
### HARLEY CLARKE CITIZENS’ ADVISORY COMMITTEE

#### CITIZEN MEMBERS PREFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Damashek</th>
<th>DiMarco</th>
<th>Hagerty</th>
<th>Shumaker</th>
<th>Zeinemann</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City retain and renovate mansion for public use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City demolish the building and redevelop the site as park land</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>City sell the building and land, and allow it to be renovated for a commercial use, such as a hotel or event space</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>City sell the building and land, and allow the site to be redeveloped under residential zoning, including senior housing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>City sell or gift the building to an organization (PNP/Foundation) that would renovate and preserve it for public cultural and/or educational use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMITTEE CONSENSUS

✓ Unanimous Committee agreement: never sell the beach, nor access to it

✓ Generally, Option 4 – Selling Building/Land for Residential Development – is Committee’s least preferred option.

✓ Generally, the Committee feels that building’s financial operation should be self sustaining.
1. **Consensus:** After three years it is clear there will not be a general community agreement on what to do with the Harley Clarke Mansion. There are passionate advocates with legitimate rationale for all sides of this issue.

2. **Cost Estimates:** There was much discussion about cost estimates. The City’s, IDNR, and Pritzker’s. The majority of the committee ultimately decided the estimates discussed are not viable because the Scope of Work is unclear and there was no industry standard design and cost estimate approach followed.

3. **Expertise:** The Committee did not have the time, nor technical expertise to fully develop each option or develop cost estimates.

4. **Lease Option:** A land-lease option could be considered under Options 3, 4, and 5.

5. **Letters from CSNA and SEA advocating public ownership.** Link to Letters

6. **Evanston Chamber of Commerce:** Completed a survey of members and submitted to Committee. Link to survey.

7. **Values Decision:** Everyone’s intentions are good. Everyone wants what they think is best for Evanston. Ultimately the City Council needs to decide what value or set of values related to the Mansion and the Community at-large are most important.
OTHER IDEAS MENTIONED DURING PROCESS

1. **Parking**: Consider converting public parcel on SE corner of Sheridan and Milburn Park 8-12 to parking for Mansion

2. **Consolidate Park District**: Use opportunity to create a consolidated park district

3. **Northwestern**: Gift the building to NU via a land-lease but seek agreement from NU to pay property tax.

4. **Vivian Meier**: Convert into a Vivian Meier museum

5. **Temporary Uses**: Laser tag; haunted house
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