

Date: December 19, 2007

Re: Minority Findings of Fact for Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M

From: Members of the Plan Commission Voting Not to Approve 708 Planned Development
Commissioners Coleen Burrus, Johanna Nyden, and Robin Schuldenfrei

To: Members of the Planning and Development Committee

We do not support the majority vote to approve the proposed planned development at 708 Church Street nor do we support the approval to rezone the site from the zoning classification of D2 to D3. This letter expands on the reasoning for not approving the proposed development and the map amendment. Please note that the motion to approve the development was carried by a **single vote**. It is also noteworthy that we three members of the Plan Commission are either trained in urban planning and architecture and have served in a professional capacity in these fields -- Commissioner Coleen Burrus worked as a certified planner (American Institute of Certified Planners) for the City of St. Louis, St. Louis County, and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; Commissioner Johanna Nyden is an economic development planner and TIF consultant with a planning firm in Chicago doing work for both public and private clients; Commissioner Robin Schuldenfrei is a doctoral candidate in architectural history at Harvard University's Graduate School of Design where she specializes in 19th and 20th century architecture and an Assistant Professor at the University of Illinois at Chicago.

The ordinance governing review and approval of this proposed Special Use mandates that the potential merits of this particular project be evaluated against its impact on downtown and the community of Evanston as a whole. It is the finding of this minority that the proposal does not meet these requirements. We have organized this letter in the following manner:

- **Public Benefits:** This development team has requested a significant modification to the site development allowances (pending an additional zoning map amendment)

but has **not demonstrated** that this development will provide significant public benefits warranting such an extraordinary allowance.

- **Capacity of Existing Public Services.** Fire Chief Berkowsky has indicated in a statement to the Plan Commission that Evanston does not have enough **first responders** to fight a fire in a high-rise of this height.
- **Architectural Review:** A critique of the quality and character of this building.
- **Preservation of Existing 708 Church Building:** This proposal would result in the loss of a significant historic building and the pedestrian scale of this prized block. As a result, it does not meet the mandatory standards for special uses.
- **Public Opinion:** The residents and members of the Evanston community have been adamantly opposed to the development of this building.
- **Compromised Process.** From the start, the process of evaluating the project proposed for 708 Church has suffered from the appearance of having been compromised.

Public Benefits

The present proposal **does not offer significant public benefits**. Instead, the public benefits identified by the development team directly enhance the marketability of their own project. For example:

- **The Hahn Building.** The purchase of the Hahn building, a building protected by the local preservation ordinance and not at risk of demolition, will lead to its being “re-tenanted” by the developer, causing current local retailers to lose their place of business.
- **LEED Certification.** The silver LEED certification is the second lowest (of four rating levels) that is awarded by the United States Green Building Council (USGBC) and would **not** be recognized as a public benefit under the proposed Downtown Plan; only gold and platinum certifications would constitute a public benefit. As recognized by the proposed Downtown Plan, there is also no guarantee

that a Silver LEED level will be awarded – this certification is awarded following construction and inspection of the building.

Other public benefits proposed by the development team do not constitute public benefits but are either inherent effects of any new development or requirements of Evanston City Code.

- **Expanded Tax Base.** The contribution of new taxes is an inherent effect of any new construction or new development and **should not be** considered a public benefit. This is particularly important because these additional taxes would not be available for the General Fund until 2019 when the TIF is dissolved.
- **Affordable Housing Contribution.** Complying with Evanston’s Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance by providing the mandated amount to the affordable housing fund is not a public benefit but merely following Evanston’s laws.
- **TIF Increment.** The development team has suggested that they will generate a significant amount of TIF that can be used to redevelop Fountain Square. Any delay in construction or development will delay the generation of TIF and reduce the total amount of TIF generated. For example, it is critical to consider that the addition of new TIF projected by the developers’ assumptions is not guaranteed because there are leases in the building that will not expire until 2012. This is three years after the development team would like to start construction. It is also important to consider that this **same** development team took almost five years from approval of Sherman Plaza to actually build a building that could be assessed and generate TIF. Finally, while the development team has stated that this increment could be used to finance a new Fountain Square, they also stated during the September 20th meeting of the Plan Commission that they intend to use some of the TIF increment to renovate the Hahn building.

The purported public benefits are not meaningful in view of the size of the modification to the site development allowance that is being requested.

Capacity of Existing Services

According to a statement delivered to the Plan Commission on December 11th, Fire Chief Berkowsky informed the Commission that “the number of firefighters available to respond to the onset of a high-rise fire will have the greatest impact in the mitigation of the event.” In his statement he points out that a high-rise in Chicago would have a 61 firefighter response, but in Evanston the most firefighters that can be sent at the **initial** response is 26 firefighters on any given day.

The critical element of this statement is the word “**initial**”; additional support from surrounding communities would likely not be considered initial because it would take approximately 15 to 20 minutes for firefighters and equipment to arrive in Evanston from Skokie or Wilmette. If this building is built, it is therefore likely that Evanston would either be faced with hiring additional firefighters or risking the lives of the occupants of the building by not providing enough fire protection.

Architectural Review of Proposed Development

This building has been called “iconic” by the development team and the City Council. We find that it is merely tall and not iconic. It is out of context with Evanston’s downtown. In its present iteration its architectural merits have been questioned by commissioners who voted both for and against it. It can be considered a vertical gated community.

The proposed building replaces character-giving vintage retail frontage with a generic retail facade that could be located anywhere. The developers have stated that they are “matching” the east side of the street to the west side; this is not an enhancement, but rather creates a mall-like appearance downtown. In terms of materials and structural and balcony articulation, the proposed building has some general similarities to the MoMo, or Modern Momentum, building in downtown Chicago (on State Street), also by Booth Hansen—although MoMo in downtown Chicago is 100 feet shorter at 409 feet. The

proposed building is very similar to glass box towers of the 1970s, such as Boston's Hancock Tower designed by I.M. Pei in 1976. Evanston, with its esteemed architectural tradition, needs distinctive, innovative buildings designed for its own architecturally vibrant downtown, not re-configured buildings from elsewhere.

The proposed building maximizes the lot line, not giving any public relief at its base. It appears to be made of three distinct parts, rather than a building that has been designed as a whole. The base is traditional and designed to appease. With its bays and "manufactured stone," rather than real stone or a new, innovative material, it does not represent exciting new design, but an attempt to mimic traditional qualities better left to the original, historic buildings themselves. Moreover, the elements at the base do not seem to connect visually with the tower. The retail base is followed by the parking, thus far three full stories that become the predominant pedestrian view of this building, substantially changing the pedestrian experience on the Fountain Square block. The new Downtown Plan calls for underground parking or parking behind building elements rather than "screens," which do not hide the fact that the base is primarily comprised of a parking garage.

Preservation of Existing 708 Church Building

This proposal would result in the loss of a significant historic building and the pedestrian scale of this prized block. It is an ill-conceived precedent to tear down historic buildings downtown. At this stage in the downtown's development, new growth should be promoted as infill of empty lots or the replacement of buildings of little architectural merit, such as the old Barnes and Noble site.

The existing 708 Church is an important historic building which contributes to the special character of downtown and is presently being considered for landmark status, along with several other downtown buildings. The Preservation Commission notes that the existing 708 Church is among those that "will be discussed for further consideration. These

buildings may have historic or cultural significance or may provide the desired physical context and character within the downtown” (April 20, 2007 report and Dec. 17, 2007 email message from Carlos Ruiz, City of Evanston Preservation Coordinator).

As the Preservation Commission has identified, it is certainly worthy of being designated a landmark. The existing 708 Church was designed by the same architect as the landmarked Hahn building, John August Nyden (no relationship to Commissioner Johanna Nyden), an important Chicago architect and Evanston resident. Visually and urbanistically, all three buildings of Fountain Square work together to form a unique, triangular, character-giving block housing many local retailers and offices. The scale, the materials, the design, and the pedestrian experience formed by all three buildings play an irreplaceable role in the heart of downtown. The connection between 708 Church and the Hahn building, which was specifically designed to stand next to 708 Church, has endured for over 80 years and is of particular significance. All three Fountain Square buildings need to be restored properly, and Fountain Square itself needs to be remodeled, at which point in time Evanston would have a dynamic central heart.

The proposed development at 708 Church is one that is extreme under current zoning laws, considerably more than four times as tall as the maximum height allowed in the D2 district (125 feet, with planned development allowances) and more than twice as tall as the maximum height in the D3 district (220 feet, with planned development allowances), as stated in the Zoning Ordinance. The granting of an exception to the maximum allowance requires the demonstration that the entirety of this height in excess of the maximum (e.g. the extra 303 feet) is essential for the achievement of a public benefit, as outlined in the current Zoning Ordinance (6-3-6-6) and the 2000 Comprehensive General Plan.

Public Comment, Public Benefit, Special Use

Although the merits of this project are to be evaluated using a wide range of criteria, in the case of “public benefit” the public’s concern over the lack of public benefit needs to be taken seriously. Who else should we listen to on this question of benefits but the public? Most importantly, the approval of any special use by the Plan Commission and the City Council *requires* (Zoning Ordinance, Section 6-3-5-1) the weighing of public need and benefit against potential adverse impact on the immediate neighborhood and the City as a whole. Therefore, one of the main questions to be decided is whether the public benefit provided is sufficient to justify the impact. During Plan Commission proceedings, many members of the public spoke often about the proposed public benefits. They have overwhelmingly indicated that no, there is **not enough public benefit** to warrant this project and outweigh its negative impact. Upon careful review of this project, we find that neither public need nor benefit has been demonstrated that would justify approval of the project and the required Special Use permit.

Compromised Process

We have participated in the public hearings since mid-August and have each witnessed the events surrounding this proposal unfold in both Plan Commission hearings and the greater political sphere of Evanston. In particular, we the minority are concerned about what appears to be a compromised process in which the development team has been given preferential treatment.

Considerable questions remain as to whether the proposal has been fairly evaluated. In reviewing the project prior to the Plan Commission process, some members of the City Council indicated their enthusiasm for the proposal during their March closed door meeting with the development team. This permitted the developers to enter the Planned Development process knowing that the only body that ultimately authorizes the approval of the project was excited about it. It certainly seems fair to ask whether this led to the developers’ unwillingness to add significant public benefit, except for a few minor

concessions, and the general inflexibility of the developers during the Plan Commission process.

Additionally we find that there are some questions raised about the decision making process of Plan Commission members when they make comments affirming their faith in the development team based on past business associations or having toured one of the development teams previous buildings. Again, for the record we are not stating that an actual breach occurred, but it doesn't help the appearance of impartiality.

Previous associations with members of the development team are not the proper way to evaluate the merits of a proposal or make a recommendation for approval. Each individual project should be evaluated own its merit and not be evaluated by the track record of the development team. This should especially be noted in the context of the narrow margin in support of this proposal by the Plan Commission.

Conclusions

The three of us have respect for our Aldermen and our fellow Plan Commissioners, but we do not think that the public has been served in this process. The public benefits suggested by this development team do not benefit all of Evanston, but rather serve to enhance the marketability of the proposed 708 development. It would set a poor precedent if approvals were to be based on the generation of taxes and characteristics of a building that make it more desirable or marketable rather than on actual benefits to the entire community of Evanston.

As you are all aware, as the Guidelines for Citizens serving on Boards, Commissions and Committees state:

"In addition to following the laws governing public meetings and the like, boards, commissions, and committees have an obligation to conduct business in a manner that wins public respect and confidence and guarantees their integrity to the community."

Cover Letter -- Minority Findings of Fact for Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M
Evanston Plan Commission
Commissioners Coleen Burrus, Johanna Nyden, and Robin Schuldenfrei
December 19, 2007

We do not feel that this has been the case during the review process for the proposed development at 708 Church, nor for the Downtown Plan process as it has proceeded to date. In respectfully submitting this minority report, which includes our findings of fact for the proposed planned development at 708 Church and the map amendment from D2 to D3, we would like to call for renewed commitment to these principles on the part of all representatives of our community.

Sincerely,

Commissioner Coleen Burrus

Commissioner Johanna Nyden

Commissioner Robin Schuldenfrei

Attachments: Minority Findings of Fact, Fire Department Memo, Preservation Commission April 20, 2007 Building Survey Preliminary Report and email from Preservation Coordinator Carlos Ruiz, Public Works Memo (see pages 5-7), Downtown Summer 2007 Visioning Results

Minority Findings of Fact
(Read into the Record December 19, 2007)

MINORITY FINDINGS OF FACT WORKSHEET FOR THE 708 CHURCH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REQUEST

Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M

Date: December 19, 2007

Standards	notes
<p>6-3-4-5: STANDARDS FOR AMENDMENTS:</p>	
<p>1) The proposed amendment must be consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan.</p>	<p>This standard has not been adequately met. The CGP (Comprehensive General Plan) states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The historic heritage of Evanston should continue to be identified and preserved for the benefit of current and future residents” (CGP, 6). The proposed planned development would require the demolition of the historic building presently located at 708 Church Street, thus undermine the goal of preserving the historic heritage of Evanston. • That “Evanston must support and promote growth while maintaining its special character.” (CGP, 19). 708 Church is a special, character-giving building and its destruction erodes the special character of Fountain Square and the surrounding area. • As the Values and Goals section of the Plan, states “The historic heritage of Evanston should continue to be identified and preserved for the benefit of current and future residents.” (CGP, 6) The destruction of 708 Church is not compatible with this Value and Goal. • In other communities “developers are attempting to emulate the character that older communities like Evanston typify” (CGP, 1). Evanston must continue to protect its valuable character. • “At a time when people are recognizing the homogeneity of shopping malls and are looking more favorably at distinctive Downtown shopping areas, their patronage cannot be taken for granted...Part of that distinction are what are termed “character-giving buildings” (CGP, 44) 708 Church is a character-giving building. • “[E]conomic strategies should consider the role of existing office space. These properties should be marketed as locations for new firms or all sizes as well as candidates for adaptive reuse” (CGP, 45). The 22,000 square feet of office spaces at 708 Church should be retained.
<p>2) The proposed amendment must be compatible with the overall character of the existing development in the immediate vicinity of the subject property.</p>	<p>This standard has not been met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development is 49 floors which is grossly incompatible with the overall

MINORITY FINDINGS OF FACT WORKSHEET FOR THE 708 CHURCH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REQUEST

Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M

Date: December 19, 2007

Standards	notes
	<p>character of existing development in the vicinity of the subject property, including both the historic buildings and downtown's tallest buildings, such as the Marshall Fields Building, the Carlson/Chase Building Block, and the Sherman Plaza Block.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This Fountain Square block is also a "character giving" block and bridges a more traditional section of downtown to the north with a more traditional section to the south.• The 1989 Downtown Plan states that "Maintaining the character of the Downtown means preserving existing buildings, having a scale and architectural quality which are unique to Evanston and requiring that new buildings respect the existing tradition. New buildings should be as enjoyable and memorable for succeeding generations as the present ones are for us." (p. 87) This standard is not met.• The proposal removes a significant building of architectural merit and replaces it with a glass structure significantly taller than surrounding buildings, and with a substantially larger mass, scale, and FAR.• The 1989 Downtown Plan also considers the important function of existing low-lying, pedestrian-friendly retail: "Many of the smaller scale retail buildings give the Downtown a special character. That character is important to the retail function. A challenge faced in this plan will be how to retain such character-giving buildings when they exist within the greatest density zone. ... anything approaching full development would ultimately have a detrimental effect on circulation, parking and the overall quality of the Downtown" (p. 28). <p>The 1989 Downtown Plan states in its objectives and policies section: "Objective: Promote development compatible with existing character and scale. Policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• "Guide redevelopment in the Downtown core to selected underutilized parcels that will not disrupt strong retail concentrations." (p. 96)• "Encourage new buildings that enhance the pedestrian oriented character of the Downtown core." (p. 96)• "Encourage rehabilitation of existing buildings that contribute to the character of the Downtown." (p. 96)• The proposal does not meet these standards.

MINORITY FINDINGS OF FACT WORKSHEET FOR THE 708 CHURCH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REQUEST

Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M

Date: December 19, 2007

Standards	notes
3) The proposed amendment will not have an adverse impact on the value of adjacent properties.	This standard has not been adequately met. The proposal will add 218 more condominiums to an already saturated Evanston market. This will further depress condo prices across Evanston. The increased supply also competes with the viability of other new developments currently under construction or in pre-construction phases.
4) There are adequate public facilities and services.	<p>This standard has not been adequately met. This proposal puts significant pressure on the public facilities and services of downtown, especially fire, sewer. For specific details, see attached public works and fire department memos. The memos note the following significant details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chicago has at least 61 “first-responder” firefighters to a fire in a building of this size. The fire department only has the capacity to send 25 on any shift. • As stated in the public works memo the applicant has failed to provide adequate information for a comprehensive review: “The size of the proposed water and sewer services are not provided. This information is required to determine which water and sewer mains these services will be directed to.” “The plans do not indicate existing water and sewer services are to be disconnected. This information is required to determine the extent of the required pavement restoration.” “The plans do not include a proposed street lighting plan.” “No civil plans have been provided.”
6-3-5-10: STANDARDS FOR SPECIAL USES:	
The Zoning Board of Appeals or the Plan Commission, as the case may be, shall only recommend approval, approval with conditions, or disapproval of a special use based upon written findings of fact with regard to each of the standards set forth below and, where applicable, any special standards for specific uses set forth in the provisions of a specific zoning district:	
(A) It is one of the special uses specifically listed in the Zoning Ordinance;	This standard is met.
(B) It is in keeping with purposes and policies of the adopted Comprehensive General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance as amended from time to time;	It is not in keeping with the purposes and policies of the adopted CGP and Zoning Ordinance. See items 1 and 2 discussed under section 6-3-4-5.

MINORITY FINDINGS OF FACT WORKSHEET FOR THE 708 CHURCH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REQUEST

Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M

Date: December 19, 2007

Standards	notes
<p>(C) It will not cause a negative cumulative effect, when its effect is considered in conjunction with the cumulative effect of various special uses of all types on the immediate neighborhood and the effect of the proposed type of special use upon the City as a whole;</p>	<p>This standard is not met. The addition of the proposed mixed use development will create a negative cumulative effect on the downtown or surrounding neighborhood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The CGP states, “As stated in the introduction to Part I: General Land Use, some major streets could experience demand for increased residential density in the future. While such development is encouraged, sensitive consideration of scale and design are important to preserve the quality of surrounding neighborhoods” (CGP, 24) This proposal is out of scale with the surrounding neighborhoods; it is twice as tall as the tallest planned development located in downtown Evanston.• This proposal diminishes the immediate neighborhood and impacts the city as a whole because it will result in the loss of significant architectural resources, affordable retail space used by independent retailers and low pedestrian scale valued by residents of this city. The attached excel spreadsheet of the 2007 summer visioning sessions for downtown Evanston concretely documents the vision and goals, as well as concerns for downtown development by City of Evanston residents.• The CGP states, “A strong priority should be placed on retaining Evanston businesses” (CGP, 17). This proposal will result in a significant loss of office space and locally-owned Evanston businesses. More than 100 businesspeople working in the current 708 Church building will be displaced.• The CGP states, “Retain and attract businesses in order to strengthen Evanston’s economic base.” (p. 33) This proposal will result in a significant loss of office space and locally owned Evanston businesses.• The CGP suggests that, Evanston should encourage a compatible mix of land uses in the Downtown, “While new residential development and adaptive reuse of existing structures should be supported, the City should support businesses and services that are amenities in a thriving neighborhood and a thriving business area” (p. 44) The current building located at 708 Church houses over a hundred different professionals in Class B office space. This proposal will result in a significant loss of office space and locally owned Evanston businesses.• In terms of scale and context (p. 9), as outlined in the Design Guidelines the proposed planned development is not appropriate to the site in the following ways:<ol style="list-style-type: none">(1) (a) the base of the building should set back at 42 ft., the proposed building rises to 55 ft. which causes a much larger street wall and erodes pedestrian scale of the

MINORITY FINDINGS OF FACT WORKSHEET FOR THE 708 CHURCH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REQUEST

Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M

Date: December 19, 2007

Standards	notes
	<p>downtown and affects the streetscape. From the street, the overwhelmingly visible component of the building will be its three levels of the parking garage.</p> <p>(2) (1.) (c.) the height of the building is out of context with the skyline of the surrounding area, because it is twice as tall as the next tallest building, it doesn't add to the skyline, doesn't create cohesion, but rather dominates it. A skyline should be composed of buildings, generally of the same height, but they should be distinguished from one another by a variety of roof forms. Evanston's skyline should not be comprised of mainly 25 story buildings and then a single building twice as tall.</p> <p>(2.) (a.) the building doesn't relate to surrounding Fountain Sq. block buildings, or the newer buildings around it in terms of height, scale, or proportion, primarily due to its extraordinary height and the building materials are not in context with the other buildings, which are limestone.</p>
(D) It does not interfere with or diminish the value of property in the neighborhood;	<p>This standard has not been adequately met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal will add 218 more condominiums to an already saturated Evanston market. This will further depress condo prices in downtown Evanston. The increased supply also competes with the viability of other new developments currently under construction or in pre-construction phases.
(E) It can be adequately served by public facilities and services;	<p>This standard has not been adequately met. This proposal puts significant pressure on the public facilities and services of downtown, especially fire, sewer. See public works and fire dept. memos.</p> <p>See item 4 in section 6-3-4-5</p>
(F) It does not cause undue traffic congestion;	<p>According to the applicants' traffic study, the project will not have a negative impact on traffic congestion and circulation. However the proposed building will have parking onsite and primarily residential uses, thus the following negative impacts are noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The only entrance and egress to the building is located on a one-way street (Orrington). The number of cars concentrated in this portion of the City should be expected to increase due to this access point. Traffic models do not identify patterns of traffic by day of the week. It can be expected that more traffic will be produced at the site on Saturdays and Sundays than currently since half of the site is composed of professional offices that are mostly closed on the

MINORITY FINDINGS OF FACT WORKSHEET FOR THE 708 CHURCH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REQUEST

Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M

Date: December 19, 2007

Standards	notes
	<p>weekend.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Five total loading berths are required as per the zoning analysis and two will be provided on the site. Therefore, when the two loading berths are occupied, other service trucks will need to use curb space or may double park. Trucks will need to back into the proposed two loading berths and will do so in the immediate vicinity of the exit ramp from the parking garage on the east side of Orrington Avenue.
<p>(G) It preserves significant historical and architectural resources;</p>	<p>The standard is not met because the demolition of 708 Church destroys a significant historical and architectural resource Downtown. Not only does it destroy the building at 708 Church, it destroys one-third of the Fountain Square ensemble of historic buildings. Preservation of the Hahn building is irrelevant to this proposal because it is already a landmark and thus preserved under City rules. 708 Church was designed by the same architect as the Hahn building and was developed just three years earlier on a piece of land that was purchased as one property and developed in two phases. 708 Church has been nominated for landmark status on numerous occasions. It is important to note that G. "significant historical and architectural resources" does not mention "landmark," but rather understands the value of architectural resources generally, not just the pinnacle buildings which have been landmarked.</p> <p>The Vision statement of the CGP states, "The primary theme of the Comprehensive General Plan is the recognition that Evanston must allow growth to occur while enhancing the community's special character" (CGP, 1) It is the character of the downtown buildings and their unique businesses that the CGP recognizes. Evanston must find a way to grow downtown while maintaining the very architectural, economic and social fabric that makes it unique. The following are from the CGP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Encourage creative adaptive reuse of properties available for redevelopment using zoning standards and the Site Plan and Appearance Review process to protect historic character" (CGP, 21). Adaptive reuse should be encouraged at 708 Church. "Encourage a compatible mix of land uses in the Downtown. Support adaptive reuse ideas that bring new life to existing buildings and which work to preserve the balance of uses (office, retail, residential) in Downtown Evanston." (CGP, 41) Adaptive reuse should be encouraged at 708 Church and it should retain its balance of use as a retail and office building.

MINORITY FINDINGS OF FACT WORKSHEET FOR THE 708 CHURCH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REQUEST

Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M

Date: December 19, 2007

Standards	notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Promote Evanston’s reputation as a community where historic preservation is a vital part of the community’s identity” (CGP, 105). 708 Church should be preserved and protected as a vital part of downtown Evanston’s identity. • Work to ensure that preservation is a standard component of all elements of Evanston planning” (CGP,106). 708 Church should be preserved and protected in future planning for downtown. • “As its ongoing goal for historic preservation, Evanston should work to identify and preserve the historic heritage of the community for the benefit of current and future Evanston residents” (GCP, 107) 708 Church should be preserved and protected for the benefit of current and future residents. It is over 80 years old and an integral part of Evanston’s unique Fountain Square block and its downtown more generally. <p>The 2000 Comprehensive Plan “Evanston should seek to preserve the structures and environments which have given the community much of its physical appeal and special visual character. An intangible, but equally important value is the sense of history given to those who live here.” (p. 110) 708 Church contributes to Evanston’s sense of history and its special visual character.</p>
(H) It preserves significant natural and environmental features; and	This standard is not applicable.
(I) It complies with all other applicable regulations of the district in which it is located and other applicable ordinances, except to the extent such regulations have been modified through the planned development process or the grant of a variation.	This standard is met.
<p>6-11-1-10 (A) – General Conditions for Downtown Planned Developments</p> <p>(1) The planned development must be compatible with surrounding development and shall not be of such a nature in height, bulk or scale as to exercise any influences contrary to the purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance as set forth in Section 6-1-2 “Purposes and Intent”</p>	<p>The standard is not met. The Zoning Ordinance states “(A) General Conditions: 1. Each planned development shall be compatible with surrounding development and not be of such a nature in height, bulk or scale as to exercise any influence contrary to the purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance as set forth in Section 6-1-2, “Purpose and Intent.” It does not meet the goals of Section 6-1-2 because it does not promote the objectives and policies of the CGP, does not secure adequate light and safety from fire and other dangers, nor does it minimize or lessen congestion in the public streets.</p> <p>The proposed project is located in the downtown D2 traditional zone, connected by D2 to the</p>

MINORITY FINDINGS OF FACT WORKSHEET FOR THE 708 CHURCH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REQUEST

Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M

Date: December 19, 2007

Standards	notes
<p>(2) The planned development shall enhance the identity and character of the downtown by preserving where possible character-giving buildings, enhancing existing streetscape amenities, maintaining retail continuity in areas where it is prominent, strengthening pedestrian orientation and scale and contributing to the mixed use vitality of the area.</p>	<p>north and south and providing a traditional corridor in the heart of downtown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The loss of 708 Church degrades the identity and character of Downtown and degrades the retail continuity presently achieved between the three historic buildings of Fountain Square, weakening the pedestrian orientation and pedestrian scale. <p>The new building does not create an iconic presence in the Evanston skyline. It is merely a tall building out of scale, proportion, and character with Evanston's downtown. It is a tall building, not an iconic building.</p> <p>The standard is not met. The proposed structure replaces a character-giving retail/office building, removes affordable retail space and independent retailers, and disrupts the pedestrian orientation of the area. The design of the proposed residential tower is more than twice as tall as all other buildings in Evanston, and is out of scale and context with Evanston's downtown.</p>
<p>(3) Each planned development shall be compatible with and implement the adopted Comprehensive General Plan as amended, the Plan for Downtown Evanston, and any adopted land use or urban design plan specific to the area, the Zoning Ordinance, and any pertinent City planning and development policies, particularly in terms of:</p> <p>i) Land use</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "A 'traditional' pedestrian and transit oriented pattern of neighborhoods with tree-lined streets and convenient business districts, including a diverse Downtown area. (CGP, Introduction, p. 2) "An appealing community aesthetic that includes distinctive architecture and landscaping and noteworthy historic preservation efforts." (CGP, Introduction, p. 2) <p>I. Land use, CGP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Neighborhood assets should be enhanced while recognizing that each neighborhood contributes to the overall social and economic quality of Evanston." (CGP, Ch. 2) Significant neighborhood assets will be lost, including a reduction in access to light and sky to neighboring buildings and pedestrians who will be in shadow for significant portions of the day, more wind, the loss of unique, independent retailers. "Evanston's housing stock should continue to offer buyers and renters a desirable range of choice in terms of style and price." (CGP, Ch. 3) This proposal only offers luxury units, no affordable housing on site.

MINORITY FINDINGS OF FACT WORKSHEET FOR THE 708 CHURCH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REQUEST

Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M

Date: December 19, 2007

Standards	notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Downtown Evanston should be an attractive, convenient, and economically vital center of diverse activity.” (CGP, Ch. 5) This proposal significantly reduces the number of local retailers who contribute to the character and economics of Evanston. Independent retailers spend more in their communities through the use of local lawyers, accountants, advertising agencies and their contributions to charities. Civic Economics’ Study of Andersonville notes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For every \$100 in consumer spending with a local firm, \$68 remains in the Chicago economy. • For every \$100 in consumer spending with a chain firm, \$43 remains in the Chicago economy. • For every square foot occupied by a local firm, local economic impact is \$179. • For every square foot occupied by a chain firm, local economic impact is \$105.
<p>ii) Land use intensity</p>	<p>The proposed land use exceeds FAR and height by excessive amounts. In the D2 zone, development allowances are only granted for up to 125 ft. but this proposal is for 523 ft. The maximum number of units in D2, with development allowances is 60, this proposal is for 218. The maximum FAR is 2.75, this proposal is for 15.77 FAR. Even if rezoned to D3, this proposal exceeds development allowances in excessive ways. With D3 allowances the total height is only 220 ft. and a FAR of 8.</p>
<p>iii) Housing</p>	<p>The proposed land use is compatible with the Zoning Ordinance. However, the proposed development only provides housing affordable to high-income households.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CGP recommends, “[E]ncourage proposals from the private sector that will maintain the supply of moderately priced housing, both rental and owner-occupied” (CGP, 27). A planned development including only luxury condominiums does not meet this recommendation.

MINORITY FINDINGS OF FACT WORKSHEET FOR THE 708 CHURCH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REQUEST

Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M

Date: December 19, 2007

Standards	notes
iv) Preservation	<p>The standard is not met. The proposed project is located in the downtown D2 traditional zone, connected by D2 to the north and south and providing a traditional corridor in the heart of downtown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The loss of 708 Church degrades the identity and character of Downtown and degrades the retail continuity presently achieved between the three historic buildings of Fountain Square, weakening the pedestrian orientation.• The proposed development weakens the landmark Hahn building: the continuity found by stepping upwards from 708 Church, to the Hahn building to the Fountain Square building, both visually and in terms of materials, will be eroded.• The Hahn building will be dwarfed and just a frail remnant of the what is now a strong vintage block.
v) Environmental concerns	<p>Environmental scientists have noted that the “greenest” buildings are those already standing, due to the amount of energy, waste and materials required to tear down buildings and build anew.</p>
vi) Traffic impact and parking	<p>According to the applicants’ traffic study, the project will not have a negative impact on traffic congestion and circulation. However the proposed building will have residential parking onsite which will produce the following negative impacts are noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The only entrance and egress to the building is located on a one-way street (Orrington). The number of cars concentrated in this portion of the City should be expected to increase due to this access point. <p>Traffic models do not identify patterns of traffic by day of the week. It can be expected that more traffic will be produced at the site on Saturdays and Sundays than currently since half of the site is composed of professional offices that are mostly closed on the weekend.</p> <p>Public Street parking will also be removed. 9 spaces on Orrington will be removed by this</p>

MINORITY FINDINGS OF FACT WORKSHEET FOR THE 708 CHURCH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REQUEST

Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M

Date: December 19, 2007

Standards	notes
	<p>development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This development also is providing fewer parking spaces than are required for this size of development. There are no provisions being made for parking as required for commercial and retail uses. There are also no guest parking spaces on-site.
<p>vii) Impact on schools, public services, and facilities</p>	<p>The proposed project will not have a negative impact on schools but will place an undue burden on public services and facilities. This proposal puts significant pressure on the public facilities and services of downtown, especially fire, sewer. See public works and fire dept. memos.</p>
<p>ix) Neighborhood planning; and</p>	<p>The standard is not met. The proposed structure replaces a character-giving retail/office building, displaces independent local retailers, and disrupts the pedestrian orientation of the area. The design of the proposed residential tower is more than twice as tall as all other buildings in Evanston, and is out of scale and context with Evanston’s downtown.</p> <p>Neighborhood Objectives and Policies/Actions, CGP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Preserve neighborhood character while supporting redevelopment efforts that add to neighborhood desirability.” (CGP, 21) This project removes significant neighborhood assets in terms of pedestrian scale, independent retail and character-giving architecture. “Encourage creative adaptive reuse of properties available for redevelopment using zoning standards and the Site Plan and Appearance Review process to protect historic character.” (CGP, 21) This standard is not met. “Encourage new developments to complement existing street and sidewalk patterns.” (CGP, 21) The height of the proposed building does not complement existing street patterns. “Work with community stakeholders in attracting and supporting businesses located in

MINORITY FINDINGS OF FACT WORKSHEET FOR THE 708 CHURCH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REQUEST

Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M

Date: December 19, 2007

Standards	notes
	<p>neighborhood business districts.” (CGP, 21) The destruction of 708 Church disrupts long-standing businesses in the downtown business district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Minimize the adverse effects of such circumstances as traffic and parking congestion or incompatible hours of operation as part of City technical assistance or zoning/site plan review of businesses and institutions proposing expansion or relocation to sites adjacent to residential areas.” (CGP, 21) The proposed building will add traffic and parking congestion. - “Continue assisting neighborhoods to recognize and preserve their own historically significant assets.” (CGP, 22) This proposal removes a significant historical asset.
<p>x) Conservation of the taxable value of land and buildings throughout the City, and retention of taxable land on tax rolls</p>	<p>The project is located in a tax increment financing district. It will have no visible impact on the City of Evanston’s tax rolls until 2019.</p>
<p>4) Each planned development shall be completed within two years of issuance of the special use permit for the planned development. If extensive or staged development is approved as part of the planned development however, the two-year requirement may be extended to provide for a more reasonable time schedule. The expanded time schedule shall be adopted as part of the planned development and so noted on the special use permit for the planned development.</p>	<p>In today’s real estate market, it is highly likely that the planned development will not be completed or even started within two years. With the state of the economy there is a strong possibility that the City of Evanston could have a half-completed building or an empty lot in the core of the city if the financing for the development is not completely stable after demolition or after construction has started. This would result in a substantial loss in revenue to the City.</p>
<p>No special use permit for a planned development shall be valid for a period longer than one year unless a building permit is issued and construction is actually begun within that period and is diligently pursued to completion. The City Council may, however, for good cause shown, without further hearing before the Plan Commission. The City Council may, at its sole discretion, place conditions on the extension in order to assure that the planned development is diligently pursued to its completion.</p>	
<p>6-11-1-10 (B) Site Controls and Standards for Downtown Planned Developments</p> <p>1) Walkways developed for a planned development shall form a logical, safe, and convenient system for pedestrian access to all project facilities and off-site destinations likely to attract substantial pedestrian traffic. Pedestrian ways shall not be</p>	<p>This standard is not met and creates a more hazardous pedestrian environment. The developer’s proposed streetscape enhancements does not significantly improve the public realm and weakens the pedestrian experience and connectivity to adjacent properties through</p>

MINORITY FINDINGS OF FACT WORKSHEET FOR THE 708 CHURCH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REQUEST

Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M

Date: December 19, 2007

Standards	notes
used by other automotive traffic.	its excessive height and loss of traditional qualities of the block.
2) Parking, loading and service amenities shall avoid adverse effects upon residential uses.	This standard is not met. The department of public works memo states: Five total loading berths are required as per the zoning analysis and two will be provided on the site. Therefore, when the two loading berths are occupied, other service trucks will need to use curb space or may double park. Trucks will need to back into the proposed two loading berths and will do so in the immediate vicinity of the exit ramp from the parking garage on the east side of Orrington Avenue.
3) Vehicular access shall provide minimum hazards to vehicular and pedestrian traffic	It creates a 55 foot curb cut on Orrington for the entrance and egress of vehicles for the building. Vehicles entering and exiting the building along a street that is lined with retail will create a hazardous pedestrian environment. It also disrupts the current street wall and pedestrian-friendly retail with a large gap.
4) The development shall provide for underground installation of utilities, if possible	City staff recommends underground utilities.
5) The proposal shall include a market feasibility statement	This standard is met.
6) For every planned development there shall be provided a traffic circulation impact study.	This standard is met.
§6-11-1-10 (C) Development Allowances for Downtown Developments	
1) The maximum height increase over that otherwise permitted in the downtown districts shall be as follows: (a) Twenty four feet (24'). D1 (b) Forty three feet (43'). D2 (c) Eighty five feet (85'). (For lots that exceed 95 feet in width a tower or towers	Even if the property is rezoned to D3 §6-11-4-8 establishes the maximum building height for residential properties within the D3 district as 85 feet. Building height (floors or stories) when 75% or more of the gross floor area is devoted to accessory parking decks, up to a maximum of 4 stories or 40', whichever is less, shall be excluded from the calculation of building height. §6-11-1-10 (C)1 provides for a maximum building height of 220' for residential planned developments. The applicant is proposing to construct a building with a defined maximum building height of 523' and requests an exception to a planned development site development allowance under §6-3-6-6 allowing this height.

MINORITY FINDINGS OF FACT WORKSHEET FOR THE 708 CHURCH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REQUEST

Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M

Date: December 19, 2007

Standards	notes
<p>D3 may be erected to a height of 220 feet, provided that the tower or towers above a height of 42 feet, shall be set back not less than 30 feet from any front lot line or side lot line abutting a street and 25 feet from an interior side lot line. Further, no tower shall be located less than 50 feet from any other tower located on the same lot.)</p> <p>(d) Forty feet (40'). D4</p> <p>Except in the D3 district, the height of any story of a building approved as a planned development pursuant to section 6-3-6 of this title may be excluded from the calculation of building height when seventy five percent (75%) or more of the gross floor area of such story consists of parking required for the building, excluding mechanical penthouse, however, in no case shall this exclusion be greater than four (4) stories or forty feet (40'), whichever is less.</p> <p>2).The maximum increase in floor area ratio over that otherwise permitted in the D2, D3 or D4 district shall be as follows:</p> <p>(a) 1.25. D 2</p> <p>(b) 3.5. D 3</p> <p>(c) 0.5 (0.6 when incorporating residential dwelling units). (Ord. 43-0-93) D 4</p>	<p>The grossly exaggerated height of the purposed planned development explodes the intent of the enumerated site development allowances in this section of the ordinance.</p> <p>§6-11-4-6 establishes a maximum permitted floor area ratio of 4.5 for buildings. §6-11-1-10 (C)2 provides for a maximum floor area ratio of 3.5 for residential planned developments. The applicant requests an exception to a planned development site development allowance under §6-3-6-6 to allow a defined zoning floor area ratio of approximately 15.77 or about 626,033 square feet.</p> <p>The grossly exaggerated FAR of the proposed planned development explodes the intent of the site development allowances enumerated in this section.</p>
<p>6-3-6-3: PUBLIC BENEFITS: The public benefits to the surrounding neighborhood and the City as a whole that are intended to be derived from the approval of planned developments, include, but</p>	<p>Few public benefits are provided by the developer. Significant public benefit is needed to approve site development allowances as large as proposed above.</p>

MINORITY FINDINGS OF FACT WORKSHEET FOR THE 708 CHURCH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REQUEST

Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M

Date: December 19, 2007

Standards	notes
are not limited to:	
(A) Preservation and enhancement of desirable site characteristics and open space.	No public benefit is provided. The current two-story low-rise building provides significant light to the surrounding streets. Both the current building and the proposed development fill the property lot line to lot line; however the current building does not fill the sky and allows for sunlight and a sense of openness.
(B) A pattern of development which preserves natural vegetation, topographic and geologic features.	Not applicable.
(C) Preservation and enhancement of historic and natural resources that significantly contribute to the character of the city.	This public benefit is not provided by the developer. The character-giving current 708 Church building will be demolished. The existing Hahn building is respected in this proposal however it is already protected under local preservation ordinances and was not at risk for redevelopment.
(D) Use of design, landscape, or architectural features to create a pleasing environment or other special development features.	This public benefit is not provided by the developer. The majority of landscaping will occur in an area above the base that will only be viewed by and be accessible to the residents of the building.
(E) Provision of a variety of housing types in accordance with the city's housing goals.	This public benefit is not provided by the developer. The development will only provide luxury condominiums that will increase the City's current abundant inventory of available condominium units. These housing units are also only affordable to high-income individuals. One of the primary purposes of the affordable housing ordinance is the integration of people from various socio-economic groups. The proposed development does not accomplish that goal, rather it perpetuates the stratification of economic classes.

MINORITY FINDINGS OF FACT WORKSHEET FOR THE 708 CHURCH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REQUEST

Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M

Date: December 19, 2007

Standards	notes
(F) Elimination of blighted structures or incompatible uses through redevelopment or rehabilitation.	This public benefit is not provided by the developer. The existing structure is not blighted or an incompatible use. Conversely, it is a well-functioning building occupied by more than 100 businesspeople.
(G) Business, commercial, and manufacturing development to enhance the local economy and strengthen the tax base.	<p>This public benefit is not provided by the developer. There is no additional business, commercial, or manufacturing development being brought about through this development. Rather businesses will be displaced by this and 22,000 square feet of commercial space will be removed from downtown. The development team has publicly stated that there will be no net gain in retail space.</p> <p>All development is located in a TIF. Additional taxes will not be available to the City of Evanston until 2019. City services may need to be increased to handle this additional service area, particularly note the fire department's concerns with a building of this height.</p>
(H) The efficient use of the land resulting in more economic networks of utilities, streets, schools, public grounds, buildings, and other facilities. (Ord. 43	The proposed planned development will result in increased strain on utilities and streets, thus undermining an existing public benefit. As stated in the public works memo the development team has not adequately provided information regarding their infrastructure plans, therefore the full impact cannot be ascertained at this time.
(I) LEED Certification	It is unknown whether this standard will be met. The developers state they will try to attain LEED silver certification but such certification cannot be guaranteed.

MINORITY FINDINGS OF FACT WORKSHEET FOR THE 708 CHURCH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REQUEST

Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M

Date: December 19, 2007

FINDINGS IN SITE DEVELOPMENT ALLOWANCES WORKSHEET FOR 708 CHURCH

6-3-6-5: SITE DEVELOPMENT ALLOWANCES:

Subject to the specific standards and limitations established for planned developments in each zoning district, the plan commission may recommend approval of, and the city council may grant, site development allowances for a planned development relative to the following features affecting bulk and density:

(A) **Floor Area Ratio:** The overall floor area ratio of a planned development may exceed the maximum floor area ratio otherwise permitted in the zoning district.

Significant public benefit is needed to approve site development allowances as large as proposed. The applicant requests the authority to exceed this planned development allowance. §6-11-3-7 establishes a maximum permitted floor area ratio of 2.75 for buildings. The applicant requests an exception for a floor area ratio of approximately 15.77 or about 626,033 square feet.

(B) **Height:** The maximum height permitted in the zoning districts may be increased in connection with a planned development.

Significant public benefit is needed to approve site development allowances as large as proposed. The applicant requests the authority to exceed this planned development allowance. §6-11-3-9 establishes the maximum building height for residential properties within the D2 district as 42 feet. Building height (floors or stories) when 75% or more of the gross floor area is devoted to accessory parking decks, up to a maximum of 4 stories or 40', whichever is less, shall be excluded from the calculation of building height. §6-11-1-10 (C)1 provides for a maximum building height of 43ft. for residential planned developments. This totals 125 ft. of allowable height. The applicant is proposing to construct a building with a defined maximum building height of 523'.

MINORITY FINDINGS OF FACT WORKSHEET FOR THE 708 CHURCH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REQUEST

Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M

Date: December 19, 2007

(C) **Location And Placement Of Buildings:** The location and placement of buildings may vary from the requirements of the underlying regulations, provided, however, that such allowances are in harmony with surrounding development.

No public benefit is provided by the developer. Significant public benefit is needed to approve site development allowances as large as proposed. The applicant requests a planned development site development allowance.

§6-11-1-4 establishes ziggurat setbacks for properties within downtown zoning districts abutting certain streets. The applicant requests a site development allowance under §6-3-6-5 (C) from the required 40' ziggurat setback from the Church Street, Sherman Avenue, and Orrington Avenue lot lines for the portion of the building greater than 42' in height.

(D) **Off Street Parking And Loading:** The number and location of off street parking and loading may vary from the requirements of this ordinance.

No public benefit is provided by the developer. Significant public benefit is needed to approve site development allowances as large as proposed. The applicant requests a planned development site development allowance.

Table 16-B in §6-16-3-5 establishes the minimum off-street parking spaces for principal structures. The proposed project (assuming non-residential uses as retail and a residential unit mix of 70 1-bedroom units, 94 2-bedroom units, and 54 3-bedroom units) requires a total of 396 off-street parking spaces. The applicant requests a site development allowance under §6-3-6-5 (D) to allow the provision of a total of 234 off-street parking spaces.

§6-16-4 establishes the minimum number of off-street loading berths for principal structures. The proposed project requires three short loading berths for the residential uses and two long loading berths for the retail/office uses (assuming all such uses as retail uses). The applicant requests a site development allowance under §6-3-6-5 (D) to provide a total of two long loading berths on the subject property.

(E) **Number Of Dwelling Units:** Increases may be granted in the number of dwelling units per lot area over that otherwise permitted in the underlying zoning district as an incentive for providing the benefits of a planned development.

No public benefit is provided by the developer. Significant public benefit is needed to approve site development allowances as large as proposed. The applicant requests a planned development site development allowance.

§6-11-3-5 establishes a minimum lot size, for Residential use, that shall at no time be less than 5,000 square feet, and the minimum lot size per dwelling unit in the D2 district shall at no time be less than 400 sq. ft. The subject property is approximately 29,024 square feet in size,

MINORITY FINDINGS OF FACT WORKSHEET FOR THE 708 CHURCH PLANNED DEVELOPMENT REQUEST

Case No. ZPC 07-04-PD&M

Date: December 19, 2007

yielding a maximum of 96 dwellings units. The applicant requests a site development allowance under §6-3-6-5 (E) to allow 218 dwelling units on the subject property.

(F) **Building Lot Coverage:** Increase may be granted in the maximum building lot coverage over that otherwise permitted in the underlying zoning district as an incentive for providing the benefits of a planned development. Not applicable

(G) **Impervious Surface Coverage:** Increase may be granted in the maximum allowed impervious surface coverage over that otherwise permitted in the underlying zoning district as an incentive for providing the benefits of a planned development. Not applicable

6-3-6-6: AUTHORITY TO EXCEED SITE DEVELOPMENT ALLOWANCES:

The city council may, upon the recommendation of the plan commission, approve a modification to a site development allowance in excess of that established in a zoning district, provided the city council shall first make a written finding of fact that the modification is essential to achieve one or more of the public benefits described in section [6-3-6-3](#) of this chapter. Approval of the modification shall require a favorable vote of two-thirds (2/3) of the aldermen elected to the city council. (Ord. 43-0-93)

The 6-3-6-6 “loophole” in the Zoning Code has been the subject of a great deal of criticism, both from the public and the consultants hired to draft a new Downtown Plan. In view of the lack of significant public benefit generated by the proposed planned development, Council is urged not to invoke 6-3-6-6

Fire Department Memo
December 11, 2007

Fire Safety at the proposed 708 Church St Tower

(Information provided by Fire Chief Berkowsky, delivered to Plan Commission Dec. 11, 2007)

For very tall buildings, such as the proposed tower at 708 Church St, firefighting on upper stories depends upon redundancies of the systems within the building to support firefighting operations. An aerial ladder's (105 foot) effectiveness is limited to the 7th floor of any building. The most critical component is firefighters for a high-rise incident. The number of firefighters available to respond to the onset of a high-rise fire will have the greatest impact in the mitigation of the event. In Chicago, their initial response to a high-rise incident is 61 firefighters. In Evanston, the most we can send on the initial response is 26 firefighters on any given day.

A working elevator is critical. Standard elevators typically fail within 20 minutes of a working structure fire. A new device called a "robust elevator" has been developed for the fire service, and the Evanston Fire Department requests that the building include this type of facility to increase the probability that upper story fires can be reached safely by fire department personnel.

Also critically important is that both water and power are at hand if such an event were to occur. This can be assisted by providing redundancy in the building's water and power systems, and by providing "zone pumps" throughout the building. The Fire Department also requests that there be sufficient redundancy in water and power systems, as well as zone pumps, specified in the building's design.

Preservation Commission April 20, 2007 Building
Survey Preliminary Report
and
Email from Preservation Coordinator Carlos Ruiz

EVANSTON PRESERVATION COMMISSION

PRELIMINARY REPORT

Downtown Building Survey

The Commission discussed a list of 25 downtown buildings that were identified for potential landmark nomination consideration within the new proposed Evanston downtown boundaries the Plan Commission's Downtown Plan Sub-Committee is currently developing. These buildings were initially identified by teams of two Commissioners and the Preservation Coordinator through a walking survey of the downtown at the request from the Downtown Plan Sub-Committee.

The Commission used the following ranking: 1 -10 (1= least likely to meet the standards; 10 = most likely to meet the standards for landmark designation)

Buildings with a 7 or above ranking should be considered for landmark nomination. **Buildings with a ranking below 7 and with an (*) will be discussed for further consideration. These buildings may have historic or cultural significance or may provide the desired physical context and character within the downtown.**

Ranking Results		Condition	
1.	1520 Chicago	7.0	Good
2.	1605-1617 Chicago	8.1	Good
3.	1728-30 Chicago	[N/R] (*)	Good
4.	1732 Chicago	9.0	Good
5.	708 Church	4.9 (*)	Fair
6.	820 Church	7.6	Very Good
7.	722-726 Clark	7.0	Very Good
8.	518-526 Davis	6.9 (*)	Fair
9.	915 Davis	8.5	Fair
10.	1000 Davis	7.4	Good
11.	1000 Grove	7.1	Good
12.	1840 Oak	5.5 (*)	Good
13.	1603 Orrington	6.4 (*)	Very Good
14.	1700-1714 Orrington	6.4 (*)	Good
15.	1745 Orrington	9.1	Good
16.	1549-1555 Sherman (627 Grove)	6.5 (*)	Good
17.	1706-1710 Sherman	6.3 (*)	Good
18.	1712-1722 Sherman	6.8 (*)	Good
19.	1729-1745 Sherman	7.6	Very Good
20.	1740 Sherman	[N/R]	Good

NOTE: 1730 Chicago Avenue is the Administration Building for the Woman's Christian Temperance Union listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 2002.

From: "Ruiz, Carlos" <CRuiz@cityofevanston.org>
Date: December 18, 2007 11:55:28 AM CST
To: "Robin Schuldenfrei" <schul@fas.harvard.edu>
Subject: RE: Downtown Plan: 2006 landmark survey

Robin:

The Commission has not discussed this in a while. I do not have an answer for you at this time.

Carlos D. Ruiz
Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator
City of Evanston, IL
847-866-2928

-----Original Message-----

From: Robin Schuldenfrei [mailto:schul@fas.harvard.edu]
Sent: Monday, December 17, 2007 7:53 PM
To: Ruiz, Carlos
Subject: Re: Downtown Plan: 2006 landmark survey

Thanks! When do you expect that the Preservation Commission will take the second look?

Best wishes,
Robin

On Dec 17, 2007, at 2:17 PM, Ruiz, Carlos wrote:

Robin:

I attached the April 20, 2007 Building Survey Preliminary Report. The Preservation Commission has not taken a second look at those buildings marked with (*) yet.

Carlos D. Ruiz
Senior Planner/Preservation Coordinator
City of Evanston, IL
847-866-2928

Public Works Memo

II. GUIDELINES FOR SITE PLANNING

- ✓ A. Landscaping
- n/a B. Requirements for Parking Lots
- ✓ C. Circulation
- ✓ D. Public Art
 - **Potential for public art at street level.**
 - **The edifice itself, being iconic by its placement and height, could potentially be considered public art.**

LEGEND: ✓ Meets Guideline X Does Not Meet Guideline n/a Does Not Apply

NOTE: The 2006 Design Guidelines for Planned Developments are available online at: <http://www.cityofevanston.org/plancommission>

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

The Public Works Department has completed a review of the Planned Development Application dated June 29, 2007 for the Fountain Square Development project and we offer the following comments:

1. Water & Sewer

The size of the proposed water and sewer services are not provided. This information is required to determine which water and sewer mains these services will be directed to. For example, the Lower Level Plan (A100) indicates that the proposed mechanical room will be along Sherman Avenue. Sherman Avenue is served by a 6-inch diameter water main whereas both Church Street and Orrington Avenue have 12-inch water mains. Depending on the size of the water service needed for the development, connecting to the 6-inch water main on Sherman may not be an option. Also, we anticipate that based on the size of the new sewer service, it will need to discharge to the 84-inch diameter MWRD sewer on Orrington Avenue instead of the 15-inch combined sewer on Sherman Avenue.

The applicant needs to be aware that the MWRD plans to rehabilitate their 84-inch diameter sewer on Orrington Avenue in 2009 (probably between January and March 2009). As part of this project, one of their major work sites is on Orrington Avenue just south of Church Street, adjacent to the proposed development site. The MWRD will need to stage on Orrington Avenue taking the parking spaces and all but the eastern-most northbound traffic lane on Orrington Avenue to complete the work.

The water meter and RPZ on the fire line must be within 2 feet of where the water service enters the building.

The applicant needs to submit calculations in support of the proposed storm water detention vault. It is unclear if a credit will be sought for the proposed permeable green areas on the sixth floor roof.

Any plans to re-configure Fountain Square should consider the potential need to re-route the City's 15-inch combined sewer on Sherman Avenue that is located under the fountain area.

2. Street and Sidewalks

The plans do not indicate where existing water and sewer services are to be disconnected. This information is required to determine the extent of the required pavement restoration. Public Works reserves the right to require additional paving (than what is depicted in the PD application) to cover the impacts of utility service cuts in the public way.

It appears there is a reduction in the number of trees in the sidewalk. The proposed removal, replacement and spacing of trees in the public way should be reviewed and approved by the City Arborist.

The plans do not include a proposed street lighting plan. There is currently Tallmadge and Davit lighting in the public way adjacent to the development site.

It is recommended that city-standard bike racks be installed at locations to be identified in coordination with the City's traffic engineer and the ongoing development of the City's downtown bike rack plan.

The curbing on Church Street should be removed and replaced with the streetscape work as proposed for both Sherman and Orrington Avenue.

The sidewalk pavers should be carried across the proposed driveway on Orrington Avenue with an 8-inch concrete base.

With the elimination of the driveway on Sherman Avenue, the sidewalk and curbing must be restored to original grade.

A streetscape plan should be submitted that provides elevations (back of sidewalk, top of curb, gutter, etc.), sidewalk cross-slopes, sidewalk cross sections every 25-feet as well as proposed location and specifications for street lighting, planters, trees, signs, traffic signals, parking meters, bike racks, ADA-ramps, etc. The streetscape plan should be in conformance with the downtown streetscape design for the special service district and/or as modified with City approval.

No civil plans have been provided for Option B.

3. Traffic and Parking

It appears that there will be a net reduction in on-street metered parking of 6 spaces (9 eliminated on Orrington Avenue with 3 additional provided on Sherman Avenue). A reimbursement cost for the lost revenue associated with the space reduction will be calculated by Parking Systems.

Five total loading berths are required as per the zoning analysis and two will be provided on site. Therefore, when the two loading berths are occupied, other service trucks will need to use curb space or may double park. Trucks will need to back in to the proposed two loading berths and will do so in the immediate vicinity of the exit ramp from the parking garage on the east side of Orrington Avenue. It is recommended that flaggers be required for all truck deliveries and pick-ups using these berths.

The applicant should provide turn template diagrams demonstrating that trucks can safely access the proposed loading berths.

The City is in the process of hiring a consultant to update its Downtown Traffic Model to (2007) existing conditions and to forecast future conditions based on approved development projects. A model run will also be prepared to include the 708 Church Street development to assess its traffic impacts. The work is expected to be completed by early October.

4. Streets & Sanitation

Trash must be stored and covered for pick up within the development and not on the public way.

FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION

Staff recommends that the Plan Commission consider the following staff observations when evaluating the proposed redevelopment for this site:

- a. The height of the structure should be further examined in light of data provided by a shadow study. A wind study would be recommended as well.
- b. The ability of fire fighting equipment (pumps especially) to reach the upper portions of the tower is a significant concern of the Fire Department staff.
- c. Fire Department staff recommend that the developer consider the integration of a firefighter service elevator – details can be sent by the Fire Department.

If it acts favorably, the Plan Commission may wish to consider the following conditions on the requested variation:

- a. Development and use of the subject property shall be in substantial compliance with all applicable legislation, with the testimony and representations of the applicant, and with the approved plans and documents on file in this case.

Attachment A. Public Notice

Attachment B. Site Plan and Appearance Review Committee Minute

Downtown Planning Process Summer 2007
Visioning Results

1. What do you see as downtown's greatest problems or challenges? Perhaps you'd like to express it as downtown's greatest need?

More family units under \$100,000/yr (affordable); not enough children downtown

Need for mixed-income (middle or low) housing (rental)

Lack of affordable housing

Requiring affordable housing might keep downtown too residential

there is a real need for affordable housing

not enough affordable housing downtown

not enough rental units downtown

all new residential construction is too expensive, catered to single:

service workers downtown cannot afford to live downtown

low wage workers are evanstonians too and should be able to live downtown where they work

are we only building downtown housing for the very wealthy?

no affordable housing downtown

where do our firemen, policemen, city workers live? They can't afford downtown

include affordable housing downtown

Loss of architectural character

Architectural heterogeneity, no design, hodgepodge, no dead space

Poor aesthetics for new construction

Lack of architectural excitement

Too much concrete used as building materials

Large concrete expanses: Optima towers w. façade, theater e. façade, Sherman Plaza painted concrete tower

Some buildings are appalling

Character is out of context

Aesthetics

Need for visual beauty and consistency of character, unlike Soldier Field

Preserve existing architecture

Architectural standards in the CBD are horrible

Require better architecture

Require better materials

Site plan appearance review committee needs more authority

not into the red orange yellow balconies

no architectural cohesiveness

step back definitely needed for 50 stories

more diversity of materials in new buildings, not concrete glass

non context sensitive development is changing the character of downtown

better architecture, more traditional

higher architectural standards

Concern re: more highrises: wind, light, blocked views, canyon effect, too concentrated

Issues of scale: mini-Chicago

Vancouverism: spread out the height

Proposed high rise: each one taller than the rest

Buildings too big

Concerned about the 2 huge buildings

Need height restrictions

Scale

Height, context and scale

High rise canyon effect

Height

Evanston is losing personality

Projects not relating

Primary Issue

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Secondary Issue

Family friendly

Fiscal Impacts/taxes

Residential

Residential

Residential

Residential

Building scale/height

Historic Preservation

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Density

Historic Preservation

Architecture

14

23

1. What do you see as downtown's greatest problems or challenges? Perhaps you'd like to express it as downtown's greatest need?

More family units under \$100,000/yr (affordable); not enough children downtown

Need for mixed-income (middle or low) housing (rental)

Lack of affordable housing

Requiring affordable housing might keep downtown too residential

there is a real need for affordable housing

not enough affordable housing downtown

not enough rental units downtown

all new residential construction is too expensive, catered to single:

service workers downtown cannot afford to live downtown

low wage workers are evanstonians too and should be able to live downtown where they work

are we only building downtown housing for the very wealthy?

no affordable housing downtown

where do our firemen, policemen, city workers live? They can't afford downtown

include affordable housing downtown

Loss of architectural character

Architectural heterogeneity, no design, hodgepodge, no dead space

Poor aesthetics for new construction

Lack of architectural excitement

Too much concrete used as building materials

Large concrete expanses: Optima towers w. façade, theater e. façade, Sherman Plaza painted concrete tower

Some buildings are appalling

Character is out of context

Aesthetics

Need for visual beauty and consistency of character, unlike Soldier Field

Preserve existing architecture

Architectural standards in the CBD are horrible

Require better architecture

Require better materials

Site plan appearance review committee needs more authority

not into the red orange yellow balconies

no architectural cohesiveness

step back definitely needed for 50 stories

more diversity of materials in new buildings, not concrete glass

non context sensitive development is changing the character of downtown

better architecture, more traditional

higher architectural standards

Concern re: more highrises: wind, light, blocked views, canyon effect, too concentrated

Issues of scale: mini-Chicago

Vancouverism: spread out the height

Proposed high rise: each one taller than the rest

Buildings too big

Concerned about the 2 huge buildings

Need height restrictions

Scale

Height, context and scale

High rise canyon effect

Height

Evanston is losing personality

Projects not relating

Primary Issue

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Affordable housing

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Architecture

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Secondary Issue

Family friendly

Fiscal Impacts/taxes

Residential

Residential

Residential

Residential

Building scale/height

Historic Preservation

Building scale/height

Building scale/height

Density

Historic Preservation

Architecture

14

23

don't want to lose balance between old time stores and new chains:	Retail		
affordable retail affects character	Retail	Local businesses	
too much retail was lost	Retail		
too many vacancies not filling, borders	Retail		
need a regular grocery store downtown, jewel or dominicks	Retail		
lack of everyday items to buy	Retail		
why are there retail vacancies	Retail		
downtown vacancies, turnover	Retail		
need more diverse retail	Retail		
Stores teens would like to see: Foot Locker, Nickel City, Dave & Busters, ESPN Zone, Guitar Cente	Retail	Vibrancy	43
Too many restaurants	Relaurants/entertainment		
Slightly unfriendly at night	Safety		
Too much crime	Safety		
Access for the disabled	Safety	Pedestrian/cyclist amenities	
Cobble stone sidewalks are not good for women in high heel shoes:	Safety	Pedestrian/cyclist amenities	
Brick sidewalk maintenance	Safety	Maintenance	
sidewalks - needs of the disabled	Safety	Pedestrian/cyclist amenities	
not handicap accessible	Safety	Pedestrian/cyclist amenities	
brick sidewalks are bad for women in high heels	Safety	Pedestrian/cyclist amenities	
Traffic is a problem	Traffic		
Too much traffic with new projects	Traffic		
New development should not add to traffic	Traffic		
Lulu's causes more traffic than Sherman Evanstor	Traffic	Residential	
More accessibility and convenience, especially cars	Traffic	Parking	
Traffic impacts of new construction	Traffic	Density	
Traffic congestion	Traffic		
Traffic congestion	Traffic		
walk downtown because congested, parking	Traffic	Pedestrian/cyclist amenities	
new condo owners still have cars	Traffic	Residential	
traffic	Traffic		
traffic = awful	Traffic		
need easy public transportation in town (downtown shuttle,	Traffic	Transit	
individual cars	Traffic	Parking	
traffic gridlock	Traffic		
developers are not addressing traffic	Traffic		
traffic congestion	Traffic		
evening rush hour congestion	Traffic		
Downtown free trolley	Transit		
Bus service is too sparse	Transit		
need to start using public transit vs. cars	Transit		
Downtown should be open/active later at night: stores, restaurants, closing earlier than norma	Vibrancy		
Missing outdoor dining	Vibrancy		
Missed creative opportunities	Vibrancy	Architecture	
Library needs more books	Vibrancy		
Public art	Vibrancy		
challenge is the balancing act	Vibrancy		
"coming from manhattan, everything looks empty to me, used to a lot of people, not wanting to become that but want small, independent retailers to thrive	Vibrancy	Retail	
loss of charm	Vibrancy		
lack of teen friendly spaces downtown ie theatre district activity disturbs adjacent residences = frequent complaints to polic	Vibrancy		
not resident friendly	Vibrancy	Local businesses	

whole area feels "anti-teen"
everything geared toward NU students
Not a lot to do, no where to hang out without being hassled by cops
The city created a dog park and dog beach, but teens are on their own
Need rec center for 13-18 yr olds.
Computer lab with access to MSWord
More cultural events, e.g., poetry slams, karaoke, dancing
City needs to host a carnival like Morton Grove
Students should get discounts on rec activities; most ETHS parents can't afford fee-based program:

Vibrancy
Vibrancy
Vibrancy
Vibrancy
Vibrancy
Vibrancy
Vibrancy
Vibrancy

Restaurants/Entertainment