

Jeffrey P. Smith
T 847.492.1665
M 312.952.6501
jeff@jefflaw.com

August 13, 2025

Land Use Commission
2100 Ridge Ave.
Evanston, IL 60201

Re: Planned Development | 601-603 and 605-615 Davis St. & 1604-1608
Chicago Ave. | 25PLND-0019

Commissioners:

I plan to appear at tonight's meeting as counsel to present, if necessary, the objection lodged by at least one of the residents granted a continuance at the last Commission meeting on the above item, Mr. Miszkowicz. However, I have also been approached by and am aware of other residents who have objections but who for multiple reasons have been compromised in their rights by a number of actions creating confusion, and *for that reason I urge further continuance*:

1. The Commission incorrectly narrowed continuance rights. All that the City Zoning Code requires is that an objector be an "eligible property owner" who wishes "to object" and that that objector make a "written request." The only "purpose" required is spelled out in the Code in very general terms: "the purpose of presenting evidence to rebut testimony given by the applicant." Ev. Code Ord. 6-3-6-11.

For years it was common practice that the proponent before the ZBA make their case in chief at an initial meeting, which is often the first time that voluminous materials are available, on only a few days' notice; anyone objecting and requesting a continuance would be granted a reasonable amount of time to prepare their response. Even the requirement that that request be in writing was not always the case. Continuances were routinely granted, including on much smaller projects.

An LUC Rule overlays an additional requirement of specificity not found in the Code, creating a conflict between the plain language of the Code and the Rules. But where there is a conflict the Code governs. The LUC Rules cannot narrow rights granted by the zoning code.

This is especially true given that in zoning cases a resident may cross-examine a proponent witness. In few if any contexts of adversarial procedure in America is a party required to tell the other side in advance the subject of their cross-examination. Anything presented in the case-in-chief is fair game.

So it was error to deny written requests for continuance from residents who wished to object; understandable error, but error nonetheless.

Best practice going forward would be to remove from the LUC rules the conflicting language, and to promulgate a simple form for request of a continuance. Like a witness slip for testimony before a State legislative committee, a simple checkbox indicating that the resident wishes to object should be all that is required, altho an *optional* text box to indicate the nature of the objection or the subject matter could be offered.

I understand some objectors were offered on Friday chance to present tonight, but this raises other problems, as follows.

2. Insufficient preparation time. In legal briefing, 28-30 days is probably the standard time to respond to a pleading or motion, except in emergency matters (which a planned development never is). A resident who was told on July 23 that he or she would **not** be allowed to present on Aug. 13 almost assuredly did not spend the interim preparing testimony or evidence or cross-examination. Some objectors may not even have been informed.

Those resident-objectors who have now been told that they may present tonight were prejudiced by the off-again-on-again info. They should be granted at least 21 days to prepare. Also, all objectors should present at the same meeting. This will all result in a cleaner record.

3. Improper continuance. The Commission granted a continuance to a resident who may not be an eligible property owner and who does not wish to object, but to weigh in in *support* of the applicant's project. This is improper.

The rhythm of due process is familiar to all litigators, administrative procedure practitioners, and anyone familiar with debate: a proponent makes their case; the other side gets to respond; the proponent gets to rebut.

Letting advocates of an application argue or present during objectors' case-in-chief disrupts and dilutes the objectors' chance to present their own position, subverting fair hearing. More to the point, the Code at 6-3-6-11 allows a continuance only for those who wish to "object," on the common sense assumption that a project proponent already has the advantage of going first and last and is well-equipped to make their case without outside assistance.

4. Unclear and insufficient time limits on presentations. Having watched the video I am unclear how anyone can properly prepare for a presentation because time limits ranging from three minutes (which is wholly insufficient) to ten minutes were mentioned. Should an adverse witness be called, that witness's answer(s) to even one or two questions might easily consume more than the time allotted.

The package on this project in the packet for the 7/23 meeting is over 600 pages. Staff weighs in with pages of report. Approximately 90 minutes was allotted for the applicant's presentation, which was allowed to be delivered in normal conversational tone. Nearly another 200 pages including a dense traffic study were made public only three business days ago.

Any objector on a project of this magnitude with a packet of this size should have at least 10 minutes as a matter of course, with more granted if it would aid the Commission in

understanding an issue. One party in an adversarial proceeding should not be forced into the embarrassing exercise of delivering testimony in machine-gun staccato.

5. New material. Developer's case-in-chief was closed on July 23. However, on Friday, Aug. 8, substantial new material was submitted by the applicant, over 250 pages of extremely dense spreadsheet and argument on two of the issues typically most heated in urban planned development, parking and traffic. While labeled "updated material" in the packet, it is new material for residents.

This new material now before the Commission and the public in effect re-opens applicant's case. Neighbors, residents and potential objectors have had insufficient time to process a textbook-sized volume of pages and data and cannot be expected to develop testimony or evidence in opposition in the short time since its release.

Summary. Basic constitutional principles of fairness embodied in longstanding federal and state case law require due process in zoning. Protection of existing property-owners against unfair encroachment *is* a fundamental purpose of zoning. The Illinois Municipal Zoning Code reinforces this, admonishing that *the principles of substantive and procedural due process apply at all stages of the decision-making of all zoning decisions.* 65 ILCS 5/11-13-15(b). This remains true regardless of the judicial standard of review. Among other things, this means that interested parties, and especially neighboring residents, are entitled to meaningful notice, and the right to meaningful participation, which includes being able to lodge objections, the right to confront and examine the proponent witnesses, and to put on their own evidence, and the right to fair hearing before decision-makers who will hold the proponent to a burden of proof and who will apply the law fairly, without bias.

This is not an ordinary application. ***This application is for what would become the tallest building in Evanston***, fronting on a stretch of Davis Street that at lot line is predominantly traditional vintage and historic commercial buildings averaging only a few stories. Yet the project adds to a Church-Chicago-Davis-Orrington block that already has more bulk and mass than any other. The multiple allowances requested virtually explode existing zoning.

The bulk of both of the project and the application materials warrant an extension of objector response to an LUC meeting three or more weeks from tonight. There is a community consensus that the currently vacant lot and unused drive-through be re-developed, so it is in the interest of the entire City that the process be free from procedural question marks.

Very truly yours,



Jeffrey P. Smith
Attorney at Law

Timestamp	Email Address	First name	Last name	Street Address	Unit number	Comments or questions for the Downtown Evanston
7/29/2025 13:52:07	bernard.reilly363@gmail	Bernard	Reilly	1500 Hinman Avenue	304	
7/30/2025 8:50:57	bruce.baumberger@gmail	Bruce	Baumberger	807 Davis St.	Unit 1009	
7/30/2025 8:52:21	manraylog@aol.com	jeff	forgash	1580 Sherman Ave	PH01	
7/30/2025 8:57:59	lynnesered@gmail.com	Lynne	Sered	807 Davis St	409	
7/30/2025 8:59:29	mahwww@me.com	Michael	Horvich	807 Davis St #415	415	Don't do it!
7/30/2025 9:16:25	Mark@the-severins.com	Mark	Severin	807 Davis St.	1405	I would welcome a building on this block but this i
7/30/2025 9:38:39	sbkdevelopment@gmail	Susan	Barrett-Kelly	1640 Maple	Unit 1608	I am not opposed to more housing in downtown E
7/30/2025 9:40:34	bursztyn@sbcglobal.net	Harriet	Bursztyn	1500 Oak Avenue	2D	
7/30/2025 9:44:28	tat2chicago@gmail.com	Tracy	Teweles	1501 Hinman Ave	8B	This is an inappropriate neighborhood for such a t
7/30/2025 9:46:12	diane456@gmail.com	Diane	Petersmarck	1860 Sherman Ave	1SW	This is NOT the Evanston I love!
7/30/2025 9:54:49	gjmagrisso@aol.com	Gwendy	Magrisso	1570 Elmwood Ave, 804	804	
7/30/2025 9:55:11	lee.schwartz@gmail.com	Lee	Schwartz	1640 Maple Ave	Apt. 1406	I have been at the meetings and agree with the po
7/30/2025 10:05:58	kane4119@gmail.com	Scott	Lewis	1500 Hinman Ave	202	
7/30/2025 10:12:27	yoshisma3@gmail.com	Ann	Silberman	1720 Maple Ave	2320	The construction and resulting traffic pollution (id
7/30/2025 10:18:41	cliffsaper@gmail.com	Cliff	Saper	1640 Maple Avenue	1602	
7/30/2025 10:21:48	ssweininger@gmail.com	Susan	Weininger	425 Grove St	3D	
7/30/2025 10:36:58	slv7enterprises@earthli	Sharon	Vuinovich	807 Davis Street	706	Follow the rules just as you would make residents
7/30/2025 10:40:26	mhminnis07@comcast.i	Margaret	Minnis	1500 Hinman Ave	603	Follow the rules.
7/30/2025 10:41:36	bshaw1057@gmail.com	Robert	Shaw	1580 SHERMAN AVE AF	304	
7/30/2025 10:42:32	amweatherhead@gmail.	Ann	Weatherhead	807 Davis St Unit 1009	Unit 1009	
7/30/2025 10:58:07	steveblanc@blanctax.cc	Steve	Blanc	1501 Hinman Avenue	5A	Absolutely ridiculous - why have zoning restriction
7/30/2025 11:05:55	borgjoan@gmail.com	joan	borg	1500 hinman Ave	101	
7/30/2025 11:06:11	glvictor@gmail.com	Gayle	Victor	800 Elgin Road	1409	
7/30/2025 11:15:17	ddadler@umich.edu	Dorit	Adler	1720 Maple Ave	1510	Please retain the beauty and uniqueness of downt We don't want to become a mini Chicago!! Work
7/30/2025 11:21:45	jenniferkfisher@icloud.c	Jennifer	Fisher	1630 Chicago Ave, 2210	2210	This building proposal appears to be in violation o
7/30/2025 11:38:28	bjorn101812@gmail.com	Carl	Bjorncrantz	1501 Hinman Ave	8A	A 31-story building in downtown Evanston violates
7/30/2025 11:41:22	mgordon8020@gmail.cc	Margie	Gordon	807 Davis St	2001	The Davis St block between Chicago Av and Orrin
7/30/2025 11:49:56	docbob@mac.com	Robert	Mark	800 Elgin Rd	512	Is it possible to not just reduce the proposed build

Timestamp	Email Address	First name	Last name	Street Address	Unit number	Comments or questions for the Downtown Evanston
7/30/2025 11:50:38	mw@msw1115.com	Michael	Weininger	425 grove	3D	
7/30/2025 11:51:27	nicolewahlert@gmail.co	Nicole	Wahlert	425 Grove Street #2C	2C	Downtown Evanston is already congested. Another
7/30/2025 12:05:38	sharonvuff@gmail.com	Sharon	Heller	800 Elgin Rd	1208	NO! We need to return Evanston to an area of bou
7/30/2025 12:09:51	cbbster@gmail.com	Chris	De Brauw	1501 Hinman Ave	8B	
7/30/2025 12:15:43	liz.schaller6@gmail.com	Elizabeth	Schaller	1630 Chicago Avenue	2305	I fully support this petition. I note that drawings pr
7/30/2025 12:18:28	claire.price@att.net	Mary C	Price	800 Elgin Rd	1410	
7/30/2025 12:49:18	rsabrams52@gmail.com	Richard	Abrams	806 Davis	514	Follow the law
7/30/2025 12:51:20	rogers2dan@gmail.com	Daniel	Rogers	1580 Sherman Avenue	510	
7/30/2025 13:45:30	lt901@yahoo.com	Lester	Ascher	807 Davis St.	1408	
7/30/2025 14:06:14	kcmcardle@gmail.com	Kay	McArdle	800 Elgin Rd	1201	
7/30/2025 14:11:47	amymatteoni@sbcglobe	Amy	Matteoni	1580 Sherman Avenue	1109	Has a noise, traffic congestion, wind tunnel and sh
7/30/2025 14:18:34	janisbattle46@gmail.com	Janis	Battle	459 Davis St, Evanston	#1052	
7/30/2025 14:27:29	barbaraputtq@gmail.com	Barbara	Putta	1720 Maple Ave	2380	While I'd be delighted to have more permanent res
7/30/2025 15:09:51	judywsegal@gmail.com	Judith	Segal	800 Elgin Road, Evansto	1603	
7/30/2025 15:30:51	janebeller0@gmail.com	Jane	Beller	425 Grove Street	8D	Building is too big, too high, too dense for the stre
7/30/2025 15:38:03	janelionberger@gmail.c	Jane	Lionberger	1730 Hinman	2B	We need to follow the rules about building height
7/30/2025 16:09:37	cindymartinpr@gmail.c	Cynthia	Martin	1720 Maple Ave.	520	
7/30/2025 17:08:43	gjh1827@gmail.com	Gary	Hamburg	807 Davis Street	303	I am opposed to waiving any zoning requirements
7/30/2025 17:31:08	juliabforgash@gmail.com	Julia	Forgash	1580 Sherman Ave	PH01	
						The proposed building violates every structural re
7/30/2025 19:08:08	lucindajk@comcast.net	Lucinda	Kovachevich	807 Davis St.	Unit 615	The developer illegally factored in the University B
7/30/2025 22:24:44	ebhenderson731@gmai	Emily	Henderson	1738 Chicago	104	
7/30/2025 23:09:49	ssmiley759@aol.com	Susan	Smiley	807 davis	413	
7/31/2025 7:00:23	peter.g.athans@gmail.c	Peter	Athans	1640 Maple Ave Evanstc	1008	
7/31/2025 14:20:18	maureenposner@yahoo	Maureen	Posner	1720 Maple Ave	1740	I object to the development plans for both Davis S
7/31/2025 20:13:30	markachler@gmail.com	Mark	Achler	1580 Sherman Ave, Evar	902	
8/2/2025 14:53:26	entirelyinteriors@yahoo.	Sharon	Perrino	1580 Sherman Ave.	703	

Timestamp	Email Address	First name	Last name	Street Address	Unit number	Comments or questions for the Downtown Evanston
8/2/2025 15:29:29	contact.timberlake@gm	Amy	Timberlake	522 Church Street	7A	This building should not exceed existing laws for
8/2/2025 23:13:43	faller9@comcast.net	Linda	Faller	1500 Hinman Ave.	Apt 301	The traffic congestion from a 445 unit building wil
8/3/2025 12:39:02	psbsynergy@comcast.n	Patricia	Blumen	1720 Maple Avenue	#2010	
8/4/2025 8:59:39	carolemark@mac.com	Carole	Mark	800 Elgin Road		512 Overcongestion in this area is definitely a huge pr
8/4/2025 14:32:54	nibsyichiban@gmail.cor	Gail	Radzevich	807 Davis Street		310
8/4/2025 17:36:47	vjkwasniewski@gmail.co	Vincent	Kwasniewski	1720 Maple Ave		2650 Like the other high rise proposed for the corner of
8/5/2025 11:05:10	l.edelstein@sbcglobal.n	Linda	Edelstein	1640 Maple Ave,		1207
8/8/2025 14:48:43	tafaghodi@gmail.com	Ata	Tafaghodi	1720 Maple Ave		2450
8/8/2025 14:49:58	sumaeliang@gmail.com	Su Mei	Liang	Sherman		1202
8/8/2025 14:53:27	millerirv@gmail.com	Irving	Miller	1720 Maple Avenue		1650
8/8/2025 14:53:31	litvinjanice@gmail.com	Janice	Litvin		807	309
8/8/2025 14:56:26	laurieandfred@gmail.co	Lauren	Levy	1570 Elmwood		1404 Too tall for that location
8/8/2025 14:56:29	weinsteins728@gmail.co	SC	Weinstein	1738 Chicago Ave		904
8/8/2025 15:01:24	jill.cabot@gmail.com	Jill	Cabot	1720 Maple Ave		2330
8/8/2025 15:40:24	j.rea@me.com	John	Rea	1501 Hinman Ave	2B	
8/8/2025 16:00:58	eblumen@comcast.net	Ed	Blumen	1720 Maple		2010 Keep Evanston Unique
8/8/2025 16:01:19	ccrobicheaux@gmail.co	Carol	Robicheaux	1426 Chicago Ave,	4S	
8/8/2025 16:48:45	will@atproperties.com	Will	Tveit	1640 Maple Ave		1308 Please stop building ugly structures in downtown!
8/8/2025 16:57:40	Mariewarshauer@gmail.	Marie	ZWarshauer	1580 Sherman Ave, 205		205 Fewer units, shorter building and less clogging of
8/8/2025 17:03:00	Janmeyers1615@gmail.	Janice	Meyers	1580 SHERMAN AVE		802
8/8/2025 17:23:45	jb1126@outlook.com	Jeff	Boarini	1800 Ridge Avenue		104 This building is simply too tall in an already conge
8/8/2025 18:10:01	f_talisch@yahoo.com	Faranak	Talisch	1720 Maple Ave		2310 What is solution for Maple heavy traffic
8/8/2025 20:46:18	alicesachs21@gmail.co	Alice	Sachs	1730 Hinman	3D	31 floors is too high and I think the building shoul
8/8/2025 20:47:54	gul.agma@gmail.com	Gul	Agha	1720 Maple Ave	Unit 2610	
8/8/2025 20:49:58	lindalhamburg@gmail.co	Linda	Hamburg	807 Davis St		303
8/8/2025 21:49:45	mpa347@northwestern.	Marie-Simone	Pavlovich	800 Elgin Road,		1008 There are projects ongoing for two more buildings
8/8/2025 22:19:05	goldbergr@me.com	Rebecca	Taveirne	1635 Hinman Ave.		2
8/9/2025 0:33:03	319fry@gmail.com	allan	freiman	1640 maple ave		702 obviously out of the scale of evanston downtown

Timestamp	Email Address	First name	Last name	Street Address	Unit number	Comments or questions for the Downtown Evanston
8/9/2025 5:13:26	taveirne@att.net	Edmond	Taveirne	1635 Hinman Ave	Apt 2	The height is absurd.
8/9/2025 5:17:32	selprice@gmail.com	Stephanie	Price	807 Davis Street, Evanston	2006	
8/9/2025 13:30:46	gretchenfathauer@att.net	Gretchen	Fathauer	1730 Hinman	4D	When the CTA is reducing service, and this project
8/9/2025 15:03:20	bethwollar@gmail.com	Beth	Wollar	1640 Maple Avenue	601	
8/9/2025 16:05:57	cjbass@comcast.net	Carole	Bass	800 Elgin Road	1003	
8/9/2025 18:58:37	yajnikvaishali@gmail.com	Sheel	Yajnik	1720, Maple Avenue	2410	Any building in downtown Evanston should not ex
8/9/2025 20:36:11	dhms98@gmail.com	Deborah	Schwartz	1640 Maple Ave	1406	I agree that it's too tall. I think it very sneaky to inc
8/10/2025 8:49:10	jscole.illinois@gmail.com	Jennifer	Cole	1720 Maple Avenue	2610	
8/10/2025 10:44:50	Doulajanine@gmail.com	Janine	Green	807 Davis Street	708	
8/10/2025 10:46:38	randyandlindaballa@gmail.com	Randall	Balla	Thanks 800 Elgin	1318	We like the affordable part but not the height!
8/10/2025 12:34:01	elizabethellenmorgan@gmail.com	Elizabeth	Morgan	1720 Maple Ave	1610	
8/11/2025 16:53:29	zlbarker831@gmail.com	Michael	Berman	1730 Hinman Avenue	2A	
						While I agree that downtown Evanston's retail mar
						What tax advantages is Evanston offering to mag
						How is building a 31-story downtown rental high-r
8/12/2025 14:17:40	mtmclaughlin316@gmail.com	Marita	McLaughlin	1862 Sherman Ave.	6SW	"More than one-third of Evanston households are burdened, spending at least 30 percent of their ho income on housing costs. However, this disproport affects renters. Less than a quarter (24 percent) o households that own are cost burdened and 12 pe severely cost burdened. Meanwhile, nearly half (4 of Evanston's renting households are cost burden 27 percent are severely cost burdened, spending a percent of their household income on housing cos
						While I am not opposed to a proper use of the 2 lo
8/12/2025 18:06:36	valylev@gmail.com	Valy	Lev	807 Davis St	2502	
8/12/2025 19:05:43	valylev@gmail.com	Aliza	Lev	807 Davis St	2502	
8/13/2025 9:29:17	artraviv@gmail.com	Artur	Raviv	807 Davis St Evanston II	2304	
8/13/2025 9:31:43	ramaraviv@gmail.com	Rama	Raviv	807 Davis St Evanston, I	2304	
8/13/2025 9:37:34	jwashbu2@gmail.com	Jenny	Washburn	807 Davis Street	Unit 1803	
8/13/2025 9:45:07	gaberaviv@gmail.com	Gabriel	Raviv	807 Davis St.	2402	

Timestamp	Email Address	First name	Last name	Street Address	Unit number	Comments or questions for the Downtown Evanston
8/13/2025 9:45:10	bertanash@yahoo.com	Roberta	Nash	807 Davis St	2206	
8/13/2025 9:47:13	doritraviv50@gmail.com	Dorit	Raviv	807 Davis St.	2402	

Name (first and last)	Address of residence or property owned	Meeting date	Agenda Item (Property address or description of agenda item)	Position on Agenda Item (as applicable)	How would you like to make your public comment?	If you are providing a written comment, please leave here:	Are you representing yourself as an individual or speaking on behalf of a group?	Please name the group of people for whom you are the designated speaker.
Martha Strong	1519 Davis Street	7/23/2025	605 Davis Street	In favor	Written comment	<p>I am in favor of the 605 Davis project.</p> <p>The property has been vacant for years, and its location is ideally suited for residential units. The density of the project will increase much-needed revenue to surrounding restaurants, theater venues, financial institutions, and small businesses. The percentage of affordable housing is also appealing.</p> <p>I urge the City to approve this project so that the downtown area can begin to heal after years of post-Covid population and revenue decline.</p>		
Stephen Schlickman	1630 Chicago Avenue	8/13/2025	605 Davis Street	In favor	Written comment	<p>August 4, 2025</p> <p>Dear Chairwoman Lindwall and Members of the Evanston Land Use Commission:</p> <p>I am a resident of the Park Evanston at 1630 Chicago Ave, where I have lived with my wife, Alison, for the last 8 to 9 years. Our building includes a rich demographic of active seniors, young couples and families, and Northwestern graduate students. It is a great place to live.</p> <p>My profession involves the advancement of transportation projects and programs for the Chicago region. I am semi-retired. My last full-time position was the Executive Director of the Urban Transportation Center in the UIC College of Urban Planning and Public Affairs. I was also the Executive Director of the Regional Transportation Authority from 2005 to 2010.</p> <p>I am writing to support the proposed 605 Davis St. project downtown Evanston. I believe that this 430-unit apartment building, proposed by Vermilion Development and Campbell Coyle, is in line with the character of Evanston's downtown district, which has one of the richest concentrations of transit service of any Chicago suburb. It is because of that service, the 605 Davis building, in which auto parking is minimized, makes total sense. It will have minimal impact on existing downtown traffic. Furthermore, the synergy of a high-rise residential development, complemented by the transit service and the great walkability of the downtown, would inject new strength to the surrounding neighborhood. It would be a great shot in the arm for the struggling restaurant and retail businesses located there.</p> <p>From project descriptions I have read, it seems that new development will generate more than \$2.5 million to the City in new revenue in 2026. Even more striking is the proposed project is estimated to yield over \$12 million of new Net Revenue in 15 years to the City of Evanston and the two school districts.</p> <p>And that means the property taxes on my building, that I pay through my rent, will not rise as much as they would without this project.</p> <p>The benefits of 605 Davis far outweigh, in my opinion, the objections about the additional height and density they are asking for. I urge you to approve this development project.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration,</p> <p>Stephen E. Schlickman</p>		

						<p>Dear Land Use Commission and City of Evanston Planning Staff,</p> <p>I'm writing to provide comments on the proposed development at 605 Davis Street. Although I would support the development of a residential building on the site, I have concerns about the environmental impact of the proposed project that significantly exceeds several of the Evanston zoning codes (height, setbacks, FAR).</p> <p>In reviewing the documents subject to discussion at this coming week's Land Use Commission meeting and the documents on the City's website Community Development page I offer the following observations, questions and concerns, noting that I have also reviewed the Planning Division January 29, 2025, Zoning Analysis, but was not able to find more recent City staff analyses. It is not easy, as a community member to evaluate the veracity of consultant assumptions and claims, as I am not an expert in wind, noise, light/shadows or traffic. As such, I urge the Commission to seek analysis from the City's staff on the consultant reports.</p> <p>I hope that every member of the Commission has visited this area on multiple occasions to experience the current traffic, wind, light/shadow and noise conditions at various times (including when Fountain Square or Sherman Avenue are closed for festivals, on stormy days, in the presence of emergency vehicles, etc.).</p> <p>I appreciate your consideration of my questions, comments and concerns. Beth Lange -----</p> <p>I question the scope of the project and whether the consultant findings are overly optimistic concerning the environmental impact on the neighborhood. Similarly, I urge the City approval bodies to carefully consider the impact of agreeing to all the zoning exceptions that are requested for this large project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The overall attention to detail in the range of documents provided by consultants is disappointing. It is hard to trust the findings when attention to detail is lacking. For one example, the Vehicle Turning Exhibits lists the site as located in Chicago. <p>Regarding the Parking Study, by consultants TYLin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Citing affordable housing vehicle data from San Diego isn't a useful comparison. What does local Evanston (or surrounding communities) data show? The report does not properly name the Davis Street CTA station, it mentions that the Sherman Plaza garage has nested areas but neglects to mention that the nested areas are private to the Residence of Sherman Plaza, and this same garage now has a parking arrangement with Lifetime, but the consultant neglects to indicate how such arrangements may impact the future availability of parking capacity as assumed. The consultant references a draft MOU between the City and Northwestern regarding parking for the new stadium but does not explain how this would impact their assumptions about available parking for the 605 Davis residents. To what extent has the City's staff reviewed the accuracy of the data in this report? <p>KLOA Traffic Impact Study (starts on page 39 of the packet of materials for the August 13 Land Use Commission meeting)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inaccurate information, such as this example (page 47) "Church Street is an east-west major collector roadway that provides two westbound travel lanes" To what extent has the current traffic pattern problems for emergency vehicles on Davis and Orrington been considered? Firetrucks often have a hard time driving westbound on Davis from Chicago Avenue due to backed-up traffic. I am surprised that the studies didn't conclude that parking on Davis should be eliminated, at least on one side of the street. Did the consultant assess the impact of current truck traffic on Davis Street when emergency vehicles are attempting to navigate Davis Street? On page 40 (of the Commission packet) the report concludes "The volume of new traffic to be generated by the development will be reduced due to the public transportation and alternative modes of transportation serving the area". How does the consultant reach this conclusion? For example, the study does not adequately provide data on anticipated use of ride-share vehicles (for residents and guests, and shoppers) that would use the loading zone in front of the building. The study claims "In addition, it was assumed that five percent of the trips will be made via taxi or ride share." While this estimate is based on a manual of the Institute of Transportation Engineers, how would this 5% estimate compare with actual data from other residential buildings in downtown Evanston? It is quite possible that this study potentially under-estimates traffic volume on Davis. On page 73 (of the Commission packet) the report concludes "As such, the loading zones should be sufficient to accommodate the peak development demand and is similar to what is provided at other residential developments." It would be easy for the consultants to provide actual data on the capacity/space of the loading zones for all the residential buildings in the downtown area. Sherman Plaza, for example, that has fewer units than the projected Davis 605 project, has more than two spaces in the loading zone and it is often at capacity. <p>Wind study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In reviewing the RWDI Pedestrian Wind Comfort Assessment Report (May 16, 2025) it is interesting that the consultants indicate that a new 31-story building will not increase wind at the Davis, Orrington, Sherman, Fountain Square area (page 21) "Wind conditions in Fountain Square are not predicted to be impacted by the proposed 605 Davis development." However, Page 19 shows projected increased wind on Sherman (north of Davis) in the winter. As the report shows, the wind conditions on Sherman are often quite severe. On Page 22 the consultant proposes the addition of wind prevention structures in Fountain Square, but these structures would completely impede the openness of this important downtown area. A second professional assessment of the wind impact in this area is essential to evaluate the assumptions and findings in this report. <p>Shadow Study by SCB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is interesting to note that this study neglects to show the likely shadow impact on Fountain Square, a public space that is used throughout the daytime and evenings, year-round. I urge the City's staff and the Land Use Commission to request an updated study that specifically illustrates the potential shadow impact of this proposed project on the Fountain Square area and adjacent intersections. 		
Beth Lange	807 Davis Street	8/13/2025	Planned Develop	Undecided	Written comment			
Marita McLaughlin	1862 Sherman A	8/13/2025	605 Davis St. - 3	Opposed	Written comment	<p>While I agree that downtown Evanston's retail market needs revitalization what assurance is there that a 31-story high-rise will add significantly greater consumer power?</p> <p>What tax advantages is Evanston offering to magnetize retail businesses to populate the empty storefronts? Longtime retail shop, Talia Boutique, is moving to Wilmette citing the following for one of it's reasons in a recent Evanston RoundTable, per Asia Cavallo, co-owner, "She added that some patrons also complained about parking availability in downtown Evanston. They can't just 'stop in' because they have to look for parking, but struggle to find a nearby spot, according to Cavallo." This shop is one storefront away from the Davis-Church intersection. Wilmette has found a way to entice many new shops to their city. What is Evanston doing?</p> <p>How is building a 31-story downtown rental high-rise addressing the following statement that is incorporated in Chapter 10 of the Envision Evanston 2045 document? How does the affordable housing percentage that will revert to market value rentals after 30 years help the affordable housing mission of Evanston? How will the added congestion of traffic be addressed at the corner of Davis and Chicago Aves. along with the current traffic congestion of The Marion, The Park Place, Whole Foods and the already approved 12-story Legacy building?</p> <p>"More than one-third of Evanston households are cost burdened, spending at least 30 percent of their household income on housing costs. However, this disproportionately affects renters. Less than a quarter (24 percent) of households that own are cost burdened and 12 percent are severely cost burdened. Meanwhile, nearly half (47 percent) of Evanston's renting households are cost burdened, and 27 percent are severely cost burdened, spending at least 50 percent of their household income on housing costs."</p>		
Bonnie Wilson	525 Grove St	7/13/2025	601-603 Davis	In favor	Written comment	<p>While I am not opposed to a proper use of the 2 lots on Davis, I have not been convinced that a 31-story high rise is the proper use.</p> <p>I am Bonne Wilson as a Realtor for 40 years in Evanston, I truly understand the need for more affordable housing in Evanston. Plus I am a member of the committee Joining Forces for Affordable Housing. I am supporting the rental development at 601-603 and 605-615 Davis. I support the 86 inclusionary housing units. More affordable housing units that have been built in the past two decades. Hope you support this development.</p>		