

Option 1

Cons:

- Too expensive, need City funding. Find ourselves in same situation down the road.
- The cost is not sustainable. There are no pros
- City has no money to do it. City has no experience. City has already wasted the property in years of ownership. No security in City ownership. Procurement process too burdensome.
- Raising the money, assuming NU gift is greatest use of that money. Assumption that other City departments will move programs there.
- Cost and ongoing cost
- It would look messy, overcrowded. Ecology Center not a (sic) mansion
- There is a small expenditure of City funds needed for operation and management
- City could not maintain the building even if it used funds to do initial restoration . Interior would not be restored or maintained.
- Cost that is sustainable will fall on tax payers. Preservation would be limited.
- City Council members and Mayor do not support this option
- Not sure if economic base is viable – should be studied by neutral experts.
- Nice idea but building wouldn't be renovated to its previous grandeur. It would just be utilitarian building for public use. Costly for City to maintain.
- City doesn't have money and staffing to support.
- Track record with Art Center and current state of H.C. mansion
- It's an asset that can't be replaced.
- Money. Lack of City vision, focus, initiative for lakefront property
- City makes a terrible landlord
- Initial cost would be higher than estimate. Otherwise my favorite option.
- City doesn't do maintenance well – Sherman Garage, Robert Crown, Civic Center and this.
- City can't manage a building well
- Realistic cost to make safe for public use
- The City is not good at running things, like private investors
- We need control over entire property
- City stall ownership of renovations
- Don't trust the City
- City management oversight
- Art Center poor management
- Secret sales of land??
- Good money after bad – not enough money info renovations
- City won't support the building properly
- Spend more money in this climate – not responsible
- Money pit
- Long term money commitment not reliable
- Funding - \$1 million will it be used to fund the H. Clark
- Faith in government poor track record in managing other buildings
- Insurance carrying costs, no money to invest
- Partnership applies to all
- City hasn't the money, knowledge, and capabilities. We also already have an old building costing money that doesn't meet the needs of the users

- Option 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, all miss the point. What is priority? 1. Preserve public open space (parks) 2. Save the building 3. Generate money for the City. None of these options address these questions.
- Any renovation will have added public contracting expense
- Very costly for the City. Who will pay for renovations? Cost to maintain the building. Don't have expertise to manage or maintain mansion. Too political. Events alone won't support the building, won't generate enough money.
- City can't afford
- Not possible to find the funds
- City needs to pass this on. Too expensive to keep.
- City is not a responsible or reliable steward. Insufficient funds, insufficient staff
- Now and later? Responsibility for continued use?
- Reliant on taxpayer money – may mean its future is uncertain if government needs revenue
- City has had this option and did not exercise it. City will not follow through as responsible steward.
- Doesn't include poss. Leave to non-profit to fundraise money. Pro, stays in Evanston control.
- Do not renovate building

Option 1 Cons (Summary)

- City hasn't maintained assets. Wouldn't maintain it well.
- Is the City working to reduce # of assets?
- How would the City administer the property
- COST to the City
- City lacks vision
- Perennial discussion on future of building

Option 1 Pros

- Fewest transaction costs
- The advantage of retaining the building for public use is that the people have access to the property
- City has funds to do the work
- Could set up a park district or enlarge the lighthouse park district
- Remains public access. Inaccessible area becomes accessible
- Very flexible uses that likely can include a café to generate some added revenue
- Stays in City hands at relatively little cost. No con
- Retain by City
- No con. City
- City retain public uses it
- Certain to follow City's desire not under developer's thumb
- My choice
- Open to public. Greatest access. Owned by Evanston. Hospitality – no privacy
- Entire building and property remains in use for public park uses
- Wide variety of public uses similar to option 5

Option 2

Cons

- Demo cost is major. (Anywhere from \$200K to \$500K) It is pure cost to the taxpayer
- Loss of a useful facility, lack of vision

- Eliminates building which has served useful purpose (landmark) for 50 years. Creates hidden potential.
- This is a listed Evanston landmark and is listed in the National Register. It is significant and worth protecting.
- Losing the house would be terrible
- Don't demolish
- Lose historical building. Lose potential revenue source. Dandelion farm – like many parks. Payment for special venues, security. Poor history of park maintenance. Operation of park will cost money. Cost of demo.
- Do not tear building down. The house is worth saving for a new use. Lose a landmark and history.
- Demolition and redevelopment and maintenance. Destroying cultural asset and landmark. Goes against City residents and founders intentions.
- Loss of older historic structure only con. Many benefits.
- Park funds needed in other parts of City. NE Evanston doesn't need as much as other parts of City
- Environmentally destructive. Eliminates public space.
- My second choice
- Loss of a beautiful asset
- No interest at all!
- Eliminates landmark building
- Absolutely not! Think of the amount of landfill
- Building is a landmark and has inherent value. It should not be torn down – has to go through preservation.
- Complete waste of real public asset
- Removes forever a historic, remarkable building from public access/use
- Makes no sense whatsoever
- Evanstonians can donate a day's work (or more) by a co-fer, plaser. Their names should be immortalized in a list inside the mansion
- Limited season and also might end up being sold for development. Open space is rarely protected
- Tax increase, no revenue
- French German prov. Style very popular in US. To destroy an example that could be used to draw public, very bad idea
- City has nearby open space that is not used for anything other than an open field
- Destroy a landmark building – no. Take away part of Evanston history
- Only con is the destruction of a unique, beautiful old building
- Demolishing the building does not add much land and detracts from beauty of current park
- Better to preserve and use the building by reliable partner
- Demolishing too expensive
- Historical value lost
- Building very lovely and historic and Jener Ganger to would be a shame to destroy. Parks need facilities and spaces to enjoy
- Yes demolish if you cannot give to another entity to rehab. No money of City should be involved. Building was bought for parkland not for mansion.
- Costs are much higher than quoted. 3 to 4 times
- Would lose a landmark building and special architecture forever!
- Loss of great building and landmark, which has great potential for creative public use

- Lose landmark
- Loss of historic building and is irreplaceable
- Loss of potential revenue
- Destroy an asset, cost City money, large historic loss, loss revenue
- Occupy Harley Clarke

Cons – sheet #2 (Summary)

- Loss of special public park and lakefront gathering spot, special treasure and historic landmark
- Loss of City's progressive reputation, preservation of culture
- Angers residents and neighbors
- Nobody was willing to speak for this option – suggests lack of community support
- Breaks up historical campus and Jens Jensen gardens and landscaping
- City and citizens abdicates responsibility to preserve public assets
- Getting rid of it instead of dealing with it
- Possibility of litigation
- Litter, noise, loss of public enjoyment
- Threat of litigation from neighbors
- Reduction of surrounding property values
- Community already rejected commercial use

Option 2 Pros

- Sell/auction bricks and materials. Open up land for sand mining
- No more arguing, City, people own land
- Park is whole all continuous. Saves millions of dollars. Now and future. Can have more beach parking. Beautiful view of the Lake!
- Educational use can be a very powerful introduction to the realities of water and land relations for all ages.
- Reason people come to Evanston is for parks and recreation. Do not turn into commercial venture
- Buildings are costly to maintain (grass, water)
- None
- More parkland/open space. Lower initial and ongoing thoughts. Stays in public hands.
- 30-40 kids can fit into a clear area. Put some use to it (camps, etc.), recreation space
- Lower maintenance. Greater access to beach and lighthouse open space preservation. Owned by Evanston. Lower liability or different. Lowest cost public ownership
- The highest and best use of this property would be to turn it back as best as possible to nature and open parkland, lake views, no buildings.
- Remains in public hands
- I could only accept this only if option 3 is not selected
- Removes a divisive issue. Preserves private ownership

Option 3 –

Cons

- Do not sell land. Do not renovate building for commercial space. Do not use for a hotel, etc.
- Limited parking is available. Would need to take parking space for parking
- Cost prohibitive for a small B&B or just an event center. Parking essential

- Loss of control of public asset. Public land should not be sold for commercial use. Bad precedent for control of public land. Not consistent with Evanston values. Inadequate parking. Limited/no access to property
- One person or organization should not own a community property
- Don't sell our beautiful public property
- Loss of property and land
- Keep for 99%
- Loss of lakefront land and property. City washing its hands of responsibility
- No commercial use
- Absolutely not – its parkland not to a few wealthy people
- City shouldn't ever unless public/private money
- Density of rooms/building could take up too much land. Diminish green space.
- City loses control of property. Not enough public use
- Don't sell our public land
- Over optimistic about jobs, job training, already turned down hotel plan. Will be unacceptable to majority
- Bad idea. Screws the public
- City should not sell parkland. Once land/mansion is sold, City has no control (even with a contract)
- Loss of public ownership. Elite access – perception. Zoning change precedent. Potential parking problem. Traffic increases. Lose access to parts of building. Interior restoration kept historical. Cost
- Do not sell land. Do not open to gross commercial use.
- The sale for commercial space undercuts the public's right to parkland. There are solutions to any other problems that don't require selling it off.
- Slippery slope of public sale of private land
- Risk of default. No public oversight
- Selling public land. Public access (questionable). Traffic/parking. Negative impact on neighborhood quality of life. Short-sighted view commercial – but parks attract residents to beach. City is control on asset. Donated/intent of public use – last piece of land.
- Do we need another hotel? Demand?
- Property should not be commercial use – protect residential area
- Land is sold. No commercial use
- Use could evolve over time to less public friendly. Not as much public uses as option 1 and 5
- Any boutique hotel will be expensive thus eliminating public access for most Evanstonians. Inadequate parking
- Don't sell
- Added density, loss of control, ??
- If building was not kept but was torn down
- Zero cultural benefits
- It is deceptive to say that the public would have access once a private enterprise took over the non-paying public would not feel welcome or have anywhere to be in the space
- Commercial use would destroy our parkland
- Shortsighted to sell a building that could be a continuing welcome by beach for restaurant in the coach house. Hotel not really public for restaurant because pay home to??
- If sell building to be used for commercial use – what happens if it fails? Would (something) be able to tear it down? No too available to the public. Parking

- The property would not remain in public hands. Slippery slope – if this lakefront and parkland is commercialized, what will be next?
- No senior center. Don't sell property rather lease it for hospitality. Do not demolish.
- City loses control of property
- Zero park benefits. "Access" is insufficient and cuts off the 4-parcel campus.
- City sells property too cheap not real economic benefit.
- Both 3 and 4 need to be off the table. Don not meet parkland acquisition terrible precedent
- What is promised may not be what is delivered. Pritzker proposal should be resuscitated.
- Too restricted. Too private. Too predictable
- Tax benefit is miniscule (per tax analysis by J. Lindwall)
- Crass decision. Real benefit only to commercial investor. Horrible in residential area. Dangerous to children
- Public space is limited and we need to hold on to the land. That house isn't worth it. More parkland a priority
- How can the City manage or regulate the actual operation? Who is potential buyer?
- It is disingenuous to argue that any commercial enterprise would bring jobs to/for Evanstonians. How would you guarantee that? Option 2 and 3 con

Option 3 – Summary (Sell building and land for commercial use)

- Potential conflict between private and public use
- Diminish surrounding property values, negative tax gain from sale
- Traffic on Sheridan and Central, parking congestion
- Loss of publicly owned property
- Loss of control of building and ability to preserve – someone could demolish it. Future use unknown.
- Slippery slope re: selling public land for private business. Sets bad precedent
- Limits access to Evanston residents
- No "Rush St. North"
- Loss of public lakefront
- Government is shirking responsibility to preserve public open space

Option 3 – Pros

- Fine dining restaurant would be nice, great place for parties and events, ice cream socials
- There is no con. The building will be accessible to public. The City has no expenses. City gets tax revenue. No cost to tax payers
- Oak Park did it with the Clooney mansion so we could too
- A hotel with public access would be wonderful! No tax money required
- Money not a problem
- Can't come up with a single pro
- Building permit fees. Private sector has capital. Any transfer to someone else (commercial or not-for-profit) reduces City risk
- Someone should ask the Pritzker family if they consent rejection of the hotel by the Evanstonians if they don't let them be generous by donating for the restoration of the mansion
- No con – good use
- Look for private funding to develop into a restaurant etc. good use
- Financially self-sustaining. Need high end boutique. Hospitality venue bigger than a B&B. Great destination, tourism. Good place for variety of food venues, concerts

- Sales tax, property tax. Jobs. Draw for community. Restaurant. Could showcase lighthouse. Highest probability of revenue
- Love the idea of a boutique hotel
- Taxes. Max revenue. Higher ?, reduces City liability
- Restore mansion to original beauty. Preserved for future generations. A fabulous place for a fine restaurant and small events such as weddings.

Option 4

Cons

- Any viable others? For senior housing who would be able to afford – too exclusive sub-divide for private development! No!
- Is this realistic? Who is the partner? Numerous single family residences would deface lakefront
- Should not sell a public amenity for private use. Senior housing would not be a draw to the park nor a resource for the public, nor others. Also (something) does not really get tax benefits because it gives discounts
- Complete loss of park space and public use
- Even if there is an easement if you sell (something) and land you lose control of everything else. Losing open space. Elite senior citizen housing – who benefits? Limited benefits to public? Ambulances/Deliveries. National Louis or Kendall College – doesn't benefit the public
- City shouldn't sell (Unknown)
- Leaves public hands
- Again – profit to developer – not good for seniors – poor access to town
- Senior housing not a profitable idea
- No public access. No view of lake. Hate thought of subdividing. No community benefit
- No residential housing at all
- Do not sell land. Do not develop the site
- Same as #3 – too restricted, too private
- More parking required. Less land for public
- City should NOT SELL parkland! Residential zoning would allow sub-division. This would just prolong controversy.
- City would lose control of land, therefore diminish our parkland. Terrible idea.
- Waste of cultural asset (complete loss)
- Has no community benefit
- Bad idea, screws the public
- Not enough parking for senior housing proposal
- Added building proposed for senior center is handsome but not consistent with existing HC mansion. Residential development (of other than senior) less public. Over time senior center might expand beyond proposal
- Insufficient parking. Too much density w/3 story residence. Commercial use inconsistent with open space use. Inconsistent with lakefront master plan. Fragments public space.
- Congestion. A lot of senior housing in Evanston already. Is it commercially viable? Trend away from institutional housing – it is a short sited. What if developer goes broke? Could have unintended results. Even if affordable, takes away from citizens.
- Senior housing takes mansion away from the public. Residential also takes it away from the public
- Land is too small in area to support senior living w/care. Other residential uses, wasted opportunity.

- It is not readily available for public use.
- Totally no commercial use
- Do not sell land
- Evanston has enough of any other type of “good” use. Don’t need to use sacred parkland.
- Tax benefit is miniscule (per tax analysis by J. Lindwall)
- Concern that zoning and other rules will not stand. Private company can appeal to Council and push changes not originally
- Loss of property, less public use of building
- Lose control of property. Not specifically mandated for senior housing development
- City loses control of land and access to beach and parks. Terrible place for senior housing
- Loss of private land
- Loss of vital lakefront property and City washes hands of making important decisions for the future of lakefront
- Grossly interrupts public space
- No control over house – could put in townhouses. Examples were urban. Senior living not attractive. Parking much worse. Affordability for seniors. Interior not compatible with senior citizen requirements. Isolate lighthouse. Not for profit? Lose tax revenue.

Option 4 Summary

- Identical to Option 3 summary

Option 4 – Pros

- Bike path and walking is a good idea
- Residential zone if building was not restored but torn down
- Clean start
- The winner, a non-profit project to benefit everybody
- Great for seniors living there. Some real estate taxes. Some access for community

Option 5

Cons

- Too many moving parts – complex management. Who will this be gifted to? No specifics. How will money be raised? Parking
- Wishful thinking. Where will money come from. Where is parking? Sounds like a commercial pitch similar to option 1
- Open to whims of exec. Directors
- What organization? Does it exist? Does the budget make sense?
- Sweet idea, but may not come to fruition. If money was forthcoming for Art Center we wouldn’t be having this meeting.
- Con - Should not sell or gift a public amenity that residents need and want. Pro – But great idea to have it be a nonprofit with rental/lease options in event café
- Money might not be forthcoming for renovation. If money is available and building would be maintained, idea is good.
- Would be essential for the City to give developing organization strong basis for how development should proceed
- Who is this organization that would “run” this “public” property? Develop a foundation? Who’s on it?
- Tough to raise money for initial renovations. Must be lease only. No sale

- No on Demolition. Historic properties should always be restored with or without City taxes
- Lack of funds/fundraising
- No guarantee that the “gifted” would optimize the potential unless there is money in it for them. Could be abandoned by them
- Pro – pay as you go
- Bankruptcy issues organizations like the State aren’t vetted
- Anyone promoting this use had better be willing to personally underwrite the cost of restoration, operations, and long term maintenance!
- As with option 1, economics need to be carefully evaluated. Need to identify organization to take over building
- Parking. ST to lease control by City
- Don’t gift
- City loses control
- City should not sell parkland. If building was gifted to an organization, what happens if organization fails?
- Possible use of City taxes. Maintenance
- Who owns land? Con: cost of preparation for gift or sale
- Danger of exclusivity if not managed property. Risk of failure without good structuring
- City loses control of vital lakefront open space, and future opportunities. Short-sighted.
- Removes issue of City O&M and removes liability from balance sheets. One less problem for City.
- Once we hand it over to an outsider we no longer have any control over what happens to the property
- What foundation??
- Do not sell land. Do not gift building. Do not develop site. No 1-time revenue from gifting building. No recurring tax revenue from a non-profit. What is the organization and where will money come from?
- Too much fundraising. Not enough volunteers
- Gives away public land? If City sells it, lose control. Overhead costs could be high. Must be nonprofit. Evanston residents are tired. Fundraising. One time profit and, lose long-term revenue. Sustainability and longevity of foundation to manage property. Who chooses the foundation?

Option 5 Summary

- Need to distinguish between sale and gift
- Hard to guarantee that building is maintained
- Continued conflict over building use
- No presented lease option
- Potential loss of neighborhood enjoyment
- Option is too complex, needs more study
- Covenants necessary in case organization ceases use
- Endangers neighborhood character

Option 5 Pros

- Truly creative and adventurous, most likely to succeed and make Evanston happy
- Must be a non-profit and a lease
- Excellent for City and for historical reasons

- Additional pro: covenants with transfer may be best or only assurance of future public use on perpetuity
- City should not sell or gift the property. This option would work if City leased the property with covenant that it would revert to City if foundation left
- Very talented group of Evanstonians and other professionals specific organization (nonprofit) to be developed
- Excellent if leased to the foundation.
- Greater community involvement. No public money. Foundation. Private/public partnership. Preserve landmark. Tie public and private events. Fulfills arts and education.
- Lease only keeps it public and no tax used
- Avoids all City renovation costs for fog houses and ecology center additions
- Entire building and property remains in use for public park uses
- All pros for option 1 are just as valid and applicable for option 5
- Foundation such as Frank Lloyd Wright Home/studio. Preserve, venue, events, restaurant, cover concept not presentation