

Development Activities Meeting Report (Version: 06/24/2020)

This report created by the Neighborhood Planner and included with staff reports to City Boards and/or Commissions.

Logistics	Stakeholders
Project Name/Address: Birmingham Place (2303-2313 E Carson St) – Change of Use and Exterior Renovations <i>(Note: initially the project address was presented as 2303-2317 E Carson St)</i>	Groups Represented (e.g., specific organizations, residents, employees, etc. where this is evident): SSCC members LRC members Friends of South Side Park Area residents Applicant team DCP neighborhood planner
Parcel Number(s): 12-G-22	
ZDR Application Number: Not Filed at date of DAM; subsequent filing shows it as DCP-ZDR-2022-04124	
Meeting Location: Zoom	
Date: 3/21/2022	
Meeting Start Time: 6:00pm	
Applicant: Jesse Gidley (LGA Partners) and Mark Speicher (building owner/with Faros Properties)	Approx. Number of Attendees: 17
Boards and/or Commissions Request(s): Historic Review Commission	

How did the meeting inform the community about the development project?

Ex: Community engagement to-date, location and history of the site, demolition needs, building footprint and overall square footage, uses and activities (particularly on the ground floor), transportation needs and parking proposed, building materials, design, and other aesthetic elements of the project, community uses, amenities and programs.

Jesse Gidley with LGA Partners presented on behalf of the applicant team. He identified the building as 2303-2317 E Carson St -- Birmingham Place -- which is used as office currently and is leased out to various tenants. As part of redevelopment, the building would undergo a partial change of use and approximately half of the floor area would be converted to apartments. He stated that there would be 15 apartments total and the rest of the building would remain as office.

He presented a 3-D aerial view of the building's location relative to the Birmingham bridge and relative to four outlined parking lots nearby. Faros, who owns the building, owns two remote parking lots in addition to a small parking lot on the corner of the property itself at S 23rd St, and they also lease some parking next to the Birmingham Bridge across from S. 23rd. Some of the parking is accessible via Sidney St., some via Wrights Way.

Jesse presented historic photos of the area to illustrate the historical context, and acknowledged it was difficult to always find adequate historical photos of the building itself. He showed a 1924 photo with a view looking west down E. Carson St near S. 25th St. He showed a 1935 photo with a view looking north from the south side of E. Carson St. at 23rd St. He described how in the 1960s the building used to be a United Bakery, and then fell into disrepair and a lot of the storefront was blocked in. It was renovated in 1993 around when the E. Carson Street Historic District was formed, and the storefront was restored and windows were brought back into operation at this time. He shared that they have a good idea of what the building did look like, based on how it was restored. The team would be eager to hear about any historic photos anyone may have of the structure.

He displayed a photo of the existing façade of Birmingham Place, identifying a narrow red brick structure on the western end, and then a longer section for most of the building length that is a white yellowish brick. He said that at one point it was likely that different buildings were combined, but now it is all one parcel and one building. He showed a photo of the existing condition of the rear and side of the building on S. 23rd Street looking towards E Carson. He shared that the façade on S. 23rd isn't as historic. The windows and façade have been added over time. The majority of the applicant's changes to the façade will be on the rear and side of the building.

He gave an overview of the site plan, where the parcel in question is in the bottom right: 2303 E Carson. There are 9 existing parking spaces off of S. 23rd Street and 1 loading space off of S 23rd St. There is also some remote parking in the other nearby lots previously identified. The total existing parking spaces (including remote parking) owned by the building owner are 51 (42 off site, 9 on site). If hypothetically an office use at the building were developed anew today, parking standards would require 64 spaces. In describing the partial change of use to residential/apartments, he showed images of which sections of the building would be apartments and which would remain as office. The small third floor at the red brick portion of the building also would be turned into residential. Jesse provided an overview of zoning requirements and parking. Under the partial change of use, the remaining office would require 35 parking spaces and the 15 new apartments would need 1 space each, meaning a total of 50 spaces required, which would be a hypothetical net reduction of 14 spaces relative to the 64 parking spaces that would be needed if all office were built anew today. They will provide at least 15 bike parking spaces, which can reduce the parking load by 30%, meaning the actual required number of vehicle parking spaces under their proposal is 35. Due to a patio they are proposing, they plan to remove 3 existing parking spaces and so instead of 51 total parking spaces they would have 48 vehicle parking spaces (when considering remote parking as well). It's about a 42,000 square foot building, about 23,000 square feet would remain business/office, and about 19,000 square feet proposed as apartments.

He discussed where there would be residential units -- studio, one bedroom, and two bedrooms – as well as lobby, entry, corridor spaces, and two units that would be two-story lofts. He detailed the loading and parking plan. There would still be a loading zone. They are not asking for any zoning variances, but they are going to Historic Review Commission.

As next steps, they will be developing exterior elevations and wanted to get community input before getting too far along in the process to address that as part of the overall project. They are not planning on changing any of the masonry openings on the front façade, but just adding some windows on the side and rear.

Input and Responses

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants [Jesse Gidley of LGA Partners, unless noted otherwise]
[SSCC lead:] Given that this is going to HRC, comments and questions regarding district guidelines are very important. Also you may hear from other residents about what it is you are planning, so this is a good opportunity for you to get feedback and to answer questions.	
Will there be any signage on the front of the building?	We don't plan to add any signage. The entry will be off of S 23 rd Street where the parking is now, so there may be a small sign at the entry but not at the main historic façade of the building. I cannot speak for the office space but as part of this proposal we would not be adding a sign for that.

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants [Jesse Gidley of LGA Partners, unless noted otherwise]
Is the trash and recycling being held in the loading area, so that there would be no outdoor trash or recycling storage?	Yes, the intent is to have all the trash stored inside of the loading dock area.
It looks like people will be exiting the office space through the residential area...is that true or maybe an oversight in the drawings?	That is a unique thing about this existing building. Yes that is true. Normally the door would be closed or alarmed but it is available for an emergency if a fire alarm goes off, the office tenants could get to a second exit that way. Since as of now it is just one large office. There is one stair on far right and two other stairs in the residential portion. These exits would not normally be accessed by office tenants but would be means of egress in an emergency.
Down on the side by the patio, it's a weird situation. Sidewalk is 12-14 or 15 feet wide. Where you see the #6 symbol, that is actually the sidewalk. Could additional street trees be added next to the patio on the public sidewalk on S. 23 rd Street? It's a huge stretch of concrete and additional trees or greenway would be appreciated.	That's a great idea. Currently it's a curb cut, but given the patio we could exploring doing that.
Yeah I'm thinking if you add street trees and redo the curb there you could reestablish it and help reinforce the parking and sidewalk itself and patio possibly.	Yeah, that makes sense.
And in front of the 1-bedroom, if something can be added there, that would be great for a tree also. There are no overhead wires, and few utilities, so it is a good spot.	
I don't know enough about residential code, but is there a requirement to have a window in a sleeping unit in the 2-bedroom?	Yeah, we have reviewed that and you need access to daylight. Windows are typically required for ventilation and we can supplement the ventilation with a mechanical system as well. They are fairly skinny and deep, but the idea is there would be living area at the window area and borrowed space at rear of bedroom.
Any idea of having an enclosed zone at front door of apartments at grade? I walk there a lot and I think it would be uncomfortable to live in that unit for many people. Or transitional zone, like maybe a little garden or fenced area that takes part of the sidewalk? I wouldn't propose it in a narrow area of South Side but here there might be reasoning of it to make it feel more residential.	Understood.
Bob Russ here. It's hard to comment without seeing something. Let's talk about the 23 rd street side. Any sense of how many windows to pop in? Is that just at the second floor? That corner building looks like three stories, is that right?	The corner building is 3 stories in the front half, so roughly where the studio....we would be adding windows along the 3 rd floor and 2 nd floor of south 23 rd .
Would these be punched openings?	They would be punched openings, double hung, and maintaining existing pattern as much as possible.

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants [Jesse Gidley of LGA Partners, unless noted otherwise]
<p>Could you show the outside of S 23rd street? Bob, would that be helpful for you to see in your comments?</p>	<p>[applicant showed image]</p>
<p>In theory, matching those windows and popping in a few others – I don't foresee an objection from HRC with that approach to the windows...I can't think of many other projects in the district that have done that. Probably not going to be a problem. Often changes like that can be made if they find the rhythm and match the module and feel like what is already established on that side.</p>	
<p>Are there any other changes to the storefronts? Are you just looking for some thoughts?</p>	<p>We realize we'll have to develop these more for HRC and happy to work with LRC too. The first floor would have an existing door that is being reworked for a 1 bedroom at the corner so that it could get exterior access. We're adding doors and windows for the lobby, and there is where would propose the patio.</p>
<p>Will you enclose the patio with fencing or just greenery?</p>	<p>Just greenery.</p>
<p>We assume all the front façade side of building – lighting and other things -- all approved in past, and so far you haven't suggested change to that. So other than these windows, is that pretty much it?</p>	<p>Yeah. It's mainly just adding windows on ground floor and lobby and some on rear as well.</p>
<p>Back to the other commenter's proposal about a buffer or setback on Carson street, this same debate came up further down the block at the bank corner. The feeling was that they will have front doors on Carson Street and there are other storefronts people may be living in that we may not know about and comes with the territory and you have to be a pioneering tenant to put up with that, aka younger. Rather than give a slice of suburbia or residential neighborhood where building may set back and give you a little yard, it comes with the territory to be loft-like living in the commercial space. We didn't feel the need to change the street-scape or sidewalk space too much or add something that seemed odd or another type of language. Guidelines don't speak to it, so hard to say what is appropriate other than it's fairly common that the sidewalk goes from curb to property line of façade and would maintain that. Tenants would open up keys from the sidewalk with people walking by.</p>	
<p>About those lights on the side, there are three down low by the doors and three way up high. There used to be a temporary sign along the S 23rd Street elevation. Do you plan to remove them or leave them?</p>	<p>Up at the corner of East Carson there is lighting for a real estate sign. Those would be removed since we'd be adding windows to the residential units. We wouldn't want to shine light into those units. But as far as East Carson, would maintain existing.</p>

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants [Jesse Gidley of LGA Partners, unless noted otherwise]
Lights all the way along there, ok.	
With this change, are there going to be new mechanicals, and if so, where would you house those? What will sightlines look like?	Understood, in these historic buildings we try to keep louvers and penetrations to a minimum, especially on E Carson. We likely would have a split system with condensers up on roof and some fresh air and mechanical units up on roof. Goal is to be set back from front façade so that it would not be visible from the street. We have quite a bit of roof area to utilize. There are many HVAC units on the roof already for office space. Basically it would be the same as now just with some new mechanical units.
If you go back to the photo on 23 rd Street...Up on that lower roof line, will that be opened up to a deck? What will that roof space be used for?	[Jesse]: Good question, I haven't explored it. [Mark]: We explored it at one time when exploring for commercial office space, but there is no elevator to that deck area, and without universal accessibility it would be hard to make a deck. Feedback when we were looking at it previously as office space was that we couldn't do it.
As you look at the image and turn the corner and go down the alley, there are some exhaust fans. Is there something that needs those exhaust fans? Are they still operable?	[Jesse:] We haven't dug into every single one yet, but my guess is some of this is a relic from what was previously there. I believe in the 1993 renovation, you could see commercial exhaust hubs sticking out near the corner. I anticipate eliminating most of these. Not 100% sure that all could go. They are from when it was a bakery in the 1960s and then turned into a restaurant, and I'd chalk it up to time. [Mark]: Yes, the two silver ones you see are inoperable and would be removed as part of this project.
Yeah, anything you can clean up it may help you to show HRC. If there is any pushback by HRC on windows, other changes, they like to trade things off, so for you to say you're improving certain aspects of back side that would be great.	Yeah.
I can't tell from the photos either, but it sort of look like the red brick areas were painted? It appears some wash faded.	I think that's accurate.
Do you plan to repaint it?	That is a good question, probably not, but it has not been discussed in depth.
As you punch through openings, you might want to homogenize that. So painted masonry could be repainted as an option. Obviously buff brick were never painted so don't paint those, otherwise would feel ire of neighborhood and HRC.	Yeah.

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants [Jesse Gidley of LGA Partners, unless noted otherwise]
Any changes in the other existing windows here on the second floor and storefronts? It seems like it will stay. The residential side comes into that first three or four bays of windows.	Yeah, so it will be the first three bays.
Do you need changes to existing windows / change them to get them operable?	We're working through where we can provide operable windows. If we do mechanical ventilation there is an exception and they don't need to be. Understanding that that would need to be approved by HRC, we have yet to determine if we may make one of sashes operable, but I believe they are all fixed at this time.
Can you show photo of 1993 to show evidence of what they were?	[showed]
Yeah, they were more industrial windows. If you stay in that vernacular, you could change them and show you're trying to restore that. Doesn't mean need to be hopper windows. Others in district had metal windows like that with glass that emulates that multi-pane industrial windows, maybe the [...] garage, Goodwill building, chimney we were talking about. Both buildings had this type of industrial windows on the first floor, so they're using some product that gives them an insulating window and mimics the style accepted by HRC.	Understood. And our goal would be to maintain what was renovated in 1993. If we replace the bottom sash, for instance, with an operable pane within that storefront system we would try to maintain that same feel.
Yeah, and you can see how the façade is broken into three parts. (1993 photo). Off to right, the more ornate multi-bay building was probably the original building, then they came back and extended it, in a bit simpler form mimicking parapet breaks but the windows are different sizes and the brick detailing different. The red brick building on the corner is the third building so you could treat that residential section/little building slightly different. The previous renovation looks like they tried to treat all those windows in a similar way with broader glass rhythms and took those yellow buildings and made them all the same treatment but I think HRC would be open to treating the middle building a bit different to give you room to maneuver, if you decided to change windows a bit so some might be that industrial multi-pane window style but wouldn't have to carry the rhythm that it has right now. They were probably three buildings from slightly different times. You have some flexibility, and we probably actually encourage a slightly different expression there.	Yeah, understood, that makes sense.
On the first floor, in the 1993 renovation picture, are you proposing with this change the entire back wall of three or four units in the bedroom will be floor to ceiling window? I'm trying to picture what streetscape will look like there.	The storefronts would all be living space in the units. The bedrooms would be set back, so that would be living area. So, for instance, the streetscape side would be the public living area of units.

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants [Jesse Gidley of LGA Partners, unless noted otherwise]
<p>I just stayed in a VRBO rental in Cleveland very similar and I know exactly what that unit is going to be like – living space in that area, and then kitchen and bathroom back in core. It wasn't terrible. Very loud HVAC systems that kept me awake all night. So try to make them quiet for your tenants.</p>	
<p>So we've talked a lot about this piece of property. I'd like to talk about the two parking lots and the third one. There have been questions and concerns over the years about their upkeep and maintenance. If were to build them new, would not be allowed to park so close to the buildings next door. Is one of them paved, or is one of them still gravel?</p>	<p>[aerial image view shown] I believed they're paved, I'm not positive, but I believe so.</p>
<p>And the lease parking zone...what will that be, is that for visitors, for overflow, for business?</p>	<p>[Mark]: It's a little bit of all of the above...there is an existing office tenant that uses some of it. We have a 20-year lease up in 2030. At least for next 8 years it will be used for a little of everything.</p>
<p>One complaint we hear over the years, not saying that we hear it often, but is about maintenance and shoveling of sidewalks, trash pick-up, weeding, etc. Will there be maintenance of those parking lots so neighbors don't have to?</p>	<p>[Mark:] I don't know exact details...when I was researching this parking I saw there are maintenance agreements in place but I am not sure exactly how enforced. I could look into it.</p>
<p>That would be great, to be neighborly. I live next to parking areas that get trash blown up in them and weeds grow up, and so that looking nice is important for neighborhoods. If you could take care of that, I would appreciate it.</p>	<p>Sure.</p>
<p>To clarify, as to next steps...there wasn't much presented aside from floor plans drawings and parking summary? Is this going to HRC as is, or will we see a revised presentation prior to that?</p>	<p>Intention was to get in front of the community early to get input before we go too far down a specific path. We would propose adding some elevations before going to HRC. As far as this group is concerned, I don't know if we need to come back, or how you would normally handle that, but we wanted to get in front of you early.</p>
<p>[SSCC lead:] So instead of having a presentation in April, you wanted to have it this month so that you could present to HRC in May.</p>	<p>Yes, our goal is to present at May HRC.</p>
<p>[SSCC lead:] And you indicated you wanted that early feedback. I believe [LRC member] has shared that there are things that you will need to add to the presentation to go before HRC. I would think that if people on this call would like to see the revised plan and what would be going to the HRC there would be time at this point on the April DAM to share that revision, in my estimation.</p>	
<p>[LRC member]: Yeah, that's a good point. I understand where you're coming from Jesse, but this is the community's opportunity to see your project pretty well</p>	

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants [Jesse Gidley of LGA Partners, unless noted otherwise]
<p>formed and pretty close to what you take to HRC. If it looks satisfactory, usually you don't have to go to the LRC, and there is the 30-day public comment period. Normally we would comment based on what you're proposing. Here it is a blank slate still. If others are comfortable, you could come to LRC if ready, otherwise at end of April you could come again to DAM meeting and present what you plan to walk into HRC with, so people could give feedback and you see where the community stands on the proposal. While you are coming here tonight with some general ideas, there is nothing really here to talk about. I think this community group and all on the call need to see what you're coming up with so that we are able to give good commentary on it.</p>	
<p>[SSCC lead]: What's good is that timing is that it provides us with another opportunity. So it's not necessarily a second DAM where you wait 30 more days for public comment, but official DAM is tonight with 30 days, and then in meantime, as others have done, they work with LRC. What doesn't happen is that people on call now don't necessarily see what the revision is unless they attend the HRC meeting or look at the application to see revisions before HRC. And there has been some discussion as with other projects whether there are changes and can we see them. So this is an opportunity for community to come back and see what you will be presenting to HRC.</p>	
<p>[LRC member]: I would ask for the City person to comment on this too. What is the nature of the DAM? If nature of DAM is to see an application and a design and allow this community group to have at least 30 days to comment on it, are we getting the opportunity to do that in scenario we're talking about, because if he comes at end of month, there's only a week or two before he goes to HRC, because there is no real design yet, since some ideas are shared but HRC wants pictures of what exactly you're going to do. Since City runs this meeting, so I guess the City person ought to comment on whether procedurally this fulfills the need of the DAM as to what will need to do. It's a bit funny and he's a bit ahead of the game and I appreciate where [applicant] is coming from but I guess it's a blank slate right now, so we don't know quite what commentary to give you.</p>	
<p>[Neighborhood planner]: Thank you. Yeah, there is a bit of a gray area depending on how much revision or new additions to the design get introduced and how that impacts if an applicant would need to go back for another DAM. As part of that, it would be important to consider if the items are of a minor scale that could get worked out</p>	

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants [Jesse Gidley of LGA Partners, unless noted otherwise]
<p>during the 30-day comment period through ongoing coordination / communication. Given the concern of a blank slate, it would be important to have community members and public (beyond LRC members) have the opportunity to comment on those elements. So that would need to be considered in the timeline for follow-up. We can follow up by email, I can double check with the staff for the HRC and follow up with a firm answer. If it's a significant enough of a new element being introduced, it is good to go to another DAM, but also we really appreciate the value of coming early to get the conversation started with the community.</p>	
<p>[LRC member]: Yeah I'm thinking about a case recently where David Morgan changed the door on a design that had already gone through HRC with an approval and they had to go back through us. So everything we will see from [applicant] is going to be fairly substantial difference from what we're seeing tonight, and we can't comment yet because we don't see anything yet.</p>	
<p>And don't they require a letter of support from the community group, or no?</p>	
<p>[SSCC lead:] We don't provide a letter. The City planner puts together a report/documentation. What we do (though it is not required) is that I will go to Planning Commission or Zoning Board and share support either with a letter or public comment. With Historic Review, Bob [LRC member] is always in attendance providing comment as to the committee's interaction and suggestions to the HRC.</p>	
<p>So since we didn't see much tonight, how can anyone really give comment? It's like you'd have to come next month to present what you're actually going to do to HRC, regardless of coming tonight, because there wasn't enough evidence tonight to do a formal review.</p>	
<p>[SSCC lead:] The April DAM is before the May HRC. The question I think we're grappling with is there is a 30-day requirement after the DAM of public comment. So this could not go to HRC in April even if everything was presented to us and we were supportive of it. In this instance, we have made comments with the understanding that the applicant will be going back and working on that. There is an interest in seeing what the plan is and what will be presented to HRC, because at this point we would not be able to approve and support anything to HRC because we haven't seen anything. But the question the neighborhood planner will be taking back is with what we have done tonight, as related to the</p>	

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants [Jesse Gidley of LGA Partners, unless noted otherwise]
<p>30-day comment. Is there a need for a second DAM? We are saying yes because we haven't seen what will be presented to HRC. The question is whether there is a need for another 30-day comment such that this would be presented to HRC in June as opposed to May.</p>	
<p>[LRC member]: And this is up to City officials like those with HRC and neighborhood planner and City Planning who ought to determine if this qualifies as a proper DAM submittal to see if it meets the DAM timeline. Normally we would see more and Jesse would come to LRC separately and we'd tweak it and get into weeds and nitty gritty and some issues would be raised and carried through LRC for refinement, such that public would get general sense and then LRC refines, but tonight we get a broad sense of the plans, but there is a lot that can be messed up with how punch in windows and what is going on with units in the back, etc., and still a lot to draw and to present to this committee before it goes to HRC. We haven't seen anything quite as big as this. It's fine you come early, but we probably need one more step through the DAM to officially see what you will do with elevations so committee has chance to comment.</p>	
<p>[SSCC Lead:] In some cases, projects will go to LRC and then go to HRC, and the community has really been developing knowledge base of historic district guidelines, and have asked, if it is changed, what will be presented to HRC. We defer to LRC but it adds to our learning to know what was tweaked and what was changed in the attempt to have the proposal approved by HRC. And I hope to others on call that I have represented your thinking well.</p>	
<p>I would agree with that. So it sounds like we will need to await for [neighborhood planner] to come back and tell us what comes next.</p>	
<p>[Neighborhood planner]: Yes, I'll follow up.</p>	
<p>I totally agree as well.</p>	
<p>I would add, before this goes to HRC, you will need an exquisite level of specificity for all these window systems. Based on Google Street View, I'm seeing on the front of the building there are three different storefront systems, one is teal, one is black, one is blue, there are material color, manufacturer, catalog cut, if you're replacing these things, if you make them operable, if you're repainting</p>	

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants [Jesse Gidley of LGA Partners, unless noted otherwise]
<p>them. HRC will ask for a high level of specificity and we would like to look at that before you go there.</p>	
<p>[Neighborhood planner]: Thank you everyone for those comments. That helps also certainly for me to hear the concerns and questions raised around making sure there is clear information presented in the first place. I think that is the key City interest that there is community wide input on a presentation that is relatively/quite close to what would be going to HRC. The SSCC lead explained it very effectively that the question is whether there would be a second 30-day comment period and that element of a second DAM. I will be conferring with staff from HRC on this and will be following up with the SSCC lead and with the applicant team.</p>	
<p>[SSCC lead:] Any other questions or comments?</p>	
<p>[SSCC lead:] Normally we would have 30 more days to comment and then it would go to HRC. Our hope is that you can come back to us at next DAM meeting on April 21st so we can see what your plan will be like before going to HRC. I don't want to speak for [LRC member], but based on some of the things another commenter shared, it may be a good idea to work with LRC to get that specificity.</p>	<p>Understood.</p>
<p>[LRC member]: LRC will meet Tuesday of next week, and then two weeks later, which is normally after the next DAM, so we can see your stuff a week before you go to HRC in case of any last minute tweaks. And that lets us write up our comments as you get ready to testify at HRC. So in terms of LRC, we have no problem you bringing stuff in during April, seeing us a week before the HRC and tweaking one last time and going into HRC. But speaking on behalf of many on SSCC side, are you all satisfied with this presentation? And to neighborhood planner, does this qualify, does it satisfy what a DAM presentation should include? That's not really defined anywhere -- we're in a new process. Normally we see more. This is the first time we see far less. Now what do we do? If this committee were satisfied that LRC could take it from here, and you come back and show it at next DAM in April, and everyone is fine and just go to HRC with comments and skip the second 30-day period, I have no objection to keep ball rolling. I'll let SSCC speak for themselves about skipping the second 30-day period, as long as they have the opportunity to see it. And they could testify. SSCC lead or anyone on this call could make</p>	

Questions and Comments from Attendees	Responses from Applicants [Jesse Gidley of LGA Partners, unless noted otherwise]
comment via email or letter to HRC or by direct testimony if unhappy with what see at end of April. There is another opportunity to comment, it's just a question of what the DAM will require. And I don't want to speak to that, it's not my place.	
[SSCC Lead]: And what has occurred at the DAM and some follow up meetings if there have been any, has been to support the development. In the two years that we have been doing this, there has been only one project that we indicated we could not support, and it was the residential development at 90 S 12 th Street – and even without our indication of no support, the ZBA would have likely denied their request for a variance. But so far I think we've worked very well as a community in being supportive of what the development is because of the additional work that has been done at times during the 30-day comment period.	
Ok, well I'd like to move it along. It's been an hour and 15 minutes and we normally don't take this long on one. But I think people know what they have to do. We need to talk with the neighborhood planner offline to see. But we need to see more before we give a thumbs up or down, more detail similar to what you plan to present to HRC. Why don't you go back and talk about it and we'll talk about it as well, and hopefully you'll get back to us sooner rather than later with updated drawings.	Thank you.
Thank you.	
[SSCC lead:] Past DAMs can be seen on SSCC You Tube page, and this will also be on there. Thanks to everyone, and we'll see you soon or otherwise in April.	

Other Notes

The neighborhood planner conferred with City Planning staff involved in overseeing the RCO/DAM program and with HRC staff and it was decided that an official second DAM would not be required, but that City Planning would ask that the applicant return a second time to the South Side Community Council (e.g. at the April meeting when DAMs are regularly held for SSCC) to present a fuller presentation with adequate details and to allow the community opportunity to see the updated proposal in advance of the opportunity to comment before or at the May HRC hearing. A second 30-day public comment period would not be required.

The applicant team returned to present to the South Side Community Council on Thursday, April 21st, 2022 at the 6pm meeting via Zoom, as a meeting but not an official DAM. The applicants identified ways in which the proposal had been modified since the March 21st, 2022 DAM and presented more details, stating that their presentation to SSCC on April 21 matched what they submitted to HRC for the May 4th HRC hearing. Community members asked questions and shared comments on the updated proposal, in conversation with the applicant. This updated presentation listed the project address as 2303-2313 E Carson St.

Planner completing report: Thomas Scharff