DESIGN AND PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DAPR) MINUTES
October 30, 2019


Staff Present: M. Rivera

Others Present:

Presiding Member: J. Leonard

A quorum being present, J. Leonard called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

1. October 23, 2019, DAPR Committee meeting minutes

L. Biggs made a motion to approve the October 23, 2019, meeting minutes, seconded by S. Mangum.

The Committee voted, 7-0 to approve the October 23, 2019, meeting minutes (D. Cueva not in attendance at this time).

New Business

1. 1804 Maple Avenue  Recommendation to ZBA
PharmaCann LLC, lessee, submits for a special use for a Cannabis Dispensary, to establish sales of recreational cannabis and expand the existing medical cannabis space in the RP Research Park District (Zoning Code Section 6-12-2-3).

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Katriina S. McGuire, attorney

DISCUSSION:

- Applicant provided a brief introduction on the relationship between PharmaCann, the applicant, and MedMen, who will be operating the dispensary.
- J. Leonard explained the recent ordinance which creates cannabis dispensaries as a special use in the RP Research Park District, and others.
- J. Leonard asked the applicant to explain how they would manage crowds at the City owned location.
- Omar Delgado, representative, explained that they use security personnel to ensure normal operation of proximate businesses and ensure lines don’t impact pedestrian or vehicular circulation. ID’s are scanned on-site prior to admittance. This is done to check that the individuals are 21 years of age and a resident of Illinois.
- J. Leonard asked if parking elsewhere and using a bus service has been considered?
- Omar Delgado stated that if the demand necessitates this, they are able to provide this service. They have experience with similar operations at other locations, but don’t anticipate the need here due to proximate public transit.
- S. Mangum noted that the proposed hours of operation in the Special Use application need to be altered to reflect the Council amendment.
• Applicant agreed and will do so prior to the Zoning Board.

L. Biggs made a motion to approve the project with amended hours, seconded by S. Mangum

The Committee voted, 8-0, to approve the project with amended hours of operation.

2. 629 Foster Avenue Preliminary and Final Review
Andy Poticha, applicant, submits for building permit for exterior site and building facade alterations, Fiedler Hillel, in the T1 Transitional Campus District.

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Andy Poticha

DISCUSSION:
• Applicant briefly explained the use of the building and provided some background information on the tenants history.
• Applicant stated that the presentation before the committee has received an approved COA from the Preservation Commission.
• Applicant stated that most of the work is interior, with some minor exterior changes to the façade.
• Applicant stated that the existing parking would remain and that exterior landscape and hardscape improvements would be added to compliment the building.
• S. Mangum asked if any changes to the plan had been made since the Preservation Commission approval.
• Applicant stated that it is the same proposal.
• L. Biggs noted that the dumpsters are blocked by the parking area
• Applicant stated they would make changes if necessary, but this has been the existing condition and no issues have come up to date

L. Biggs made a motion for approval, seconded by S. Mangum.

The Committee voted, 8-0, to approve the project as presented.

3. 120 Dodge Avenue Preliminary and Final Review
TFA Signs, applicant, submits for a sign variance to install a freestanding sign in the R4 General Residential District where the facades of the principal building fronting the street right-of-way are less than 30’ (Sign regulation 4-10-10 (B) 1.).

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Property Owner

DISCUSSION:
• S. Mangum asked what happened to the existing sign
• Applicant stated it was damaged during construction
• S. Mangum asked how the size of the proposed sign relates to the previous sign
• Applicant stated it was smaller
• S. Mangum asked if a wall sign would be more appropriate
• Applicant stated that it would not be visible enough

L. Biggs made a motion to approve the variation request, seconded by M. Tristan

The Committee voted, 8-0, to approve the variation request.
4. 2715 Hurd Street

Recommendation to ZBA

The Salvation Army, contract purchaser, submits for a special use for a Religious Institution to provide Sunday and mid-week worship service, after school programming including a music program, senior programming, a food pantry, youth character building, a women’s ministry program, and summer day camps, in the R1 Single-Family Residential District (Zoning Code Section 6-8-2-4).

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY: Mitchell Melamed, attorney

DISCUSSION:

● M. Melamed, attorney for the applicant provided a brief introduction on the Salvation Army and how they determined this location was suitable for their future needs.
● M. Melamed stated that the existing space on Sherman is in disrepair, necessitating a move.
● M. Melamed submitted an updated list of proposed program elements. Notably the proposed food-pantry and summer day camps will not be offered at this time.
● M. Melamed addressed concerns with traffic that had come up at a previous neighborhood meeting, including additional capacity in the parking lot than is needed, and no programming which overlaps with Willard School pick-up, or drop-off.
● M. Melamed stated that the church at 2715 Hurd has no current capacity for a food pantry. However, the Salvation Army would like to offer this program in the future and would come back to seek approval at that time.
● M. Melamed stated that no exterior alterations are proposed.
● L. Biggs inquired if any donation of goods would occur on this site, and if so how would that be handled
● M. Melamed stated that no donation of goods would occur on this site and they would provide signs to that effect.
● L. Biggs stated that it would be reasonable to expect some drop-offs of goods to occur since it's a reasonable assumption, based on other Salvation Army sites, that it could be done here.
● M. Melamed said that they would likely have a few mistakes such as that per year and they would handle them as they came up. As stated earlier signage would be provided to help prevent these issues.
● J. Leonard stated that the referenced signage would be a requirement of the Special Use
● J. Leonard asked if most participants would drive to the site
● M. Melamed stated that that would be a reasonable assumption although bus service does exist on Central Street.
● M. Rivera asked what the capacity of the existing parking lot(s) were.
● M. Melamed stated that 30 cars can park in the existing lots vs 10 at their current location
● J. Leonard asked if the 30 parking spaces were adequate for the programming
● M. Melamed stated that it was more than adequate and most of the spaces would likely be vacant, pointing to appointment only case management on weekdays with no additional programming.
● M. Tristan asked the applicant to provide more information on the Summer programs
● M. Melamed stated that summer camps would not occur at this site. The Salvation Army was hopeful that it would, but not at this current time.
● M. Tristan stated that the Special Use would be contingent on fire review and an occupancy inspection
M. Melamed agreed to an inspection and review.
S. Mangum requests an updated site-plan with lower level floor-plan submitted.
M. Melamed submitted the lower level floor-plan as a hard copy to staff.
J. Leonard asked if it is realistic to use public transportation to access this site in the future?
M. Melamed stated, no.
J. Leonard requests that the special use application be updated to be consistent with the project as presented today. Notably, the application relies heavily on access to public transportation, however there is no genuine attempt to use it since the programs aren’t offered during times when transportation is effective, and the application has stated multiple times that most users will drive since public transportation is not viable.
J. Leonard stated additional inconsistencies with attendance numbers on the application and the information provided today, and believes the answers in the application do not adequately address the impact on the neighborhood.
M. Melamed stated that the proposed programming is smaller than what was proposed in the application and that the programs do not overlap with school drop-off or pick-up.
M. Melamed stated that a different church could come into this space and propose much larger programs. What the Salvation Army is proposing is much smaller than what the size of the space demands.
M. Melamed re-stated that the new programs on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday are by appointment only and the Sunday Service doesn’t conflict with any school programs.
J. Leonard stated that the information must be consistent and the application revised.
L. Biggs stated she was comfortable with the proposal but agrees that a consistent application is needed showing what the accessory uses are and what future programs are being considered. The community’s raised concerns with the long-term vision for this property are legitimate.

Public Comments:
Anne Smiley, neighbor since 2002.
- Stated she was against the proposed special use because the proposal is more attune to a business rather than a religious institution.
- Stated that the existing church is underutilized and at most has 5 or 6 cars in the parking lot. Additionally, the proposed programs are not similar to what’s existing, because the existing church doesn’t provide much for the community.
- Stated that the existing church has been a good neighbor only in regards to keeping a well maintained building and grounds. The existing church, many years ago, offered election polling and had Girl Scout programs, but these haven’t occurred for many years and when they were provided, the neighborhood didn’t feel welcome.
- Stated that Willard School had asked the existing church if they could use their parking area as a refuge in instances of a fire emergency and they said no. She wondered if the proposed Salvation Army would have the same stance.
- Stated that the existing church parking lot is used by staff at Willard Elementary School and wanted to know where they would park if the proposal moved forward.
- Stated that Willard School is one of the largest in the District, serving around 500 children with robust after school and evening programs as well as providing a location for pre-Fourth of July events.
- Stated that the existing programs and events offered at the school already create traffic congestion on Hurd Street and there is concern amongst neighbors that
these issues will become exacerbated with the proposed use by the Salvation Army.
- Stated concern that there is no four-way stop at Park Place and Lincolnwood.
- Noted that the proposed location is many blocks north of Central Street and that the Salvation Army predicts over 50% of its users will be from Chicago. How are they going to get to this location, so far north, with limited public transportation options.
- Stated that the idea of utilizing public transportation to get to this location is disingenuous.
- Stated that she would like the Salvation Army to explain why this location is well suited for their needs, especially when a food pantry is already located close by, and the residents of the surrounding neighborhood do not require the Salvation Army’s services. Those who can benefit from it, are no-where near this location.
- Peter Boyle, resident at 2708 Lincolnwood
  - Stated his concerns with the Special Use because he has two young children and doesn’t think the proposed use is similar to the existing use.
  - Stated that there are more programs and there will be more traffic, which make the already un-safe conditions worse.
  - Stated that he does not think the applicant is being genuine with their answers in the Special Use Application and is worried that this location will become a business district.
- Rick Planos (sp), resident at 2646 Lincolnwood.
  - Stated that the surrounding community does not need these programs or services and fears that additional traffic will make this neighborhood un-safe, particularly during school pick-up and drop-off.
- Hada Dimitrijevic, resident at 2821 Thayer.
  - Stated her concern with the project because she has a grandson who attends Willard School and wants to understand how this will effect the safety of children walking to and from school.
  - Stated her concern that the types of individuals seeking services at the church would be outsiders and requests assurances that they won’t be sexual predators.
  - Stated her particular concern with the proposed counseling services and who that would attract.
- Henry Kohn, resident at 2716 Lincolnwood
  - Requests that the updated list of programs be scanned and uploaded so the community can review them
  - Stated that a neighborhood meeting was held on October 16 where representatives from the Salvation Army gave their proposal. However, there wasn’t enough information provided at that meeting, and there still isn’t enough information, particularly because the programs are changing.
  - Stated that the neighbors are worried and confused about what is and what isn’t included, what will happen now, and what the Salvation Army will come back with and request in the future. Worried about giving an inch now and having them request a mile next year.
  - Requests a floor plan showing the basement
  - Requests a clear picture of what the long-term vision is for the building because it’s much larger than the Salvation Army’s existing space, and the programs being proposed do not necessitate that size of space.
  - Stated that the intensity of use is changing and the proposed use is more attune to a social service organization than a religious institution. The current location has one case worker, and now they’re proposing 4 or 5 at this location, but it’s
located so much further from their client base. How are people expected to get here?
  o States that the cumulative effect of this special use on the neighborhood is negative and it should be rejected.

L. Biggs made a motion to hold the proposal in committee pending a revised application and what programs are anticipated in the next 12-months, seconded by M. Jones

The Committee voted, 8-0, to hold the proposal in committee pending revisions.

5. 1012-1014 Davis St.  

Recommendation to ZBA

Grant Manny, broker, submits for a special use, Daycare Center-Child, for Guidepost Montessori to provide daycare services for children 6 years and younger, in the D2 Downtown Retail Core District (Zoning Code Section 6-11-3-4).

APPLICATION PRESENTED BY:  Grant Manny, applicant

DISCUSSION:
• Applicant provided a brief introduction of the proposal, including similar locations in Chicago.
• Applicant stated that the interior of the building will be substantially renovated, but exterior alterations will be signage and paint only, intended to make the extant two-buildings look more similar.
• L. Biggs asked how pick-up and drop-off would be managed for roughly the 85 kids who don’t use public transportation.
• Applicant stated that they have experience in similar locations and can adjust their methods to work with parents and employees to maximize efficiency. This can be done through curb-side pick-up and drop-off such as at their Wicker Park Location. However, the current proposal is to use all seven parking spaces off the alley for pick-up and drop-off as well as potentially use some of the front parking spaces off Davis for short term parking.
• Applicant stated that they would work with parking Services to determine the feasibility of that.
• Applicant stated that they have no employee parking and they are willing to lease spaces from a City garage, although they would like more flexibility through a shorter term lease.
• S. Mangum inquired about accessible access to the site.
• Applicant stated that the accessible entry is at the rear of the building.
• S. Mangum asked if classrooms are located in the front and if the glass would be covered in any way.
• Applicant stated that they would have classrooms on the primary street frontage and that the glass would not be obstructed as the interaction between pedestrians and the children is positive.
• L. Biggs asked if anyone would potentially park on-site
• Applicant stated that no employees would but in certain circumstances and emergencies a parent may.
• J. Leonard asked that signage be included to show that parking in the rear of the building is not allowed and is for pick-up and drop-off only.
• Applicant agreed.
• M. Rivera stated that parking services would be willing to lease 10-15 spaces at the employee rate in the Maple Garage and would entertain a conversation about the
spaces on Davis so long as they benefited all businesses and weren’t specifically for this use.

- C. Sterling reminded the applicant that today’s discussion is not an endorsement of the proposed exterior alterations to the building and that the proposal would need to come back to DAPR once it was submitted for permit.
- Applicant agreed.
- C. Sterling noted that painting the existing brick building at 1012 Davis was not ideal and noted the excellent architectural integrity of that building. It was suggested that the building at 1014 Davis have the paint removed from the masonry via a chemical treatment.
- Applicant said they would look into that and test a section of the masonry to see if it was in good condition under the paint.

L. Biggs made a motion to approve the proposal on the condition of leasing 10 spaces from the Maple Garage for employee parking as well as providing an alternate layout for the rear-parking as a drop-off area, seconded by J. Leonard.

The Committee voted, 8-0, to approve the proposal with the above conditions met.

Adjournment

S. Mangum made a motion to adjourn, seconded by J. Leonard. The Committee voted, 8-0, to adjourn. The Committee adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

The next DAPR meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, November 6, 2019, at 2:30 p.m. in Room 2404 of the Lorraine H. Morton Civic Center.

Respectfully submitted,
Cade W. Sterling