

# LAND USE, PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting of September 4, 2008

## Members Present

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Joyce Lenhardt, Co-Chair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Patrick McGranaghan
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jean McCoubrey, Co-Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Larry McEwen
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Harriet Brumberg	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ned Mitinger (temporary reassignment)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Steve Gendler	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bill Washburn
<input type="checkbox"/>	John Haak	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Allison Schapker
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Alfred Dragani	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ned Mitinger, VP Physical (ex-officio)

## Others Attending

Lauri Strimskovsky, Chestnut Hill College  
Cameron Mactavish, Voith Mactavish Architects  
Ignatius Wang  
Henry and Suzy O'Reilly, owners garage 424 W. Springfield Ave  
Sister of Mrs. O'Reilly  
Neighbors of the O'Reilly's  
Meredith Sonderskov  
Melissa Nash, recorder

Jean McCoubrey, co-chair, opened the meeting at 8:10. (Approval of minutes was held to the end of the meeting.)

## **Sugar Loaf Campus, Chestnut Hill College**

•Presentation/Discussion: Lauri Strimskovsky and Cameron Mactavish introduced the project. It is an addition to the existing mansion that is being rehabbed for dining, classrooms and offices. The Lodge is completed and has 62 students in residence. The mansion presently has 24,000 sf. The addition would increase the square footage by 1200 sf. This would involve the demolition of 1800 sf and adding new construction of 3000 sf. The addition would accommodate dining for 140 students, and conferences (as in the past). The college met with the Historic District review Committee on Tuesday. The addition cannot be seen from the front of the building. The mansion was renovated in the 1960's and the college proposes to remove the renovations on the front. The front would be traditional while the rear would retain the modern. The entire exterior would be renovated. The refusal is in the packet; the ZBA hearing date is October 22. Joyce Lenhardt asked the size of the dining area. It is 35'x70', about 2500sf±. J McCoubrey asked if the rooftop equipment would be screened. It will be screened with an acoustic screen and, due to the siting on a slope, the equipment will not be visible. The existing foundation will be reused. The new will be spread footings with a crawl space. It was asked if the storm water plan had been submitted and approved by the Water Department. It was not known but this is a part of the City's review process. J McCoubrey asked if the site is connected to the sewer system. This was also not known but believed that it is. Steve Gendler asked about handling kitchen grease as L&I has been cracking down on grease in the sewer system. This was not specifically known; the college does have a kitchen contractor. J Lenhardt asked the stage of the drawings. The project is out to bid; construction drawings would be available soon. Occupancy would be next fall. J McCoubrey asked about materials on the exterior. The mid '60s steel/glass bays on the front would be removed. Cast stone would be used to restore windows and door surrounds. Dormers would be rebuilt. Ludovici tile will be used, matching original mansion roof and the college campus roofs. It was noted that the Historical Society liked the Edward Durrell Stone removal and the two-sided approach. There was some concern about removing the work of a well-known architect.

•Committee Action: Steve Gendler moved that the committee recommend approving the request for a variance for continued conditional use and the design as presented. J Lenhardt seconded the motion.

Discussion included concerns about storm water run-off. The Wissahickon Watershed approval was added to the motion as a condition for approval. The motion was approved 5-0. (Allison Schapker recused herself, as her employer, Andropogon, is involved with the new campus work.) The college need not attend the DRC meeting but should attend the Board meeting on September 25.

### **Garage for 424 W. Springfield Ave**

- Presentation/Discussion: The garage proposal was presented by Harry O'Reilly, owner, and Larry McEwen, architect. In this block the four garages are located in the center of the block. Of the four garages, this is the smallest and will remain the smallest after the new garage is built. The height of the proposed garage is comparable to the neighbors' garages. Shadows on the neighbor's property will be minimal. The garage would have a workshop/exercise/game room on the second floor. Impervious site coverage will be 11-12% when the garage is completed. The maximum height of the garage was lowered by 26" after the DRC meeting at a neighbor's request. The garage has two refusals – use based on the upper story and height 15' allowed, 23' proposed. It was asked if the garage could be seen from neighbors' houses. It can but not because of the height.

- Committee Questions and Comments: Alfred Dragani asked if the height of the eaves of the garage could be lowered to create a story and one-half look. L McEwen noted the eave lines and roof slope echo the existing house. Lowering the roof also makes the upstairs room smaller. J McCoubrey suggested that the creation of the upper space was introducing more activity in to the center of the block, impacting safety and privacy. It was noted that there are no windows on the neighbor facades. A Schapker asked about the hedge separating the drive/garage from the neighbors. The hedge is arborvitae and stops at the garage.

- Neighbor Input: One neighbor, Tom Halloran, stated that he can see the garage from his house now and will see a two-story box when the new garage is built. L McEwen noted that due to the location of the neighbor's house he would see the sidewall with windows. A Dragai suggested adding a pergola to relieve the blankness. Another neighbor, Brigit Crooks of 429 W. Moreland, said she would see a sheer face of stucco. S Gendler noted that the walls of stucco affect the views especially from the neighboring yards. And suggested that matching eave and rooflines of the house was not important. Discussion of other roof and eave lines and sizes of other garages followed. J McCoubrey asked about approvals from other neighbors in the block, noting that there is value in neighbor approval. Henry O'Reilly stated they have not been able to contact the third neighbor on the block. T Halloran and L McEwen discussed uses of neighbors' garages. J Lenhardt suggested landscaping to shield the view of the garage. H O'Reilly stated that the neighbors don't want the height. J McCoubrey asked the O'Reillys and the neighbors if the committee member could look at the site from their yards. All approved this. J Lenhardt suggested the stark façade be revisited, using layering, roofline changes and landscaping.

- Committee Action: It was moved that the committee support the use and ask approval from the neighbors to try to resolve the views and the architecture to make the building more acceptable. The motion was seconded and approved 4 –0. (As the building's architect, Larry McEwen abstained.) The O'Reilly's were asked to provide more neighbor response. The committee members should visit the site.

### **Minutes Approval**

- It was moved that the August minutes be approved as submitted. The motion was seconded and the minutes were approved.

### **Adjournment**

- The meeting was adjourned at 10:20PM.