DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting of December 20, 2022

**The DRC meeting was held via Zoom**

# Members Present

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **✓** | Larry McEwen, Co-chair |  | **✓** | Sam Filippi, Business Association |
| **✓** | John Landis, Co-chair |  |  | , Parking Foundation |
| **✓** | Chris Linn, LUPZC |  |  | , Streetscape Committee |
| **✓** | Steve Gendler, LUPZC |  | **✓** | Larry McEwen, VP Physical |
| **✓** | Patricia Cove, HDAC |  |  | Kathi Clayton, President CHCA (ex-officio) |
|  |  |  |  |  |

##### Others Attending

Katrina and Daniel Spillane, owners 113 West Chestnut Hill Ave

Justin Krik, attorney for113 West Chestnut Hill Ave

Jeff and Tallulah Regan, architects/designers for 113 West Chestnut Hill Ave

Merrie Allison, neighbor 113 West Chestnut Hill Ave

David Lace, neighbor 113 West Chestnut Hill Ave

Iain Dukes and Kimberly Ilgenfritz, owners 5 East Chestnut Hill Ave

Matt Millan, architect 5 East Chestnut Hill Ave

Ben Loughlin, architect with Milan Associates

Harry Cook, attorney 5 East Chestnut Hill Ave

Richard Bartholomew, HDAC (also substituted for P Cove for 5 E. Chestnut Hill Ave)

Randy Williams, HDAC

Eileen Javers, HDAC

Karen Allen

Chris Manzo

Carethe Casey

Catherine Rooney

Carolyn Adams

Deirdre Godin

Lori Salgonicoff, CH Conservancy

Tony Banks, VP Physical, CHCA Board

Anne McNiff, Director CHCA

Celeste Hardester, Design Review Facilitator

Melissa Nash, recorder

The meeting was opened by Larry McEwen, co-chair, at 7:04 pm. There are 2 action items on the agenda. 113 West Chestnut Hill is presenting for the RCO meeting. 5 East Chestnut Hill Ave is making its first appearance. L McEwen explained the meeting structure. The goal is to find a path forward to resolution. The minutes approval will be held until after the project presentations.

**113 West Chestnut Hill Avenue**

•Presentation: Justin Krik introduced the project. The owners wish to build a 3 car garage with a second floor space to be used as a home office, guest quarters or an exercise room. There is no intention to rent the space. The garage can be built as right. The addition of the dormer triggered a refusal based on the building height. The code allows 15’, which is an averaged measurement. With the dormer, the height is 20’-3/4”. The side yard setback for a garage is 3’. The exterior walls will be stone finished. The dormer allows a functional use of the second story as a home office, guest space, or exercise room. They have met with some of the neighbors. There will be a utility sink in the garage level. Downspouts will collect rainwater and take it to a dispersal system on the property. The letters have been sent to the neighbors. Dan and Katrina Spillane have spoken to near neighbors and have 6 letters of support including 130 and 102 Laughlin and 11 West Chestnut Hill Ave. At the LUPZC concern was expressed for the side yard setback and storm water. Storm water has been addressed

•Committee and Neighbor Reports: L McEwen asked for the LUPZC and HDAC reports. S Gendler reported that in addition to the setback and storm water, LUPZC was concerned about the nearest neighbors, especially 115 and 117, and 111. Landscaping is also needed. The footprint of the proposed building is the maximum allowed. Suggestions are to a make the dormer smaller, move the building away from the property line, and provide information about the storm water management. The dormer is very wide and very visible. Patricia Cove reported for the HDAC. The committee had concerns about the setback and the height. The HDAC asked why this is called a garage and not an ADU. The progression through the process is not normal. They also had a question about what would happen to the existing garage. The suggestion was for the setback to be increased to 10’. Neighbor letters are needed. The old garage should be maintained. The neighbor at 117, Merrie Allison noted that the proposed garage impacts her the most. The rear of the building is near her front door and she loses openness. It feels claustrophobic and property value will be impacted. There will be a stone wall as high as her house. David Wallace of 115 felt that the timing to consider this project was too tight as he has just heard about it. At the moment, he and his family do not live in the house full time, and so they received the plans late. L McEwen noted that all had received the documents late. This is a large structure on a large property. Why is it so close to smaller properties? The structure is too close. Water run off does seem to be solved. The building should be moved from the property line. The suggestion of landscaping is positive. S Gendler asked about the existing trees. M Allison noted the trees are not the problem; the wall is the problem. L McEwen asked to have 117 entrance pointed out. M Allison is not concerned about the window closest to the structure. It is the closeness of the wall to her house.

•Committee Comments: John Landis asked what could make the LUPZC support this project. The current location has a huge visual impact. LUPZC cannot support the 3’ setback. It should be moved an additional ±7’ from the property line. The project cannot be supported without the move. Sam Filippi reiterated the closeness was a concern. He also asked about the change in impervious cover. Working on water control is good. He asked if the house is on sewer or septic. It is on sewer. S Gendler noted that the LUPZC did not have Merrie Allison’s input. He asked if moving the building up and down rather than just to the side would help. It would not. He asked about the roof material. It is to be cedar shake. There is a lot of land; were other locations considered. This is the best option. L McEwen noted that moving further away from the property line is neighborly versus law. Tallulah Regan stated that other locations were considered. As the designer she respects the concerns. This is a matter of privacy versus viewing a playset. Most people fear the new. J Krik noted that relationship with the Spillane’s house was important and that other locations were considered. The garage can be built as of right without the dormer. However, the interior space is too constricted without the dormer. J Krik asked about moving the building. Joyce Lenhardt noted that while the garage could be built without a variance, the choice was made to ask for a variance. There needs to be a compromise. M Allison reiterated she is not opposed to the lower side window being blocked. J Landis suggested that all parties can work for a compromise before the January 11 ZBA. J Krik noted that administrative problems made the timeline tight, but the dialogue can be continued. L McEwen suggested the LUPZC meeting on January 5 could be used for a new look and possible approval. S Gendler noted that there should be a vote to deny or approve the variance request to have an RCO opinion for ZBA. Anne McNiff noted that there is no December Board meeting. A special meeting would be needed A letter to the ZBA should be available by January 9. L McEwen suggested at least 10’ from the property line was needed.

•Committee Action: S Gendler moved that the DRC deny the request for a variance subject to reconsideration upon a site plan compromise between the applicants and near neighbors (115 and 117). The motion was seconded. It was suggested that a proviso be included that stated the storm water management plan be included. An additional proviso was that the historic garage building be restored. J Krik noted that there is no intent at this time to do anything to the older building. P Cove suggested encouraging steps to preserve the building and to cause no negative impacts to it. L McEwen asked the applicants and the neighbors if they could work with this. They indicated that they could. P Cove asked how the changes would be presented and how to proceed with the approval. The compromise will be presented at the LUPZC on January 5. C Linn asked who would work on the compromise and when. It was asked if the applicants and neighbors would like a committee representative to meet with them. This was added to the motion. They would meet after the New Year. The motion was approved without the process issues. This motion can be modified/changed. J Landis thanked all for the civility shown.

**5 East Chestnut Hill Avenue**

•Presentation: P Cove stated that she is involved in this project and is recusing herself. Richard Bartholomew will represent the HDAC for this project. Architect Matt Millan presented the project. This is the Samuel Austin House. The house has a third floor addition plus others including a two story addition, an open porch and a small addition at the rear. It is zoned RSD-3. It is surrounded by institutions. It was purchased by the current owners around January 2022; at that time it had 6 apartment units and an office. Occupancy was changed to 3 units. There are two curb cuts. The project is to build a 3 car garage with an apartment over. The variance is needed for a second primary building on the site and a setback violation; the side yard setback should be 7’; it is proposed for 5’-5”. The property is in Wissahickon Watershed zone 5 and has no coverage restrictions. There will be a slight increase in coverage. The variance are required for an accessory dwelling as multifamily is not allowed and the side yard setback. There is no storm water management at this time, but it will be addressed. A landscaping plan was presented. In 1910, there was a barn in the location of the proposed new building that was approximately 50’ x 30’ in plan. Old photos were shown. The new 2 bedroom apartment will be over the garages. The garages will be separated by walls. Materials and colors were shown. An older style brick will be used. 3D views were shown. No trees will be removed. There will be 3 additional open parking spaces. The three units in the existing house will be reduced to two; there will be a total of three units. It was asked if the owner will live on site. They will probably no. The house will be restored. It was noted that the site is large enough to subdivide and a large house to be built.

•Committee Questions and Discussion: It was asked if neighbors have been contacted. Kim Ilgenfritz, owner, stated that she has spoken to the church and hospital, who expressed support. The ZBA list has 32 contacts; letters have been sent. Some work has been done including working on the landscaping and installing an iron fence. The three units will be condos. The committee questioned parking. The existing spaces are not adequate. The two units in the existing house are not enough to make the project financial viable. Architectural integrity of the existing will be restored. J Landis asked about the selected materials. They reflect a personal design style. Brick is a warm material. It was noted that the existing house is not brick. P Cove noted there was an effort to have the two buildings relate. The house includes stone. It was asked if any of the additions would be demolished. They will not. S Gendler asked about the current driveway on the OMC side. It will be used as a walk way about 6’ wide. Some impervious coverage will be removed. It was noted that the materials on the new building are a contemporary memory of the barn. L McEwen asked about the encroachment on the setback – could the building be moved further from the property line. He also asked about tree removal. S Gendler also expressed concern about the setback. The building placement was based on careful concern about turn radii.

•Committee Action: The project should be seen by the HDAC and the LUPZC on January 5 at 6:30 PM and 8 PM, respectively. Richard Bartholomew asked about shutters only being shown on Germantown Avenue; J Landis asked to have a site plan showing the neighborhood for the LUPZC. Both presentations will be on Zoom.

**Committee Business**

• Minutes Approval: The minutes were reviewed. HDAC reference needs to be corrected. With that correction noted, it was moved that the minutes be approved. The motion was seconded and was passed.

•Updates. 9402 Meadowbrook has a building permit and construction is proceeding slowly. 9410 Meadowbrook is not pursuing its variance. A garage may be built that does not need a variance. P Cove asked if 10 Bethlehem Pike could be cleaned up. A McNiff will ask. She added that a briefing on the status of the project is expected at the end of January. The Women’s Center building at Chestnut Hill Hospital is working on a historic nomination. The whole property will be included. Additional parking needs to be added to make up for the parking that was on the Norwood lot. An addition at the rear will be removed and the carriage house at the rear will be demolished. The hearing is January 13. The changes are not imminent. The central block and the portico will be retained.

**Adjournment**

•The meeting was adjourned at 9:26 PM.