

**Joint Meeting of  
LAND USE, PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE  
and  
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE**

*Minutes of the Meeting of March 7, 2024*

LUPZC Members Present

- |                           |                                          |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| ✓ Steve Gendler, Co-chair | ✓ Joyce Lenhardt                         |
| ✓ Chris Linn, Co-chair    | ✓ Jean McCoubrey                         |
| ✓ Jan Albaum              | ✓ Andrew Moroz                           |
| ✓ Jason Friedland         | ✓ Camille Peluso                         |
| ✓ John Landis             | ✓ Craig Schelter                         |
| ✓ Greg Lattanzi           | Laura Lucas, President CHCA (ex-officio) |

DRC Members Present

- |                          |                                                            |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| ✓ Larry McEwen, Co-chair | ✓ Sam Filippi, Business Association                        |
| ✓ John Landis, Co-chair  | ✓ Matt Rutt, Parking Foundation<br>, Streetscape Committee |
| ✓ Chris Linn, LUPZC      | ✓ Matt Rutt, VP Physical                                   |
| ✓ Steve Gendler, LUPZC   | Laura Lucas, President CHCA (ex-officio)                   |
| ✓ Patricia Cove, HDAC    |                                                            |

Others Attending:

Matt Millan, architect 2009 West Chestnut Hill Avenue  
Lavi Schenkman, developer 209 West Chestnut Hill Avenue  
Adam Laver, attorney for 209 West Chestnut Hill Avenue  
Numerous neighbors and others. They are identified when they speak  
Lori Salgonicoff, Chestnut Hill Conservancy  
Ruffian Tittman, Friends of the Wissahickon.  
Anne McNiff, Executive Director CHCA  
Celeste Hardester, Development Review Facilitator  
Melissa Nash, recorder

The joint meeting was opened by Larry McEwen at 8:03 PM.

**209 W Chestnut Hill Avenue**

•Presentation: The meeting was turned over to Matt Millan and Lavi Schenkman. M Millan noted that the proposed fourth floor on the mansion was removed. The twins and the triplex are moved to open up the view and a bank of garages was moved. The refusals are now multifamily/principal buildings, steep slopes and tree removals. Views of the site from the Lavender Trail were shown. The chimney of the mansion is the major view element from the trail. The site constrains moving the new construction. It was noted that the windows on the mansion are generally smaller facing the park than those facing West Chestnut Hill Avenue. The dimensional (rear yard) variance has been removed. There are no watershed

problems. The garages have green roofs. Openings onto the mansion side of the carriage house have been made larger. The traffic study was shown. Traffic generated on the site is small compared to overall volume current traffic. There is additional guest parking. The community benefits from the restoration of the historic buildings and the site. Storm water management is an improvement. The project adds neighbors to the street and taxes to the city. Adam Laver noted that storm water flowing to the park is limited. L McEwen noted that there may be an additional benefit of extra trees in the neighborhood.

•Committee Comments/Questions: Steve Gendler asked about the type of fencing around the pool. It has not been selected. It is required to be 4' high. John Landis thanked the developer for the changes. Sam Filippi complemented the storm water control. Craig Schelter noted that the project has been made better. Andrew Moroz stated that there is still too much new construction. The arrangement of the buildings seems too suburban. He suggested grouping buildings on the sides of the site. Joyce Lenhardt asked about a plan showing the Lavender Trail. It was shown. The axis view of the mansion needs respect. She asked if the fire marshal has seen the site layout. They have asked the fire marshal to evaluate the site. It has been reviewed by a civil engineer. There is a fire hydrant on the site. She asked about trees being donated to the community or to FOW. M Millan noted that the City has a provision for the developer of pay an *in lieu* fee to offset trees. M Rutt stated that some good changes were made. Trees added locally are good. He feels there is too much emphasis on the view of the site from the Lavender Trail. The view from West Chestnut Hill Avenue is more important. S Gendler suggested moving the far twin closer to the Crefeld school property line and the second twin closer to the triple. The developers explored alternate location including pushing buildings into the corners. It was also noted that moving buildings moves paving as well. L McEwen reiterated that the view from West Chestnut Hill Avenue is the primary public view. The view of the house from the trail is secondary. C Linn noted that angularity of the siting of the new buildings at the rear of the site won't be seen from the street.

•Neighbor Comments/Questions: Brad Bank spoke on behalf of the neighbors. The project is opposed by 12 of the 14 near neighbors. The school and the mental health facility are against the project. The new buildings created the water shed problems. The project is a grotesque, over-scaled plan. He asked the committees to oppose the proposal. George Zeleznik noted that the view from Crefeld School is a public view. He had a brief statement from the school. (The statement has been distributed before the meeting.) In addition, the developer knew of the easements when the property was purchased. The students will suffer from the noise and the construction. Kim Dukes noted that she was required to submit a letter of support from the hospital before gaining support for her project at 5 E. Chestnut Hill Avenue. This should be a requirement for this project as well. (A check of the minutes noted that this was a suggestion that was not approved.) David Fineman, attorney for the neighbors, stated that the neighbor opinions need to be taken into consideration. He has a son in architecture school. This review is like a project critique. L McEwen noted that the LUPZC is tasked with reviewing zoning. Dave Danneberg, a Mt. Airy neighbor, suggested the project could be taken over by a new owner for 1-2 million who would not need the 30 million profit. He stated that this project with no rules would turn Chestnut Hill into Houston. There is strong opposition and no neighbor support. Mason Barnett stated that she is neutral or in support and believes there are others who feel the same. She does not feel the project is over developed. L Schenkman noted that the tree variance would be removed through the fee. The property has insurance and has been maintained. Dave Danneberg stated that the property has not been maintained. He also asked whose interest the committee was representing. J Landis noted that the neighbors' opinions have been heard, but there is no clarity on what the negatives were specifically and said we have not heard substantive concerns raised by the neighbors. He also informed the neighbors that the project still would be heard by the Board and then the ZBA. G Zeleznik stated no maintenance was done as he could see all

the activity on the site. D Fineman asked about the other meetings. L McEwen reviewed the meetings: tonight the LUPZC and the DRC will vote on the project, then the Board on March 14 at 7 PM and the ZBA on March 27. Dave Danneberg noted that the easements will prevent the project from going forward.

•LUPZC Motion: No further comments were made by the LUPZC. Craig Schelter moved that the committee recommend support of the project including the tree replacement provision and that the development be mindful of easements, which are a private agreement between the owner and the Conservancy. The motion was seconded by J Landis. S Gendler asked about the tree replacement provision. L Schenkmann stated that due to the tree replacement fund, that variance was no longer needed. C Schelter noted that steep slopes only applied to the mansion and the carriage house. A Moroz stated that he cannot support the motion as presented and that the project does not support parts of the easement. C Peluso stated that the motion should mention the excessive density. C Schelter noted that the density proposed for 208 Rex is greater than that proposed for 209 West Chestnut Hill Avenue. A Moroz stated that the two properties cannot be compared. J Landis suggested adding a proviso that if the project goes forward with ZBA approval and easement approvals that the project return to the LUPZC for further consultation design elements details. This would be done prior to receiving the building permit. The details need to be seen. Anne McNiff noted that a proviso like this would not be supported by the ZBA. Adam Laver noted that the applicants would continue to work with the committee. J McCoubrey noted that this proviso should not be limited to design details but should include massing and operational issues, including construction. Construction issues should be worked out with neighbors. C Linn noted that he sympathizes with A Moroz's concerns about the layout of the structures on the site relative to the mansion. G Zeleznik (of Crefeld) stated he would like to know what the reasonable provisions will be as student will be literally 10' away from construction. Adam Laver stated to let this serve as a public commitment to occasion reasonable discussion, and my lines are open - we are happy to engage. J Lenhardt noted that she is uncomfortable with the site plan. The final version of the motion:

*Craig Schelter moved that the committee recommend support of the project (with the two remaining variances of steep slope and MFD and understanding that the third variance for tree removal will be withdrawn) and that the development be mindful of easements, which are a private agreement between the owner and the Conservancy and that there be a proviso that if the project goes forward with ZBA approval and easement approvals that the project return to the LUPZC for further consultation on design elements details that have not been seen to date.*

*This would be done prior to receiving the building permit. The details need to be seen.*

The 5 to 5 vote was by roll call. The motion was supported by Chris Linn, John Landis, Craig Schelter, Jason Friedland, and Jan Albaum. The motion was opposed by Andrew Moroz, Camille Peluso, Greg Lattanzi, Joyce Lenhardt, and Jean McCoubrey. Co- chair Steve Gendler broke the tie by voting to support the motion. The committee charter was consulted to verify that this was the proper procedure.

•DRC Motion: The DRC representatives included John Landis, Chris Linn, Steve Gendler, Matt Rutt, Sam Filippi, HDAC, and FOW. The DRC charter was consulted to verify that this was the proper procedure. Jon Landis moved that the DRC endorse the LUPZC motion with the 2 variances and the proviso. The motion was seconded. The vote was by roll call. The motion passed with 4 votes in support, one vote against and 2 abstentions. John Landis, Steve Gendler, Chris Linn and Matt Rutt voted to support the motion; Sam Filippi voted to oppose the motion; and Patricia Cove of HDAC and Friends of the Wissahickon abstained. The next meeting for the project is the special Board meeting on March 14 at 7 PM via Zoom.

**Adjournment**

- The meeting was adjourned at 10:11PM.