

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

Minutes of the Meeting of February 19, 2024

Members Present

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| ✓ Steve Gendler, Co-chair LUPZC | ✓ Joyce Lenhardt LUPZC |
| ✓ Chris Linn, Co-chair LUPZC | ✓ Jean McCoubrey LUPZC |
| ✓ Jan Albaum LUPZC | ✓ Andrew Moroz LUPZC |
| ✓ Jason Friedland LUPZC | ✓ Camille Peluso LUPZC |
| ✓ Larry McEwen DRC Co-Chair | ✓ Craig Schelter LUPZC |
| ✓ Greg Lattanzi LUPZC | ✓ Laura Lucas, President CHCA (ex-officio) |
| ✓ Patricia Cove DRC | ✓ Matt Rutt, VP Physical CHCA |
| ✓ John Landis LUPZC/DRC Co-Chair | |

Others Attending:

Bill Cullina, Morris Arboretum

Eric Deiss, Morris Arboretum

Lavi Schenkman, developer Greylock

Matt Millan, architect Greylock

Adam Laver, attorney Greylock

Many neighbors and interested parties. (Those who spoke are named in the body of the minutes)

Lori Salgonicoff, Chestnut Hill Conservancy

Ruffian Tittmann, Friends of the Wissahickon

Anne McNiff, Executive Director CHCA

Celeste Hardester, Development Review Facilitator

Melissa Nash, recorder

The meeting opened at 7:03 PM by John Landis, co-chair of DRC. Note: in the comments sections, responses to comments are italicized.

Morris Arboretum

•Presentation: Bill Cullina of the Arboretum presented the project, which is a storage building for the model railway exhibit. The exhibit has been in existence for 26 years. Currently, train storage is accommodated in a tent. The proposed building is a small storage area with a larger covered porch. The enclosed area is 8’x16’. The total roofed area is 24’x16’. The building is designed as a scaled down version of the Chestnut Hill West newsstand. The building will have electric service. It will not be habitable.

•Committee Comments/Questions: J Landis noted that this meeting was the introduction to the project and the RCO meeting. He asked about the refusal. *The project received a refusal as it is located in RSD1 zoning that does not permit the second structure on the property.* Steve Gendler asked how the porch be used. *It will be used as a question and answer area for visitors.* Greg Lattanzi asked if the area would be

used for exhibits. *The porch may be used for informational exhibits. These may not be restricted to the porch location.*

•Closing Comments/Motion: The meeting was turned over to the LUPZC. It was moved that the LUPZC recommend support for this variance to the DRC. The motion was seconded and passed with 9 votes for and one abstention. The meeting then went to the DRC for action. After asking about the HDAC response to the project, which was in support, it was moved that the DRC recommend support of the project. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved. It will next be seen by the Board.

(At this point Larry McEwen became the co-chair. He explained that the committees will not be discussing easements. The order of the meeting will be developer presentation, committee members, neighbors within 250' and others who wish to speak)

Greylock 209 West Chestnut Hill Avenue

•Presentation: The presentation was begun by Matt Millan, architect for the project. He focused on changes made since the last presentation. The pool house has been eliminated. The rear porches on the twins have been eliminated; this removed the rear yard setback violation. The 5 unit building is now a three unit building. The mansion now has 6 units instead of 4. This is accomplished with a ground level garden unit and the addition of a fourth floor. The roof of this addition is moved back from the park so it is less visible. The overall height of the mansion is increased from 44' to 54'. A total of 10'-3" is added to the mansion height. Parking is increased from 34 spaces to 39. Handicapped spaces are included. This eliminates the need for another variance. There is only a low retaining wall at the pool. Emergency vehicle access to the buildings is improved. Wissahickon Watershed coverage is less than the maximum for both categories. For much of the year, the house is not seen from the Lavender Trail. Simplified elevations were shown. The new buildings have more stone than previously. A traffic study used 64 trips per day, which increases the load on W Chestnut Hill Avenue 1.1% to 1.4%. The community benefits from the restoration of the historic mansion.

•Committee Comments/Questions: Jason Friedland, acknowledged the great views from the proposed location, suggested moving the pool to the space between the carriage house and the mansion. *This location has too much shade.* J Landis asked if the changes require changes to the septic system and the stormwater system. *It should not.* He also suggested that the site is crowded; the number of units should be reduced. *It was noted that site topography guides building locations.* He asked how much was site driven and how much was financially driven. S Gendler asked if there were charts/tables with the old and new schemes compared. He also voice the need to reduce the number of units. He likes the greater density in the mansion. He noted that the fourth floor addition is jarring. Joyce Lenhardt suggested eliminating the fourth story. She addressed the variances needed for the multiple buildings, trees and steep slopes. *It was noted that there is no building on the steep slopes, which are man-made for the most part.* She asked how the site could be used without the easements. *It could be divided in to 16-18 lots, the mansion would be demolished to do this.* L McEwen noted that the steep slopes are a minor issue; trees can be mitigated. The multiple buildings and building height have the most visual impact. Chris Linn suggested that the fourth floor needs to be removed. It is more visible as one moves away from the house. Jan Albaum asked about the garden unit's size. It has 1100-1400 sq ft. She also asked how the traffic study determined the trips. *They figured 2.1 trips per unit car.* S Gendler noted the parking. J Friedland stated the density is acceptable. The fourth floor was a self-imposed problem and will require a new variance. Craig Schelter asked how residents could be stopped from adding trees on their own. *There will be HOA restrictions.* He also noted that the fourth floor was a problem for him. L McEwen noted that the

house can be seen from the trail at this time of year. He asked if there is selective clearing for the trail for improved views. Ruffian Tittmann noted that the park is planting trees not thinning them. J Lenhardt stated that she is troubled by the fourth floor and obstructed view from the mansion to the park with the twin in the way. Matt Rutt noted that the change from the 5 unit building to the triple is positive. He finds the fourth floor to be jarring. C Peluso finds the roofline to be messed up by the fourth floor.

•Near Neighbors Comments/Questions: George Zeleznikk, head of Crefeld School stated that he has not been contacted by the developer. The school includes 35 staff members and 88 families. He prefers the status quo, leaving things as is. He read a letter. The new plan has no reduction in density. He also feels that there will be more traffic than the study indicates. The house is very visible from the trail. *Lavi Schenkman stated that he has reached out to the school via email, letter and in person.* G Zeleznik notes that there has been no contact since the last meeting. *The developer has met with the Board of trustees.* Brad Bank, 130 W Chestnut Hill Avenue (not a near neighbor), is the chair of the Chestnut Hill Landmarks, which does include 3 near neighbors. He has submitted petitions against the project. He sees no change in the scheme and asked about hardships. David Fineman, attorney for the neighbors, asked what version of the project would go to the L&I. Would it be the same presentation presented to the community? *L McEwen noted that at present no presentation will be sent as there has been no motion or vote.* Melissa Epperly of W. Hampton noted that there has been some good progress. Iain Dukes, 9002 Crefeld (not a near neighbor), stated that he can see the mansion from his house, and it can be seen from the trail. The traffic study is unrealistic; it does not consider deliveries and service people. Mason Barnett, 11 W Chestnut Hill Avenue ((not a near neighbor), noted that there has been good progress and it is a great proposal. Traffic is very heavy now; this will not create a great difference. A better view of the fourth floor is needed. Lisa and Martin Mancuso, 8803 Crefeld (not a near neighbor), stated that they are opposed to both the old and new proposals. They object to the new construction and the fourth floor. Adriana Della Porta, 8925 Crefeld outside of near neighbor area, stated that there are way too many units. *The units are necessary to allow renovation of the existing buildings and the site.* Tallulah Regen, 510 W Chestnut Hill Ave (not a near neighbor), stated that she is in favor of something being done with the property. The new buildings are subservient to the mansion, which needs to be loved. She suggested buildings along the driveway. The scale of the new structures needs to be considered. Caretha Creasy, 7 W Chestnut Hill Avenue (not a near neighbor), stated that she needs a better idea of what the fourth floor would look like. She suggested removing the middle twin and replacing it with the pool. Christina Fournaris, 25 Laughlin Place (not a near neighbor), stated that she is disappointed with the plans. Problems include density, over-development, traffic, noise and the pool. She noted that there is a country club a block away. She is also disappointed with the process. Dave Dannenberg, Mt. Airy resident (Crefeld School board director/not a near neighbor) noted that financial viability is not important. As the property exists now, the storm water management is not needed.

•Closing Comments/Motion: L McEwen asked if the development team had any additional comments. They did not. Closing comments by J Landis include objecting to the fourth floor as presented, problems with the view, and the crowded nature of the development. More drawings are needed. J Lenhardt suggested the tree planting plan was not viable. It may not be appropriate to replace all the trees. They could be planted in other places. M Rutt noted that the allée needs to be restored. S Gendler noted that a plan for the trees is needed.

•Closing Comments/Motion: Adam Laver stated that the new ZBA hearing is March 27. C Linn called for a motion from the LUPZC. S Gendler stated that a precise chart comparing square footages with and without the fourth floor was needed as are more detailed elevations of the building. J Friedland

suggested better views from the Lavender trail were needed. J Landis suggested a panoramic view from the mansion to the trail and the review was needed. It was noted that the season affect the views. The view from the mansion to the park should be improved. It was asked how long it would take to get this new info together. The next LUPZC is March 7 and the DRC is March 19. The Board meeting is before March 27. M Millan suggested that 2 weeks might be enough time. M Rutt suggested another joint meeting. It was suggested that the freestanding garages be incorporated into the new buildings. J Landis moved that the LUPC delay consideration until the next meeting on March 7. Responses to comments made tonight can be considered. It was noted that time should be allowed to review changes before the meeting. S Gendler suggested 10 days. This was not accepted. Items that should be considered are more detailed studies of the fourth floor, dimernsional studies, better renderings, re-location of new construction, better view corridors, more comparison of old and new schemes, parking garage locations. A Moroz noted that while new construction is needed the project should have fewer units. To him the fourth floor is a non-starter. J McCoubrey agreed with A Moroz. She suggested removing the middle twin and no fourth floor and possibly moving the pool to the park side of the property. Most agreed that the fourth floor should not be added. J Lenhardt said that it should be recognized that the applicant has considered some aspects of the easement requirements in their design proposal. She also pointed out that the easement allows for 12 units but it also allows for commercial use, which neighbors might not like. C Schelter suggested the list of changes is excessive and that he is OK with the pool as is and the fourth floor. The revisions should be received by March 4 to allow review by committee members before March 7. The motion simply restated consideration of the issues noted and including additional graphics and analysis. The motion was seconded and passed 7 in favor and one against (due to the excessive nature of the ask). The DRC stated that it will meet with the LUPZC for March 7. M Rutt reiterated that the fourth floor needs to be reconsidered.

Committee Business

- Minutes: It was moved that the minutes of the January LUPZC and the January DRC be approved as submitted. The motion was seconded and approved.

Adjournment

- The meeting was adjourned at 9:32PM.