

LAND USE, PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting of January 6, 2021

Members Present

- | | |
|----------------------------|--|
| ✓ Jean McCoubrey, Co-chair | ✓ Larry McEwen |
| ✓ Steve Gendler, Co-chair | Ned Mitinger |
| Jason Friedland | ✓ Andrew Moroz |
| ✓ John Landis | ✓ Camille Peluso |
| ✓ Joyce Lenhardt | Kathi Clayton, President CHCA (ex-officio) |
| ✓ Chris Linn | ✓ Joyce Lenhardt, VP Physical (Interim) |

Others Attending:

Susan Swartz
Karen Pilling
Janet Potter
Ann Williams
Elizabeth Wright
Melissa Degenhardt
Celeste Hardester, Development Review Facilitator
Anne McNiff, Executive Director CHCA
Melissa Nash, recorder

The meeting was opened at 8:03 pm by Steve Gendler, co-chair. This meeting was conducted remotely using Zoom. A motion was made to approve the December minutes. The spelling of a participant's name was corrected. A question was asked about HDAC; it was noted that there was no HDAC meeting this evening. The minutes were approved with the noted correction. The agenda includes the selection of a new co-chair and committee procedures.

New Co-Chair

•Discussion: S Gendler spoke about the role of the co-chairs. J McCoubrey's term as co-chair is expiring. It was asked if Jason Friedland was available. The role of the co-chairs as reps to the DRC was stressed. Anne McNiff and Celeste Hardester are great resources.

Projects in Formation

•Discussion: It was noted that a process to handle projects that are in development stages. There may be future benefits to pre-meeting with potential applicants. This process is used by other community associations; South of South Street Neighborhood Association has an extra layer of work sessions that works with pre-review. It was noted that this pre-review has been done by CHCA but without guidelines. It was asked if this is appropriate. The process needs to be codified. John Landis asked why this is needed. Recently, applicants have been coming in prepared. The work is reactive not proactive. Pre-review could work with potentials, be proactive. Camille Peluso noted that the process is based on agreed upon goals of the community that try to keep Chestnut Hill as it is. Proactive actions are needed. S Gendler asked how historic communities evolve, how they use the underused sites, accommodate cars and protect affordability. It was asked if documents like the Green Book

and the Germantown Avenue guidelines are available on-line. They are. Larry McEwen noted that Chestnut Hill is an evolving community, not a Williamsburg. It was stated that maybe people like Chestnut Hill the way it is. Not all agree. Community entries could be better designed. Is Chestnut Hill ready to adopt guidelines. An alternative to guidelines could be a statement of values. Andrew Moroz noted that new projects can surprise community members when seen for the first time. Ideas need to be explored before details. Mermaid Lane has inadequate idea development. There needs to be more collaborative work. J McCoubrey suggested a programmatic presentation with dimensional ideas later. The pre-review could be a drawingless presentation and might address use changes, density and general massing/height. Joyce Lenhardt noted that the Goldenberg Group was asked to do this type of meeting but did not follow through. She asked if the preliminary meeting should be public or private. They have not and there should be a pushback against this. S Gendler noted the pre-review should not be through the LUPZC but rather through DRC or the Development Planning Group. J Landis stated that this is like a pre-application meeting with planning for a larger project. The public would still not be involved. A pre-application advisory group would have no legal force but could give advice about what needs to be addressed. The advice is not binding but could guide developers. C Peluso asked about engaging the community to avoid surprises. The CHCA Board is more broad than other committees. The LUPZC is a technical committee with a focus; it does not have the same viewpoint as other groups. It was asked how to deal with disagreement. There was a discussion about community vs opinion. The role of the LUPZC was questioned. The community and the applicant need to be balanced. Elizabeth Wright noted that this is an important agenda item, not a question of hours of work. The community and committees are disconnected. Things are reviewed piecemeal. The whole picture is missing. There should be a way for the community to see rezoning and remapping. More info needs to be made available for the community. All groups should be included. J McCoubrey noted that there is no updated community wide plan. The last one was produced in 1982. The Conservancy has worked on this more recently. L McEwen stated the Board voted 13-4 regarding 30 West. J Landis spoke of a pre-application advisory that may see more proposals originating from outside the community. S Gendler reiterated that this should come from the Development Planning Group or another. Anne McNiff noted that it should be a different group than the regular review groups. There should be separate members. Alternative groups were discussed. It was suggested that applicants could talk to Planning. A McNiff noted that Planning is short-staffed. S Gendler noted this planning meeting is all conceptual. This would not be needed for all projects – two examples that could have been pre-reviewed are Mermaid Lane and Bethlehem Pike. The project on the corner of Abington and Germantown was mentioned as one in which the massing was reduced. Some developers are not aware of the community and should be directed to do a better job for the community. How can the community engage them. In some cases, zoning is as-of-right. These should be pointed out. Bonuses can be used for exceptions and can change as-of-right outcomes.

New Co-Chair

•Discussion: The floor was returned to the issue of a new co-chair. A call was made for volunteers. Candidates need one year of committee service and 2 years of CHCA membership to be eligible. The co-chairs can appoint alternate DRC reps if needed. Chris Linn asked about the meeting date for DRC third Tuesday of each month at 7 PM. C Linn volunteered. His nomination will be sent to the Board with a personal statement or bio. E Wright suggested a short statement. S Gendler suggested C Linn call him or have coffee to discuss the position. The nomination will go to the February Board meeting for appointment in March.

New Business

•New RCO Rules: J Landis noted that there have been discussions about changes to RCO rules. A McNiff noted that this is beyond the discussion phase; it has passed city council. Community benefits need to be carefully reported. This includes community agreements with applicants as well as anything that can be considered a perk. This does not need to be done until 2023 for 2022. The definition of a community benefit is being worked out. J Landis asked if this also includes provisos in recommendations to the ZBA, which has not been enforcing provisos. It has not come up. It was asked why ZBA does not enforce provisos. It can look out for any deals being made and to make them public. Details need to be worked out.

•10 Bethlehem Pike: L McEwen stated that he received a letter of notification that an appeal has been filed. Case is going to Court of Common appeals.

Adjournment

•The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 PM.