

**LAND USE, PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE**  
*Minutes of the Meeting of March 3, 2022*

Members Present

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

Others Attending:

Greg and Susan Thiel, owner 14 Laughlin Lane  
Bill O'Brien, attorney 14 Laughlin Lane  
Jeanne Connolly, neighbor 14 Laughlin Lane  
David Lockart, owner 8330 Millman  
Donna Lisle, architect 8330 Millman  
Juliet Farjardo, architect 8330 Milman  
Rob Fleming  
Greg Lattanzi  
Craig Schelter  
Elizabeth Wright  
Tim Breslin  
Karen Pilling  
Ross Pilling  
Randy Williams  
Tarik Khan  
Bernie Burch  
Celeste Hardester, Development Review Facilitator  
Anne McNiff, Executive Director CHCA  
Melissa Nash, recorder

The meeting was opened at 8:04 pm by Steve Gendler, co-chair. This meeting was conducted remotely using Zoom. It was moved that the minutes for February be approved. Andrew Moroz questioned that the minutes said that the residents had lost confidence in the processes. This was said in the meeting Chris Linn noted that pre-reviews involve community members and developers. SOSNA is the correct acronym for the South Street group. Its pre-meetings are confidential. It was moved to accept the minutes with the corrections. The motion was seconded. The minutes were approved with corrections noted. Potential new committee members, Craig Schelter, Rob Fleming and Greg Lattanzi, were introduced. Jan Albaum, a fourth candidate, was not able to attend this meeting.

### **8330 Millman Place**

•Presentation: Donna Lisle and Juliet Fajardo, architect, presented the project. The desire is to create an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) on the property. The project has been reviewed by the Historical Commission in two meetings. Zoning states that an ADU should be contained in an existing building, so a variance is needed to allow a separate structure. The side yard is 8' rather than the required 10', generating a second refusal. The property was put on the national register in 2016. Adding to the structure is not allowed. The owner cares for the house, allowing tours and maintaining the building. He wants to be able to age in place in the house. The ADU will be used to host family and a possible caretaker. It will be built with high quality materials. J Fajardo called it a garden pavilion or a granny flat. It will include 2 bedrooms and 2 baths, a kitchenette, dining area and a grand piano. The ADU is not clearly seen from the historic house. Landscaping will form a screen. It is also not seen from the street. The "postcard" view of the historic house is not affected. The 8' side yard is the result of the Historic Commission asking that the ADU be moved further from the house. It was also made smaller. The Historic Commission noted that every 6" matters. The neighbor who shared the property line that abuts the 8' setback is OK with the placement. The Historic Commission was specific with keeping the slender design.

•Discussion: Jason Friedland asked if the neighbor had signed a letter regarding the ADU. They have. S Gendler asked to see a site section and elevations. The property slopes up about 3' from the Venturi house. The ground heights of the buildings match. The ADU roofline is lower than the main house. The mechanical equipment will be located in the taller portion of the roof. Celeste Hardester asked about the setback envelope. The corner rectangles shown on the site are raised beds for vegetables. The setback diagram was shown. The site has less than the allowable coverage. The 2 buildings would cover about 2600 sq ft and make up about 5-6% of the lot. J Friedland noted that density is increased without impacting the street. Camille Peluso asked about the area of the footprint of the existing house. It is about 1400 sq ft and 800 sq ft for the ADU. Larry McEwen asked if the maple on the building site will survive the construction. He noted the hip roof was good. A Moroz noted that there is a special eddy on the lot. Long term, the residence needs the dependency. It will serve the life of the iconic structure. S Gendler suggested care with the Japanese maple. Rob Fleming suggested a conservation easement on the façade. A Moroz noted the preservation of only the street facade is unfortunate. The façade easement is too limited. David Lockard noted that the interior is also protected and cannot be changed.

•Committee Action: S Gendler called for the question. L McEwen moved that the committee support the application for a variance as presented. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved. The project should move back to the DRC for the RCO meeting on March 15.

### **14 Laughlin Lane**

•Presentation: Bill O'Brien stated that more information is being provided as requested. He first showed a zoning plan with the building envelop and setback lines. The dining room addition has 198 sq ft. The rear yard should be 30'; the project has a 15'. The Thiels have the support of their neighbors. The rear neighbors' yards are house on Germantown Avenue and W. Chestnut Hill Ave. Photos were shown. There is a heritage tree in the side yard that would not be affected. There is no window on the rear of the addition. The rear window of the kitchen would be removed; the opening would connect the kitchen and dining room. The tree at the rear of the lot would also not be affected. They do not have a full first floor plan. It was noted that the locations of the dormers on the rear

elevation were incorrect; they were to be corrected for this presentation. The old plan needs to be compared to the new.

•Discussion: J Landis noted that he has no problem with the basic variance. Additional specific information was requested but not provided. A Moroz noted that the choice of location for the dining room is not demonstrated as there is no first floor plan. More good faith planning is needed. S Gendler noted that the addition simply juts out and does not engage the outside. There were questions about the new windows. The end piece of the building is a sun room. A question was asked about the roof covering on the addition. B O'Brien stated it will be metal and showed a version of metal that mimics shingles. Randy Williams and J McCoubrey noted that standing seam was what was envisioned. The new roof should not imitate the existing. The roof will be standing seam metal roof. J Landis noted that a detailed rendering of the addition would be helpful.

•Committee Action: J Landis moved that the committee make no recommendation regarding the variance going forward. There is no confidence in the design, but the addition impacts only the owners and no others. The motion was seconded. A Moroz noted that he cannot support the project as it is not a good design. It needs a better design standard. More needs to be shown regarding the zoning envelope and what is being proposed. He added that there is no need to be neutral in making a decision about the project. C Peluso agreed that more information is needed. J Lenhardt noted that she still has concerns about the rear elevation. A full floor plan is needed to justify the location. The rear elevation is not correctly drawn. It needs better scaling and alignments. S Gendler asked about the remodeling company having an architect on the staff. L McEwen state that he has no confidence in the design and noted that approval of the neighbors does not make the design acceptable J Friedland noted that there is a motion on the table but there is not enough information to make a decision. It was noted that there is a motion on the floor. There was a general discussion of the implications of the motion. [Jeanne Connolly's response was delayed due to technical problems.] A neighbor, Jeanne Connolly, approves the project. J Connolly stated that the location for the dining room is appropriate. The sun porch at the end of the living room complements the living room and fireplace. The new dining room solution is the best solution. The existing spaces are functional. L McEwen noted that the set back is not the problem; the design is the problem. There should be a vote on the motion. The vote was tied. As chair, S Gendler voted to not support the motion, which was then defeated. J Lenhardt moved that the applicant bring requested information with accurate elevation of the rear to the DRC. The motion is not opposed to the plan, just the accuracy of the representation. The project needs a corrected design and a full floor plan. The motion was seconded. A Moroz objected that March 30 is the ZBA date. The amended motion asks the project should return to the LUPZC with correct information. Continuance for ZBA would be needed. The drawings could be brought to DRC for approval. Discussion followed about the where the drawings should be viewed. The drawings presented should be what were requested by the committee. The committee needs the information to properly judge the project. J Landis asked that the architect/engineer should be present. The motion was restated: accurate documents should be brought to the DRC. The LUPZC should be invited to the meeting to review the documents. Others asked for similar items. The drawings do not communicate and do not provide confidence in the design. Evidence is needed. Without the documents, there is no support. There could be a special LUPZC meeting if documents are received before the DRC. Information needed included interior and exterior to match, full floor plan, window details, and accurate elevations. Some committee members are prepared to approve the project but need the information to make that decision. If the info can be provided the committee

could review them before the DRC meeting. B O'Brien will try to get D Remodeling to clarify and possibly speak. If received in time, a committee of the whole could review and make a recommendation to the DRC.

### **Introduction of Potential Members**

•Craig Schelter: C Schelter has lived in Chestnut Hill for 54 years. He has worked for the City Planning Commission and has been its executive director. He was involved in the most recent total re-zoning effort. He has had 5 houses and 2 rentals He has also worked on the Redevelopment Commission. He works as a private consultant for dispute resolution and has served on the LUPZC before. C Peluso asked about recent work. He has worked for the Union League and the Navy Yard. S Gendler spoke of C Schelter's institutional knowledge.

•Rob Fleming: R Fleming is a landscape architect and had a business in Chestnut Hill for many years. Recently, he has been involved with personal property on the Iowa prairie with an easement, creating a native restoration of the property. He is interested in historic property preservation and has worked and taught it. He has worked with the Conservancy and on the Olmstead celebration. He supports operating at arm's length with the Conservancy. C Peluso asked about the need to remain arm's length from the Conservancy. It was noted that those are short arms. He has also served on the LUPZC.

•Greg Lattanzi: G Lattanzi is the New Jersey State Archaeologist and the NJ State Museum Curator. He has done historic preservation nominations and other preservation work. He has been a consultant for designers, organizations and governmental agencies. He is a Chestnut Hill resident. S Gendler asked him how he viewed the Board vs the LUPZC. The scope of the groups varies. L McEwen asked about his opinion on the developments proposed in Chestnut Hill balanced with his historical background. The historic landscape should be addressed. C Peluso asked J Landis why the LUPZC should not work with the Conservancy. The two groups have different missions. Their roles are different. A lively discussion of committee and community functions followed.

### **Announcement by a Current Member**

•Larry McEwen announced that he will rotate off the LUPZC for a year. Kudos to Larry for his years of service.

### **Adjournment**

•The committee went into executive session to discuss the candidates. The public meeting was adjourned at 10:30 PM.