

LAND USE, PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting of May 5, 2022

Members Present

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| ✓ Steve Gendler, Co-chair | ✓ Joyce Lenhardt |
| ✓ Chris Linn, Co-chair | ✓ Jean McCoubrey |
| ✓ Jan Albaum | Andrew Moroz |
| ✓ Rob Fleming | Camille Peluso |
| Jason Friedland | ✓ Craig Schelter |
| ✓ John Landis | |
| ✓ Greg Lattanzi | ✓ Kathi Clayton, President CHCA (ex-officio) |
| | ✓ Larry McEwen, VP Physical CHCA |

Others Attending:

David Lockard, owner 8330 Millman
Donna Lisle, architect 8330 Millman
Juliet Fajardo, architect 8330 Millman
Joan Lau, neighbor 8330 Millman
Richard Bartholomew, HDAC
Matt Millan, HDAC
Miles Orvell, HDAC
Debra Popky, HDAC
Bill O'Keefe, HDAC
Patricia Cove, HDAC
Lori Salgonicoff, CH Conservancy
Leah Silverstein, CH Conservancy
Celeste Hardester, Development Review Facilitator
Anne McNiff, Executive Director CHCA
Melissa Nash, recorder

The meeting was opened at 8:02 pm by Steve Gendler, co-chair. This meeting was conducted remotely using Zoom. 8330 Millman is returning to this LUPZC/HDAC combined meeting to review the progress made by the owner, neighbor and subcommittee.

8330 Millman Place

•Background Presentation: Joyce Lenhardt provided background. A sub-committee was formed at the DRC to mediate between the owner and the near neighbor. It met twice. The committee includes J Lenhardt, Craig Schelter, Rob Fleming, Randy Williams, a near neighbor Jim Ballengee and his wife, the owner David Lockard, near neighbor Joan Lau, and the architects, Donna Lisle and Juliet Fajardo. They have explored new ideas about the building and landscaping. There was a presentation of solutions landscaping and changes to materials. Stringlines were set up to help with visualization. The appearance at the April DRC was postponed to May. The LUPZC and the HDAC need to consider the progress. Joan Lau has indicated via email that she still objects to the location.

She could support the project if the ADU were moved to Navajo Street. A new proposal is being made. There will be votes today then the project will move to the DRC on May 17 and the Board on May 26. The ZBA hearing is June 1.

•Project Presentation: David Lockard introduced the project. The architects will present it. They have spent 4 months with the committees. D Lockard stated that the ADU does not make a bad view especially with more landscaping. J Fajardo began presenting the images including the existing building with the stringline ADU, which helps define the view. From Lau's house to the ADU the view includes the shed and shrubbery. A 25' x35' garage with a higher roofline could be built by right in the area where the ADU is proposed. Various landscape images were shown including a 4' fence and a line of trees. Study of the neighborhood shows that 8330 Millman is the least densely built property. Other landscaping ideas were shown. Landscaping can be layers and the Venturi house can be made the main view. S Gendler questioned the line of view of the house. The large screening shrub currently exists. Some of the tall trees may be removed. The elevation toward the Lau house was shown. Some windows were added to relieve the flatness of the elevation. It was noted that Lau's property contributes to the visit to the Venturi House. The Navajo location was explored. It is deemed negative. An addition to the existing house is not allowed. J Lau is OK with the use; she objects to the location. The ADU is a blatant violation of zoning. The ADU does not set a precedent. It does not upset the density of the area. Privacy is being impaired. The postcard view of the Venturi building is most important. The house is on the National Register and the Philadelphia register. The Historical Commission has approved the project. The ADU is not public. It is tucked into the landscape and does not intrude on the existing house. The house is an iconic image in a field of grass. The move to Navajo is not viable as it affects the postcard view. Views were shown. Public utilities would be moved closer to the house. The Navajo location makes ADA accessibility more difficult and adds pathways (137' path from ADU to the house) in the current scheme minimal landscaping is disturbed and the ADA access already exists. Navajo would require more re-landscaping. A scheme to turn the ADU 90° in its current location was shown. The Historic Commission did not approve of this idea due to its effect on the existing house.

•Neighbor Presentation: J Landis suggested that the Historic Commission's statement should be accepted. J Lau noted that she does not want the ADU near her property. S Gendler asked J Lau to speak concisely as all have heard her earlier discussion. J Lau noted that she has the link to the documents but that it is hard to absorb and react meaningfully to the information. She stated that the ADU is against the code and that it has a negative impact on them. She feels like there is pressure and that she does not understand the consideration being given to the ADU. It was suggested that she has not considered the proposals. She answered why she should consider non-standard proposals. S Gendler noted that committees exist to evaluate proposals for variances. A garage vs the ADU was discussed. J Lau asked why there needs to be 2 bedrooms, 2 baths and a kitchen. J Landis noted that exceptions to zoning balance the benefits and the harms. J Lau was asked what her specific concerns were. J Lau stated that she objects to size, shape, and location of the ADU. Landscaping can be done regardless. P Cove noted that at the HDAC meeting 2 alternate locations were discussed. She asked if the new landscaping was not satisfactory. It was not studies. It was all on the Lau property. The wall of evergreens was not satisfactory. J Lau noted that the landscaping was OK. The size, shape and the location of the ADU are not. She does not need landscaping. S Gendler noted that the ADU can be made garage size and be moved away from the property line to allow for landscaping. L McEwen noted that a garage can have 875 sq ft and 25'x35'. The ADU is

only 800 sq ft. It was asked if the courtyard was necessary. Turning the ADU could be considered. Modifications could be tried. Changes could be coordinated with the Historic Commission. Craig Schelter echoed L McEwen and J Landis, the Historic Commission minutes should be read. The building could be rotated and the public view could be protected, D Lockard asked why the Historic Commission needed to be consulted, and there would be less impact on the Lau property. The architects can provide recommendations. He also noted that the rotation will not satisfy J Lau. The current design has no engagement with the Vanna Venturi House and is inconspicuous. The ADU cannot be reduced in size much. The Navajo location has problems The ADU is already screened by the shed and shrubs. Other locations need walkways, the rotation spoils the design. J Fajardo stated that shortening the building does not help. Matt Millan noted that the building is protected, including the interior and asked why there were no projected views from the inside to the outside. D Lockard noted that the spirit of the house is not just the building but includes the site. R Fleming suggested landscaping could create a view to the left of the ADU to the house. The ADU could be made more obscure. Landscaping could be softened. S Gendler noted that the existing driveway spur is reused to not add parking. S Gendler asked if J Lau would consider having most of the landscaping on her property and views improved for them and visitors. D Lockard stated that he would consider moving the ADU to accommodate landscaping on his property. J Fajardo stated that this can be explored. But that the wall might need to go as the ADU would be closer to the house.

•Committee Action: J Landis stated that the committee tries to mediate disagreements and that so far no compromise has been reached. He moved that the LUPZC support the proposal that keeps the ADU in the general location, reduces the dimensions to garage size (Some opposition to the motion was expressed at this time.) The motion was seconded Miles Orvell observed that Lau's own shed blocks about a third of the ADU and existing shrubs block some. The visibility of the ADU is not significant and he is puzzled by the objection. R Fleming stated that better views can be created with landscaping. The view can be directed to the left from the Lau house. D Lockard added that some of the taller trees blocking the view of the Venturi house will be removed. P Coved noted that Randy Williams was on the sub-committee. R Williams noted that they did not consider moving the ADU.

•LUPZC Action: S Gendler called for the question for the LUPZC. The motion called for using the current location and changing the long dimension to 35'. R Bartholomew noted that the 35' dimension was too much change. The current actual dimension is 48'. It could be minimized. D Lisle noted that shortening could make it too tall and too wide. L McEwen noted that the courtyard is a feature and should not be eliminated. It was asked if the ADU could be shorter without increasing the depth. L McEwen suggested adding a landscape element to help reduce length. J Fajardo suggested pulling the garden into the building, which could be moved with a lush screen of landscaping. It was noted that compromise was the objective. The ADU could be made smaller and pulled away from the property line. J Lau stated that if the size and location were changed, she would consider. J Fajardo noted that changes like this do not happen instantly. J Landis noted that more than landscaping was needed. D Lockard noted that small changes would be OK but that there were too many cooks in the kitchen. The courtyard lets light into the building but could be smaller. M Millan suggested that the perceived height would be lower. D Lisle stated the ADU has been made lower. J Lau will consider a version with a change of size, location and shape. J Landis asked if this should be pursued. D Lockard noted that he was OK with modest changes. There should be no second story. J Landis noted that he can withdraw his motion. D Lockard wants the project to

advance. R Fleming noted that changes to the ADU will not affect much as this is a site planning problem. J Albaum suggested that solutions be shown. S Gendler noted the landscaping design is on the neighbor. J Landis moved that the committee support the ADU in the current location with the addition of at least 2' increase in the setback from the Lau property line and a reduction of no more than 36" on the length of the building. The design is worked out with the owner and neighbor. The motion was seconded. D Lockard recommended a length reduction of no more than 30" L McEwen noted that the 2' increase in the setback is significant for the building but not for the neighbor. C Hardester asked if the reducing the other sideyard setback from 8' to 6' would help. The vote on the new motion was taken and the motion was unanimously approved.

- HDAC Action: P Cove asked for an HDAC vote on the same motion. Matt Millan asked about the short time frame as the DRC is on May 17 and how the changes would be viewed before that time. J Lau noted that she also needs time to review and react. S Gendler noted that the subcommittee can meet in person. Others will help. C Schelter noted that the DRC final design goes to the Board. The HDAC approved of the motion unanimously.

Adjournment

- The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 PM