KLEHR HARRISON HARVEY BRANZBURGllp

## PERMIT HOLDER EXHIBIT PACKET

 10 BETHLEHEM PIKEZBA Calendar No. MI-2021-003377
Application No. ZP-2021-003377
Wednesday, October 13, 2021 @ 2:00pm

## 1. By-Right Project RCO Presentation

2. Zoning Plans
3. July Neighbor Presentation
4. Letter Opposing Appeal
5. Bill No. 210075
6. Zoning Code Sections:
A. §14-701(1)(c)
7. Woodcock Design - Expert Report
8. Expert Witness CV
9. List of Community Meeting
10. Letter to Chestnut Hill Neighbors

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION AS-OF-RIGHT




| SCALE <br> $12 "=1$ <br> 1 | DRA" |
| :--- | :--- |
| JAV |  |



VIEW FROM BETHLEHEM PIKE


VIEW TOWARD BETHLEHEM PIKE (FROM SUMMIT ST)


VIEW FROM SUMMIT ST

| SCALE | DRAWN <br> JAV | PROJECT NO. <br> 567 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SHEET NO. |  |  |
| $\mathrm{AO2}$ |  |  |




10 BETHLEHEM PIKE
10 BETHLEHEM PIKE, PHILADELPHIA PA 19118
sheet title
GROUND FLOOR PLAN
AS-OF-RIGHT

| SCALE <br> $1 / 16 "=1$ <br> 1 $\mathbf{- 0 "}$ | DRAWN | PROJECT NO. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

SHEET NO.


10 BETHLEHEM PIKE
10 BETHLEHEM PIKE, PHILADELPHIA PA 19118

SHEET TITLE 2ND FLOOR PLAN AS-OF-RIGHT

| SCALE <br> $1 / 16^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ | DRAWN <br> JAV | PROJECT NO. <br> 567 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SHEET NO. |  |  |
| A05 |  |  |





| SCALE <br> $1 / 16^{\prime \prime}=1^{1}-0 "$ | DRAWN <br> JAV | PROJECT NO. <br> 567 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SHEET NO. |  |  |
| A08 |  |  |





CROSS SECTION - 1


CROSS SECTION-2

10 BETHLEHEM PIKE
10 BETHLEHEM PIKE, PHILADELPHIA PA 19118

| SHEET TITLE |
| :--- |
| SECTIONS |
| AS-OF-RIGHT |


| SCALE <br> $1 / 16^{\prime \prime}=1^{1}-0 "$ | DRAWN <br> JAV | PROJECT NO. <br> 567 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SHEET NO. |  |  |
| A 11 |  |  |



10 BETHLEHEM PIKE
10 BETHLEHEM PIKE, PHILADELPHIA PA 19118

SHEET TITLE
3D VIEW
AS-OF-RIGHT

| SCALE <br> $12 "=1$ <br> 1'0" | DRAWN <br> JAV | PROJECT NO. <br> 567 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SHEET NO. |  |  |
| A 12 |  |  |



## 10 BETHLEHEM PIKE

10 BETHLEHEM PIKE, PHILADELPHIA PA 19118

SHEET TITLE
3D VIEW
AS-OF-RIGHT

| SCALE <br> $11 / 2^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0 "$ | DRAWN | JAV |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

SHEET NO


## 10 BETHLEHEM PIKE

10 BETHLEHEM PIKE, PHILADELPHIA PA 19118

SHEET TITLE
3D VIEW
AS-OF-RIGHT

| SCALE <br> $11 / 2^{\prime \prime}=1$ <br> 1'-0" | DRAWN <br> JAV | PROJECT NO. <br> 567 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

SHEET NO

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION 55'-0" SCHEME

LOT INFORMATION

| LOT ADDRESS(ES): | 10 BETHLEHEM PIKE, PHILADELPHIA, PA, 19118 |
| :--- | :---: |
| LOT AREA(S): | 11,113 SF |
| BASE ZONING DISTRICT: | CMX-2 |
| OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICT: | WWO WISSAHICKON WATERSHED OVERLAY DISTRICT |

Note 1: Section 14-602(4)(a)[2].b) A minimum of 480 sq. ff. of lot area is required per dwelling unit for the lot area in excess of 1,919 sq. ft.; provided that (.c) If the green roof conditions set forth at § 14-602(7) are met, the number of units allowed is twenty-five percent $(25 \%)$ greater than indicated by the foregoing lot size requirements.
OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICT: WWO WISSAHICKON WATERSHED OVERLAY DISTRICT

| USE REGULATIONS |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| PROPOSED \& PERMITTED USES: | BASEMENT THRU 1ST |  <br> BEVERAGE, <br> RESIDENTIAL LOBBY, <br> MECHANICAL |
|  | 2ND THRU 5TH | MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING |


| DISTRICT \& LOT DIMENSIONS | REQUIRED | PROPOSED |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| MIN LOT WIDTH (FT) | N/A | NO CHANGE |
| MIN LOT AREA (SF) | N/A | NO CHANGE |
| MAX OCCUPIED AREA (\% OF LOT) | $80 \%$ | $76 \% ~(8,462$ SF BLDG) |
| MAX UNITS ALLOWED | 35 (see Note 1) | 34 |


| YARDS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MIN FRONT YARD DEPTH (FT) | N/A | $0^{\prime}$ - 0 " |
| MIN SIDE YARD WIDTH, EACH (FT) | 5 FT if used | $5^{\prime}-0{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| MIN REAR YARD DEPTH (FT) | $9^{\prime}-01$ (see Note 2) | 10'0" |

Section 14-702 (7) (b) A floor area, height, or housing unit density bonus, as applicable if he owner of the property enters into a payment-in-lieu agreement that meets the standards set forth in subsection (6). Per Housing Unit density Bonuses table, 25\% increase in units permitted is provied for Moderate Income.

Maximum units allowed $=11,113$ SF $/ 480$ SF per unit $=23$ units Green Roof Bonus $=23$ units x $.25 \%=5.75$ units ( 5 rounded down) $=28$ units Moderate Income Density Bonus $=28$ units $\times .25 \%=7$ units $=35$ units allowed.

Note 2: Minimum rear yard depth shall be the greater of 9 feet or $10 \%$ of the lot depth per Table 14-701-3.

Minimum rear yard depth $=77^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime} \times .1=7^{\prime}-83 / 4^{\prime \prime}$, therefore, it shall be $9^{\prime}-0$ " or greater.

Note 3: Per table 14-701-3 Dimensional Standards for Commercial Districts, Max Height ft $=$
$388^{-0}$ ".
Section 14-702 (7) (b) A floor area, height, or housing unit density bonus, as applicable if the owner of the property enters into a payment-in-lieu agreement that meets the the owner of the property enters into a paymenti-n-liel ugreement that, meets the
standards set forth in subsection (.6). Per Additional Building Height table, $7^{\prime}-0$ of height bonus.

Section 14-202(6) Rules of Measurement - Height, Building or Structure the vertical distance from the average ground level at the base of the structure to the top of the structure.

Building Height= $38^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}+7^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}\left(\right.$ height bonus $=45^{\prime}-0$
Building Height= $38^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}+7^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}($ (height bonus $)=45^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$
Grade at Building Corners $=441^{\prime}, 440.2^{\prime}, 437.85^{\prime}, 436.8^{\prime}, 437.2^{\prime}$
Average Grade $=438.61^{\prime}=+1.81^{\prime}\left(1^{\prime}-91 / 2^{\prime \prime}\right)$
Total Building Height $=38^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}+7^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}+1^{\prime}-91 / 2^{\prime \prime}=46^{\prime}-91 / 2^{\prime \prime}$
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VIEW FROM BETHLEHEM PIKE
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LEVEL 2 - APARTMENT MIX
$\begin{array}{ll}1 \mathrm{BDR} & 4 \\ 2 \mathrm{BDR} & 3\end{array}$
UNIT TOTAL $\quad 7$



LEVEL 5-APARTMENT MIX
$\begin{array}{ll}1 \mathrm{BDR} & 6 \\ 2 \mathrm{BDR} & 2\end{array}$
$\overline{\text { UNIT TOTAL }} 8$
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## Carl S. Primavera

Direct Dial: (215) 569-1663
Email: cprimavera@klehr.com
October 5, 2021

## VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Frank DiCicco, Chairman c/o Sharon Suleto, Esuire Zoning Board of Adjustment City of Philadelphia 1515 Arch Street, $18^{\text {th }}$ Floor Philadelphia, PA 19102
suletazba@gmial.com

## Re: 10 Bethlehem Pike (the "Property")

Application No. ZP-2021-002274 (the "Application")
Dear Chairman DiCicco,
This law firm represents the Applicant of ZP-2021-002274 who is also the owner of the Property (the "Owner or Applicant") in the above referenced Appeal. A third-party appeal of the by-right issuance of the Application's Issued Zoning Permit was filed on behalf of the Chestnut Hill Civic Association and additional neighbors (the "Appellants") on May 25, 2021 (the "Appeal").

As outlined below, all the Appellants' claims have either been rendered moot by the issued permit or is a clear misinterpretation of the code. Therefore, we respectfully request that the Zoning Board of Adjustment ("ZBA") deny the Appeal. Below will find an outline each of the Appellant's claims and our subsequent responses.

Claim \#1: The proposed project does not meet the dimensional standards o the Zoning Code at Phila. Code. §14-701(1)(c).

Appellant is attempting conflate zoning provisions to create non-existent restriction at the primary frontage on Bethlehem Pike. They are relying on the incorrect interpretation of the cited Code provisions. Appellant appeal relies heavily on Section §14-701(1)(c) of the Philadelphia Zoning Code (the "Code"), which states the following:

Where any block frontage on one side of a street is divided into two or more districts, no structure shall be erected nearer to the street line than is permitted under the regulations for the district that covers the largest percentage of the street frontage on that block face;
provided, however, that, when residential districts are included, the front yard depth shall be the highest required of the applicable residential districts.

Appellants go on to explain that the RSD-1 zoning district covers the highest percentage of parcels on the Summit Street Block Face thus subjecting the frontages on that block frontage to a 35 feet setback. Appellants erroneously ignores that fact that the subject property sits on more than one block frontage and thus subject to two separate analysis under §14-701(1)(c.) of the Code.

The Code defines block frontage as "The distance along any street line between the nearest streets intersecting it." See Phila. Code §14-203(40). As such, the block frontage along Summit Street stretches along Summit Steet from the intersection of Bethlehem Pike and Summit Street to the intersection of Prospect Ave and Summit Street (the Summer Street Frontage. but the property is not subject to the summer St frontage only (the "Summit Street Frontage").

The Property is also subject to the street frontage that stretches along Bethlehem Pike from the intersection of Summit St and Bethlehem Pike to the intersection of Bethlehem Pike and Germantown Ave (the "Bethlehem Pike Frontage").

It is clear from the arial map below that the Property is a corner lot that sits at the intersection of Bethlehem Pike and Summit Street.


The appellant acknowledges this fact multiple time within their own appeal exhibit. See below:

The Block ${ }^{2}$ containing the Property is bounded by Bethlehem Pike, Summit Street, Prospect Avenue, Evergreen Avenue, and Evergreen Place. The Block is depicted on the below portion of the zoning map from ATLAS (the Property is right on the corner of Bethlehem Pike and Summit Street, and is depicted in red with blue shading below):

The Property in this case is a corner lot fronting on two streets. § 14-701(1)(d) of the Phila. Code ("Requirements for Lots with Multiple Street Frontages.") states:

The CMX-2 zoning district covers the $100 \%$ of the Bethlehem Pike Frontage. Therefore, the CMX-2 setback requirement controls when applying §14-701(1)(c) of the Code to the Bethlehem Pike Frontage. CMX-2 zoning district does not require any front yard setback. The Commercial Dimensional Standards table below clearly shows that:


Additionally, the Appellants challenges to the Summit Street Frontage setback is rendered moot by the current language of § 14-701(1)(c) of the code. Both the legislative history and the facial language of the Code makes it clear that the § 14701(1)(c) applies only to Front Yard Depths. The section is unambiguously titled "Front Yard Depths for Zone Blocks with More than One Zone" obviously intending the restrictions to apply to Front Yards. See table below:

Where any block frontage on one side of a street is divided into two or more districts, no structure shall be erected nearer to the street line than is permitted under the regulations for the district that covers the largest percentage of the street frontage on that block face.

Furthermore, the Legislative history shows that the Philadelphia City Council ("City Council"), clearly intended to clarify that § 14-701(1)(c) applies ONLY to front yards in Bill No. 210075 (the "Bill"). The Bill, passed on March 29, 2021, swapped out the term "Setbacks" for "Front Yard Depth" in both the title and body of § 14-701(1)(c).

- Pre-Bill Language:
[Setbacks] for Zone Blocks with More than One Zone.
Where any block frontage on one side of a street is divided into two or more districts, no structure shall be erected nearer to the street line than is permitted under the regulations for the district that covers the largest percentage of the street frontage on that block face; provided, however, [that] when residential districts are [included] the [setback] shall be the highest required of the applicable residential districts.
- Post-Bill Language:

Front Yard Depths for Zone Blocks with More than One Zone.
Where any block frontage on one side of a street is divided into two or more districts, no structure shall be erected nearer to the street line than is permitted under the regulations for the district that covers the largest percentage of the street frontage on that block face; provided, however, that, when residential districts are included, the front yard depth shall be the highest required of the applicable residential districts.

Plainly put, the Summit Street frontage is not the "front yard" or the "front" of the Property. The Planning Commission has determined the Bethlehem Pike Frontage is the front of this property. ${ }^{1}$ As such, the Summit Street is not subject to §14-701(1)(c). Therefore, this Project is in full compliance with the Code and the ZBA should dismiss this appeal.

[^0]Claim \#2: One of more of the Roof Decks of the proposed project do not meet the dimensional standards of the Zoning Code at Phila. Code. 14-604 (5).

Appellants' claims have no basis in fact. All roof decks in the proposed project have at least a 5 $\mathrm{ft} \mathrm{minimum} \mathrm{from} \mathrm{all} \mathrm{building} \mathrm{lines} \mathrm{on} \mathrm{a} \mathrm{street} \mathrm{frontage} .\mathrm{As} \mathrm{we} \mathrm{established} \mathrm{above}$, frontages for the Project are on Bethlehem Pike and Summit Street. As you can see from below the proposed roof decks both the deck circled by the Appellant in their appeal is set back from Summit Street Frontage 5 feet and 5 inches:


Claim \#3: An Outdoor Lighting Plan was required and must be submitted in order for the proposed project to meet the standards of the Zoning Code at Phila. Code. 14-707.

Although separate lighting plans are rarely submitted for zoning permits that are not proposing an athletic field, we do have a lighting plan the reflects and incorporates the over-all proposal
that was reviewed and approved by L\&I. We can provide it to the Board should they deem it necessary. As such, the Appellant's claim is moot.

## Conclusion

The Appellants' claims have either been rendered moot or is clearly erroneous under the Code. As such this project is clearly by-right and L\&I was correct in issuing the Zoning Permit.
Therefore, the ZBA must dismiss Appellants' appeal and reject this attempt to delay the Applicants project. Any other decision would be a miscarriage of justice and severely prejudice the Applicant.

Thank you for your time and attention to this request. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Very truly yours,

Carl S. Primavera

cc: Tanya Sunkett (ZBA Administrator)
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# City of Philadelphia 

(e) Zoning Permits Not Required.
(.1) Existing permits for roof decks and roof deck access structures may be modified by L\&I prior to the issuance of a building permit to allow for one or more of the following modifications, provided the roof deck and the roof deck access structure remain in compliance with the provisions of this § 14-604(5):
(.a) A relocation of the roof deck or roof deck access structure to a different location on the roof;
(.b) A reduction in the area of the roof deck or the roof deck access structure; or
(.c) A reduction in the height of the roof deck access structure.
(.2) Modifications allowed under this subsection (e) will not require new zoning permits or Zoning Board of Adjustment hearings. This subsection (e) does not apply to any other modifications to a zoning permit.
(11) Accessory Dwelling Units.
(h) Location of Entrances.

Only one entrance to a [detached or semi-detached house] building containing an accessory dwelling unit may be located on the front facade that faces a street, unless the [house] building contained an additional street-facing entrance before the accessory dwelling unit was created.

## CHAPTER 14-700. DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

## § 14-701. Dimensional Standards.

(1) General Provisions.

(c) [Setbacks] Front Yard Depths for Zone Blocks with More than One Zone. Where any block frontage on one side of a street is divided into two or more districts, no structure shall be erected nearer to the street line than is permitted under the regulations for the district that covers the largest percentage of the street frontage on that block face; provided, however, [that] that, when residential districts are [included] included, the [setback] front yard depth shall be the highest required of the applicable residential districts.
(2) Residential District Dimensional Tables.

# City of Philadelphia 

BILL NO. 210075 continued
Certified Copy
(b) Notes for Table 14-701-1.
[3] In the RSA-5 district, buildings on lots equal to or less than 45 ft . in depth are exempt from the \{minimum open\} maximum occupied area requirement.
[4] If abutting lots on both sides of an attached building contain only two stories of enclosed area, the stories above the second story of the attached house shall be set back an additional eight ft. from the minimum \{setback\} distance between the front facades and the front lot line required by § 14701(2)(b)[5] below; \{shown in this table; \} except this requirement shall not apply to corner lots.
[5] In the RSA-5 district, front [setbacks] facades shall comply with the following:
(.a) On any given street, the distance between the front \{setback\} facade and the front lot line shall be no \{deeper\} greater than the distance between the front \{setback\} facade and the front lot line of the principal building on the immediately adjacent lot on such street with the \{deepest\} greater distance between its front [setback] facade and its front lot line; and shall be no \{shallower\} less than the distance between the front \{setback\} facade and the front lot line of the principal building on the immediately adjacent lot on such street with the \{shallowest\} lesser distance between its front \{setback.\} facade and its front lot line.
(.b) On any given street, if there is no principal building on an immediately adjacent lot, then the distance between the front \{setback\} facade and the front lot line shall match the distance between the front \{setback\}facade and the front lot line on the closest building to the subject property that is on the same blockface. If there is no such building, the minimum distance between the front \{setback\} facade and the front lot line shall be zero.
(.c) If the property is bounded by two or more streets, only the primary frontages as designated in § 14-701(1)(d)(.4) (Primary Frontage) shall be subject to the front \{setback\} facade requirements of (.a) and (.b) above.
[8] In the RSA-1, RSA-2, and RSA-3 districts, side yards \{for\} shall comply with the following:

## City of Philadelphia

BILL NO. 210075 continued
Certified Copy

(8) Adjustments and Alternatives.

The minimum parking requirements listed in this Chapter 14-800 may be adjusted as follows:
(c) Reduced Need Populations.
(.1) The required minimum number of off-street parking spaces may be reduced by $33 \%$ for any group living use or multi-family use in which occupancy of at least $80 \%$ of the units is restricted for use by those 60 years of age or older. In making the determination as to whether this reduction is available, L\&I may rely on an affidavit from the applicant as presumptive evidence, absent evidence to the contrary.
(9) Off-Site Parking.

Required accessory parking in an RMX-1, RMX-2, RMX-3, CMX-3, CMX-4, or CMX-5 zoning district may be provided on a lot separate from the lot on which the principal use is located; provided that the parking complies with all of the following standards.
(e) If any parking is provided on-site, it shall include required accessory parking for persons with [disabilities] disabilities, in accordance with § 14-802(5), before providing other parking spaces.

## § 14-803. Motor Vehicle Parking Standards.

(1) Accessory Parking Standards.
(b) Location of Accessory Parking.
(.1) Residential and Commercial Districts.
(.b) Exceptions.

$$
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(a) Applicability.

All primary and accessory structures must comply with the dimensional standards in this (§ 14-701). These dimensional standards may be further limited or modified by other applicable sections of this Zoning Code. General rules for measurement are in § 14-202 (Rules of Measurement).
(b) Dimensional Tables.

Basic dimensional standards for Residential, Commercial, and Industrial districts are listed in Tables 14-701-1 through 14-701-4. Dimensional standards for special purpose districts are included in § 14-404 (SP-INS, Institutional (Special Purpose) District) through § 14-408 (SP-AIR, Airport (Special Purpose) District).
(c) Front Yard Depths for Zone Blocks with More than One Zone. 556.1

Where any block frontage on one side of a street is divided into two or more districts, no structure shall be erected nearer to the street line than is permitted under the regulations for the district that covers the largest percentage of the street frontage on that block face.
(d) Requirements for Lots with Multiple Street Frontages. ${ }^{557}$

For a lot fronting on more than one street, each street frontage shall be considered a front. The front yard requirements of the zoning district shall apply to those street frontages and the following side yard, rear yard, and primary frontage requirements shall apply. In all circumstances, the requirements for minimum open area and maximum occupied area remain the same. (See figure below for illustrative purposes only).

\{'\{'\}For printable PDF version of image, click HERE $\left\{^{\prime}\right.$ ' $\}$ '\}
(.1) Properties Bounded by Two Streets.

When a property is bounded by two streets:
(.a) That constitute a corner, one of the remaining lot lines shall be deemed a side and the other remaining lot line shall be deemed a rear. Where the determination of side and rear lot lines is necessary for L\&I to approve or deny a zoning permit application, the Commission shall determine the side and rear lot lines based on the orientation of the lot, orientation of the primary structure, orientation of the structures on adjacent lots, orientation of structures with frontage on the same blockface, the street type designation of the bounding streets, or any additional criteria stated in the regulations of the Commission for the purposes of clarifying or implementing this determination. 558
(.b) That are opposite each other, the remaining two property lines shall be considered sides and the side yard requirements of the zoning district shall apply to the remaining lot lines. The rear yard requirements of the zoning district shall not apply.
(.2) Properties Bounded by Three or More Streets.

When a property is bounded by three or more streets, the remaining lot line shall be considered a rear. The rear yard requirements of the zoning district shall apply to that lot line, except a rear yard is not required for attached buildings or semi-detached buildings but the requirements for lot coverage and open space remain the same. The side yard requirements of the zoning district shall not apply.

## (.3) Properties Completely Surrounded By Streets.

When a property is completely surrounded by streets, only the front yard requirements of the zoning district shall apply.
(.4) Primary Frontage.
(.a) When necessary to apply certain provisions of this Zoning Code, properties bounded by two or more streets shall have at least one street frontage designated as a primary frontage by the Commission.
(.b) The Commission shall determine which street frontages shall be designated as a primary frontage based on the orientation of the primary structure, the orientation of the structures on adjacent lots, the orientation of other structures with frontage on same block face, the street type designation of the bounding street, or any additional criteria stated in the regulations of the Commission for the purposes of clarifying or implementing this determination.
(.c) The primary frontage designation shall only apply to those provisions of this Zoning Code where specified, otherwise the front yard and front setback requirements of this Zoning Code shall apply.
(e) Using the Dimensional Tables. ${ }^{559}$

All primary and accessory structures are subject to the dimensional standards set forth in the following tables.
(.1) " Y " indicates that the building type is permitted, subject to compliance with the dimensional standards set forth in the table.
(.2) " N " indicates that the building type is prohibited.
(.3) "S" indicates that the building type may be allowed if reviewed and approved in accordance with the special exception procedures of § 14-303(7) (Special Exception Approval).
(.4) A number in brackets (e.g., "[2]") is a reference to a table note that contains supplemental standards or other explanatory information. Table notes are found in § 14-701(2)(b) (Notes for Table 14-701-1); § 14701(2)(c) (Notes for Table 14-701-2); §14-701(3)(a) (Notes for Table 14-701-3); and § 14-701(4)(a) (Notes for Table 14-701-4).
(.5) Cross-references to other sections of this Zoning Code are indicated by the word "see" and a specific section number.

## Notes

556.1 Amended, Bill No. 210075 (approved March 29, 2021); amended, Bill No. 210078-A (approved April 28, 2021).

Added, Bill No. 150766 (approved December 8, 2015); amended, Bill No. 161003 -A (approved May 8, 2017).
Amended, Bill No. 180346-A (approved July 18, 2018).
Renumbered, Bill No. 150766 (approved December 8, 2015).
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## INTRODUCTION

## SUMMARY

On April 26, 2021 the City of Philadelphia issued zoning permit \#2021-002274 for 10 Bethlehem Pike. The project includes 33 residential units and eight underground parking spaces. The project was designed to be as-of-right.

On May 25th, 2021 a group of near neighbors located on Summit Street, Evergreen Place, Germantown Avenue, and Bethlehem Pike filed an appeal to the Zoning Board of Adjustment to request that the permit be revoked.

The appeal presents several reasons why the project is not in compliance with the zoning code and that a refusal should have been issued, generating a variance.

The appeal states that, because of this as-of rightpermit,
"....the proposed building will adversely impact the appellants adjacent single-family homes on Summit Street, ... 2 Bethlehem Pike, and the Chestnut Hill Baptist Church." endnote 1

This report presents a rebuttal of the appeal in three sections.

SECTION 01: LAND USE + DESIGN OVERVIEW Reviews how the proposed project fulfils the land use policy as implemented by the City's comprehensive plan and zoning for the area, and how the City applied the rules to the site to carry out this policy.

SECTION O2: ZONING TECHINALITIES
Reviews the regulatory arguments put forth by the appellants showing how their analysis of the City's zoning regulations and process is incorrect.

## SECTION 03: REVIEW OF ADVERSE IMPACTS

Discusses whether the project has the adverse impacts on the area that the appellants represent in their opening charge. We will demonstrate that features of the design respond to the context and will not have an adverse impact the appellants.


## SECTION 01: LAND USE + DESIGN OVERVIEW

The City of Philadelphia regulates land use and urban design through its comprehensive plan and zoning code, [14-105(1)] as well as through project reviews undertaken by the city's regulatory agencies [14-105.(3)]. ENDNOTE 2

The city recently replaced its outdated zoning code with a new set of regulations, transferring the old, mapped parcels into new categories.

To guide this process and to assist in adjustments to the map, the Philadelphia City Planning Commission published Philadelphia 2035, a comprehensive plan followed by 18 District Plans.

The District Plans are used by the Commission to guide zoning remapping and project reviews.

The District Plan applicable to the 10 Bethlehem site is the Upper Northeast Plan, summarized in the diagram far left.

A core element of the Northwest District Plan is to attract new residents. The plan states, "development will be guided by a general growth strategy... encouraging housing and commercial development in core growth areas, found along major avenues and near train stations [see pink box below]." The red shading shown below clearly designates the 10 Bethlehem site as a "growth area."


## SECTION 01: LAND USE + DESIGN OVERVIEW

Another excerpt from the plan below, clearly demonstrates the rationale for designating the site as a growth area. The 10 Bethlehem Site, adjacent to the yellow tag on the map, is located across the street from the Chestnut Hill bus loop (bus transit station), the Chestnut Hill West (light rail) Station and the Chestnut Hill East (light rail) Station.


Chestnut Hill Bus Loop


Graphic from Northwest District Plan, 2018


## SECTION 01: LAND USE + DESIGN OVERVIEW

The Northwest District Plan, completed in in 2018, involved extensive public input and citizen participation. Using the plan as a guide, the Planning Commission made adjustments to the zoning maps to implement the desired land use policy.

The 10 Bethlehem Pike site remained zoned as a commercial parcel, reflecting both its former use as a gas station and the goal to promote higher density growth around Germantown Avenue.

There are eight commercial zoning classifications developed to establish the correct size, density and degree of auto-dependency for commercial sites. the 10 Bethlehem Pike site is zoned Commercial Mixed Use 2, (CMX 2) at the lower end of the scale. The purpose of this classification is,
".... to accommodate active commercial and mixed-use development, including neighborhoodserving retail and service uses. [14-402-1].

The Philadelphia Zoning Code gives the Planning Commission the authority to apply zoning standards to a site using the mapped zoning regulations [14-105.(3)].

Specifically, the code gives the Planning Commission the authority to designate the front, sides, and rear lot lines of a property as set forth in Section 14-301 (3). endnote 2


In doing so, they must make a judgement as to what best accomplishes the goals of the comprehensive plan. [14-105.(1)].

This responsibility is clearly stated in the Zoning code in the following section:
> "The Comprehensive Plan that is adopted by the Planning Commission ("the Commission") serves as the statement of goals, recommendations, and policies guiding the development of the physical environment of the City[14-105(1)]. endnote 3

In the case of 10 Bethlehem Pike, the Planning Commission designated the "front" of the parcel as Bethlehem Pike. The rationale to designate Bethlehem Pike as the Front can be seen by looking at the development patters as one travels down the arterial. At the corners of blocks you see commercial properties built up to the front lot line. The underlying commercial zoning clearly supports this pattern (see photos below and zoning map of vicinity, far left).

To summarize, the City of Philadelphia conducted a review of this site and came to the conclusion that a) properly determined that the frontage of the property was Bethlehem Pike, and b) correctly applied the dimensional standards of the applicable zoning regulations for CMX-2 to the site and most importantly, was c) consistent with the citizen-driven District Plan for the Upper Northwest.



KEY:
-..-...- = PROPERTY LINE
$[-\infty$$\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { BUILDABLE AREA } \\ & \text { WITH } 35 \text { ' SETBACK }\end{aligned}$
Site Plan from Coscia Moos Architecture with Diagram Overlay

The above illustration shows the resulting buildable area when the requirements of the adjacent residential zoning classification is applied to the site. Instead of supporting the goal of increased growth near commercial streets and transit, only $43 \%$ of the site would be buildable. If the provision the appellants say applied to the site, the resulting development would conflict with the city's stated land use policy.


## SECTION 02: ZONING TECHNICALITIES

The appeal of permit ZP 2021-002274 for the 10 Bethlehem Site seeks to disqualify the issued zoning permit for the following reasons:

- Decks must be set back from the front property line five feet,
- There is no lighting plan, and
- A thirty-five foot setback from adjoining residentially zoned sites applies to the commercial site because it is a corner lot with four front yards.

Each of these objections will be reviewed in turn.
Deck Setback: The deck as designed by Coscia Moos Architecture is set back a minimum of 5 feet from the street and is therefore in compliance. The graphics shown in the appeal do not include dimensions, and as a result, the observation is unsubstantiated at best.

Lighting Plan: The appeal states that Section 14-707(2) requires a lighting plan. Instead, the code says that outdoor lighting standards apply to lighting installed on private lots. This provision protects adjoining properties from light and glare. The lighting for this lot is installed on the underside of the structure above, below grade. It is within the jurisdiction of the city's review agencies to refrain from asking for materials irrelevant to the review of a project. In this case, the lighting impacts are not significant and therefore a lighting plan was not required by they City.

Setbacks from Adjacent Lots: The appeal of permit ZP 2021-002274 seeks to apply Chapter 14-700 (1) (a) to the site, selecting what appears to be the most favorable combination of provisions to support the revocation of the permit. The zoning code is quite clear at the beginning of the referenced section 14700 on how the regulations should be used:

> "[14-701 (1)(a) All primary and accessory structures must comply (emphasis added) with the dimensional standards in this [chapter]. These dimensional standards may (emphasis added) be further limited or modified by other applicable sections of this Zoning Code."

In other words, is not within the purview of appellants, neighbors, or any other individual to select the provisions of the zoning code to apply to a project, it is instead the purview and responsibility
of the Planning Commission. This point appears throughout the Zoning code but clearly evident the following sections of Chapter 14-701.

> 14-701 (1) (a)(.1) (.4) Primary Frontage. (.a) When necessary to apply certain provisions of this Zoning Code, properties bounded by two or more streets shall have at least one street frontage designated as a primary frontage by the Commission (emphasis added).
(.b) The Commission (emphasis added) shall determine which street frontages shall be designated as a primary frontage based on the orientation of the primary structure, the orientation of the structures on adjacent lots, the orientation of other structures with frontage on same block face, the street type designation of the bounding street, or any additional criteria stated in the regulations of the Commission for the purposes of clarifying or implementing this determination.

It is clear from the language above that it is the Planning Commission's duty to interpret the Code and do decide whether or not to apply a specific section in the dimensional standards.

It is worthwhile to discuss whether the Planning Commission's rationale in selecting Bethlehem Pike as the "front" of the lot was correct. It appears so: 1) the address names the lot. 2) the lot line running along Bethlehem Pike is longer than that of Summit Street and 3) the front door of the proposed commercial space opens onto Bethlehem Pike, reinforcing the main commercial street. By contrast, the diagram at far left shows the absurd result of cherry picking zoning provisions that the code indicates "may" or may not be applied.

To Summarize, the objections in the appeal to the issuance of a zoning permit are invalid as follows:

- The first objection relative to the deck location is dimensionally incorrect.
- The second objection relative to the lack of a lighting plan cites a requirement not applicable to the architectural design.
- The third objection appears to replace the authority and judgement of the Planning Commission with those of the appellants and their attorney.


Front View of Church will be Unchanged


Map showing appellant addresses


Proposed Building is Set Back to Reveal Church

## SECTION 03: REVIEW OF ADVERSE IMPACTS

The appeal of permit ZP 2021-002274 for the 10 Bethlehem Site states that the project will have adverse impacts on the surrounding neighbors. This section presents the qualities of the design that respond to the context of the site and the city's land use policy.

The appeal has been filed by individuals who are indicated as near neighbors. The location of the near neighbors is indicated on the map at left, with a green dot for each appellant. The near neighbors are also mapped on an arial photograph to demonstrate their spatial relationship to the property.

As can be seen by the diagram and photographs, the proposed project is not visible to the individuals on Evergreen Street because there is a large grove of trees between the proposed property and these homes. Likewise, the residents located on Summit Street except for the next-door neighbor, will not be able to see the property as the topography slopes down and away from the proposed project.

The proposed project will be constructed very close to the historic church but in this case the designers have made an open space at the west end of the lot to allow a side view of the church building. The front of the church, which is most prominent on Germantown Ave, will remain as is, a highly visible landmark (see rendering, left and photo above rendering).

The appeal does not list the specific adverse impacts on the neighbors, but from conversations with the community the designers have understood that there was a concern for parking. Therefore parking, which was not required by the CMX 2 zoning classification has been added to the project at the ground level and hidden by the building to minimize the impact of the surface lot on the surroundings.

For the above reasons, the adverse impacts alluded to by the appellants are not substantiated when their location relative to the site is considered. For this reason, the appeal should be denied.



Floor Plans from Coscia Moos


[^1]

Rendering from Coscia Moos Architecture


Rendering from Coscia Moos Architecture

## SECTION 03: REVIEW OF ADVERSE IMPACTS



Rendering from Coscia Moos Architecture

ENDNOTES

Endnote 1: Appeal dated May 25, 2021 sent by the firm of Fineman Krekstein \& Harris to the City of Philadelphia, Exhibit C Page 1.

Endnote 2: See Also the following excerpt: Where a Comprehensive Plan or an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan has been adopted pursuant to § 14-304(2) (Comprehensive and Other Plan Adoption), the recommendations of that plan shall be considered by the Commission and Zoning Board as a factor in making any decision on a zoning permit application on a topic or area covered by the adopted plan." [14-105.(3)]

Endnote 3: See also: Review and Prerequisite Approval Authority. (.1) The Commission provides prerequisite approvals for: Zoning permits regarding properties bounded by two streets where the determination of primary frontage(s) or side and rear lot lines is necessary for L\&I to approve or deny an application. [14-301(3)(c)(.o)]
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## JANICE WOODCOCK, AIA, LEED-AP

BIOGRAPHY
Janice Woodcock is an urban planner and architect with over 30 years experience working in the Philadelphia area. Woodcock successfully ran her own design practice before her appointment to the City of Philadelphia's Capital Program Office, where she administered the $\$ 3.6$ million annual capital budget for Fairmount Park, overseeing the preservation and restoration of historic sites and recreational facilities. She introduced LEED training to City Staff and served on the Mayor's advisory committee for the President's House on Independence Mall.

From there she was appointed Executive Director for Philadelphia's City Planning Commission; chairing the Zoning Code Commission, Central Delaware River Advisory Group, and "Imagine Philadelphia" a study to update Philadelphia's Comprehensive Plan. Her work formed one basis for the City's Comprehensive Plan and Philadelphia 2535 District Plans, a framework that had not been updated since the 1960s.

Woodcock resumed her practice, Woodcock Design, Inc. in 2009. Recent projects include a Master Plan for Germantown High School, the conversion of two waterfront warehouses into 224 apartments, a Master Plan for the Penn Dental School, a Plan of Development for the Central Delaware, the design of the Fillmore Theater, Fabrika Dinner Theater, and renovations for Frankford Friends Lower School. The firm prides itself in creating beautiful spaces at every scale; along the way employing teamwork, follow-through, and attention to clients' goals.

| Registration | Registered Architect, NJ, PA, VA <br> LEED Accredited Professional, US Green Building Council |
| :---: | :---: |
| EDUCATION | M-Arch, University of Washington College of Architecture and Urban Planning, Seattle, WA Certificate in Urban Design, University of Washington, Seattle, WA Bachelor of Arts, Sociology/Economics, St. Lawrence University, NY |
| CAREER HISTORY | President, Woodcock Design, Inc; Philadelphia, PA 2009 - Present |
|  | Project Architect, KieranTimberlake 2008-2009 |
|  | Executive Director, Philadelphia City Planning Commission 2006-2008 |
|  | Project Director, City of Philadelphia Capital Program Office 2004-2006 |
|  | President, Woodcock Design, Inc; Philadelphia, PA 2000-2005 |
|  | Associate, Cecil Baker \& Partners; Philadelphia, PA 1993-2000 |
|  | Architect, Ewing Cole; Philadelphia, PA 1992-1993 |
|  | Urban Planner, Intern Architect, Seattle, Boston, various firms 1985-1992 |
| PROFESSIONAL HONORS | Preservation Achievement Award, Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia, |
|  | For the Ajax Building and Fillmore Theater, Woodcock Design Inc. |
|  | National AIA Design Award, AIA's Top 10 Green Buildings, Police |
|  | Forensic Science Center, City of Philadelphia; with Cecil Baker \& Partners |
|  | National Design Award from HUD, HUD Section 811 Housing, Inglis Gardens |
|  | Accessible Housing, Philadelphia; with Cecil Baker \& Partners |
|  | Design Awards, AIA Philadelphia and AIA Pennsylvania, "Turning on the |
|  | Lights Upstairs," Study for Converting Philadelphia's Vacant Commercial |
|  | Buildings to Residential Use; for the Center City District; with Cecil Baker \& Partners |
|  | Design Awards, AIA Philadelphia and AIA Pennsylvania, Addition to the Railroad Museum of Pennsylvania: with Cecil Baker \& Partners |
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## List of Meetings with Community Stakes Holders

- January 7, 2021 - CHCA LUPZ Meeting
- February 16, 2021 - CHCA Community Meeting (Development Review)
- February 24, 2021 - Phone call with David Mercuris (representing near neighbors and Summit Street Neighbors)
- March 9, 2021 - Zoom meeting with Summit Street Neighbors (was blindly presented their letter)
- July 15, 2021 - Community Meeting at Church
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July 27 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2021$
Dear Neighbors,

Thank you for taking the time to meet with us on July $15^{\text {th }}$. For the past seven months we have engaged with our neighbors and the Chestnut Hill Community Association in order to ensure that the development of 10 Bethlehem Pike adds the greatest possible value to the neighborhood while respecting the rich history of Chestnut Hill. Over the course of our many meetings the ideas of the community have been heard and discussed, and we have made great strides towards reaching this goal.

Over the course of our latest meeting, we directly addressed several questions that have been brought to our attention regarding the project. A list of concerns and our mitigants are as follows:

Concern: The height and scale of the proposed building, as well as the number of set-backs, terraces, or other relief from the street

- Despite the height of the proposed building as well as proposed unit count conforming to code, we have taken measures throughout the plan to address any perception of the scale in comparison to surrounding structures. Our building still remains significantly shorter than the adjacent church building, and from our initial design we have set back the footprint of the building as far as possible from the intersection of Germanton Avenue, revealing the majority of the adjacent church.

Additionally, we have included significant setbacks and terraces on the top floor of the three outward-facing sides of the building. We have also included a mansard roof on the highest floor, the angle and material of which reduces the perceived scale from the street level.

Concern: The materials proposed to be used for the building, are not typical in Chestnut Hill

- Through several alterations of massings and materials we have devised a façade that is constructed of design components that are typical of Chestnut Hill architecture and seen throughout the neighborhood. Our building includes brick and stone that are seen throughout the surrounding community, as well as window fenestrations and a mansard roof that are exemplified throughout the neighborhood.

Concern: Lack of parking proposed

- Our building plan has been altered to include parking on-site, despite the fact that we are not required to do so by the zoning code. Additionally, we have approached neighboring sites to provide parking for ancillary vehicles.

Concern: Potential for the structure to further exacerbate problems with stormwater runoff currently affecting the Baptist church graveyard and some houses on the south side of Summit Street

- Our project includes a green roof, which will substantially improve stormwater runoff in the immediate area. The site is currently asphalt, which does not absorb and drain stormwater and impacts neighboring sites. Our green roof system will help mitigate this issue by providing absorbent vegetative surface on the majority of the roof.

Additionally, we understand that there are concerns over the low water pressure on Summit St. This concern arises from very low pressure at the nearby valves, and while our project will not worsen this, we are committed to working with the Philadelphia Water Department and the Councilwoman's office to improve this for our neighbors.

Concern: Impacts of construction activities on nearby residents

- We are committed to minimizing the impact of the construction activity of the project on the neighborhood and to informing our neighbors of activity on site. We hope to reduce sidewalk re-direction as best as possible and maintain normal daytime working hours. We will establish a constant dialogue with the community regarding weekly construction processes.


## Concern: Privacy and light effects on adjacent/near-adjacent residential neighbors

- Our project is setback 10 feet from the property line of the adjacent church and 5 feet from the adjacent property line on Summit Street. Given the setback of these neighboring homes, there will be nominal effect on the privacy and light of the adjacent neighbors.


#### Abstract

We share the same goals of responsible development and the desire to work in good faith with the community. We also foresee the redevelopment of 10 Bethlehem Pike as an opportunity to enhance the beauty and livability Chestnut Hill. At this point we believe that our development at 10 Bethlehem Pike has evolved significantly from its original design to address the concerns that the community presented to us. We are hopeful that we can work together to ensure that this project maximizes utility to for the community.


Sincerely,


Zachary Frankel
Principal
Frankel Enterprises


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Bethlehem Pike Frontage is the logical choice for the front of the property for the following reasons: (1) The Address of the Property is 10 Bethlehem Pike, (2) Bethlehem Pike is the largest frontage on the proper (144 feet), (3) The proposed building is oriented toward Bethlehem Pike, (4) All other properties on Bethlehem Pike Block face are CMX-2.

[^1]:    Elevations from Coscia Moos

