

Review criteria.

The following criteria shall be evaluated by the Planning Board, any or all of which may be used by the Planning Board in making its determination to approve or deny an application for a demolition review:

(i)

Whether the demolition and/or proposed redevelopment plan is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, neighborhood or district plans, this USDO, and/or City or regional planning objectives.

Yes

(ii)

Whether the structure has significant historical, architectural, aesthetic or cultural value in its present or restored condition and whether the loss of the building would be detrimental to the historical or architectural heritage of the City.

No

(iii)

The relationship of the building to the character of the neighborhood as an established and definable area, the streetscape and its environs, or any adjacent or attached buildings.

No

(iv)

The age and condition of the building, its architectural, archaeological or historic importance, and its importance to the streetscape and the surrounding neighborhood.

The building was built in 1940 and has no architectural, archaeological or historic importance.

(v)

The public health and safety.

Controlled demolition will be performed. Additionally, a temporary barricade wall will be erected in the ROW.

(vi)

Whether the proposed redevelopment project is consistent with the requirements and whether any required approvals for variances or conditional use permits have been granted.

No, Variances will be obtained after presentation to the board.

(vii)

The architectural merits of the proposed new construction, as compared to the building or structure proposed to be demolished, and as related to the character of surrounding neighborhood or district.

The front portion of the existing building structure has deteriorated substantially. The roof and the foundation have deteriorated beyond repair. Hence, this portion of the building does not lend itself to renovation.

The alternate choice is between renovation of the dilapidated front portion of the existing building versus reconstruction on the front portion of the building.

(viii)

The details of the development plan and proposed use, and the timeframe within which the applicant intends to commence the proposed redevelopment of the site.

Already submitted the detailed drawings. ASAP.

(ix)

Whether realistic alternatives, including adaptive uses, are likely based upon the nature or cost of work necessary to preserve the structure.

The front portion of the existing building structure has deteriorated substantially. The roof and the foundation have deteriorated beyond repair. Hence, this portion of the building does not lend itself to renovation.

The alternate choice is between renovation of the dilapidated front portion of the existing building versus reconstruction on the front portion of the building.

(x)

The condition of the structure(s), the economic viability of rehabilitation, and whether the building or structure can be rehabilitated or reused.

The front portion of the existing building structure has deteriorated substantially. The roof and the foundation have deteriorated beyond repair. Hence, this portion of the building does not lend itself to renovation.

The alternate choice is between renovation of the dilapidated front portion of the existing building versus reconstruction on the front portion of the building.

(xi)

Whether the hardship is self-created or whether the building or structure proposed for demolition is structurally unsound despite efforts by the owner to properly maintain it.

The reconstruction of the front of Masjid As-Salam is not self-created. The existing structure is not safe and adequate for the intended Use.

(xii)

Whether some portion of the building, such as a facade or distinctive architectural details, can or should be retained or reused in the new construction.

The front portion of the existing building structure has deteriorated substantially. The roof and the foundation have deteriorated beyond repair. Hence, this portion of the building does not lend itself to renovation.

The alternate choice is between renovation of the dilapidated front portion of the existing building versus reconstruction on the front portion of the building.

(xiii)

Evidence or testimony presented by any established City board, committee or department, community organization, neighborhood association, elected official or member of the general public.

The neighborhood is in favor of this reconstruction.