PHILADELPHIA CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
June 10, 2014

PRESENT:	Alan Greenberger, Chairman Joseph Syrnick, Vice Chairman Manny Citron, representing Richard Negrin Bernard Lee, Esq. Elizabeth K. Miller Nancy Rogo Trainer Nilda Ruiz Saskia Thompson, representing Rob Dubow
ABSENT:	Patrick J. Eiding

Executive Director:	Gary J. Jastrzab
Deputy Executive Director:	Alan Urek

Chair Alan Greenberger convened the City Planning Commission Meeting of June 10, 2014 at 1:08pm.

He stated this is a long agenda; it is not as long as the last time.

1) Approval of the Minutes for the May 20, 2014 meeting.

Upon motion by Mr. Syrnick, the City Planning Commission approved the minutes for the May 20, 2014 meeting.

Ms. Rogo Trainer pointed out that there was a mistake in the minutes that we approved the AAA site, and she pointed that out to Ms. Beltz.

Ms. Beltz did correct the minutes, and forwarded the amended minutes to the Commissioners.

Mr. Syrnick replied he was approving the amended minutes.

Judith Robinson asked if she could make a statement regarding the minutes. She was on the Steering Committee for the North Philadelphia Plan. Her concern was presented on May 20th; it was Election Day. She was running for office. Say hello to your new Committee person. She wanted to put this in the record that "we in the North Philadelphia area" are very concerned that a substantial amount of PHA is a part of the Lower North Philadelphia Plan. It's being disconnected, but will very much affect our overall area because it is disconnected and it hasn't gone through a Civic Design Review. It seems that when there is an institution, such as PHA, dealing with housing there is some disconnect. In that regard, we have been paying much attention to the Blumberg implosion project, which we know has to replacement housing. But in addition to that project, PHA is doing some units near N. Oakdale Street in Strawberry Mansion. In addition, they are taking lands that were never PHA owned on Arlington and Monument Street in Strawberry Mansion right across from lovely Fairmount Park. They are concerned that you all, as the planners, are not as involved as we think you should be, giving us feedback on design, impact, density, etc. They wanted to have some input in that process prior to you accepting that North Philadelphia Plan. She asked the Commissioners to refer to her comments from the February 28 meeting regarding the Lower North Philadelphia Plan because she had stated that they would like the Commission to help them get a handle on all of this PHA in North Philadelphia. They are trying to grow too. We know we are having gentrification, but they don't understand how PHA is helping them overall. She wanted to get that in the record. She thanked the Commission.

Mr. Greenberger thanked her and said he would like to pursue that with her.

2) Executive Director's Update

Mr. Jastrzab stated he is going to try to make this brief.

- **CDR**
  The next scheduled CDR Committee meeting is July 1st, and we anticipate 2 or 3 projects for that meeting.

- **LNW DISTRICT PLAN SECOND PUBLIC MEETING**
  The second public meeting for the Lower Northwest District Plan is Thursday June 26th, from 7:00 to 8:30 pm at the Schuylkill Center for Environmental Education, 8480 Hagys Mill Road.
  There will be more information about this Plan in Matt Wysong's presentation.

- **RCO UPDATE**
  An application period for the new RCOs is open during the month of June. To date, we have been received only 3 applications. The second RCO workshop will be June 20 at 12:30pm in this room. These presentation-style workshops will walk members of existing and new RCOs through the Philadelphia development process and how RCOs fit into the process and review "best practices" for meetings with developers.

- **STAFF RECOGNITION**
  Welcome new staff member, Matt Pickering, to the Urban Design Division.

LEGISLATIVE BILLS RECOMMENDED FOR ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL:
All of the legislative bills listed below are consistent with policies of the Commission. The sidewalk encroachment bills all meet City guidelines for pedestrian clear space:

1. Streets Bill No. 140412 legalizing an existing encroachment at the second and third floor levels of 3066 "E" Street (Introduced by Councilmember Quiñones-Sánchez on May 15, 2014; Presented by Sarah Chiu).

2. Streets Bill No. 140446 legalizing an existing encroachment and authorizing new encroachments at 4300 Tacony Street (Introduced by Councilmember Quiñones-Sánchez on May 22, 2014; Presented by Sarah Chiu).

3. Streets Bill No. 140454 legalizing a one-story concrete masonry structure at 6528 North Broad Street/Oak Lane Diner (Introduced by Councilmember Bass on May 15, 2014; Presented by Sarah Chiu).

4. Streets Bill No. 140482 striking a multi-utility right-of-way and creating a new gas main right-of-way on a portion of former Hamilton Street, between 18th and 19th Streets (Introduced by Councilmember Greenlee for Council President Clarke on May 15, 2014; Presented by Sarah Chiu).

5. Streets Bill No. 140483 striking a variable width portion of the southern footway of Vine Street from 17th Street to a point 304 feet to the east (Introduced by Councilmember Greenlee for Council President Clarke on May 15, 2014; Presented by Sarah Chiu).

6. Streets Bill No. 140490 authorizing Café Italiano to construct, own, and maintain an open-air sidewalk café at 1871 Cottman Avenue (Introduced by Councilmember O'Neill on May 22, 2014; Presented by Sarah Chiu).

7. Property Bill No. 140440 authorizing the City to acquire 1312-1314 North 16th Street from the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority for a new park to be added to the Fairmount

Park System (Introduced by Councilmember Greenlee for Council President Clarke on May 15, 2014).

This is part of a larger development collectively known as Ingersoll Commons and Ingersoll Park. It is bounded by 16th, Master, Smedley, and Seybert Streets. Community Ventures will build 10 assisted single-family homes on the western portion of the block. The Department of Parks and Recreation (PPR) will build a public park on the eastern portion, using a grant received from PA DCNR. Commission actions for this block include:

- August 2010: 38th Amended Redevelopment Proposal / 30th Amended Urban Renewal Plan to authorize PRA acquisition of 1312 N 16th Street in the Model Cities Urban Renewal Area (administrative approval).

- March 2012: 41st Amended Redevelopment Proposal / 33rd Amended Urban Renewal Plan to authorize PRA acquisition of 1314 N. 6th Street in the Model Cities Urban Renewal Area (administrative approval).

8. Property Bill No. 140484 authorizing the City to acquire 2100-06 Cecil B. Moore Avenue from the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority (Introduced by Councilmember on May 22, 2014). This will permit the construction of a new Martin Luther King Jr. Older Adult Center, one of the priority recommendations in the *Philadelphia2035* Lower North District Plan. Commission actions for this block include:

   - January 2011: Blight Recertification for a portion of the North Philadelphia Redevelopment Area Bounded by 19th Street, 23rd Street, Master Street, and Montgomery Avenue.

   - April 2011: Amended the Model Cities Urban Renewal Plan to authorize the acquisition of certain North Philadelphia properties. The design for the Stephen Klein Wellness Center was shown with a temporary parking lot on the eastern portion of the block. This is the site of the proposed MLK Jr. Older Adult Center.

   - May 2013: Bill 130347 remapped to “CMX-3” the area bounded by Cecil B Moore Avenue and 21st, Nicholas, and 22nd Streets.

   - August 2013: Redevelopment Agreement with MPower Development Corp for construction of the Project HOME Wellness Center at 2108-44 Cecil B Moore Avenue, 2105-47 Nicholas Street, and 1631-37 N 22nd Street (*administratively approval).*

9. Property Bill No. 140491 authorizing the City to lease Piers 27 through 35 North (The Festival Pier at the foot of Spring Garden Street), including adjacent property and riverbed rights, to the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority (PRA) for sublease to the Delaware River Waterfront Corporation (DRWC) and further sublease (Introduced by Councilmember Squilla on May 22, 2014). The purpose of this bill is to correct and clarify property boundaries and descriptions. These properties have long been under public control, and their redevelopment is a major recommendation of the Central Delaware Riverfront Plan, adopted by the Commission in March 2012.

3) *Staff Presentation: Philadelphia2035* Lower Northwest District Plan Update.

Matt Wysong, Lower Northwest District Plan Project Manager, stated today he is giving the introduction to the Lower Northwest District, and an update on our planning process. We are currently entering month 6 of this 10 month process. We are just a little bit more than half way through. The Lower Northwest is well connected to our metropolitan center by I-76 and Manayunk/Norristown Regional Rail Line, and also the Chestnut Hill West Line (there's a stop at Queen Lane in Germantown that is accessible through the District). The location of this District also provides good access to some of the more regional job centers, such as, King of Prussia, Plymouth Meeting, and Conshohocken. The boundaries are Route 1 (the Roosevelt Expressway), the Schuylkill River, City Line and the Wissahickon Creek. The major neighborhoods within this District are East Falls, Manayunk and Roxborough. We also have a lot of smaller enclaves within the District, such as, Andorra, Dearnley Park, Germany Hill, Ridge Park, Shawmont Valley, Upper Roxborough, Wissahickon, and Wissahickon Hills. We also have a few large institutions within our District, such as, the Veteran's Administration Center, Drexel College of Medicine at Queen Lane, Philadelphia University, Penn Charter School, Roxborough Hospital and Fairmount Behavior Health. As of 2010, we had a population of 50,799, which over the last 30 years dropped from a high of about 56,000. While we did see some decline within this District; it isn't similar to the decline in population to the City as a whole. They have been relatively stabled over the past 30 years. However, we are projecting growth in to the year 2040 with the addition of roughly 3,000 new residents. As of now, we can see this taking shape with the number of new home starts that are taking place primarily in Manayunk and Roxborough. One trend of note within the population is the decline of school age children; we have seen a 45% drop between 1980 and 2010. Conversely we have seen a 26 % rise in young professional population, that is the age group between 20 to 44 years old. A lot of the growth we are seeing now is being driven by millennial generation, which is the age between 25 to 34. You see the 18 to 24 (college age group) is mostly in Manayunk and East Falls. The millennials that are between 25 and 34 are also clustered in Manayunk and East Falls but also spreading out to Upper Roxborough area. A lot of this growth follows new patterns of construction starts. Finally you can see a Cluster of 65+ within the Wissahickon Hills neighborhood, and also some of the areas in Upper Roxborough, such as, Shawmont Valley and Andorra. This District is a solidly middle class district. When we look at the economic indicators, we can see that educational attainment, median income, are roughly doubles the City as a whole. Conversely we can see the poverty rate is roughly half of the City average. Homeownership rate is on par with the City. This is also a bedroom community. We have 23,800 employed residents in the District, which 91% commute out of the District. We do have 11,600 workers that commute into the District; creating a total of 13,800 jobs in the District when you count the number of people who live and work in the District. Our largest employers are Veteran's Administration Center, Roxborough Hospital, Philadelphia University, and Fairmount Behavior Health. One third of the District is residential land use. One third is dedicated to parks and open spaces, one of the biggest contributors to that is the Wissahickon Valley Park. We have a piece of industrial land in the area, but some of that is accounted for by some of the larger utilities in the area, such as, the Queen Lane Reservoir and the Roxborough Antenna Farm. Accordingly our zoning, for the most part, matches that land use with one-third of it going to parks and open spaces, and almost 50% going to residential. He showed some sites that are incorrectly zoned, such as, the transmission towers in Upper Roxborough, the Philadelphia University, and the Queen Lane Reservoir. He showed zoning inconsistencies in the Manayunk/Roxborough/ Wissahickon area converging on Ridge Avenue near Hermit Street and Walnut Lane area. We see 24% are incorrectly zoned. In this area, we have a lot of single-family lots that tend to be over zoned. And one of the trends that we are seeing within some of

these neighborhoods are that people are coming into these neighborhoods and buying up the larger homes on the larger lots and they are demolishing these homes and subdivide into smaller homes. This is something we view as possibly having a detrimental character to the esthetics of these neighborhoods. When we talk about vacancy within the Lower Northwest, we don't view it in the same light as we typically view vacancy within the City of Philadelphia. A lot of the land that we have that is classified as vacant, which is essentially 4% of the District, is essentially undeveloped greenfields. These are pretty much clustered in the far part of the District in the Rural Shawmont Valley area. We also have a decent amount of vacant parcels located in some of our obsolete industrial areas, such as, Venice Island and Lower Main Street and Umbria Street. These are also areas that happened to have environmental constraints upon them. We have identified 13 distinct commercial areas within our District. The majority of them are located along Ridge Avenue, and are serving daily consumer needs, such as, grocery stores, banks, etc. We also have a few specialty areas; a great example would be Main Street in Manayunk, where we have eating and drinking options, and small boutique stores. Another area similar to that is the East Falls Riverfront Business District. For the most part these distinctive commercial areas are relatively healthy with the vacancy rate between 5 and 15%; but we have 3 that are in the 25 to 35% range – the East Falls Riverfront District being one of them. So we want to look at ways within the Plan to address some of these vacancy issues. Regarding Transportation – this area is well connected by regional rail lines, and Schuylkill Expressway and Roosevelt Expressway. We also have some of the best trail connections within the City – the Schuylkill River Trail, and Forbidden Drive which goes through Wissahickon Valley Park. This is a District with very high car ownership: 93% of households have access to a car here, and 74% of the people drive to work, and 17% take public transit to work. The areas around the East Falls, Wissahickon, and Manayunk train stations actually have very high transit ridership. We have more people riding the bus up here than the Regional Rail. Any conversation regarding planning, zoning, etc really need to take into account the topography of the area. This topography is something that is very unique to this District, not really seen anywhere else in our City. This has a lot of effects upon the physical development of the Lower Northwest. It creates increase costs for development, as well as, legal hurdles, especially in areas with steep slopes. It creates difficult road connections, and this has a lot of impact on the walkability of this District, especially in some of the more densely developed areas. There are environmental consequences due to development when we build on steep slopes related to erosion and flooding. But on a positive note, these slopes create some really great vistas within our District. Parks and Open Space – Wissahickon Valley Park, this is one of the true gems of the regional park and open space system. The Schuylkill River Trail – we do have some gaps that we need to fill within that trail. We are looking at taking that to the next level. In our Plan one of the issues that we hope to tackle is also is vacant land; these larger, undeveloped, unprotected, open space parcels that have very high value to the residents here. In the Shawmont Valley, the Schuylkill Center for Environmental Education, that is a really good example of taking a big piece of privately, undeveloped land and putting conservation easements around it. You can see the brown area around that, the vacant land is what we need to take a closer look at in this Plan. The first public meeting was held on April 15 with over 90 participants. We had really good geographic representation here. One of the outcomes was that we helped established the preferences and priorities for our Plan, and we received over 100 individual comments from this meeting. The meeting summary is available on the website at www.phila2035.org. As people entered we asked them some basic questions about where do they live, where do they play. Then we showed them a more regional map and asked them where do you work and play. You can see that a lot of activities took place within the District, Center City, and University City. You could also see that people conducted a lot of their activities outside of the City in Plymouth Meeting, Willow Grove, King of Prussia, and Conshohocken. One of the first exercises that they had people complete was open ended

comments about sharing their vision on some very particular geographic areas that don't have a lot of focus and planning in place. The first was the Schuylkill Waterfront. These were some of the top comments and received repeated responses: 1) creating a destination along their 5 mile waterfront in the District; 2) residential and commercial development on underutilized land; 3) enhance river access through recreation, transportation, and historical interpretation; and 4) activate the Manayunk Canal. The next geographic area was Ridge Avenue, which expands the entire length of the District. Majority of these comments were directed toward the Central Roxborough area, where we have a traditional pedestrian oriented type main street. People wanted to see more of a destination created here, a place where we have specialty retail shops and restaurants; more mixed-use development; a reinforcing of that main street feel; but also people want to see how we could possibly mitigate traffic along Ridge Avenue. And then we have people provide responses to their vision on Shawmont Valley and Upper Roxborough. This is an area that is seeing a lot of development pressure right now; a lot of these important open spaces are slowly becoming threatened up here. Some of the comments that rose to the top were addressing safety and aesthetics on Henry Avenue; transitioning to more diverse uses on around Umbria Street along the Ivy Ridge Station; the preservation of open space; and limiting development in the area. We move on to a group exercise, where we had groups of about 7 or 8 around a table with planners just having a conversation to help us establish again those preferences and priorities for planning. We laid out 5 different maps, and people draw on them. The first one was asking people to identify their destinations and landmarks that they engage on a daily bases. These were the 6 that were the most popular: Andorra Shopping Center, Wissahickon Park, Gorgas Park, Ridge Avenue in Central Roxborough, Ridge and Midvale in East Falls, and Main Street in Manayunk. Then we asked people to identify some of the physical barriers that prevent them from getting to these places. The top ones were: Henry Avenue, Lincoln Drive, Route 1 (Roosevelt Expressway), the Schuylkill River, the topography of the District and the Manayunk/Norristown line. People then identified areas of stability in the District. These are areas that we anticipate won't change all that much over the next decade. The top 6 were: the Schuylkill Center for Environmental Education, Wissahickon Park, East Falls residential neighborhood, Andorra Shopping Center, Philadelphia University, and Gorgas Park. Conversely people identified the areas of change within their District. These were Upper Roxborough and Shawmont Valley, Central Roxborough, Venice Island, Wissahickon Gateway, and Ridge and Midvale area. We then had people identify preferred focus areas for our District Plan. These are places where we take a very in depth look from a planning perspective. These are also areas where we might focus a lot of public resources. And these are also areas where positive changes can have ripple effects throughout the whole District. The ones that were identified were the Ivy Ridge Station and Umbria Street area, Ridge Avenue in Central Roxborough, Ridge and Midvale area, Venice Island, and the Wissahickon Gateway. We took these focus areas and vetted them internally with our staff, and we had a final selection of 2 focus areas. We dropped Venice Island from the conversation along with Ridge Avenue in Central Roxborough. We feel these are places where a lot has already been planning wise, and any recommendations that come out of this Plan will mostly be related to zoning remapping. So the areas that we settled upon were the Ivy Ridge Station and Umbria Street, and Wissahickon Gateway. But with the Wissahickon Gateway, we actually expanded it to taking a large portion of our East Falls proposed focus area. One of the goals of this area is to create better connections from East Falls, Manayunk, and Roxborough area into that confluence of the Wissahickon Creek and the Schuylkill River area. The second community meeting will be held on June 26 at 7pm at the Schuylkill Center for Environmental Education in Upper Roxborough, 8480 Hagys Mill Road. If you would like more information, please contact him or look at our website www.phila.2035.org.

Ms. Rogo Trainer thanked him. She said that was a great summary.

Mr. Greenberger said they will look forward to seeing the next piece.

4) *Staff Presentation:* Philadelphia2035 "CONNECT" Implementation Update

Jeannette Brugger stated you may remember an April update on RENEW given by Ian Litwin. This is the follow-up, we are going to talk about CONNECT today. The purpose of this is to update you on the status of projects in the CONNECT realm that are mentioned in the Citywide Vision and the District Plans. THRIVE will follow in the coming months. We also want to highlight how Planning Commission staff helps to implement some of these projects as well.

Focus on 3 subjects: Transit studies, Complete Streets, and Pedestrian and Bicycle Implementation. The first one is Roosevelt Boulevard. There are 2 ongoing DVRPC's studies to be aware of. One is Transit Alternatives Study and the other is the Safety Study; both are underway. The Transit Alternatives Study is about three-fourths of the way done. It is recommending better bus ways and bus rapid transit. It is another way of saying they recommending bus rapid transit light. So a lane designated for bus rapid transit, but without grade separation. That is the current thought on that study; it's not complete yet. You will hear more about that likely soon when that study is complete. The Safety Study is following up on some of the unfortunate accidents you may have heard about within the past year on Roosevelt Boulevard. That is targeting some key intersections, and some pedestrian and vehicle implementation that we can do for infrastructure to make that safer. City applied for Tiger Planning Grant for Tiger 6 to think broader about Roosevelt Boulevard, to think about grade separation, and some of the more major infrastructure changes that can really make a difference along the Boulevard. That is following directly on the Lower Northeast Plan 19 and Central Northeast Plan 13, as well as, the Citywide Vision. Next is the City Branch Transit Feasibility Assessment. That is another DVRPC study. There is not much to share about this study, since it has just started in the past 6 months. The concept follows up on the Central District Plan 25 recommendation; and that is a cultural corridor transit that goes along the City Branch line through Fairmount. Next is the SEPTA Capital Budget. Act 89 has made it possible to bring back some of the projects that were taken off of the infrastructure list for SEPTA. Some of these projects were recommended in the Citywide Vision, as well, as the Central District Plan for the City Hall Station and Concourse Rehabilitation Station - some key ADA accessibility improvements and some Rail Station rehabilitation. This is just a few of the projects. The next one is Complete Streets, and some of the things we are going to focus on are the Complete Streets Handbook, the Frankford Transportation Center, DVRPC Transportation Community Development Initiative (TCDI) Applications and Studies, and the Washington Avenue Transportation and Parking Study. You may remember hearing about the Complete Streets Handbook, which is something you hear about here at the Commission in regards to the CDR applications. The Complete Streets Handbook was put into effect last year. There is a check list that developers fill out. Seven projects have gone through CDR and the Complete Streets check list so far. And Planning Commission staff review things like sidewalk width, walking zones, curb cut locations and widths, bollard encroachments, and bike parking locations. The CDR check list and the Complete Streets check list follows up on the Citywide Vision for 4.2.1 and 4.2.3 to implement the Complete Streets policy and to improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists. We are following up and tightening up that process as we go. Next is the Frankford Transportation Center. This was a focus area in the Lower Northeast Plan. That was an aim to create a neighborhood center through streetscape improvements and the development of a new Health and Wellness Center. We are just going to be talking about the pedestrian portion of that study right now. The Frankford Transportation Center serves

thousands every day, but its pedestrian environment lacks definition and improves public spaces of facilities can transform the area into a complete neighborhood center. What you see here is something that happens a lot around the Transportation Center, and that is crossing mid-block - an unsafe way the desire lines around the Transportation Center do not correspond to the facilities that are there. The Lower Northeast team conducted a charrette last year. The results of that are shown here, and includes mid-block crossings, increase green space, and pavement treatments for increase safety and efficiency around Transportation Center. That is something we are working with the Streets Department and SEPTA on implementing. Next we have the Transportation Community Development Initiative applications for 2015. It is not just the applications, it is also some projects that we have finished, include the Washington Avenue Transportation and Parking Study, Front and Laurel Study to actually improve the efficiency of the street network with a-round-about, and a streetscape study at 52nd Street. We worked with our on-call consulting teams to increase the way those intersections work. The Washington Avenue Transportation and Parking Study – the goal of this study was to organize behavior and space along Washington Avenue the entire length from Delaware Avenue to Grays Ferry, and to increase safety along the corridor, and to fit in bike lanes along the entire corridor. There are some key gaps right now; there are some very creative parking and loading practices along that area, including folks striping their own parking lines and doing business within the cartway (things that are definitely along the legal side of things). The consultant team has done, as part of the parking study, shown what is legal and what is actually happening that is not legal. Things are a little different than what is supposed to be happening right now. So what we recommended, as part of this study, in close coordination with the Streets Department, L&I, Parking Authority, and some other folks is to do a 3-lane cross section instead with back angle parking. There are still some portions of the entire way that are 5-lane cross section, but most will be this 3-lane cross section. This was vetted through the Streets Department. We believe this will work from a traffic perspective, and there are revised signal plan that go along with this. The Streets Department will take this conceptual plan and move it towards implementation to a final design plan. We hope to see street stripes within one to two years.

Mr. Syrnick asked how are you going to stop the behavior that is happening out there today. And implied in that question is you have talked to the Streets Department, and that is all well and good, but there has not been a political will to make that happen in the last 30 years that he has ever seen.

Ms. Brugger replied you right. And that is a picture that she could not show with a graphic so she didn't go too much into it; but that is the most important part of the study in her opinion as well. She thinks implementation is the most important part of planning, and that enforcement is very important. We have gotten Police Department, L&I, Parking Authority, Streets, and City Council together and we are working on an implementation plan that we make this restriping actually work. Because putting stripes on the road is not the end of this story; we have to enforce it, and that is our goal. You are right that is something that we are going to come up against, and we plan to figure it out as we go. But we are going to put a lot of energy towards it.

Mr. Syrnick replied you will be my hero when it all happens.

Ms. Brugger stated next item is Bike/Ped Implementation. There are 3 projects: Bicycle Directional Signage, Priority Bicycle Network Expansion, and 13th and 15th Streets Neighborhood Bikeways. These are targeted recommendations both in the Citywide Vision and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan. So with Health Department money and Streets Department coordination, Planning Commission and Health staff was able to implement a Citywide bike

directional signage system of 370 signs. You may have seen them Citywide. You will see how they coordinate with existing bike network. The goal is to or was to lead people from the on-road network to rec centers and parks locations and schools as well. So we hope to expand the signage network as the on-road bicycle and trail networks expand. We have over 220 miles of bike lanes, and 9 miles of sharrows. Sharrows are the chevrons with bicycle signage paint, which is in the middle of the lane on S. 15th Street, and also on Main Street in Manayunk. How it works right now is implementation of the bike network is these lines, these bike lanes, and sharrows are striped with road work repaving. There is not a dedicated crew that goes out and does bicycle infrastructure. These are expanded only piece meal, often only several blocks at a time. The Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan proposed almost an additional 120 bike lanes and more than 200 miles of sharrows. That is a large ask, and we realize that is not something that is going to happen short term. We realize that we have to pare back that ask, and look for more priority infrastructure. We identified along with the Streets Department and Mayor's Office of Transportation and Utilities 70 priority miles of bicycle infrastructure expansion. This is closing key gaps in the existing network, and also focusing infrastructure expansion on areas of high concentration of cycling, like South Philly, Center City, and West Philly. We are also pursuing alternative implementation strategies and funding sources so that we can hopefully implement the 70 miles without that piece meal approach of repaving and restriping. Hopefully we can bite off bigger pieces of this priority network. Next is the 13th and 15th Street Neighborhood Bikeway. In the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan, these were identified as major community corridors north/south in South Philadelphia. The neighborhood bikeway treatment is an enhance treatment on a street that there is no room for bike lanes. One of the challenges we come up against in Philadelphia is that there is not necessarily room for bike lanes unless with take parking. And we know that we are not doing that in most places in Philadelphia. Something we came up with along with the Bike Coalition and the Mayor's Office of Transportation and Utilities is this Neighborhood Bikeway concept; and that includes signage, directional and messaging signage, and green backed sharrows to show to show the priority that bikes do belong there, and this is where they should be riding. This was recommended for the 2014 State Transportation Alternatives Program for 250,000. We believe that this will be happening in the near term, and you will see this between South and Oregon on both 13th and 15th Streets. Other City of Philadelphia projects that were recommended for the Transportation Alternatives Program totaled $4.2 million and included Bike Share, Frankford Creek Greenway, and an outdoor advertising project. Bike Share is coming soon. This was recommended in the Citywide Vision and the Central District Plan. This is going through Council right now for the okay, as you may know, for a Spring 2015 roll out. The Planning Commission will be involved in the outreach and choosing docking station locations. We hope to be using it soon, and we hope you will too.

Mr. Greenberger thanked Ms. Brugger. He is very impressed that all of these studies and grants, and of where they are leading. He thinks all of this is helping us to do things like 13th Street Bikeways, or the reconsideration of Washington Avenue. If you are in a car, there are complaints about bikers, pedestrians; and if you are one of the others, you have complaints about the other two. There is always some bad behavior. But he believes that all of this organizing of how to share and use the streets productively is and will continue to lead to better behavior on all fronts. He complemented Ms. Brugger and all of the people associated with this. He thinks this is managed correctly, even though it shows up little bit by little bit. He thinks this is a very big deal for the City.

Mr. Jones asked how did you pick the zones.

Ms. Brugger replied we are not in charge of this process. The Mayor's Office of Transportation and Utilities is leading this project. She believed they picked the zones based on to the north – Temple University; to the west – University City and some of those folks there; to the south including Center City, they are trying to capture where people live where they will bike the most, so they are focusing on usability for Zone 1 and then for Zone 2 kind of expanding that as the project grows.

Mr. Greenberger replied he can add to that. He knows there is a lot of concern about how to make sure that the Bike Share system finds its way into neighborhoods other than in the center; including Bike Share costs money, how do you pay. How do you pay if you don't have a credit card for example? He knows that the Mayor's Office of Transportation is looking at all of those things, to make sure that there is some guaranteed success – that has to happen first, but also some real sharing in a broader range of neighborhoods in these zones. The third thing is it's mostly flat. He thinks it's likely to be more successful just from that point of view.

5) Action Item: Baxter Trail Sidepath Review

Ms. Brugger stated this is the Baxter Trail Sidepath review. You see this at the Commission because the sidepath Ordinance is something that includes both pedestrians and cyclists on the same right of way. It is typically a 10 to 12 foot path where both cyclists and pedestrians are welcome. The Planning Commission reviews these sidepath Ordinances, and applications, and comments during the preliminary design phase, and then advises the Streets Department our staff and Commission opinion on these projects. The Delaware River City Corporation was the applicant for this sidepath. They worked with close coordination with the Streets Department, Parks and Recreation, and PennDot in this project. It is in the Holmesburg section of the City. The Baxter Trail will be part of the Philadelphia Trail and Bicycle Network, and will provide a valuable bicycle and pedestrian connection between the Pennypack on the Delaware Park and residential areas of Holmesburg, including a link to Pleasant Hill Park. The trail will extend from the existing Pennypack Trail in *Pennypack on the Delaware Park* northward through City of Philadelphia Police, Fire, and Water Department land and along Pennypack Street, State Road, and Linden Avenue. The portions of the trail which will be shared use for pedestrians and cyclists are Pennypack Street, State Road, and a section of Linden Avenue. The trail will run along the Pennypack Creek, Pennypack Road, State Road, and Linden Avenue to connect Pleasant Hill Park and the *Pennypack on the Delaware Park.* It will be part of the North Delaware Greenway. This is a crucial link in the City's trail network. This is $4.8 million construction project; that is local, State and Federal sources for that funding. There was extensive outreach over the last 5 years. This is in final design and it is to be let by PennDot this month. That is not the way this process is suppose to happen. The way the process is suppose to happen is that we are to see this preliminary design that we can comment on it. As stated earlier, this goes through Streets Department, PennDot, and Parks and Recreation processes, but sometimes they are looking at different things then we might; so they might not point out that this has to be connected the on-road network. Though some things we may have missed here, because we missed the boat and we are seeing this so late, both a curb cut might provide access for cyclists and pedestrians, or some types of signage we may have missed. So again, this is another example of just like the Race Street Connector North, unfortunately that we saw last fall, that we are seeing too late in the game to make comments that might make a difference. She mentioned that because it is important to have on the record that and for the Commission to know that we need to see these earlier in the design process. This is supported in the Citywide Vision in THRIVE, CONNECT AND RENEW. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval.

Mr. Greenberger asked pointed to the graphic and asked why does the red trail go all the way around from here to there along the river.

Ms. Brugger replied it goes around the Water Department facility, because of Homeland Security issues they don't want the trail to be a near sensitive water issue area so they want it to go around that.

Upon motion by Mr. Syrnick, seconded by Mr. Citron, the City Planning Commission approved the Baxter Trail Sidepath Review.

6) Action Item: Market Street East Advertising District "Public Improvement Program" for a proposed Lit Brothers Building roof sign, 701 Market Street.

Mr. Jastrzab stated this is in the Market Street East Advertising District, which has some special requirements for large format signs. It is the former Lits Brothers Building. Independence Center Realty LP is proposing to build on its property at 701 Market Street a four-faced, large-format rooftop sign that mimics the appearance of the historic, mid-twentieth century Lit Brothers department store sign. The 14-foot tall mesh framework comprising the sign will be placed at the building's cornice line, approximately 71 feet above ground level. The sign faces will wrap around the corners of 7th and Market and 8th and Market Streets. The signs will utilize digital lighting technology with changeable messaging/advertising. In June 2011, legislation was enacted creating the *Market Street East Advertising District*, permitting the installation of large-format accessory and non-accessory signs in this portion of Center City. The district is centered along Market Street from 7th and 13th Streets, between Filbert and Ludlow Streets.

Before a permit can be issued for large-format sign installation, the City Planning Commission must:

1. Determine that the design of the sign structure does not detract from the building's key architectural or character defining features. In November 2012 the Historical Commission was the first to look at it and they approved it.
2. Determine that the sign will not create a material distraction to drivers of motor vehicles or otherwise present a safety hazard or substantially interfere with the peaceful enjoyment of the neighborhood. Documentation prepared by a licensed professional traffic engineer must demonstrate this to the satisfaction of the Commission. Law requires an engineer complete that traffic study.
3. Approve a $10 million Public Improvement Program (PIP) investment schedule. They can install these improvements before installing it or the investment schedule must contain a scope of work; documentation of PIP component costs; require that a minimum of $6 million be spent within the first year following permit issuance, with the remainder spent by the close of the second year; and post a bond to guarantee the expenditure of the $10 million PIP.

The first year, they would spend $7.5 million on a variety of streetscape, bike racks, public upgrades in the Lit Building, such as, public restrooms, and lightening in the subway/concourse. By the second year, the total would come to $10 million. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval of the proposed PIP. This would not cause a

distraction to drivers. We believe that these improvements will add the $10 million spent over a two years period. They must also post $10 million bond, and the City could claim any un-spent funds. Mr. Jastrzab asked the development team to give their presentation.

John Pringle, of Stantec Architecture, stated they have been working for the Brickstone Company to develop some ideas on what these improvements could look like. The categories for the improvements are:

1. Façade lighting – it will be a pleasure to highlight the features of this historic building
2. Streetscape improvements – improve sidewalks with new concrete, planters, awnings, lighting, bike racks, and some video display in windows.
3. Concourse improvements – SEPTA bridge, the entrance to Lits, and PATCO. There are pieces of property not owned by Brickstone – it is a SEPTA entrance, we are looking at what could be done. We still need to meet with SEPTA and work out what the possibilities are. We are trying to keep it light to create a much nicer experience then what they have now; and bring some color down here. Entrance to Lit Building to Concourse – we are looking at enhancing the lighting, and looking at locations for video signage. PATCO – there is a wall that is part of Lit Building. We are looking at creating some interactive video walls, where they are blank display walls now, where a projected computer generated situation equipment. We want to bring color, lighting and reflective surfaces, replace the tile, widen the escalator at street level to enhance to enhance pedestrian traffic. We don't have an exact budget for what we are doing.
4. Integrated digital signage put it along the Concourse and the exterior, and on the interior first floor level including Historic Mellon Lobby with digital back-lit glass that would be interactive and historical in nature.

Mr. Jastrzab replied the Commission staff has been working with the development team for several months now to clarify and select items that are public in nature. We think that we have done that. And that the staff finds that based on the Historical Commission of November 2012, which the proposed large format roof sign doesn't detract from the building's key architectural features. Additionally based on the Traffic Engineering Report, that was included in your package, we believe also that the sign at this level, 70 some feet above street, will not create a material distraction to drivers, a safety hazard, or present any situation that would interfere with the with the peaceful enjoyment of the neighborhood. And then finally as we reviewed the proposed investment schedule, we believe that these improvements will provide public benefits to the Market Street East corridor in a variety of ways, and that the $10 million spent over a 2 year period satisfies the requirement of the Market Street East Advertising District. He added that one of the other requirements here for the development team to apply for a permit is that they must post a $10 million bond guaranteeing that the money will be spent within a 2 year period, and the City would have rights to claim any unspent funds from this investment schedule. So with that staff recommendation is approval for this proposed investment program.

Ms. Rogo Trainer replied she has some questions about the sign itself and the public improvements. About the sign itself, in the image that's provided for us, it's quite pretty; it's mostly black with some lettering on it. She's curious. She doesn't know if she understands the technology. Is it the kind of sign that is able to be solid color throughout the whole 14 foot strip?

Mark Merlini, from Brickstone Company, replied it would be like what you see at Madison Square Garden's in Manhattan; it's an active sign that is multi-colored. It is an active sign that is multi-colored and video-like.

Ms. Rogo Trainer replied so the image that you have shown us with the black background that says Lits on it, in fact everything that is shown there as mesh could actually be different colors and solid

Mr. Merlini replied just in the area where you see it lit so it runs approximately 75 feet down 8th Street and 81 feet down Market Street, and then it repeats at the corner of 7th and Market in approximate the same dimensions. It will be a screen that depicts any image you want. We intend to use it as much as we can for advertising. We hired a media company that is going to rent it, and when it not rented we intend to use it for the tenants that are in the building as accessory signage, as well as, public announcements If Phillies were playing in the World Series, you could watch it on that screen.

Ms. Rogo Trainer replied that was her first question. And her second question is the nature of the public improvements, because some of the public improvements are advertising signage – the video walls and columns, are you counting those as public improvements in the costs.

Mr. Jastrzab replied we are considering them to be public improvements because as we worked with the applicant team we have discussed a variety of the different kinds of displays, as it would not necessarily be advertisements. It could be directional signage, other historical displays.

Ms. Rogo Trainer replied but it's up to the building owner to decide how they would be used.

Mr. Jastrzab replied he thinks the media firm would help to program that signage.

Mr. Merlini replied the signage that will be used, especially that column wrap that would be accessory signage only for tenants in the building. We wouldn't be leasing that to Coke or Nike. It would be somebody that is in the building would utilize it. Our real intent for that signage is to have it interactive. If you looked at the Mellon Lobby, the historic lobby, that paneling was in Independence Hall for 130 years. It was taken out in 1960 and stored under JFK Stadium when they wanted to replica what Independence Hall was at the signing of the Declaration of Independence. Our intent is to have the Founding Fathers and other people whose portraits were on that wall, where you would interact and hit that screen that you saw there, that is a 60 inch hollowed out piece of glass. It would activate, and it might be George Washington comes up on the screen, and you could interact with him.

Ms. Rogo Trainer replied her questions had to do with whether or not all of the signage, including the accessory commercial signage, could be considered as a public improvement. So the answer is yes, is that correct.

Mr. Jastrzab replied yes.

Stephen Jones replied he would like to piggyback off of Ms. Nancy. If this is public improvement money, and was the public actually brought in on it, like any of our mini groups or stakeholders from the public? Or was this just a private firm or company doing this with anticipated public money?

Mr. Jastrzab replied it's private money that is provided by the development team that would be making these public improvements. The staff worked very closely with the development team for the past several months to come up with the list that we thought was appropriate. We didn't conduct community meetings for this particular kind of proposal, but we feel that it represented the public nature of these improvements in a way that captures the spirit and the letter of the Ordinance.

Mr. Greenberger replied this is a very good building right now, it presents itself well. The development team asked us a lot of questions about various things like could they be part of the public improvements. We, specifically Gary, said no to a lot of them because while we felt they were good things, they were very much a part of routine building maintenance. We expect you to keep your building presentable. That's important to us, but they don't count in this particular exercise. This was actually a pretty long drawn out process, and trying to find things to make an investment in public improvements. It is not as easy a picture as building a new building on a vacant site, which would be substantially easier. We have seen proposals like that at this Commission like the 1100 block of Market. He is sure that will come back to us. We will see more of that on the Gallery. He gave Gary and the development team a lot of credit for methodically working this out. Is there everything in this $10 million proposal, every single thing that everyone would agree 100% on the public improvement? Most people would agree that the vast majority would agree that it is; some would debate points. Ten million dollars is what's in the law. It's not a magic number. It says we are looking for a serious investment in the quality of the public improvements environment on Market Street to make this work. This is the first one that we have seen for the Market Street East Advertising District. He thinks a critical question for the Commission is the public investment, the traffic engineer's report, and he thinks they have the right to rely on the Historical Commission's findings to at least determine the relationship to the building asset, which is a landmark building, which they had done that rather enthusiastically. He thinks that surprised a few people.

Ms. Rogo Trainer replied you answered another question that she had regarding the Historical Commission. She thinks it is a positive thing the improvements to the Concourse; it is well overdo. The awnings she could do without; the sidewalk is okay. She thinks the improvements to the Concourse are going to make the most significant change to the quality of life.

Mr. Greenberger replied the development team needs to keep us informed on the progress of that, because obviously some of that is in the SEPTA Concourse and SEPTA is interested in doing it. We need to make sure that you have a bond to back it up, and is in fact there is a project here. We will work on that with you over the next year or two.

Mr. Merlini replied we have a 4 o'clock meeting with SEPTA today.

Mr. Lee asked in addition to the lighting, what is going to be on the façade itself.

Mr. Merlini replied really just lighting the façade itself; the up lighting of it. So our lighting consultant would be lighting practice; they would come in and spend 3 months just doing mock ups to get what the Historical Commission would like to see. And then we will move forward with the project.

Mr. Greenberger replied that is a good example of when they said lighting improvements; we said okay that makes sense. When they said how about maintaining the paint work on it; we said no.

Upon motion by Ms. Thompson, seconded by Ms. Ruiz, the City Planning Commission approved the Market Street East Advertising District "Public Improvement Program" for a proposed Lit Brothers Building roof sign, 701 Market Street.

Ms. Rogo Trainer and Mr. Syrnick opposed.

7) Action Item: Zoning Bill 140407 requiring public notification of the issuance of "by-right" zoning permits (Introduced by Councilmember Blackwell on May 8, 2014).

Paula Brumbelow stated this Bill amends Title 14 of The Philadelphia Code, entitled 'Zoning and Planning,' by providing that zoning permits, issued as of right, be posted on the Department of Licenses and Inspections official website, that copies of such permits be provided to the district councilmember whose district includes the permit holder's property, and making technical changes, all under certain terms and conditions. The purpose of the Bill is to amend Section 14-303(6)(e) for Zoning Permit Issuance by adding a requirement for the posting of "as of right" permits by L&I. The Department of Licenses and Inspections will be required to post "as of right" permits as follows:

- No later than 5:00 p.m. of the next business day following the date of issuance.
- Post the permit on its official website, in searchable format, by date of issuance, name of permit holder, address of permitted property, and council district.
- It will also become effective 18 months after it becomes law.

This Bill was amended out of the Rules Hearing on June 3. Originally they asked for a hardcopy to be given to the Councilmember, and for it to be effective within 30 days.
The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval as amended.

Mr. Greenberger replied while the timing is imperfect, as it sometimes happens this time of year and in December when we are in the rush to or Council is in the rush to get to recess; we are not in any rush here, this has been amended in Rules to include the 18 months start delay, and no required paper notifications. Is that correct?

Ms. Brumbelow replied yes, so they have removed the requirement of giving each Councilmember a hardcopy of the permit less than 24 hours after issued. It is now just going to be on the new Eclipse program that is going to replace Hanson.

Mr. Greenberger asked is L&I reasonably comfortable with this.

Ms. Brumbelow replied L&I at the Rules Hearing introduced these amendments along with others, these were the amendments the Council said they would take from L&I recommendations.

Upon motion by Mr. Citron, seconded by Ms. Thompson, the City Planning Commission approved staff's recommendation for Zoning Bill 140407.

8) Center City Zoning Amendment and Remapping (Introduced by Councilmember Greenlee for Council President Clarke on May 15, 2014):

a) Action Item: Zoning Bill 140439 amending Benjamin Franklin Parkway Area height restrictions and retail use regulations in the "/CTR" Center City Overlay.
b) Action Item: Zoning Bill 140442 remapping the area bounded by John F. Kennedy Boulevard, 23rd Street, Cherry Street, and the Schuylkill River.

Mr. Lee recused himself.

Ms. Brumbelow stated this is for a Center City zoning amendment and remapping. We are going to be doing 2 different Zoning Bills, and she is going to try to do them in one presentation. The first is Zoning Bill 140439, which amends the Benjamin Franklin Parkway Area height restrictions and retail use regulations. And the second is the Zoning Bill 140442, which will remap a very small area bounded by John F. Kennedy Boulevard, 23rd Street, Cherry Street, and the Schuylkill River. She asked the architect to come and give a brief information only presentation before she would get into the Bills.

Mr. Greenberger replied one thing he is confused about, and he doesn't know if anybody else is, the two pieces of this Bill 140439 and Bill 140442 relate to the same project. Is that correct? So it is just removing the height restrictions from this particular area, and the area itself is being rezoned.

Ms. Brumbelow replied yes that is correct.

Mr. Syrnick replied he doesn't know why in the description of this on the west side says to the Schuylkill River, because most of the graphics show it to the east edge of the CSX right-of-way. While it is being presented if we could you clarify that it would be helpful to him.

Ms. Brumbelow replied our agency didn't write the Bills. We would have gone to the right-of-way or the Schuylkill River to make those Bills consistent. Every Bill needs to have a closing, so basically it can be a multi-shaped box but it still needs to be a box. So one Bill got closed at the River; and one got closed at the right-of-way of the CSX lines.

Mr. Syrnick asked do you think that's right then. What he is asking, are we changing anything from east side of the railroad right-of-way and the river. And if we are, why are we doing that? Is something going to happen in that area?

Ms. Brumbelow replied we are not, and if she was actually writing the Bill she would have included going to the River as her boundary just to close it. Just because we are closing something in the boundary, doesn't mean things are changing 100% within the boundary.

Mr. Syrnick asked does title of either Bill say Schuylkill River.

Ms. Brumbelow replied both say Schuylkill River. They both have the same boundary area in the short title. She did not write the Bill.

Tom Witt, Esq., with Cozen O'Connor, replied he is council to NP International, which is the party at interest here. He introduced Charles Nolan (who is the Chief Executive of the

company), his colleague Brent Reynolds has been the principal face of the project in Philadelphia, but Mr. Reynolds is traveling on business so Mr. Nolan came in from Minneapolis and Jim Kean (of Gensler Architecture) is about to make this presentation. The height limit, as it has been written, has always been defined as relation to the river. And in writing an amendment to it, they didn't change that, they just left that alone.

Mr. Kean replied there are certain key attributes in that they set out early on in the project. And they defined those working with the local community. And to get their input for establishing a feasible, market-sustainable development, but one that is specifically walkable and bikeable. The proposed project could be a great gateway to the City from the 30th Street Station. We think it creates a connection to JFK Boulevard. It helps to connect the grid to Arch and Cherry Streets, to improvements to those streets. There is also aesthetic improvements to the SEPTA rail bridge; further security improvements to the site that's existing. It is great proximity to Drexel University and University of Penn. And direct access to 30th Street Station. So those are the goals they set out to achieve. The sites are primarily the Walnut on the River, an attempt to produce a design that enhances the local community. And is why they have spent 18 months working with the local community to arrive at the design that they have. It is a fantastic location. It is a ½ mile, 10 minute ride to downtown Philadelphia, and very close to 30th Street Station. There is only 1 mile further out to Drexel and Penn. They think it is a great location that is currently not really helping the community being a car park. They are all very keen bikers. He bikes to work every day. There is an existing bike path, which is very strong within the City. We are looking for our development to further connect and further improve bike connects through this area of the City. There is one tall tower, two smaller towers, and then a public plaza surrounded by townhomes, car parking, and above that retail. He showed a concept rendering of the buildings. They have tried to create a common language between the buildings, but each one has its own distinctive identity. The view across the river, directly in front of us, we have a parking garage with a screen, and above that grocery and retail behind a frosted glass wall, and a residential tower above that. To the right of that, you will see the other 2 towers: one will be residential, and the other will be a hotel and residential. The view on JFK looking back towards 30th Street Station, what we see in the foreground is the base of the tower, which will be a hotel and built up residential, and to the right a smaller residential building. These are concept renderings on how this deals with JFK Boulevard entrance needs to be further refined. We are looking at flipping it so that the building comes directly down JFK with retail and the drop off would be behind to keep with the street edge. He showed a view at the end of Arch Street extending down to the river. This would be a public promenade, and to the left at ground level would be retail, and to the right we can see the brownstone townhomes wrapped around the car parking, and above that we would have grocery supermarket and retail and to the right and left we can see the 2 residential towers. It is something that is sympathetic to the neighborhood, but is also modern in its appearance. He showed a rendering of the entrance up to the supermarket and retail. We are trying to do something that finishes the development along 23rd Street, but will also make it quite spectacular – so a glass box with escalators carrying you up through the space. We have an interesting challenge up to the north of this site. At N. 23rd and Cuthbert Streets is another lot that has been purchased. You can right now that it is not a very attractive space. There is a very interesting precedent that is being done in New York, which is the highline, and we would like to use this as a precedent. We have not gone into the detail of the design on what to do with this space yet. Along the highline they have done a very interesting job of creating small parks above and below through careful use of lighting, paving, and introduction of this specific boutique retails. They really managed to re-invigorate things up until now for many, many years it has been quite desolate, A large part is getting people down to this site at JFK. We were careful to design a PennDot

ramp leading down to this site. To the left is JFK, and to the right is the SEPTA rail bridge; so we are bringing stairs and an ADA accessible ramp down to 23rd Street, and we will be landscaping the zone between the two bridges. The landscape design needs to be worked out; this is very conceptual. To the right you can see the sort of improvements we have looked into under the bridge, kind of like high end retail under that space. Another option is it could be an external courtyard, sculptural gallery. This is just a conceptual rendering of what we could do with that space. In the distance, you can see the ramps and the stairs coming down from JFK. We have polished the floor under the bridge, introduced new lighting, and showing ways that we can turn something. Right now it is not a great space; but we could make it into a feature or draw.

Ms. Miller asked could you list a few of the organizations that you were working with.

Mr. Witt replied we have been working with Logan Square for about a year. Mr. Panek is here, he can answer that.

Mr. Kean replied what was really good about working with Logan Square when we first spoken to them, we really didn't have a design in place. What we had was an as of right along the linear bars. We could build across the river, but we felt that was quite aggressive. So we made the decision to do what we did, which was to turn the buildings this way, make the mass taller, and maximize the view across the river.

Ed Panek, attorney and Zoning Chair for Logan Square Neighborhood Association, replied they support both Bills that are before you here today. The developer on this project has been extraordinarily cooperative with the near neighbors and LSNA in trying to preserve views of the near neighborhoods and to take into account their concerns with respect to the aspect of this project as we go along. These two Bills are the result of the process, and as a matter of fact they were submitted to him for review before they were submitted anywhere else, and we in fact proposed some changes. Tom Witt made the changes and they are incorporated in what you have before you. These two Bills really do facilitate what the neighborhood would like to see built, as opposed to other alternatives in this area. And without these Bills, it won't be built accordingly. So therefore, he is here to suppose the Bills, and he will entertain any questions from the Commission

Mr. Greenberger said the question he had, it is not a criticism, he thinks the general plan and the imagery is very compelling. We are not voting on imagery today, this is all still to come. He hopes you get to do pretty much everything we saw. Paula, what exactly is the change? What are we actually voting on today?

Ms. Brumbelow replied she wanted to highlight the site contents again. The Bills were written for Cherry Street, 23rd Street, John F. Kennedy Boulevard, and the Schuylkill River. They were introduced by Councilmember Greenlee for Council President Clarke on May 15, 2014. It is an existing parking lot that we probably have all seen. It is zoned RMX3, CMX5, and along the edge of the river it is zoned Special Purpose Park Open Space Active. She also noted all of the hatched area is the 100 year flood plain. They have not submitted a plan, so we have not reviewed it for the flood plain, but we made the applicant aware they are in the 100 years flood plain, and that special requirements for construction and zoning will apply. She gave a quick summary. The total square feet is 1.75 million square feet; 58% of the project is proposed to be residential; 8% is commercial; 11% will be a hotel, which will be located on 12 floors; they are providing parking garages, which will take up 23% of that square footage; the height of Building A (which is the north building) would be a maximum of 21 stories at 220 feet

in height; and the height of Building B (which would be fronting JFK, and the other part of Building B would be on the other side of the SEPTA rail line) would be a maximum of 42 stories at 446 feet in height as proposed. So the Zoning Bill 140439 is a text Bill; and the first part of the Bill would adjust the height limitations of the Benjamin Franklin Parkway, which are currently at 125 feet maximum. The Bill would change the right-of-way for the area bounded by 23rd Street, JF Kennedy Boulevard, the Schuylkill River, and the SEPTA right-of-way (which is in red), and allow a maximum of 500 feet in height. The yellow area, which is from the 23rd Street, the SEPTA right-of-way, the Schuylkill River, and Cherry Street, will be allowed to be 300 feet in height. The second part of the Bill, will amend the notes for Table 14-6021, so it will allow a retail sales and commercial service uses not to exceed 25% of the gross floor area, so that is an increase, and it is to be located above the ground floor of the building if they have direct entrances from the ground floor. Right now our RMX3 has a very small amount of square footage for commercial on the ground floor only, this will increase it to 25% of the total gross floor area, and it will allow it to be located above the ground floor. Now the second one is Zoning Bill 140442 this will adjust the zoning boundary line between CMX5 Commercial mixed-use and RMX3. The CMX5 area will be moving 61 feet away from JF Kennedy Boulevard; so the CMX5 will now be coming to the north side of Arch Street. The RMX3 will be getting smaller; the CMX5 will be increasing. The meets our Citywide Vision under THRIVE, and meets the Central District Plan encouragement for large scale, mixed-use development. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval of both Bills.

Mr. Greenberger replied the two Bills, changing the height limitations and rezone and reworking where CMX5 happens.

Ms. Brumbelow replied yes, and it only applies to this area; not the rest of the CMX5 zoning in the Code.

Mr. Greenberger replied one question that comes up in his mind, is one of your acquisition is one of those strips of land on JFK Boulevard part of your acquisition.

Mr. Witt replied yes. The parcel is the land west of 23rd Street, and then the land 23rd Street east to 20th Street along the north side of JFK.

Mr. Greenberger asked is there anything contemplative for those. We have seen controversial stuff in the past that frankly wasn't all that interesting.

Mr. Witt replied he deferred to the Design Team on whether they have set loose on any of that. He doesn't believe that we have any work done on that yet.

Mr. Kean replied we have not looked at those sites so far.

Mr. Panek replied not to be labored the obvious, at least he thinks it is obvious, that these Bills also do not affect the Height Limit Overlay except in this particular area. It has nothing to do with the rest of the District; we want to preserve every other place.

Mr. Greenberger replied we do to. We understand.

Ms. Rogo Trainer replied that was going to be her question for Paula or anyone on the staff who wants to answer it. So we understand what we are voting away, could you explain the purpose of the 125 foot height limit, and how it was seen to apply to this site?

Ms. Brumbelow replied the 125 foot setback used to be just along the Benjamin Franklin Parkway' it expanded approximately 7 years ago, and it expanded in a much larger area and we were seeing in 2005/2006 a lot of development that was kind of debatable on what was a matter of right. The community said they really want to take the time to look at each application; so the Councilman Clarke introduced a Bill for 125 feet, and has changed the Bill several times on a spot by spot basis. The Comcast Center is a good example of the one that we saw recently, that exempted itself out of the Benjamin Franklin height.

Mr. Panek replied Paula that is exactly right. He added this comment, they were faced, a number of years ago, with developers who wanted to come in and do development as a right on a massive scale. There really wasn't anything to prevent them from doing that. So they went to Councilman Clarke, and asked him to enact an Ordinance that would provide 125 foot Height Overlay, and that's what got enacted. That doesn't mean it can't be pierced if we so agreed to have it pierced on a project by project basis, but what it does is now it forces the developer who wants to build something taller than 125 feet in any particular area that the overlay applies to have to deal with the neighborhood association that was the intend with they going to Councilman Clarke; that was the intend with having the Ordinance enacted.

Ms. Rogo Trainer replied she wished she hadn't heard all of that, but now that she has heard that, she wanted to re-state her question, from the staff point of view the 125 feet height limit in this particular location serves no planning purpose other than the control issue.

Ms. Brumbelow replied she is going to go back a little farther, we had several copies of proposals or copies of plans that even started under Ed Bacon, when he had Planning Commission staff envision taller buildings along here. Originally this was the proposal for the Convention Center with taller buildings. So from a planning perspective, it was not our idea to put the 125 feet at this location. We have always envisioned taller buildings.

Ms. Rogo Trainer replied that's what she wanted to know. Thank you.

Mr. Greenberger replied he is perfectly comfortable with all of this. His only concern is, and it is not really a concern about what is going to work for the City. It's actually a concern about how development moves forward, so you have a lot of ideas, they look pretty intriguing; we hope you get to do all of them. The zoning is very tightly wrapped up around the concept proposal as it lives now. Which is fine; he is a little worried about as you get into the market and start to concern yourself with, well hotel maybe yes, maybe no; 500 feet building here; not 100% sure. He worried about whether you're defining too tight a box around yourselves given the unpredictable market conditions. That said he is perfectly comfortable moving ahead with this. You need to recognize that there may be a moment when you have to come back into the system, the circumstances of what you can realistically do in the market change. This will require Civic Design Review, which is a separate matter. Just want you to be aware of that.

Mr. Citron said he just had a technical question. Bill 140439 is that going to create 2 different height limits on the same parcel?

Ms. Brumbelow replied she is not sure how they are dividing their parcel, whether they are consolidating it into one parcel or two; but there will be a clear line of where that height limit is.

Mr. Greenberger replied he guessed that is enforced by the rail cuts.

Mr. Citron asked is currently one parcel.

Ms. Brumbelow replied she doesn't believe it is one parcel.

Mr. Witt replied there are two parcels there today, and the parcel lines match the existing zoning lines. If these Bills are adopted, then their next step will be a change of lot lines to make the lot lines conformed to the new zoning lines.

Ms. Brumbelow replied so then it will have two heights on one parcel.

Scott Mays replied he was the Vice President of the Delaware Valley Association of Rail Passengers. He is very much for the development around 30th Street. He thinks what the staff is doing looks beautiful, the staircases and all that; but there is a very big concern that goes back 60 or 70 years with the railroad right here, and the future of getting New Jersey and even North and Northeast Philadelphia into 30th Street. The future development is coming to 30th Street area; this was intended for 70 to 80 years to happen. But if you look at this picture here you see the railroad bridge on the other side, the Schuylkill Expressway is 6 tracks wide. There are 5 tracks that could be expanded to 6 on the platform as it comes to CSX. And with cosmetic changes it could be a full 6 tracks there. The reason that that was, and the reason there is a green strip along the JFK Boulevard is because this was intended for 2 more tracks. The Pennsylvania Railroad, which designed the Northeast tracks corridor, is still the leading high speed rail line in the entire Western Hemisphere; what Amtrak is looking to put 2 additional tracks in other areas. He believes they are the owner of the tracks here not SEPTA, but they are not of course looking to expanding for a tenant, for SEPTA. But the big missing piece of 30th Street is New Jersey; it's PATCO. Parsons Brinkerhoff did a study of extending the PATCO line down Locust Street, which would mean a stop at 20th or 22nd and Locust (not a real good spot). There was no park along the Riverfront. They were going to come right up there, stop right under this bridge/elevator and walk across. Not a very good design. They also before PATCO was actually built, advocating building another tunnel under the Delaware River rather than using the existing subway line that went to Camden, and building a 3 track fan. It is a little elaborate on both cases. When there is a much simpler way; use what the Pennsylvania Railroad left here for us to use later as this area is going to double, triple, and quadruple in size; and have it go down 18th Street after stopping at 21st, 18th and Suburban Station (where there is extra room down there), and then the short subway down to 18th and Locust. Now what he is asking for is not to take the tower out, and not to mess with the existing zoning that you guys were talking about. But to create a box on the south side of maybe 22 feet minus any pillar that a PATCO, as well as, a Broad Street subway, which are completely compatible once the fare zones changes on SEPTA, so that and you can build over it which is exactly what is being done on the highway side of JFK, but on a much high scale something like 30 feet into the air you having a carved out box for cars to pull in off of the Boulevard. He is asking as this goes forward, as the Zoning Commission looks at this that 22 feet wide by 15 feet high be allowed to be in there. Because it's really going to be needed and you are going to save a half a billion dollars doing it this way rather than trying to create more subway tunnels under the River and all; that's way the upper level of 30th Street is 6 tracks wide. It is set and ready to go. We just have to preserve this right of way. At the same time like they are doing in Washington, Union Station, and Penn Station, there are ways to build over these things completely if you do it right from the beginning. Thank you very much.

Mr. Greenberger replied thank you, interesting point. He didn't know that.

Craig Schelter, for the Development Workshop, replied we would like to endorse this proposal. We think it is a very strong planning reason for increasing the height limit on the parcel along JFK Boulevard; and also allowing for that area north of JFK Boulevard to be the transition zone when you design this parcel, it is extremely difficult to get building cores and escalators up to the level over the tracks. That's been a problem with the site being developed going back to 1968, where this project was dumped in his lap when he was the Center City Planner. And because of the excess expense of covering the tracks and getting escalators up to the lobby levels, and to create attractive retail on the ground floor; it is really critical to have that space in there, And he disagrees with the previous gentlemen in terms of, while it might be good for something for rails in the future, right now what you have to do is have the area for elevators to come down to the ground to be received, and again you have to have the escalators and elevators come up to what becomes the dispersal level on the project. So they would support this project as presented.

Upon motion by Ms. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Citron, the City Planning Commission approved Zoning Bills 140439 and 140442.

9) Action Item: Zoning Bill 140436 remapping the area bounded by 45th, 50th, Market, and Spruce Streets (Introduced by Councilmember Blackwell on May 15, 2014).

Mr. Lee recused himself.

Andrew Meloney stated this Bill remaps the Walnut Hill neighborhood of West Philadelphia. The area is bounded by 50th, Spruce, 45th, and Market Streets. The zoning remapping recommendation of the University/Southwest District Plan was adopted by this Commission in June 2013. The purpose of this Bill is to align zoning to existing land uses, preserve single-family housing, and promote multi-family uses along commercial corridors and at transit nodes. The existing zoning is "RM-1" and "RSA-3". The proposed zoning is "CMX-3" and "RSA-5". The Walnut Hill zoning sub-area of the University/Southwest Planning District includes the high traffic corridors of Walnut and Chestnut Streets and the potential high density transit oriented area around the 46th and Market Street El Station. The station area has significant vacancy which holds the potential for new commercial and institutional development. The sub-area also contains single-family residential areas that need protection from conversion to multi-family by zoning them RSA-5 instead of RM-1. There are also two park and open space areas -- Drexel's Vidas Fields and Barkan Park -- that are zoned for development. They should be zoned for active and passive open space uses. It has been established that they want to save West Philadelphia High School, which was established as a historic property many years ago. We have received support of three community groups in the area: Garden Court, Spruce Hill, and Walnut Hill. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval.

Upon motion by Ms. Rogo Trainer, seconded by Mr. Syrnick, the City Planning Commission approved Zoning Bill 140436.

10) Action item: Zoning Bill 140437 remapping and revising the use and dimensional regulations in the area bounded by 36th, 37th, 38th, Warren, and Filbert Streets, and Powelton and Lancaster Avenues (Introduced by Councilmember Blackwell on May 15, 2014).

Ms. Rogo Trainer recused herself.

Martine Decamp stated this is a zoning remapping Bill that will rezone the site of the former University City High, Drew Elementary, and Walnut Center Annex. The area is located in West Powelton section of West Philadelphia. It is approximately a 14 acres site. It's bounded on the west by Presbyterian Hospital, and on the south by science related uses, on the north side along Warren Street (there are 3-story, single-family homes), and Lancaster Avenue by retail related uses. The site is currently zoned RM1. It is bounded on the south side by high density commercial uses, on the west side by multi-family residential zoning, and on the north by retail. The Development Plan was submitted by Drexel/Wexford, this is subjected to change, partially because this has been a quickly moving transaction where the School District wanted to sell the school in a quick manner. Through their due diligence they have now found a sewer under Warren Street; so this site plan is subject to change. The general idea is that they are proposing approximately 2.7 million sq. ft. that includes a proposal for both an elementary school, retail and housing, research and commercial, offices related uses and a structured parking garage in the center. One of the things we do like about this is that one of the things we do encourage in the University/Southwest District Plan was creating through streets to go through the property. The proposal is to rezone the property from RM1 Residential to CMX4 High Density Commercial, but they are also proposing an overlay over the site. The overlay would remove the special requirement exception for parking garages. It would allow a 750% FAR with no bonuses allowed. And it provides height restrictions along the north end of the streets. What we have discussed at staff level is that the special exception for the parking garage is not necessarily an issue for City Planning because we will still be reviewing this proposal under façade review controls for under parking garage under CMX4. We will also see this through the Civic Design Review process. The 750% FAR is a mid-range FAR for a CMX4 District, in that CMX4 normally allows 500% plus an additional potential of 700% if they were to receive bonuses. And one thing we have discussed heavily was the height restrictions along the northern portions of the street. As it stands the current Bill provides for a 50 feet of a 75 foot height limit along Powelton Avenue, Lancaster Avenue, and 37th Street; and a 120 foot height restriction for the first 50 feet along Warren Street. And then along 37th Street it would scale up to 120 feet for the second 50 feet. One thing that is important to note here is that the developer is still in negotiations with the community. This has moved so fast. The School District has been looking for a decision. So these heights are most likely in influx. In general though, the City Planning staff, as part of the University/Southwest District Plan recommends that this site be rezoned for higher density commercial use. And we support the fact that the negotiations are continuing; and we would recommend support for this Bill, particularly given that they are working on additional revised height restrictions and additional work with the community. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval.

Mr. Greenberger replied this Bill was in Rules last week, the Committee recessed over this to allow more time for discussions between the developers, the Councilwoman, and several of the community groups. It was brought back to a new session of Rules yesterday. It was moved out of Rules. And it is intended to go to first reading on Thursday. So we are not where we would normally be in this process; and there are still a lot of intense discussions going on, so he thinks before going on he thinks Commissioners should get some updates on where discussions are. Could we do that?

Peter Kelsen, Esq. replied on behalf of Drexel University and Wexford Science Center a joint venture partner. As Alan indicated the Bill is moving as quickly as it is for a major reason, the School District has set a time frame whereby this project must close and be funded to the

tune of $25,150,000 on June 16, which is basically a week away. Due diligence and the earnest money, hard money of 5%, has be put up by the end of business on June 12. Unfortunately those time frames are not extendable, and have been set for a variety of reasons, that he is sure we all know we are aware of due to the fiscal needs of the School District. Having said that, that is why this process is as abbreviated and is moving as quickly as it is. He is pleased to say on behalf of Drexel and Wexford that we have been engaged in active discussions with our community partners. There are quite a few Community Registered Organizations in the area. And through the auspices and leadership of Councilwoman Blackwell, he thinks they are getting close but they are not there yet. He thinks you will probably here that for the community in a few moments. It is their goal to reach a consensus. He thinks that Martine correctly pointed out that the original Ordinance, which was introduced on May 15th has certain height limitations. If he could use the term placeholder would be helpful because, for example on Warren Street, which he calls the south side of the legally opened Warren Street, the Ordinance as introduced calls for 120 ft. of maximum height for the first 50 ft. of property area. That has already been revised down per Drexel/Wexford, and we are prepared to go to 65 ft. for the first 50 ft. There are additional height limitations that have been modified, but they are not introduced into the Bill, there were no amendments produced. If there are any amendments the deadline for introductions would be Thursday, June 12. That is the first reading date as Alan indicated. That would be the last opportunity to introduced amendments, and still have the Bill pass, if it were to pass on June 19 the last session of Council. Remember as he indicated, closing is set to occur on June 16 three days before Council would issue final action on the Bill. He hoped that clarifies it, and they are scheduled to meet again tomorrow; we are waiting for comments back from the community. He is happy to answer any questions anyone may have.

Mr. Greenberger asked from the development team's perspective, you are saying that the height control on Warren Street as proposed by the development team is now 65 ft. for the first 50.

Mr. Kelsen replied yes, that is correct.

Mr. Greenberger asked are they any other modifications to the height controls that are listed there.

Mr. Kelsen replied there are. If he can do it perhaps in a narrative format, that would be helpful. For Lancaster, Powelton, and he believes a portion of 37th Street the recent offer to the community is for the first 10 ft. of the distance from the property line in that quadrant the maximum height limit would be 65 ft.; and then it would increase to 75 ft. in the 50 ft. zone or 50 ft. beyond. That is the area as you know where we are across the street from the retail corridor along Lancaster and Powelton. He would repeat that on the south side of legally opened Warren Street that would be 65 ft., that going back 50 ft. The sewer interceptor that Martine referred to can be seen in this overhead if you follow the legally opened Warren Street and just run to his left going to Powelton - 500 ft X 50 ft. in width is the right-of-way for sewer interceptor. It basically bisects that portion of the development site, and renders any development on that right-of-way impossible. The existence of that right-of-way was discovered during due diligence prior to the offer made to the School District.

Michael Jones, representative for Powelton Village Civic Association and the Powel Home and School, replied he is here to basically oppose the Bill as it is currently written. The zoning overlay as proposed would basically offer an FAR of 750%, in essence we feel they

are awarding bonuses for work that should have been incentivize for work that would need to be done for certain kinds of construction, such as ground parking for various things like that, that the developer is not committing to do. The developer has also exempted himself from the special exemptions for parking and so forth, something that we are also concerned about in terms of how that produces good development on the site. It is a 14-acre site; it's huge. It is tremendously important both to the City and to the neighborhood; and it's integration into the neighborhood he thinks is tremendous importance and we are really trying to make sure the development is as good as possible. The height limits along Lancaster Avenue, Powelton Avenue, and Warren Street that those be contextual for the neighborhood and don't feel at this point that negotiation is where it is appropriate, and we are afraid that what they are going to do is incentivize other development and tear down along Lancaster Avenue using this as basically a precedent for what appropriate development along that corridor looks like. The parking is an issue.

Lucia Esther, Chair of West Powelton Saunders Park Association RCO, replied our neighbors are rather up in turmoil about this. They say the process is going so fast. The lack of civic engagement should have been done much longer ago; and also worrying about the precedent being set because on Warren Street after our last meeting with the developer, another developer came to us and he wants to put 25-story apartments up there and demolish the Victorian shops. So we feel that once the excessive height comes into our neighborhood then all of the other developers will be surrounding us and then tearing down. They also remember in the neighborhood when the school was put up, that many of our folks were dislocated because land was condemned to put the school in. Now they are going through the same process all over again. So they are quite upset. So if there is any way that we can slow down, so that we can gather and talk some more on it. That would be appreciated.

Paul Boni, Esq. replied he is a Land Use Attorney in Philadelphia. He is representing the Powelton Village Civic Association. He would like to object to the process, but unfortunately there really is no process. And that's the problem. Sometimes when we, what he calls spot zone – we have a project to look at: uses, massing, circulation, and everything that we particularly see. Here we have nothing. We have a concept plan, but that concept plan is by no means reliable in fact we are told that it can change, and change, and change again. There is no commitment whatsoever that the concept being shown is actually what anybody is going to be talking about in one year, two years, or three years. So we are really talking about this in the abstract. So the situation that is sort of thrust upon us is a very generous Bill from the developer's point of view, very generous, a time limit thrust upon us, and the way he likened this too is a large number of squirrels put into a barrel, put a lid put on the barrel. Now who are these squirrels? These squirrels don't have any real planning expertise, no real good information, some of the squirrels come from large institutions, many of the squirrels come from rowhome neighborhoods, and some of the squirrels have law degrees for better or for worst. The barrel is then rolled down the hill, and at the end of the hill two things can happen. Either a bell goes off and we have an amended Bill that is passed into law and we go forward. Or the project dies. That is a terrible way to do planning. The seller in this case is the School District. The custodian of the Bill is City Council. Both of those are public institutions that have responsibilities to the public. Those two institutions should get together and make sure that for this site for the next School District sell off that a process is put in place where professional planning can be done at the beginning where we would have an idea of what the project is going to be so we know we are not talking about things in the abstract; and we would encourage the Planning Commission, as the professional planners in the City, to encourage those two institutions to adopt the process if not for this property, then for the next one. We are trying as hard as we can, and we thank you very much.

Kira Strong, from the People's Emergency Center, replied she represents the CDC that is local to this area, territory and boundaries that cover and abut this parcel. She doesn't have any good analogy as the squirrels for you today. But she wants to echo what you have heard so far from representatives from the local civic groups, and also from Mr. Boni regarding the process of the development of this site. And to really ask the Planning Commission and to say that Martine has been fabulous, but frankly we miss you, your technical expertise throughout this process, she thinks it is sorely needed. She thinks a Master Plan to which the community can respond to would be incredibly helpful as we move forward on this site. She thinks there is a lot of potential to this 14 acre site. A lot of real positives that can come out of it; but in the current process, the speed, the lack of community engagement over, and the she knows it got very specific around heights, she would like to remind people that on the north side of Warren Street there are 3-story rowhomes that with stood the past urban renewal development here exactly – that is standing about 35 feet to give people some context. You have a group of very committed civics and residents. They hosted a planning charrette before we knew who the intended buyer of the site was, just to get a sense of where the community vision and sentiment was. There were 150 people in attendance with the very understanding that this will be a very densely mixed-use site with some real excitement around that with the possibility of the location of a public school in the site, which Drexel is very committed to, and we would like to see happen. So she reiterated that seeing a Master Plan that the community can really respond to, and seeing the Planning Commission's expertise as we move forward during the process of developing the site would be really helpful and welcomed.

Scott Mays replied the title he will be using for this item is the former chief planner for the Philadelphia Trolley Coalition, of which our former Executive Director is in the audience also, we looked at this site and area for many, many years and with the University City District and others, the community groups and all had developed a plan to put in more public transportation in here; and this was in contrast to the Lucy bus, which has done a fine job of getting people down to the hospitals there. This would have been something called the University City Streetcar Loop, which would have been a figure eight of a line using the tunnel coming out at where the 10 line comes out there at 36th Street at Market, but also extending a short new track on 38th Street that would be one-way but used in both directions, the cars would split up and down Lancaster, one going inbound to 36th and one going outbound 40th Street, and going down to 40th and Market to the rest of general University City and into West Philadelphia before coming back and to the site. That could put a 1,000 seats light rail through this area here to reduce the parking podiums. And add to the number 10, which by the way is a subway line just out or sight that runs 24 hours a day. It's always run 24 hours a day. He would like to emphasis what Kira just said that the balance of all of those different things would be his position; you've got to look at it all very carefully. Wonderful things can happen here. This has been a long time coming, but there are places like Warren Street, parts of Lancaster, that are very sensitive. He is willing to discuss things in much more detail as we work them out.

Mr. Kelsen replied he thinks it would be helpful very briefly just to indicate where we are; although there is no agreement in any way, shape, or form that has been finalized. He thinks it is fair to say from both the developer's side and the community's side a clear framework has been created to create an advisory group that would be involved on a global basis, all of the RCOs would be involved prior to any plan being submitted and even any plan being created. Outreach to the community, and input from the community is structured hopefully in a document that would be executed that would give an initial dialogue before any plans are finally presented or prepared. Not to go over all of the details because it is in negotiation. It's a very meaningful process that the developers are comfortable and supportive of. So he doesn't want the impression to be that there is not going to be active community

engagement prior to anything more than base concept plans being create for discussion only. The last point, he believes this site was looked at in Philadelphia2035 as a CMX4 site. A CMX4 site, as the Commission knows, does not have any height limitation at all. It's an FAR District of 5, and we feel that by creating the height limitation zones along those very sensitive portions of the site are appropriate in order to relate to the context and respect the context of the abutting properties, especially on Warren Street. But again this Ordinance, would call for restrictions on height, a base CMX4 would not; and we feel that is an appropriate approach to take.

Mr. Lee asked Mr. Kelsen to tell him about the public school.

Mr. Kelsen replied when the RFP was submitted to the School Reform Commission, which was accepted, a commitment was made by Drexel University to retain a portion of the property which is basically the portions that abuts Warren Street (the open portion) for a period of 5 years to explore the possibility of Drexel and School District, because only the School District can decide to have a public school on that location. With the efforts of Drexel and the efforts of the School Reform Commission and the School District to establish a public school there. As part of the process, in the potential agreement would also involve a steering committee that would be participating in it, therefore participants of the community would be part of that. That is part of the transaction with the School Reform Commission, and Drexel is committed to that. What will happen is obviously the site, if it is acquired, would be subdivided into various pieces. The pieces that Drexel would retain, two-thirds will be Wexford's development pieces, will be closest to that Warren Street piece. That is why when Martine showed you the graphic that was submitted to the School Reform Commission as part of the RFP, it showing that area along Warren as being a placeholder site for the public school.

Mr. Syrnick asked if this were to receive approval today, and subsequently this Ordinance were to be passed, explain to us how it would move forward with emphasis on the public participation which you allude to just a few moments ago.

Mr. Kelsen replied first of all if the Ordinance passes, and the property is acquired, he would virtually guarantee that Civic Design Review would be a pre-requisite for pretty much any one of the buildings and structures proposed; because they will clearly meet the triggers. He is going to work his way backward. Civic Design Review has always been contemplated as a formalized community, Planning Commission, developer obligation. And as you know, we cannot pull final zoning permits until that process is complete. In addition to the, let's call it the formalized zoning process with CDR, the community benefits agreement as negotiated, but not final, would call for what he called very preliminary Advisory Group participation at the community level, RCO level, and developer level, to inform before any plans are actually created or move forward, to get input, comment, and advice. That he would view as perhaps similar to the charrette process that occurred maybe two months ago, as Kira mentioned between community representatives, and representatives of Drexel and Wexford. So there will also be more formalized community process, because as part of the Civic Design Review before one can go before the Civic Design Review there is a mandatory meeting with the Registered Community Organization that must occurred before the Civic Design Review meeting. There are contemplated to be several points of contact; informal, formal, and then legal as part of the process.

Mr. Schelter replied we would strongly support the staff recommendation in this particular area. And it brings to mind at least two cases in the past, where he was in Mr. Greenberger's position. A scary position when City Council wanted to close the budget on the back of a land sale. And that was critical, if you follow the budget discussions, just how critical

$25 million is. You can't go around and find another $25 million easily. He thinks the important thing here is when this was done with John Connors, who was here today with his project on Lits, when it was done with Penn and CHOP on the old Civic Center site. Those institutions are going to be around for a long time; they are going to be regularly coming back to the Commission. And neighborhoods, established out there, will be coming back to the Planning Commission. He thinks that Drexel now has created excitement out in this area that we have not had ever before. And he thinks that they don't want to interrupt that in any way by essentially trampling on what's talked about with the community. So for us, it's a reasonable risk to take to make sure that budget gets filled, and rely on the fact that they will be back many times before this Commission. And that will be regularly reported in the local media with meetings with the local community group.

Ms. Miller replied she has a question for Mr. Kelsen. In this process, it is pretty clear that there are communities of interest around acquiring this site. You outlined what is required moving forward, but why wasn't there more of an attempt to convene that group in advance?

Mr. Kelsen replied as soon as Drexel/Wexford was awarded the RFP, and prior to the point of Drexel/Wexford being awarded the RFP, there was community outreach staring in June of last year. We didn't know we had the site under control, but we began that process. We began a more formalize outreach process once we knew we had the RFP, and there were probably 5 community meetings in the last 2 months that were convened between the stakeholders meetings, the RCOs, immediate neighbors, Drexel/Wexford reps participating with the Councilwoman's office as well. He gave a little perspective, his colleague Paul Boni characterized it correctly. The timeframe is unbelievable. The agreement of sale was not signed by the School District, and Mr. Lee will appreciate this, until May 19 (less than a month ago). There has been a lot of outreach. And he thinks what that outreach has done frankly in additional with that charrette that was participated by a lot of community members and development representatives. It has allowed us to get to the point where we are almost at an agreement. We are not there, but we are almost at an agreement. Look it's obvious this is not the best way to do any project for any zoning or any acquisition. And he has said this publicly before, if we had more time, would it be better. Sure, but we don't have it. That's the reality on the ground. It's a decision we all have to make with our eyes wide open. He can say there is a full committed on behalf of Drexel, because he represents Drexel, to have meaningful dialogue. We have always had meaningful dialogue in community interaction, especially with PVCA in other matters; that will not change. But he doesn't have the luxury or the ability to tell you as a Commission that it's just okay we can extend the time and get it done. It just won't happen. But we can get it done if the parties can reach agreement on 4 issues now out of 13. That's pretty good odds; that it can get done.

Mr. Greenberger replied he had a few comments he wanted to make and then he wanted to bring this to a conclusion. He said that he honestly can't explain to the Commissioners the interior machinations of who talked to whom, what time, have many community meetings happened, how many didn't happened, exactly why were are in this time crunch were are in. Can't explain it to you; wish I could. It is frustrating to him, the community, and Drexel and Wexford. The time pressure of this sale is very real, that weighs on him very heavily. This is an immense amount of cash. The day after it closes or the day it closed to the School District, and that's given the School District's situation, it is an incredibly powerful thing or which there is tremendous from all parties (understandably), Council, Mayor, and School District to get this done. Sorry that's the case, but it's the case. He doesn't think fundamental zoning changes here are problematic. He thinks logically this is a CMX4 site. When it come to

us early it was suggested that it might be more than that, and we said no it needs to be that and that only. It needs to have height limitations on the northern edge. They are still working at what those height limits are. He doesn't think 65 ft. is an unreasonable number. But they are talking about it, and he doesn't think it helps for us, given how this process has gone, to insert ourselves as a Commission into the negotiation. It's too intense. The Councilwoman is trying to do her best to manage it. He doesn't think it helps for us to say 65 ft. it the right answer, is the wrong answer, or 42 ft. is the right answer, is the wrong answer. There are certainly plenty of circumstances in the City that are similar height deferential between 35 to 40 ft. row houses and large pieces on the other side of the street. But he thinks they are working that out, and hopefully they will continue to work it out. Parking issues – think about the Brandywine story at Cira South. They were forced, in order to get the IRS to move into the Post Office building, to build a very substantial parking garage with 1,600 cars to account for demands from the Federal Government, and they thought they needed additional parking beyond that to suit the things that are now being built at Cira South. Brandywine's hunch about don't build it all now turned out right, because the IRS turned out to not need anything near what they said they were going to need because of its proximity to 30th Street and people naturals interest in not having to fuss with a car, and possibly pay for parking. So he doesn't think they are ever going to have to build those extra 800 spaces. He feels a little bit of the same thing here. There is a belief that some people are going to drive to this site, these cars will need to handle on site rather then find their way into the neighborhoods. That's going to have to come with some operational realities about how streets are managed in the neighborhoods, and so on. We are going to need to park some people on this site. Is this concept plan the right number? He doesn't think so. He hopes it is not. He doesn't think it's a massive amount of parking.
There are 1,200 spaces conceptually. He doesn't think it is going to happen that way. But we don't know for sure. What he does know is that we have problems of getting parking underground because of the economics of building in the City. It's not going away tomorrow. As a Commission, we have absolute approval rights over the façade treatments of these parking garages. They are introducing a new City grid into this, which doesn't exist now. He thinks we are going to look very closely and hold peoples feet to the fire on how are you treating any parking that lives above ground. How are you treating that toward those streets that are there, as well as, toward the streets that are proposed. Major streets like 37th Street extension, we are going to have a keen interest on how those facilities relate to that. We will probably have less anxiety about things that are legit like middley back street and alley ways that are being created. The reintegration of the City grid is important. And it is ultimately streets on the City map or not, those will be perceived and function as public space. The point being that between CDR and our approval rights over these façade treatments; this is a long game we have more to go. The last thing that is critical to him; and it is the first time he has heard about it today, and he would be supportive of it, there needs to be an advisory committee that is drawn from the developer, the community, and maybe Councilwoman if necessary. The key interested stakeholders in moving this forward. He has faith, especially since Drexel involved, that this will get done right. An Advisory Board needs to happen. Moving forward he wants to have Commission staff involved in that Advisory Board, and doing this in full public view. Yes we should move this along, possibly for reasons that not everybody is comfortable with. They need to keep negotiations going between now and Thursday. We should let that happen. It will be back. It will be back time after time, and there is going to be a lot more said and done about this than this one particular zoning Bill unfortunately is totally related to this School District transaction.

Upon motion by Mr. Citron, seconded by Ms. Thompson, the City Planning Commission approved Zoning Bill 140437 with the condition that an advisory board be established to guide the planning and development of these sites.

Mr. Syrnick asked would it make sense if we are making that motion to include in there some recommendation regarding that Advisory Council will or community participation, that was a large part of our discussion, and we ought to capture it if that is the way that we feel.

Ms. Miller opposed.

Ms. Ruiz left at 3:50pm.

11) Action item: Zoning Bill 140447 remapping the area bounded by Frankford Creek, Kensington and Adams Avenues, Griscom and Wakeling Streets, and the Northeast Corridor Railroad Right-of-Way (Introduced by Councilmember Quiñones-Sánchez on May 15, 2014).

Kathleen Lambert stated this Bill relates to the Lower Northeast District. She showed a map that indicated the need for corrective zoning. Frankford Avenue is a major commercial corridor. And backed up against the Northeast right-of-way is kind of a smattering of industrial sites, and several of them are involved in the Bill today. There are row houses (residential) sandwiched in between the industrial and commercial corridors. This Bill amend the Philadelphia Zoning Maps by changing the zoning designations of certain areas of land located within an area bounded by the Frankford Creek, Kensington Avenue, Griscom Street, Wakeling Street and the Northeast Corridor Right-of-Way. The existing zoning are: “I-2”,”CMX-2”,”CMX-1”,”RM-1” and “RSA-5” in various locations following a corridor located along the Frankford Avenue Business Corridor, East Frankford Industrial, Globe Dye Works neighborhood. The proposed zoning are: “I-2”, “I-1”,”ICMX”,”IRMX”,”CMX-2”,”CMX-1”,”RM-1” and “RSA-5” in various locations following a corridor located along the Frankford Avenue Business Corridor, East Frankford Industrial, Globe Dye Works neighborhoods.”SP-PO-A” is added in select areas to preserve existing playgrounds and community garden areas where not previously designated. The changes to the area reflect existing uses and preserve existing single family homes. A primary goal is to reduce the amount of industrial land within the neighborhood fabric, and create areas to foster live/work light industrial, commercial services, and transit oriented development. This Bill represents further implementation of the Lower Northeast District Plan, adopted in October 2012. The bill provides corrective zoning for recommendation Hedge Plums Playground and to strengthen the commercial side of Frankford with commercial zoning, and a community garden was added which wasn’t in the District Plan. And then this is “zoning to advance the plan” for items: as mentioned before, Globe Dye Works is part of that and also to encourage the light industrial that’s been happening in the neighborhood already versus the medium industrial the it’s zoned now. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval with technical amendments. The technical amendments were found in the Bill that needed to be corrected.

He thanked Ms. Lambert.

Mr. Mays replied he talked to people at the Northeast Corridor Committee about the Northeast Corridor’s future and other programs, FRA and about some of these things. Of course you are looking at 200 a mile an hour trains. There are many people in the City Planning Commission and others which are which are looking at 10 mile, and he is saying 15 mile, tunnels from the Airport up to the Frankford Junction area, which is where we are talking about right here. Which he doesn’t think will happen, because of what is going on at 30th Street will drive it to go on the existing line. But either way no matter which line it would take, right

there, where some of the zoning you are talking about, there is going to have to be some new curves kind of built into getting the line in Frankford directly that goes deep into Frankford to Berks Street, which is going to have to cut into some buildings to make that curve at 200 miles an hour. Or the way the Pennsylvania Railroad had planned to do before World War I, which is to use East Erie Avenue, which they specifically had to build to fix the notorious Frankford Junction curves. The government took the land and build factories on part of it, and East Erie Avenue was laid out in later times. In today's situation if you are going to 30th Street Station, which is where all of the development is going which is much cheaper to do, and where you can get to it at high speed. You would need to be over a double height elevated over East Erie Avenue pass the Global Dye Works without touching them. Or in a shorter subway tunnel under some obsolete or underused factories to pick-up and avoid 2 other curves that are in the area. The Zoo Junction curve is close enough to 30th Street Station that it is not a problem if it is speeded up, as is Amtrak, who is also mentioned as possible. When you are doing zoning around the Northeast corridor, and approving buildings based on this it is absolutely critical that we preserve rights of way as Pennsylvania was trying to do as it bought, as it was interrupted, as well as what is being contemplated for a possible alternative using extensive tunneling technologies.

Mr. Greenberger replied one comment to have on this, we have proposals for rezoning from Councilmember Quiñones-Sánchez, Councilmember Blackwell, and Council President Clarke. We are seeing strategic rezoning; and he thinks this is great. This is exactly what we need to be doing to get the remapping up to speed. A lot of the rezoning we are going to see is preserving single-family use. It is hard to see how the City is ultimately going to develop around this; and the density demand is going to create other issues out there, but this is what we need to do right now. People will be living above commercial again.

Ms. Rogo Trainer wanted to clarify that nothing we are doing here affects the railroad right of way. Is that correct?

Mr. Greenberger replied we are not intruding on the railroad right of way. There may be changes that come as a result of high speed rail, where the railroads may have to either acquire additional property or condemn. There are all kinds of things out there.

Ms. Rogo Trainer replied but that would happen regardless what the zoning is.

Mr. Greenberger replied that is correct.

Upon motion by Ms. Rogo Trainer, seconded by Ms. Thompson, the City Planning Commission approved Zoning Bill 140447.

12) Action Item: Zoning Bill 140444 remapping an area bounded by 2nd, 3rd, 5th, Spring Garden, and Brown Streets, and Girard Avenue (Introduced by Councilmember Greenlee for Council President Clarke on May 15, 2014).

Ian Litwin stated this Bill is the separation of two Districts: 5th District, which is Council President Clarke's District, and the 1st District, which is Councilmember Squilla's District. This Bill (5th District) along with Bills 130727 (January 2014) and 140149 (May 2014) in the 1st Council District, completes the remapping of Northern Liberties neighborhood between Spring Garden Street, Girard Avenue, Delaware Avenue, and 5th Street. The existing zoning are a

mixed of “I-2”, “ICMX”, “RSA-5”, “I-2”, “CMX-1”, and “CMX-2”. The proposed zoning are a mixed of “ICMX”, “IRMX”, “CMX-2”, “CMX-2.5”, “CMX-3”, “RM-1”, “RSA-5”, “SP-PO-A”, and “SP-PO-P”. The purposes are for the following: aligns zoning to existing land uses; reinforces existing commercial corridor on N. 2nd Street; and zones open space accordingly. This is a rezoning of a very strategic area. This is from the recommendations of the District Plan. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval.

Upon motion by Ms. Rogo Trainer, seconded by Ms. Thompson, the City Planning Commission approved Zoning Bill 140444.

13) Action Item: Property Bill 140481 authorizing the City to convey 669 Hutchinson Street to PAID for further conveyance (Introduced by Councilmember Greenlee for Council President Clarke on May 22, 2014).

Mr. Litwin stated this Bill authorizes the Commissioner of Public Property to convey to the Philadelphia Authority for Industrial Development (PAID), a parcel of land located at 669 Hutchinson St, for further conveyance, under certain terms and conditions. It is not an active street. The property is currently a landlocked parcel, surrounded by the proposed purchaser, 913 Wallace Street Associates, L.P. The purchaser was unaware that they did not own this small parcel. The parcel is part of a parking lot that serves the business. The sale price is $4,144, which will be deposited in the City’s General Fund. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval.

Upon motion by Ms. Thompson, seconded by Mr. Citron, the City Planning Commission approved Property Bill 140481.

14) Action Item: Property Bill 140450 authorizing the City to lease a portion of the East Park Canoe House to Temple University for 20 years with renewal options (Introduced by Councilmember Jones on May 15, 2014).

Nicole Ozdemir stated this Bill leases the East Park Canoe House to Temple University for their collegiate rowing programs. It is located on Kelly Drive in East Fairmount Park, directly south of Strawberry Mansion Bridge. It is a historical building that was built in 1914 by Philadelphia architect, Walter Smedley. Presently it is vacant. It was previously used by Temple University for their rowing teams from 1959 until 2008. This is for a 20 year lease, with two 10-year renewal options. Rent would be $1. Both the City of Philadelphia and Temple University will be funding the $5.5 million renovation of the building. Temple will contribute $3 million and the City will be funding $2.5 million. Temple University will operate their collegiate rowing programs, as well as run two, one-week long summer camps for middle school students. The Police Department’s Marine Unit will continue to use storage facilities in the west wing of the first floor, and offices and showers on the second floor. There will be public restrooms on the first floor that Temple will maintain. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval.

Mr. Syrnick asked why is the City paying $2.5 million as part of the deal.

Mr. Greenberger replied because we own it. And we let it get in this condition, and we will be using it for the public and the Police use.

Upon motion by Ms. Rogo Trainer, seconded by Ms. Thompson, the City Planning Commission approved Property Bill 140450.

15) Action Item: Zoning Bill 140485 authorizing the City to accept and convey School District of Philadelphia property to PAID for further conveyance (Introduced by Councilmember Henon for Council President Clarke on May 22, 2014).

Mr. Jastrzab stated this Bill authorizes the City to accept from the School District of Philadelphia property to PAID for further conveyance to PIDC. PIDC is actively working with the School District on it. Twenty of these are in the process of receiving bids. The additional 6, the School District may not want to sell. And the Strawberry Mansion one is Leslie P. Hill, it doesn't fall into those lists. The City Planning Commission staff recommendation is approval. The staff believes that the process now being managed by PIDC is the fastest and most efficient way to sell and redevelop School District properties. While this Bill authorizes the City to accept the properties from the School District, it does not require this.

Mr. Greenberger replied that he and Rob Dubow testified on this in Council last week, along the times of what Mr. Jastrzab just said, thank you for the authorization to accept them, but we are in the process of selling them. We are moving ahead, and he supposes that if they are properties that don't sell, and we wish to rethink the process, this gives us the authority to accept them into our system if that is what everybody wants to do.

Mr. Schelter replied the Workshop would very much support this Bill, and would add that in the future when this type of conveyance is used, you can use deed restrictions that PAID puts on the property to solve particular sticky zoning problems that are difficult otherwise that would involve the Board, or specific changes to land use. And again that was done at the old Civic Center site that CHOP and Penn that worked extremely well and efficient, and got the abutting neighbors what they wanted in the project.

Upon motion by Ms. Miller, seconded by Mr. Citron, the City Planning Commission approved Zoning Bill 140485.

Mr. Greenberger adjourned the City Planning Commission Meeting of June 10, 2014 at 4:15pm.

SUMMARY

1) Approval of the Minutes for the May 20, 2014 meeting. Approved

2) Executive Director's Update.

3) *Staff Presentation: Philadelphia2035* Lower Northwest District Plan Update (Presented by Matt Wysong) Presented

4) *Staff Presentation: Philadelphia2035* "CONNECT" Implementation Update (Presented by Jeannette Brugger). Presented

5) Action Item: Baxter Trail Sidepath Review (Presented by Jeannette Brugger). Approved

6) Action Item: Market Street East Advertising District "Public Improvement Program" for a proposed Lit Brothers Building roof sign, 701 Market Street (Independence Center Realty LP; Introduced by Gary Jastrzab; Presented by John Pringle of Stantec). Approved

7) Action Item: Zoning Bill 140407 requiring public notification of the issuance of "by-right" zoning permits (Introduced by Councilmember Blackwell on May 8, 2014; Presented by Paula Brumbelow). Approved as amended

8) Center City Zoning Amendment and Remapping (Introduced by Councilmember Greenlee for Council President Clarke on May 15, 2014; Presented by Paula Brumbelow):
    a. Action Item: Zoning Bill 140439 amending Benjamin Franklin Parkway Area height restrictions and retail us regulations in the "/CTR" Center City Overlay. Approved
    b. Action Item: Zoning Bill 140442 remapping the area bounded by John F. Kennedy Boulevard, 23th Street, Cherry Street, and the Schuylkill River. Approved

9) Action Item: Zoning Bill 140436 remapping the area bounded by 45th, 50th, Market, and Spruce Streets (Introduced by Councilmember Blackwell on May 15, 2014; Presented by Andrew Meloney). Approved

10) Action Item: Zoning Bill 140437 remapping and revising the use and dimensional regulations in the area bounded by 36th, 37th, 38th, Warren, and Filbert Streets, and Powelton and Lancaster Avenues (Introduced by Councilmember Blackwell on May15, 2014; Presented by Martine Decamp). Approved w/condition of establishing and advisory board

11) Action Item: Zoning Bill 140447 remapping an area bounded by Frankford Creek, Kensington and Adams Avenues, Griscom and Wakeling Streets, and the Northeast Corridor Railroad Right-of-Way (Introduced by Councilmember Quiñones-Sánchez on May 15, 2014; Presented by Kathleen Lambert). Approved w/technical amendments to the Bill

12) Action Item: Zoning Bill No. 140444 remapping an area bounded by 2nd, 3rd, 5th, Spring Garden, and Brown Streets, and Girard Avenue (Introduced by Councilmember Greenlee for Council President Clarke on May 15, 2014; Presented by Ian Litwin). Approved

13) Action Item: Property Bill No. 140481 authorizing the City to convey 669 Hutchinson Street to PAID for further conveyance (Introduced by Councilmember Greenlee for Council President Clarke on May 22, 2014; Presented by Ian Litwin). Approved

14) Action Item: Property Bill 140450 authorizing the City to lease a portion of the East Park Canoe House to Temple University for 20 years with renewal options (Introduced by Councilmember Jones on May 15, 2014; Presented by Nicole Ozdemir). Approved

15) Action Item: Property Bill 140485 authorizing to accept and convey School District of Philadelphia property to PAID for further conveyance (Introduced by Councilmember Henon for Council President Clarke on May 22, 2014; Presented by Gary Jastrzab). Approved